

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Response to Bodorgan Marine Limited D6 Submission

Deadline: 7

Application Reference: EN010137

Document Reference: S_D7_14

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-JVW-10545

14 January 2025

F01



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	Submission at D7	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	14 Jan 2025

Prepared by:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

Prepared for:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Contents

	RESPONSE TO BODORGAN MARINE LIMITED D6 SUBMISSION	1
1	RESPONSE TO BODORGAN MARINE LIMITED D6 SUBMISSION	1
1.1	Introduction	1
2	RESPONSE TO BODORGAN MARINE LIMITED D6 SUBMISSION	2

Tables

Table 2.1:	REP6-140 Bodorgan Marine Limited.....	2
------------	---------------------------------------	---

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Glossary

Term	Meaning
Applicant	Mona Offshore Wind Limited.
Appropriate Assessment	A step-wise procedure undertaken in accordance with Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, to determine the implications of a plan or project on a European site in view of the site's conservation objectives, where the plan or project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in-combination with other plans or projects.
Bodelwyddan National Grid Substation	This is the Point of Interconnection (POI) selected by the National Grid for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Competent Authority	Regulation 6(1) defines competent authorities as "any Minister, government department, public or statutory undertaker, public body of any description or person holding a public office".
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for one or more Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Environmental Statement	The document presenting the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Evidence Plan Process	The Evidence Plan process is a mechanism to agree upfront what information the Applicant needs to supply to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) applications for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Expert Working Group (EWG)	Expert working groups set up with relevant stakeholders as part of the Evidence Plan process.
Inter-array cables	Cables which connect the wind turbines to each other and to the offshore substation platforms. Inter-array cables will carry the electrical current produced by the wind turbines to the offshore substation platforms.
Interconnector cables	Cables that may be required to interconnect the Offshore Substation Platforms in order to provide redundancy in the case of cable failure elsewhere.
Intertidal access areas	The area from Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) to Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) which will be used for access to the beach and construction related activities.
Intertidal area	The area between MHWS and MLWS.
Landfall	The area in which the offshore export cables make contact with land and the transitional area where the offshore cabling connects to the onshore cabling.
Local Authority	A body empowered by law to exercise various statutory functions for a particular area of the United Kingdom. This includes County Councils, District Councils and County Borough Councils.
Local Highway Authority	A body responsible for the public highways in a particular area of England and Wales, as defined in the Highways Act 1980.
Marine licence	The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 requires a marine licence to be obtained for licensable marine activities. Section 149A of the Planning Act 2008 allows an applicant for a DCO to apply for a 'deemed' marine licence as part of the DCO process. In addition,

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Term	Meaning
	licensable activities within 12nm of the Welsh coast require a separate marine licence from Natural Resource Wales (NRW).
Maximum Design Scenario (MDS)	The scenario within the design envelope with the potential to result in the greatest impact on a particular topic receptor, and therefore the one that should be assessed for that topic receptor.
Mona 400kV Grid Connection Cable Corridor	The corridor from the Mona onshore substation to the National Grid substation at Bodelwyddan.
Mona Array Area	The area within which the wind turbines, foundations, inter-array cables, interconnector cables, offshore export cables and offshore substation platforms (OSPs) forming part of the Mona Offshore Wind Project will be located.
Mona Array Scoping Boundary	The Preferred Bidding Area that the Applicant was awarded by The Crown Estate as part of Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4.
Mona Offshore Cable Corridor	The corridor located between the Mona Array Area and the landfall up to MHWS, in which the offshore export cables will be located.
Mona Offshore Cable Corridor and Access Areas	The corridor located between the Mona Array Area and the landfall up to MHWS, in which the offshore export cables will be located and in which the intertidal access areas are located.
Mona Offshore Transmission Infrastructure Scoping Search Area	The area that was presented in the Mona Scoping Report as the area encompassing and located between the Mona Potential Array Area and the landfall up to MHWS, in which the offshore export cables will be located.
Mona Offshore Wind Project	The Mona Offshore Wind Project is comprised of both the generation assets, offshore and onshore transmission assets, and associated activities.
Mona Offshore Wind Project Boundary	The area containing all aspects of the Mona Offshore Wind Project, both offshore and onshore.
Mona Offshore Wind Project PEIR	The Mona Offshore Wind Project Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) that was submitted to The Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) and NRW for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Mona Offshore Wind Project Scoping Report	The Mona Scoping Report that was submitted to The Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) and NRW for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Mona Onshore Cable Corridor	The corridor between MHWS at the landfall and the Mona onshore substation, in which the onshore export cables will be located.
Mona Onshore Development Area	The area in which the landfall, onshore cable corridor, onshore substation, mitigation areas, temporary construction facilities (such as access roads and construction compounds), and the connection to National Grid substation will be located
Mona Onshore Transmission Infrastructure Scoping Search Area	The area that was presented in the Mona Scoping Report as the area located between MHWS at the landfall and the onshore National Grid substation, in which the onshore export cables, onshore substation and other associated onshore transmission infrastructure will be located.
Mona PEIR Offshore Cable Corridor	The corridor presented at PEIR that was consulted on during statutory consultation and has subsequently been refined for the application for Development Consent. It is located between the Mona Array Area and the landfall up to MHWS, in which the offshore export cables and the offshore booster substation will be located.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Term	Meaning
Mona PEIR Offshore Wind Project Boundary	The area presented at PEIR containing all aspects of the Mona Offshore Wind Project, both offshore and onshore. This area was the boundary consulted on during statutory consultation and subsequently refined for the application for Development Consent.
Mona Potential Array Area	The area that was presented in the Mona Scoping Report and in the PEIR as the area within which the wind turbines, foundations, meteorological mast, inter-array cables, interconnector cables, offshore export cables and OSPs forming part of the Mona Offshore Wind Project were likely to be located. This area was the boundary consulted on during statutory consultation and subsequently refined for the application for Development Consent.
Mona Proposed Onshore Development Area	The area presented at PEIR in which the landfall, onshore cable corridor, onshore substation, mitigation areas, temporary construction facilities (such as access roads and construction compounds), and the connection to National Grid infrastructure will be located. This area was the boundary consulted on during statutory consultation and subsequently refined for the application for Development Consent.
Mona Scoping Report	The Mona Scoping Report that was submitted to The Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) and NRW for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
National Policy Statement (NPS)	The current national policy statements published by the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero in 2024.
Non-statutory consultee	Organisations that an applicant may choose to consult in relation to a project who are not designated in law but are likely to have an interest in the project.
Offshore Substation Platform (OSP)	The offshore substation platforms located within the Mona Array Area will transform the electricity generated by the wind turbines to a higher voltage allowing the power to be efficiently transmitted to shore.
Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4	The Crown Estate auction process which allocated developers preferred bidder status on areas of the seabed within Welsh and English waters and ends when the Agreements for Lease (AfLs) are signed.
Pre-construction site investigation surveys	Pre-construction geophysical and/or geotechnical surveys undertaken offshore and, or onshore to inform, amongst other things, the final design of the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Point of Interconnection	The point of connection at which a project is connected to the grid. For the Mona Offshore Wind Project, this is the Bodelwyddan National Grid Substation.
Relevant Local Planning Authority	The Relevant Local Planning Authority is the Local Authority in respect of an area within which a project is situated, as set out in Section 173 of the Planning Act 2008. Relevant Local Planning Authorities may have responsibility for discharging requirements and some functions pursuant to the DCO, once made.
the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	The decision maker with regards to the application for development consent for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.
Statutory consultee	Organisations that are required to be consulted by an applicant pursuant to the Planning Act 2008 in relation to an application for development consent. Not all consultees will be statutory consultees (see non-statutory consultee definition).
Wind turbines	The wind turbine generators, including the tower, nacelle and rotor.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Term	Meaning
The Planning Inspectorate	The agency responsible for operating the planning process for NSIPs.

Acronyms

Acronym	Description
AfL	Agreement for Lease
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
BNG	Biodiversity net gain
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EnBW	Energie Baden-Württemberg AG
EWG	Expert Working Group
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
IEF	Important Ecological Feature
IEMA	Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment
ISAA	Information to support the Appropriate Assessment
MDS	Maximum Design Scenario
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
NBB	Net Benefits for Biodiversity
NRW	Natural Resources Wales
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NTS	Non-Technical Summary
OSP	Offshore Substation Platform
PDE	Project Design Envelope
PEI	Preliminary Environmental Information
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
POI	Point of Interconnection
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
SPA	Special Protection Area
TCE	The Crown Estate
WTW	Wildlife Trust Wales
TWT	The Wildlife Trusts

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Units

Unit	Description
GW	Gigawatt
km	Kilometres
km ²	Kilometres squared
kV	Kilovolt
MW	Megawatt
nm	Nautical miles

1 Response to Bodorgan Marine Limited D6 Submission

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1.1 The Applicant has responded to Bodorgan Marine Limited's D6 submission below.

2 Response to Bodorgan Marine Limited D6 Submission

Table 2.1: REP6-140 Bodorgan Marine Limited

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.1	<p>3 Commentary on Applicant's D5 Key Submissions (amendments) Schedule of Changes in Revision F06 to Draft DCO (REP5-086)</p> <p>11 There are many minor and consequential changes to the draft DCO (Revisions F02, F03, F04, F05 and F06 are set out in this latest 75pp Schedule), but only those relevant to BML's interests are covered here.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges Bodorgan Marine Ltd's (BML) response.
REP6-140.2	<p>12 Although these changes do not require BML's comments the following omissions should be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no interpretation definition of 'aquaculture', commercial fisheries', 'co-existence' or 'co-location' or any combination thereof – a consequence of the absence of appropriate provision(s) within the draft DCO to facilitate the co-location of bivalve aquaculture; • There is no Requirement linking to or securing the Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule (MMS) or the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (OFLCP). Whilst the MMS is a Schedule 15 certified document, there is no opportunity for this to be changed or amended under Article 42 post-consent and whilst it is acknowledged that the OFLCP forms part of the Offshore Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), which is in turn linked to the deemed Marine Licence (dML), again, there is no specific Requirement in the draft DCO covering this and BML consider it should be addressed; • Schedule 15 sets out all documents to be certified and whilst the MMS (J10) and OFLCP (J13) are listed, however, there is no guarantee or commitment that these documents are secured by the draft DCO separately or as part of any Control Plan, except the ML. 	The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.3	<p>Deemed Marine License (dML) Principles (F04, F05) (REP5-023)</p> <p>13 The dML, undertaken by National Resources Wales (NRW), does commit to submitting a FLCP in accordance with the OFLCP prior to commencement, but there is no commitment for BML to be a consultee or and commitment to securing the OFLCP or any provision within it for aquaculture provision.</p>	<p>The NRW Marine Licencing Team (NRW-MLT) determine who it will consult with in discharging marine licence (ML) conditions. This applies to both the standalone NRW ML and the dML. For the dML, Requirement 18 specifies the consultees for the sign-off of the various pre-commencement plans. These consultees are regulatory bodies such as the advisory team within NRW, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), and other statutory authorities such as the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), rather than commercial organisations. Given that BML's proposal relates specifically to the Mona Array Area, it is the dML that is most relevant in this context.</p>
REP6-140.4	<p>Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule (F04, F05) (REP5-025)</p> <p>14 The minor changes do not require BML's comments, however, the following inadequate commitment at Ref. Nos. 62 – 78 and 105 – 109 should be noted.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.5	<p>15 The OFLCP is only secured through the dML, which is part of the offshore environmental management plan in Condition 18(1)(e)(v) of Schedule 14 of the draft DCO and is expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence. BML has no ability, except through this DCO process, to ensure that the OFLCP is adequate or covers any provision for aquaculture or commitment to be consulted through the dML process.</p>	<p>The OFLCP is indeed secured through the deemed Marine Licence (dML) as part of the Offshore Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) under Condition 18(1)(e)(v) of Schedule 14 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). It is anticipated that the OFLCP will also be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence.</p> <p>The OFLCP is primarily designed to address interactions with existing commercial fisheries and to mitigate potential impacts on the established commercial fishing activity undertaken in this area. Including reference to aquaculture provisions within the OFLCP at this stage would extend its intended scope and could risk diluting and undermining its current primary purpose.</p> <p>The Applicant remains open to engaging in “without prejudice” discussions with BML post-consent to explore potential opportunities for co-location, provided BML can supply more detailed information about their proposals. This would be expected to include a detailed technical feasibility study, a consenting strategy, information on the approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA), where required, and stakeholder engagement plans as well as confirmation of the securing of necessary seabed rights from The Crown Estate. At that time, if aquaculture activities are judged to be feasible, then wording could be added to a future version of the FLCP at an appropriate time.</p> <p>We trust this clarifies the Applicant's position regarding the scope and intent of the OFLCP.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

REP6-140.6

Statement of Commonality (F03) (REP5-048)

16 Currently, there is no Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with BML and no technical engagement to date. Consequently, there is no reference to BML within this document, which is considered a significant omission. As noted, BML has been engaged with this process since May 2024 and the Applicant has made no approach to BML to seek its agreement on issues pertaining to bivalve/mussel or wider aquaculture or to discuss future opportunities.

The Applicant wishes to clarify that BML's specific ambitions were first brought to its attention through BML's Deadline 5 submission (REP5-103). These plans were not communicated during the pre-application phase or through any subsequent engagement prior to Deadline 5. Following this, the Applicant met with BML on 19 December 2024, during which additional information about BML's intended proposals was presented.

As explained above BML did not provide any prior opportunity for collaboration or technical engagement on this matter during the pre-application phase or afterward. Consequently, the Applicant has not had the opportunity to undertake a detailed review or assessment of BML's proposals and, therefore, is unable to give further consideration to these proposals prior to consent.

Prior to the meeting between the Applicant and BML on 19 December 2024, The Applicant had made repeated efforts to engage with BML, but these attempts were not effectively reciprocated. Specifically:

- An initial meeting was arranged on 19 September 2024, attended by the Bodorgan Estate Manager. However, this representative was unfamiliar with the Mona Offshore Wind Project and BML's Relevant or Written Representation submissions and the Applicant agreed to re-schedule the meeting.
- The Applicant subsequently rescheduled the meeting for 10 October 2024. However, on the 9 October 2024 BML requested the meeting be re-scheduled.
- The Applicant re-scheduled the meeting for 15 October 2024. Again, this was cancelled the day before by BML on the 14 October 2024.
- Following these cancellations, the Applicant proposed alternative meeting dates. Specifically, the Applicant offered dates during the weeks commencing 4 November 2024 (from Tuesday 5 November 2024 onwards), Monday 11 November 2024, and Monday 18 November 2024. To facilitate scheduling, the Applicant also provided a spreadsheet indicating its availability during these weeks. Despite these efforts, BML did not respond.

The Applicant has provided detailed responses to the points raised by BML and has acted in good faith throughout the engagement process. The lack of further engagement opportunities with BML is due to their unresponsiveness, not any lack of willingness or effort on the Applicant's part.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
		<p>The Applicant remains open to engaging in “without prejudice” discussions with BML post-consent as set out above in our response to REP6-140.5</p> <p>We trust this provides clarification on the timeline and context of the Applicant's engagement with BML.</p>
REP6-140.7	<p>Applicant's Responses to ISH Action Points</p> <p>17 Again, there is no reference to BML or any responses relating to BML within all Action Points arising from ISH1 – ISH5. The Action Points (AP) from ISH6 have been published and assign two APs to the Applicant and Welsh Government respectively (AP5 and AP6) for responses at D6</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.8	<p>Response to NRW Submissions (ISH3 Post Hearing Submission and D4 Submission) (REP5-060 and REP5-061)</p> <p>18 The ISH3 Post Hearing Submission responses do not require BML's comments. However, BML notes in relation to the Responses to NRW's D4 Submission that there are no comments (particularly in Sections 2.1.3 or 2.1.8) from NRW or the Applicant on aquaculture or its co-location.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.9	<p>Applicant's Response to BML's ISH4 Post Hearing Submission (REP5-062)</p> <p>19 The Applicant's responses (primarily REP4-113.5 – REP4-113.20) relating to BML's submission relating to NPS and WNMP policies and in relation to the OFLCP are dealt with in Sections 4 and 7 below</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.10	<p>Applicant's D3 Response to ExQ1 1.5.1 'Scallop Mitigation Zone' (REP3-062)</p> <p>20 BML notes that this document excludes any reference to aquaculture or colocation and proposes just a scallop exclusion zone from any offshore wind turbines. Clearly, this does not represent co-existence or co-location, rather it excludes both, simply maintaining the status quo.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers BML to its response to REP5-103.20 in the BML Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ2) Submission (REP6-106), which provides a detailed explanation of why the Applicant strongly disagrees with the assertion that the Scallop Mitigation Zone (SMZ) does not constitute a form of co-existence or co-location.</p>

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.11	<p>4 Commentary on Key Policy Documents</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>21 As the ExA are aware, together with its partners, BML has ambitions to co-locate an offshore mussel farm on part of the sea bed and in the water column within the Order Limits of the Mona OWF, which would comprise a suitable environment for offshore aquaculture (though this has hitherto failed to be recognized by the Applicant). The potential for such an asset to be co-located within the Order Limits comprises a significant economic opportunity in terms of increased food production and jobs (which also has hitherto failed to be recognised by the Applicant) and accordingly the failure to do so would comprise a significant economic opportunity cost, i.e. loss. Furthermore, since Brexit aquaculture production has significantly fallen with less access to EU markets caused in part by inshore water quality not being adequate, whereas offshore water quality is significantly better. These ambitions and in particular the opportunity to co-locate an offshore aquaculture asset within the Order Limits, are supported by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS-EN1 Section 4.5 (in particular paragraphs 4.5.2, 4.5.3, 4.5.4, 4.5.8, 4.5.11) – further detail is provided below; • NPS-EN3 and in particular paragraphs 2.8.46–2.8.48 and 2.8.250–2.4.8.251 – further detail is provided below; and, • WNMP policies ECON_01, ECON_02, FIS_01a and FIS_01b. Noting that ECON_02 is highlighted in bold text because despite not having been subject to any questions in ExQ2, the issue of whether the Project complies with ECON_02 is a statutorily relevant consideration – further detail is provided below 	<p>As outlined in row REP6-140.6 above, the Applicant reiterates that BML's stated ambition to "<i>co-locate an offshore mussel farm on part of the sea bed and in the water column within the Order Limits of the Mona OWF</i>" was first brought to its attention through BML's Deadline 5 submission in response to ExAQ2 (REP5-103) and had not been communicated during the pre-application phase or any subsequent engagement prior to Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the economic opportunity cost mentioned by BML is not substantiated with sufficient data or detailed analysis of feasibility, operational requirements, or potential conflicts with other users, including fishing stakeholders. Moreover, the benefits of offshore aquaculture must be weighed against practical and technical challenges, as well as compatibility with existing fisheries within the Mona Array Area.</p> <p>Regarding the final point on NPS EN1, EN3, and the WNMP policies, the Applicant directs BML to row REP6-140.12 below for further details.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.12	<p>22 The Applicant's failure to make any provision for (or, indeed to provide any – let alone any adequate – explanation as to why) offshore aquaculture as part of the Project is not just a substantive failure mitigation (though it is that too); rather, it is a fundamental defect of the Project as a whole and means that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the context of S104(3) PA 2008 the Project does not comply with EN-1 and EN-3; and, • In any event (noting that WNMP is a document falling within S104(2)(aa) rather than S104(2)(a) PA 2008) in the context of S104(7) PA 2008, the Project's adverse impacts (namely, the failure to make a policy-compliant level of provision for offshore aquaculture) outweigh its benefits such as they are. 	<p>The Applicant refers BML to its responses to REP5-103.10 to REP5-103.18, provided in REP6-106, which detail the Applicant's full compliance with the relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs) EN-1 and EN-3, as well as the WNMP. These responses specifically address the consideration of offshore aquaculture within the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project, demonstrating that the Applicant has adhered to all applicable policy requirements and guidelines.</p>
REP6-140.13	<p>23 The failure to make any (let alone any adequate) provision for the co-location of offshore mussel farms in Welsh waters, as part of the Project, would be a missed opportunity of significant magnitude and should militate significantly against a grant of Development Consent.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised by BML in REP5-103.10 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.14	<p>National Policy Statements (NPS EN-1 and EN-3)</p> <p>24 EN-1 paragraphs 4.5.1-4.5.12 indicate that decision-makers will have regard to marine planning documents (including, in Wales, the WNMP) and will <i>'determine if and how proposals meet the high-level marine objectives, plan vision, and all relevant policies'</i> (emphasis added). In this context albeit that marine plans are documents within S104(2)(aa) PA 2008, rather than NPSs within S104(2)(a), it is clear from EN-1 that the Government expects compliance with marine planning documents, save to the extent that they conflict with an NPS (EN-1 paragraph 4.5.12). BML's submissions below with respect to ECON_01, ECON_02 and FIS_01 must be seen in this context.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.12 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.15	<p>25 It is notable that EN-1 itself (see paragraph 4.5.3) refers to the imperative to <i>'maximise co- location possibilities'</i>.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.13 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.16	EN-3 para. 2.4.48 requires Applicants to ' <i>work collaboratively with those other developers and sea users on <u>co-existence/co-location opportunities</u>, shared mitigation, compensation and monitoring where appropriate.</i> ' (underlining added). BML has consistently pointed out that the Applicant has entirely failed in this respect. At no point (whether during the formative stage of the DCO application or thereafter) has the Applicant sought to work collaboratively with the aquaculture community to identify opportunities for co-existence/co-location within Order Limits. This policy has been breached, therefore.	This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.14 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.
REP6-140.17	27 For the same reasons, EN-3 paragraph 2.8.250 has been breached. As to EN-3 paragraph 2.8.251, it clearly would be possible to 'enhance' the benefits (both in the medium, but particularly in the long term) to the aquaculture industry in North Wales. The failure to do so would be a significant missed opportunity and contrary to policy. Steps must be taken to rectify this matter.	This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.15 and REP5-103.16 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.
REP6-140.18	28 Comments on Applicant's Response dated 3 December 2024 (REP4-113) – the Applicant considers it has complied with both mitigation and engagement requirements, but did not seek at any point to engage with the bivalve/mussel aquaculture sector representatives and only dealt with overarching fishing industry representatives. It is accepted that BML did not respond to the DCO Statutory Consultation in June 2023, but began engagement during the Examination stage in May 2024 and yet has not received any direct engagement from the Applicant over these critical issues, beyond an initial meeting held the day before D6.	The Applicant notes that BML has raised points regarding engagement in row REP6-140.36 below and REP6-140.6 above and refers BML to those responses for further information.
REP6-140.19	29 BML does not accept that enhancement through provision for aquaculture is not within the phrase 'where reasonably practicable', which is amply demonstrated in Section 5 below as being entirely feasible and practicable. Such provision does not necessarily require overlapping of existing operations and BML entirely reject the Applicant's assertion that only scallop fishing interests are important and require equality of consideration.	For clarity, the Applicant notes that BML's query is in relation to the policy outlined in NPS EN03 paragraph 2.8.251. Whilst Section 5 of the BML response provides an overview of the potential feasibility of co-location, it does not " <i>amply demonstrate</i> " feasibility. In order to do this, a more detailed site-specific feasibility study would need to be produced by BML that fully considered a wide range of factors specific to the Mona Offshore Wind Project site (including the effects on the high-level of existing commercial fisheries activity). The Applicant would be happy to review such a feasibility study as/when produced by BML.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.20	<p>Welsh National Marine Plan (WNMP) (REP2-101)</p> <p>30 The Section entitled 'Sector Policy – Aquaculture' from paragraphs 280 – 288 sets out the policies relating to aquaculture and demonstrate that the Welsh Government are very supportive of its development and Figure 12 is relevant. Also, the Section entitled 'Sector Policy – Energy – Low Carbon from paragraphs 324 – 358 sets out policies that recognise and support the potential role of the marine environment. The most relevant policies though are set out below and are part of the General Policies about achieving a sustainable marine economy.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.21	<p>31 Policy ECON_01 Sustainable Economic Growth – 'Proposals for economically sustainable activities are encouraged, particularly where they contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the sustainable management of natural resources; • thereby supporting ecosystem resilience;</i> • <i>a more resilient economy; • employment opportunities particularly for coastal communities; 6</i> • <i>protecting and creating employment at all skill levels;</i> • <i>maintaining communities with a high-density of Welsh speakers; and/or,</i> • <i>tackling poverty by supporting deprived coastal communities.'</i> 	<p>The Applicant refers BML to its responses to REP5-103.17 to REP5-103.22, provided in REP6-106, which detail the Applicant's full compliance with policy ECON_01: Sustainable Economic Growth.</p>
REP6-140.22	<p>32 This places the concept of co-existence (and its subset, co-location) at the heart of the WNMP's core goal of sustainable economic development. Marine resources are finite and it is necessary to maximise opportunities for co-existence and co-location. It follows that opportunities that are not taken to do so cannot be regarded as sustainable economic development and accordingly breach ECON_01.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.17 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.23	<p>33 It must be noted that WNMP paragraph 98 itself draws a distinction between 'coexistence' and 'co-location', albeit that the latter is a subset of the former. BML's previous written representations have highlighted the distinction and have shown that the Applicant has failed to understand or apply it. It could not be clearer, however: 'Co- location is a subset of co-existence and is where multiple developments, activities or uses co-exist in the same place by sharing the same footprint or area.'</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.18 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.24	<p>34 It is this '<i>sharing of the same footprint or area</i>' that is critical to the notion of colocation. Co-location is where two mutually compatible uses of marine resource take place in the same spatial footprint at the same time. Co-existence is where two mutually incompatible uses of marine resource take place in the same spatial footprint, but at <i>different</i> times, so as to avoid the externalities of the mutual incompatibility.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.19 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details. However, for clarity, and noting that BML continue to incorrectly define co-existence, we include the exact wording on co-existence from Paragraph 98 (pg26) of the WNMP. We have highlighted the phrase "<i>and/or at the same time</i>" in order to correct BML's comment in REP6-140.24 that co-existence is based on "<i>two mutually incompatible uses of marine resource take place in the same spatial footprint, but at <u>different</u> times..</i>".</p> <p>(Para 98 – WNMP): "<i>Coexistence is where multiple developments, activities or uses can exist alongside or close to each other in the same place and/or at the same time. Coexistence is already common in the marine environment</i>".</p>
REP6-140.25	<p>35 For the avoidance of doubt, the Scallop Mitigation Zone is patently neither a form of co-existence nor co-location. Rather, it is the complete opposite. It is an area where the Applicant considers that co-existence is impossible and accordingly it proposes not to situate any turbines in that zone. It is an area, therefore, where albeit that the status quo will be preserved, no form of coexistence or co-location will exist. It is a division of a resource into two separate zones, each with its own use. There are of course good reasons for this: the scallop beds in this zone are significant economic goods in their own right, so turbines/cables cannot be situated on them. But it is wrong for the Applicant to point to the Scallop Mitigation Zone and claim that it meets the policy imperative for co-existence and co-location. It does not: rather, it avoids the need to develop forms of co-existence and co-location ab inito.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.20 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.26	<p>36 BML submits that it is proposing the <i>only</i> genuine form of co-location that is feasible and deliverable at an Offshore Wind Farm (OFW). The bivalve aquaculture assets will share the same sub-surface marine resource, in space and time, as the OFW generating infrastructure. It is well-documented that offshore aquaculture is mutually compatible with OFW energy generation and transmission infrastructure. Many OFWs in northern European waters (Germany, Holland etc.) incorporate co-located bivalve aquaculture as standard (refer to Section 5 below). United Kingdom OFW is a notable, and regrettable, exception to the rule, notwithstanding many years of policy support for colocation. This must change so that the marine resource can sustainably be used and shared.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.21 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.27	<p>37 The co-location of bivalve aquaculture as part of the Project would meet all of the policy objectives of ECON_01. Accordingly, the failure to seek to enable its colocation would breach the policy. The ExA must note that WNMP paragraph 101 (see below) <i>expressly</i> refers to situations where there 'could be' scope to co-locate bivalve aquaculture development. Here, such scope exists, though it has been ignored by the Applicant, and as such there has been a clear breach of policy. The Project cannot be supported, therefore.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.22 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.28	<p>38 Policy ECON 02 Co-existence – ‘Proposals should demonstrate how they have considered opportunities for coexistence with other compatible sectors in order to optimise the value and use of the marine area and marine natural resources.’</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.23 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.29	<p>39 This requires that ‘Proposals should demonstrate how they have considered opportunities for coexistence with other compatible sectors in order to optimise the value and use of the marine area and marine natural resources.’ Here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bivalve aquaculture is a compatible sector; • co-existence (and, in particular co-location) would optimise the value and use of the Welsh marine area and resource; and, • the Applicant has failed to consider this opportunity let alone make any adequate provision for it in the dDCO. <p>The policy has plainly and transparently been breached, therefore.</p>	

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.30	<p>40 It should be noted that in the context of S104(2)(aa) PA 2008, the extent to which the Project complies with ECON_02 is a statutorily relevant consideration, and not just an 'important and relevant consideration' within the meaning of S104(2)(d) PA 2008. BML notes that the ExA has omitted to ask the Applicant or the Welsh Ministers to advise whether the Project complies with WNMP Policy ECON_02. That said, an important part of the context for Policy ECON_02 is the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science's (CEFAS) Review of the potential for co-existence of different sectors in the Welsh Marine Plan Area (April 2020) ('the CEFAS Review') (REP2-101). That document certainly is an important and relevant consideration; yet it has been omitted from consideration by the Applicant and merits further consideration as part of the examination process (see below).</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.5 and REP5-103.6 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.31	<p>41 BML therefore strongly encourages the ExA to seek written clarification from the Applicant and from the Welsh Ministers as to the extent to which the Project complies with ECON_02, which BML contends it plainly does not, as it has made clear in previous representations. See, for example, page 6 of BML's Deadline 4 post-hearing submissions (REP4-113).</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.7 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.32	<p>42 FIS_01(a) and (b): Fisheries (supporting) – ‘FIS_01 a: Proposals that support and enhance sustainable fishing activities will be supported where they contribute to the objectives of this plan. Proposals should comply with the relevant general policies and sector safeguarding policies of this plan and any other relevant considerations.</p> <p>FIS_01 b: Relevant public authorities and the sector are encouraged, in liaison with other interested parties, to collaborate to understand opportunities to develop a strategic evidence base to improve understanding of opportunities for the sustainable development of fisheries in order to support the sustainable development of the fisheries sector through marine planning.’</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the response and fully understands the importance of policies FIS_01(a) and (b), which support sustainable fishing activities and encourage collaboration to enhance understanding and opportunities for the sustainable development of the fisheries sector.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.33	43 It should be noted that Policy FIS_01 has two parts: (a) and (b). In this case, both would be breached. As to FIS_01(a), bivalve aquaculture co-located with OFW infrastructure is a 'sustainable fishing activity' within the meaning and scope of the policy. The Project will neither support nor enhance it. On the contrary, it will squander this important opportunity to secure a symbiotic co-located asset.	This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.28 and REP5-103.29 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.
REP6-140.34	44 As to FIS_01(b), BML's previous written (and oral) representations have illustrated the Applicant's wholesale failure to engage with (let alone 'collaborate with') the North Wales aquaculture community (which comprises many 'interested parties' within the meaning of the policy) with a view to developing a strategic evidence base in respect of offshore bivalve aquaculture.	This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.30 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.
REP6-140.35	45 Comments on Applicant's Response dated 3 December 2024 (REP4-113) – it is noted that the Applicant recognises Policy ECON_02. However, it is clear that the Applicant has only made provision for scallop and some other commercial fishing interests, but not bivalve/mussel or wider aquaculture. The Applicant continually stresses co-existence but does not refer to co-location and furthermore continues to exclude the aquaculture sector unlike the experiences in other European countries (refer to Section 5 below). BML contends that aquaculture is a compatible industry with OFW projects and this has been demonstrated in an earlier trial in this area set out in more detail in Section 5 below	The Applicant does not disagree that aquaculture can be a compatible industry with OFW projects. However, as outlined above in row REP6-140.35, whilst Section 5 of the BML response provides an overview of the potential feasibility of co-location, it does not " <i>amply demonstrate</i> " feasibility. A detailed site-specific feasibility study would need to be produced by BML that fully considered a wide range of factors specific to the Mona Offshore Wind Project site (including the effects on the high-level of existing commercial fisheries activity). The Applicant would be happy to review such a feasibility study as/when produced by BML.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.36	<p>46 It is clear that over the past 8 months, the Applicant has sought to avoid both technical engagement with BML and to singularly not provide for the aquaculture sector at all within the DCO, despite policy requirements to the contrary. This is amply demonstrated in its lack of response beyond mere acknowledgement, to points raised by BML, notably REP4-113.8, REP4-113.9, REP4-113.11, REP4- 113.12, REP4-113.13, REP4-113.14, REP4-113.15 and REP4-113.17-18.</p>	<p>The Applicant strongly disagrees with the assertion that it has avoided engagement with BML. The Applicant has made multiple efforts to engage with BML, but these attempts were not reciprocated effectively. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An initial meeting was arranged on 19 September 2024, which was attended by the Bodorgan Estate Manager. However, the representative was not aware of the Mona Offshore Wind Project or familiar with BML's Relevant Representation or Written Representation submissions and the Applicant agreed to re-schedule the meeting. • The Applicant subsequently rescheduled the meeting for 10 October 2024. However, on the 9 October 2024 BML requested the meeting be re-scheduled. • The Applicant re-scheduled the meeting for 15 October 2024. Again, this was cancelled the day before by BML on the 14 October 2024. • After these cancellations, the Applicant reached out to BML to propose alternative meeting dates. Specifically, the Applicant offered dates during the weeks commencing 4 November 2024 (from Tuesday 5 November 2024 onwards), Monday 11 November 2024, and Monday 18 November 2024. To facilitate scheduling, the Applicant also provided a spreadsheet indicating its availability during these weeks. Despite these efforts, BML did not respond. <p>The Applicant has provided detailed responses to the points raised by BML and has acted in good faith throughout the engagement process. The lack of further engagement opportunities with BML is due to their unresponsiveness, not a lack of willingness or effort on the Applicant's part.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.37	<p>CEFAS – A review of the potential for co-existence of different sectors in the Welsh Marine Plan Area (PINS Ref. REP2-101)</p> <p>47 In April 2020 CEFAS produced a report specifically with a view to reviewing the evidence in respect of various forms of OFW co-existence. Section 3.2.12.1 of that report deals with bivalve aquaculture and offshore wind energy and states, after referring to a co-location trial in Welsh waters at the North Hoyle OFW that:</p> <p><i>‘This trial demonstrated that aquaculture activities could be carried out without a negative impact on wind farm operations. Further commercial-scale trials were recommended to both refine the technology to grow mussels offshore on fixed gear and assess environmental impacts and economic performance. Anticipated socio-economic benefits from co-locating aquaculture within OWFs include (Syvret et al., 2013):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Job creation and employment opportunities;</i> • <i>Potential for expanding seafood provision from UK waters;</i> • <i>More space left in the sea for other economic or recreational activities in the region; and,</i> • <i>Knowledge and experience acquired through the trial to mitigate impact on local fishing grounds.’</i> 	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.25 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.38	<p>48 The Report's conclusion on page 18 is, as follows: <i>‘The mussel aquaculture sector appears to have the greatest current potential to be combined with offshore wind arrays, and thus meeting economic, environmental and technical requirements.’</i></p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.26 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.39	<p>49 BML submits that the CEFAS Report is an important and relevant consideration and ought to have been regarded as such by the Applicant. It is also highly probative to the matters which go to Policy ECON_02. If the Applicant had read and considered the CEFAS Report during the preparation of the DCO application (which they did not, and that is agreed by them), it is inevitable that they would have promoted some form of bivalve aquaculture co-location (or at the very least readiness for such) as part of the Project.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.27 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.40	<p>50 Comments on Applicant's Response dated 3 December 2024 (REP4-113) – the CEFAS Report is not yet acknowledged in the Applicant's response to BML (REP4-113), which is surprising as it is part of the Examination Library since Deadline 2 on 27 August 2024 and formed part of BML's responses to ExQ2 (paragraphs 25 – 27) (REP5-103).</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the referenced CEFAS report has been thoroughly acknowledged and addressed on multiple occasions in response to BML's submissions. The Applicant refers BML to the following for more information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REP4-113.18 of the Applicant's response to BML's ISH4 Post Hearing Submission (REP5-062), to which the Applicant has responded and refers BML for further details. • REP1-062.7 of the Applicant's Response to Written Representations (REP2-078) • RR-006.1 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PDA-008), to which the Applicant has responded and refers BML for further details • REP5-103.25 to REP5-103.27 of REP5-103.
REP6-140.41	<p>FLOWW Best Practice Guidance for Offshore Renewables Developments: Recommendations for Fisheries Liaison</p> <p>51 It is understood that although this document is dated January 2014, it is not part of the Examination Library and it is considered worthy of inclusion and for the Applicant to demonstrate compliance – it is appended in Annex 2 below for completeness. Such compliance is particularly relevant in the light of BML's previous submissions on the lack of engagement both with BML and the bivalve/mussel aquaculture sector (as referred to in Pp 3 and 60 and Appendices 1 and 2).</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the importance of the FLOWW Best Practice Guidance for Offshore Renewables Developments: Recommendations for Fisheries Liaison and confirms that this document has been considered throughout the development phase of the Mona Offshore Wind Project. It has informed the preparation of relevant application documents, including Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries (APP-058) and the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (FLCP) (REP3-016).</p> <p>As previously stated in responses to BML, the Applicant has focused its engagement efforts on <u>existing</u> fisheries stakeholders active within the commercial fisheries study area. This is due these groups being the ones most likely to be affected by the proposed development.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.42	52 Unfortunately the FLOWW Key Contacts set out in Appendix 3 have not been recently updated (even CEFAS is not included), but the Applicant should have sought engagement with the bivalve/mussel aquaculture sector representatives; and, BML urged the Applicant to do this in its representations in October 2024 (refer to Section 8 below).	<p>The Applicant refers BML to its response in row REP6-140.36 above, which provides a detailed explanation of the Applicant's efforts to engage with BML.</p> <p>As outlined, the Applicant scheduled meetings with BML, including an initial meeting on 19 September 2024, which was attended by the Bodorgan Estate Manager. However, this individual was not familiar with the Mona Offshore Wind Project, BML's Relevant Representation or Written Representation submissions. Subsequently, the Applicant invited BML to further meetings on 10 October 2024 and 15 October 2024, both of which were cancelled on short notice by BML. Despite these cancellations, the Applicant reached out to BML to reschedule but did not receive a response.</p>
REP6-140.43	<p>5 Technical Commentary on Benefits, Support and Precedents for Bivalve Aquaculture Co-Location within Offshore Wind Farms – Context</p> <p>53 Multi-Use of the Marine Environment Context 53 The principles of multi-use within the marine environment emanate from the wider development of the concepts of marine planning (MP), or marine spatial planning (MSP) as it was more often described in the earlier stages of its development. Discussions and development of thought around MSP began in the latter part of the 1990's and early 2000's, largely occurring within the quasiformal setting of the United Nations educational, scientific and cultural organization (UNESCO). The UN had committed to roll out of the Millennium Development Goals, which has subsequently been superseded by the wider UN Sustainable Development Goals and recognised of how vital the global oceanic environment was in achieving progress toward these goals.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.
REP6-140.44	54 Much academic study was undertaken during this period, also the time when the first commercial developments of offshore renewable energy were starting to manifest. By the mid 2000's some researchers, in particular in the Alfred Wengener Institute in Germany recognised the possibilities for joint use of such areas and proposed some theoretical concepts	The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.45	<p>55 The UK Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 created a tiered approach to marine Planning in English, Welsh, Northern Irish and Scottish waters. The principle was driven by an understanding that the rapidly developing industrialization of parts of the UK marine zone was not adequately served through the previous consenting procedures, which were often piecemeal and disparate. Marine Planning was envisaged to be the solution to this, ensuring a more joined up mechanism that enabled the multi-dimension nature of the 10 marine zone to be effectively described within the planning process; thus ensuring the most effective and efficient use of the space. However, it has not necessarily worked out this way.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.46	<p>Co-Use/Co-Location – Wales</p> <p>56 OWF development off the North Wales coast began in mid 2000's with the development of North Hoyle and then Rhyl Flats OWF. The mussel cultivation sector in Bangor had/has a long-established relationship with the research community. Deepdock Ltd (DD) identified the potential for co-location and sought to trial this within the North Hoyle area. DD was and remains committed to the extensive seabed cultivation mussels – this is an approach where mussels (ideally juvenile or part grown) are transplanted from a source area to an on-growing location, i.e. an area which has suitable environmental conditions to engender that growth. The North Hoyle location met these site selection criteria (high primary productivity in the water column, correct substrate, etc.). DD reached out to the North Hoyle operator and developed a dialogue. Despite significant concerns by the OWF operator, codes of working practice were agreed between parties. One of the issues that facilitated this activity was that, given the type of cultivation practiced not requiring any insertion of markers into the fundus, no Crown estate sub lease was required, however, all other requisite permissions were acquired.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.47	<p>57 Whilst this pilot scale activity was successful at some level, no adverse interaction between the activities and the mussels grew; although then suffered unexplained mortality – the Crown Estate (TCE) posed a series of questions that the pilot activity had not sufficiently answered. They suggested a larger study of the potential that was not driven by a single company. As such the Shellfish Association of Great Britain (SAGB) obtained European Maritime fund funding to undertake a wider study on the principle.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.48	58 DD and Bangor University were granted a lease by TCE on a small experimental 6.5ha experimental area to trial sub surface long line technology, in part as recognition of future OWF were likely to occur in deeper waters, unsuitable for seabed cultivation. In the subsequent decade significant study has demonstrated the viability for offshore shellfish cultivation within the challenging environment of the Irish Sea, with its high current and tidal regimes and increasingly frequent extreme weather. It has been demonstrated that mussels will settle on the sub surface ropes, grow and produce a viable market attractive product over an accelerated time frame in comparison to seabed and long line systems elsewhere.	The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.
REP6-140.49	59 DD (and its successor company for offshore shellfish cultivation – Open Sea Aquaculture LLP (OSA) maintained an ongoing dialogue with the OWF sector developing off the North Wales coastline, with the operators of the Gwynt Y Mor OWF. Jointly DD and Gwynt Y Mor identified a 140 ha area – immediately adjacent to the southern edge of the windfarm area, where a scaled co-location could be undertaken. OSA is currently in process of acquiring marine licence for this and two other stand-alone areas.	The Applicant highlights here a clear inconsistency in BML's interpretation of co-location. In row REP6-140.24 above, BML correctly defines co-location as the shared use of the same marine space, as per paragraph 98 of the WNMP. However, the example provided, which describes mussel cultivation <u>adjacent</u> to the Gwynt y Môr Offshore Wind Farm (OWF), fails to meet this definition. Rather than illustrating shared use within the same footprint or marine space, the example describes activities occurring in a separate area immediately adjacent to an existing OWF.
REP6-140.50	60 Bangor University is currently part of the ULTFARMS project which is seeking to further progress the commercial uptake of multiuse of OWF areas and overcome some of the remaining barriers.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and looks forward to updates on the progress and outcomes of the ULTFARMS project, including practical solutions to the 'remaining barriers'.
REP6-140.51	Wider EU 61 Over the past 10-15 years there has been an ever increasing research base and real life application of co-location / co-use of shellfish and seaweed cultivation (collectively often referred to as 'Low trophic aquaculture') inside the frameworks of OWF areas in Belgium and Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Denmark nd	The Applicant acknowledges BML's response. However, as outlined in REP5-103.21 of REP5-103, while several initiatives in countries such as Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark have investigated the feasibility of co-location, these efforts are primarily focused on research and feasibility rather than fully operational commercial ventures. As such, the Applicant queries whether this is in fact an evolving field rather than established industry practice.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.52	62 The European Union has to date funded projects with a total cost of +/-€100 million that have sought to progress the concept of co-location into large scale reality. It has done this in part in recognition of the growth and current scale of the Offshore renewable sector and in particular the OW sector and also in part in recognition of how much more growth is required to meet the EU and UK targets to decarbonise their economies in order to meet net zero objectives.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.
REP6-140.53	63 However, the EU has also funded and plans to continue to fund further projects to better enable co-location between low trophic (and other) aquaculture in recognition of the role that food production systems also need to de carbonize to meet the same net Zero targets. In the UK for example it is envisaged that food production (largely considered on the basis of the agricultural food system) will contribute up to 25% of UK GHG emission by 2035. Low trophic filter feeders, such as mussels, oysters, scallops, in addition to producing high quality nutrient dense protein, high in content for essential minerals and vitamins, also has one of the lowest GHG profiles for any food type.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.
REP6-140.54	64 Furthermore, the same shellfish species are also acknowledged for the role that they play in natural remediation of the marine environment (a process known as bio-remediation) through the take up of excess nitrates and phosphorous that emanates from terrestrial food production	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's reference to the role of shellfish species in bio-remediation, particularly their ability to uptake excess nitrates and phosphorus from the marine environment.</p> <p>However, the Applicant notes that one of the potential advantages of further offshore or deeper water aquaculture sites is the presence of improved water quality (WQ) compared to nearshore environments. In such settings, the benefits of bio-remediation provided by shellfish may be significantly reduced, as the concentration of excess nutrients from terrestrial food production is typically much lower in these offshore areas.</p> <p>The Applicant highlights this distinction to underscore the importance of context when considering the potential environmental benefits of shellfish aquaculture in co-location scenarios. While bio-remediation is a valuable ecosystem service in nutrient-enriched environments, its relevance and impact may diminish in cleaner offshore waters (such as the Irish Sea location of the Mona Offshore Wind Project) where nutrient levels are already lower.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.55	65 Recent research undertaken in Lyme Bay, on the activities within the Offshore Shellfish Limited shellfish farm, conclusively described the positive biodiversity	The Applicant acknowledges the response.
REP6-140.56	What might Co-Location of Shellfish Cultivation and OWF look like? 66 Much of the technology currently being utilised (and increasingly rolled out) for sub surface offshore mussel cultivation outside the confines of OWF will of course be equally applicable for activities within OWF areas.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.
REP6-140.57	67 These consist of 250m long apparatus anchored into the seabed through the deployment of helical screw anchors. These anchors have very high strength to weight ratio and have been proven in the Welsh environment to provide a highly secure basis for the sub surface systems.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.
REP6-140.58	68 Within a 50-56ha area, 14 to 21 such systems would be deployed. Productivity from each system is envisaged to be comparable to that experienced in other sites off the Welsh coastline with between 5-10kg/m of growing medium production per year – with some 1,750m of medium deployed on each sub surface system. At current market value it is expected that each such block of 14 to 21 systems would generate between £4-500k pa with a working time frame for each system being 8-10 years.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.
REP6-140.59	69 It is clearly an essential element in co-use of space that the interests and needs of the OWF operator are fully accommodated within the siting of the shellfish 13 cultivation infrastructure. A recently produced graphic provides a very useful illustration of how this could be provided.	The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
--------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------

<p>REP6-140.60</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>70 Co-location between OWF and shellfish cultivation within the European marine area is happening and will happen with increasing frequency. It is implicit within EU and UK marine planning policy that the vast areas required for OWF development required to meet Net Zero/decarbonization commitments must not be seen as monopolistic use sites and should accommodate co-existence of other compatible activities. Low trophic shellfish cultivation and indeed all forms of aquaculture, are clearly activities that can be seen to satisfy the criteria to be considered compatible. They have a potentially significant to play in reducing the GHG loading from the current food system, all whilst naturally undertaking bio-remediation of the marine environment and having a potentially positive effect on biodiversity.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges and agrees with the principle that OWF developments should not be viewed as monopolistic use sites and should accommodate the co-existence of other compatible activities, as emphasised in EU and UK marine planning policies.</p> <p>In alignment with this principle, the Applicant has specifically designed the Mona Array Area to maximise opportunities for co-existence with established fishing activities. This approach reflects the Applicant's commitment to supporting multi-use practices within the marine environment.</p> <p>While the Applicant recognises the potential compatibility of low trophic shellfish cultivation and other forms of aquaculture within marine spaces, the Applicant reiterates that the feasibility of aquaculture co-location must be assessed on a site-specific basis. Key considerations include the presence of existing commercial fisheries activity, environmental and operational challenges associated with offshore environments, and lessons learned from previous trials, such as North Hoyle. These factors must be carefully evaluated to determine the practicality and environmental benefits of shellfish cultivation within the proposed OWF area.</p> <p>As outlined above in row REP6-140.35, whilst Section 5 of the BML response provides an overview of the potential feasibility of co-location, it does not "amply demonstrate" feasibility. A site-specific feasibility study would need to be produced by BML, fully considering a wide range of factors specific to the location of the Mona Offshore Wind Project (including the high level of existing commercial fisheries activity). The Applicant would be happy to review such a feasibility study if and when it is produced by BML.</p>
--------------------	---	--

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

REP6-140.61

6 BML's Marine Limited's 'Technical Ask'

71 BML has set out what it requires as a minimum in its responses to ExQ2 on 3 December 2024 and these are:

- The identification of not less than 5 blocks of marine space (surface and seabed) each block not being less than 50ha in area. This is relatively modest in size: the offshore mussel farm at Lyme Bay comprises 1,000 hectares, for comparison. Each block to be situated within a separate notional 1400m x 1400m 'grid square' marked off as a result of having a turbine in each notional 'corner', in which aquaculture can take place (Note: these blocks would not be situated in the Scallop Mitigation Zone). Note: the area between each array of four sited turbines is around 196 ha, such that the 50 ha area required for co-located bivalve aquaculture blocks is extremely modest in the context of the operational area of the project as a whole, which BML estimate to be 0.83% of the Order Area). It would not compromise (to any extent) the suitability of the intra-turbine corridors to be subject to navigation (note that the aquaculture blocks would fall to be marked on Admiralty charts and other GIS maps and software) and would be situated so far away from individual turbines that the Applicant's ability to operate, inspect, survey and maintain the turbines (and cables) would not be compromised, again to any extent at all, including in emergency scenarios. It is for this reason that it is clear that bivalve aquaculture has the ability for frictionless co-location with the Project (and why this is becoming standard practice for OFW farms in other European countries);
- The grant of a sub-lease (or alternatively a surrender and re-grant of part or the assignment of part of the Applicant's 'head lease') on appropriate terms to BML in respect of the 5 blocks, so as to enable the delivery and operation of the aquaculture asset;
- The grant of a deemed Marine License (dML) in respect of the use of the relevant areas for aquaculture (to the extent that this is possible). It is noted that the dML covers the Mona Array area that is more than 12 miles offshore, which is also within the area proposed for aquaculture. BML notes the contents of Schedule 14 of the draft DCO relating to the dML, which it proposes for amendment (as set out below in the second part of Section 7); and,
- The making of navigational arrangements and protocols (or at least the establishment of a framework for such arrangements and protocols to be developed in consultation with appropriate bodies) for the use of such area for that purpose (as covered in Section 7 below).

This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.36 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.62	<p>72 As to what the aquaculture asset 'looks' like, the ExA are invited to note the relevant in the main this comprises the tethering of a headline and droppers to the mooring cables and screw anchors affixed to the sea bed such that the droppers can be used for the cultivation of mussels. Floats on the surface tethered to the headline and droppers (i.e. the aquaculture unit) indicate the location and position of the headline and droppers at sea. The structure is designed to withstand tidal and wave energy. The cable is inspected and harvested by way of static line operations from a boat. The mussels on the droppers obtain the nutrition they require from the marine environment: no additional delivery of nutrition is required. An illustrative representation of one such unit (sectional detail) is shown below.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.37 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.63	<p>73 Clearly, the Applicant has not yet responded to this request, but BML would ask the ExA to consider requesting further information from the Applicant under the provision in Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules, 2010 that allows for a range of further information to be requested from the Applicant – as undertaken by the ExA on 17 August and 16 October 2024 in its letters respectively to the Applicant, NRW, the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Nature Scotland</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the response and remains open to reviewing any detailed technical feasibility study in the context of the Mona Offshore Wind Project that BML may produce.</p>
REP6-140.64	<p>74 Action Points AP5 and AP6 from ISH6 require responses from the Applicant and Welsh Government respectively and BML will review these responses and make its submission within 'Closing Statement' at Deadline 7 (D7) on 14 January 2025 (as instructed within Appendix F of the ExA's Rule 6 Letter dated 7 June 2024). BML notes that it was not part of the initial list of parties requiring Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), but believes it should be now (refer to Section 8 below)</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.65	<p>75 BML requests the ExA and Applicant to note that the proportion of the total Mona Array area required for aquaculture is extremely small. The Mona Array area is 300 km² (or 30,000ha) (refer to Section 1.2 of the Planning Statement (APP186)). The area required, as a minimum, by BML (as set out above) is 250ha (i.e. 5 x 50ha). This represents only 0.83% of the total Mona Array area and yet the benefits and minimal impact (as set out in Section 5 above) contributes to sustainable resource development nationally.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's estimate that the proposed aquaculture area represents only 0.83% of the total Mona Array area. However, as previously outlined, the feasibility of co-location must be assessed on a site-specific basis, considering existing commercial fisheries activity, environmental and operational challenges, and lessons from previous trials.</p> <p>A site-specific feasibility study would need to be produced by BML, fully considering a wide range of factors specific to the Mona Offshore Wind Project (including the high level of existing commercial fisheries activity). The Applicant would be happy to review such a feasibility study if and when it is produced by BML.</p>
REP6-140.66	<p>7 DCO Securing Mechanisms and 'Control Plan' Introduction</p> <p>76 As the ExA is aware there are limited securing mechanisms with any DCO that will ensure commitments are delivered. These are broadly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DCO Order itself, including Requirements (usually in Schedule 2); • Certified and Control documents as set out in a 'Control Plan', each of which is secured within the draft Order; and, • A separate Legal Agreement (often a Section 106 Agreement, but not relevant here). 	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.67	<p>77 The Control Plan is sometimes referred to as the 'Mitigation Route Map', but is the framework for mitigating, monitoring and controlling effects of the Project. It is usually made up of a series of 'control documents', which present the mitigation measures identified in the application that must be implemented during design, construction and operation to reduce the adverse effects of the Project. Each document within a Control Plan is secured within the draft DCO by means of an Article, a specific Requirement within Schedule 2 Requirements, Protective Provisions or the Deemed Marine Licence.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.68	<p>78 It is not clear to BML from investigations into the current DCO documentation submitted by the Applicant, which is set out in the Examination Library, if a wider Control Plan exists beyond that of the Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule (MMS) (APP-196, REP4-014 and REP5-025). However, even with the MMS it is not clear how it is secured by the DCO documentation, even though it is listed as a certified document in Schedule 15 of the draft DCO. Documents where such an explanation and confirmation would normally be found is the Application Guide (APP-005), which just lists all documents originally submitted. Furthermore, Schedule 15 of the draft DCO merely lists all documents to be certified under Article 42 of the PA2008 by the Secretary of State as true copies of those documents following the making of the Order.</p>	<p>The Applicant is not clear on the point seeking to be made in relation to a Control Plan. The commitments made by the Applicant in relation to mitigation and monitoring are clearly set out in the Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule (J10 F07), which itself includes clear reference to the location of the measure within the draft DCO, dML or relevant outline plan where applicable (that is itself secured through the DCO). In addition to this, the Applicant has prepared a Marine Licence Principles document that explains how it is anticipated that the relevant mitigation measures will be secured for the standalone transmission marine licence from NRW (REP5-022). This approach has been adopted across numerous DCO applications and has been accepted as appropriate by the key regulators, NRW, JNCC and the relevant local planning authorities. A Control Plan is not necessary and would merely duplicate the MMS.</p>
REP6-140.69	<p>79 It is acknowledged that the OFLCP is secured through the OEMP as part of the dML, which is part of the offshore environmental management plan in Condition 18(1)(e)(v) of Schedule 14 of the draft DCO and is expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence. However, BML has no current role in ensuring that the OFLCP is adequate or covers any provision for aquaculture or commitment to be consulted through the dML process</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that this was raised by BML in row REP6-140.5 above, to which the Applicant has responded and refers BML for further details.</p>
REP6-140.70	<p>80 Schedule 14 of the draft DCO (REP5-007) sets out the provisions relating to the dML in two parts (activities and conditions). It is clear that notification and consultation only occurs with the official licensing bodies list in Paragraph 1(4) and no other interests are represented, particularly the various commercial fishing interests to ensure the OFLCP is both monitored and complied with. The exception is notification of commencement as set out in the Marine Licence Principles Document (REP5-023).</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.71	<p>81 BML requests that the Applicant clarifies its full and coordinated Control Plan/Mitigation Route Map and how each element is secured separately, particularly the MMS (REP5-025) and the Biodiversity Benefits and Green Infrastructure Statement (APP-193). Also, it would be helpful to understand from the Applicant if the measures proposed below are agreed and delivered, how will BML be involved in the securing process.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers BML to its response to REP6-140.68 above.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.72	<p>Proposed DCO Securing Mechanisms for 'Technical Ask'</p> <p>82 BML believes that the measures set out in Section 6 above should be inserted into Section 1.3 on Mitigation and Co-Existence, within a new Sub-Section 1.3.7 (suggested header: Co-location with future aquaculture developments during the operational and maintenance phase) of the OFLCP. Moreover, that the OFLCP should have a more prospective outlook and confirm a commitment to assist and facilitate future opportunities for co-existence and co-location. These measures would also need to be transposed into an updated version of the Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule (MMS). Appropriate revisions to the Environmental Statement – Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial fisheries (APP-058) and the HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-034) should be also considered by the Applicant.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.38 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>
REP6-140.73	<p>83 Furthermore, consideration should be given to inclusion of the bivalve/mussel or wider aquaculture sector into the consultation bodies required by NRW during the dML process.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.74	<p>84 Without the iterations/updates of the control documents in this manner BML submits that the Project remains 'not consentable' in the context of S104(3) and S104(7) PA 2008.</p>	<p>This point has already been raised verbatim by BML in REP5-103.39 of REP6-106. The Applicant has responded to it previously and directs BML to that response for further details.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

REP6-140.75

85 In order to ensure compliance with policy, notably the co-existence and colocation imperatives which afford significant public benefits, it is BML's position that the Mona Offshore Wind Farm should not sterilise or prevent aquaculture operations from being undertaken within the Order Limits. The aquaculture industry should not be excluded from this area and it should be afforded future opportunities to operate in this area. Indeed, the wider and developing aquaculture community should be encouraged to take co-existence and colocation opportunities as they emerge and nothing in the draft DCO or the OFLCP should be constructed as preventing TCE/the Applicant from providing further areas and rights to other commercial aquaculture entities. BML's position, as it has explained in detail throughout the Examination, is that it considers it should be supported by the Applicant to secure the policy objectives as part of its proposal. Because the 5 marine blocks have been subject to the DCO Examination, BML would like the Applicant to secure for the benefit of BML, these 5 marine blocks, as a minimum (as described below in BML's proposed updated text to the OFLCP) within the Order Limits as part of its leasehold arrangements with the Crown Estate. BML has, in an effort to be helpful and acknowledging that the OFLCP is a 'live' document, sought to draft a new SubSection 1.3.7 within the OFLCP. This sets out its preferred wording below in bold italics (the numbering within this new section can be adjusted by the Applicant).

'Section 1.3.7 Co-location with future aquaculture developments during the operational and maintenance phase.'

The Applicant acknowledges that there are significant commercial, social and environmental benefits to be realised from the co-existence and colocation of the fishing and aquaculture industries within the Mona Offshore Wind Farm. This position is supported by the Welsh National Marine Plan (WNMP) and the Applicant will therefore co-operate with these industries to ensure their continued and future operations within and around the Mona Offshore Wind Farm area.

To demonstrate its commitment to co-existence with the aquaculture industry the Applicant will ensure that its leasehold arrangements with the Crown Estate (TCE) do not prohibit or sterilise its demised area from use by the aquaculture industry.

To support the policy objectives for co-existence and co-location set out in the WNMP, the Applicant will seek to identify and secure no less than 5 blocks of marine space (surface, airspace, water column and sea bed) (known as 'marine blocks') within the Mona Offshore Wind Farm for the benefit of Bodorgan Marine Limited, a Welsh aquaculture company. Each marine block will be no less than 50ha in area and each situated within a

The Applicant acknowledges BML's response. The Applicant does not believe that the operation of the Mona Offshore Wind Project would 'sterilise' or prevent future aquaculture operations from being undertaken within the Order Limits. The Agreement for Lease is a commercially sensitive document that the Applicant is not prepared to share even under a non-disclosure agreement.

As previously stated, it is the Applicants opinion that key first steps for BML are preparation of a feasibility study and engagement with The Crown Estate on the potential for leasing rights within the Mona Offshore Wind Project Order Limits. It is not a matter for the Applicant to promote leasing or sub-leasing or any arrangements with The Crown Estate on behalf or another entity's project.

The Applicant also notes reference to leasing arrangements by the Applicant for a 'peppercorn rent'. This is new information not previously included in the BML submission at Deadline 5 or earlier in the Examination and suggests that BML are not only seeking leasing rights to co-locate an aquaculture project within the Mona Offshore Wind Project Order Limits, but financial support for the proposal as well. The Applicant would note that it is for BML to discuss any leasing arrangements, including cost, directly with TCE.

The Applicant does not understand the BML reference to five aquaculture blocks having been subject to the DCO examination. What has been examined is an offshore wind farm proposal, the scope and details for which are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the Environmental Statement (APP-050).

As stated above, the Applicant does not believe that the operation of the Mona Offshore Wind Project would 'sterilise' or prevent future aquaculture operations from being undertaken within the Order Limits, and therefore, sees no reason to update the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (J13) with BMLs request.

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
	<p><i>separate notional 1400m x 1400m 'grid square' in which aquaculture can take place. These areas will not be located within the Scallop Mitigation Zone.</i></p> <p><i>18 In terms of securing the marine blocks on behalf of BML, the Applicant will ensure that an express right is obtained from TCE in favour of BML, which allows the Applicant to either:</i></p> <p><i>(i) sub-let up to 5 marine blocks (for a peppercorn rent) to BML for the purposes of aquaculture;</i></p> <p><i>(ii) surrender part of its leasehold area and re-grant up to 5 marine blocks (for a peppercorn rent) to BML for the purposes of aquaculture; or,</i></p> <p><i>(iii) assign that part of its leasehold area that comprises up to 5 marine blocks to BML (for a peppercorn rent) for the purposes of aquaculture.</i></p> <p><i>Moreover, as part of this commitment, the Applicant will also ensure that a framework for navigational arrangements and protocols is agreed with the aquaculture industry (including BML) to ensure the effective use and coexistence of the aquaculture industry with the Mona Offshore Wind Farm.'</i></p>	

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

<p>REP6-140.76</p>	<p>86 Further to the points made about the dML in Section 6 above, the proposed amended drafting for Schedule 14 of the draft DCO is set out in bold italics below, with instructions preceding each element of new drafting.</p> <p>Insert into paragraph 1(1) (Interpretation) of Part 1 of Schedule 14 (Marine Licence ORML2429G: Mona Offshore Wind Farm Generation Assets) the following new defined term:</p> <p><i>‘CEFAS’ means Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science’</i></p> <p>Insert a new paragraph 1(4)(g) (Interpretation) of Part 1 of Schedule 14 (Marine Licence ORML2429G: Mona Offshore Wind Farm Generation Assets), as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science</i> ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ <i>Tel: ██████████;’</i></p> <p>Insert reference to CEFAS in the list of bodies to be consulted (as appropriate) at Condition 18(1) of Part 2 of Schedule 14 (Marine Licence ORML2429G: Mona Offshore Wind Farm Generation Assets).</p> <p>Replace condition 18(e)(v) of Part 2 of Schedule 14 (Marine Licence ORML2429G: Mona Offshore Wind Farm Generation Assets) with:</p> <p><i>‘a fisheries liaison and coexistence plan in accordance with the outline fisheries liaison and coexistence plan to ensure that:</i></p> <p><i>(i) the fishing and aquaculture industries are notified of commencement of the authorised scheme pursuant to condition 13(8); and</i></p> <p><i>(ii) (ii) the interactions between the authorised scheme and the fishing and aquaculture industries as set out in the outline fisheries liaison and coexistence plan are adhered to.’</i></p> <p>Insert the following words at the end of condition 19(3) of Part 2 of Schedule 14 (Marine Licence ORML2429G: Mona Offshore Wind Farm Generation Assets):</p> <p><i>‘in consultation with those relevant bodies (as appropriate) listed in condition 18(1).’</i></p>	<p>The licencing authority determines who it consults with. It would not be appropriate for the Applicant to add the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS) into Part 1 of the deemed marine licence under Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO (C1 F08). The Applicant would note that CEFAS did not register for or take part in the examination and this addition has not been requested by any other Interested Party.</p> <p>The Applicant notes BML’s comment regarding reference to the fisheries liaison and co-existence plan under condition 18(1)(e)(v) of Schedule 14, Part 2, but sees no reason to revise the current drafting in the draft DCO (C1 F08).</p>
<p>REP6-140.77</p>	<p>87 In addition, BML proposes for the ExA to include an additional Requirement that requires the Applicant to submit a draft TCE lease to the SoS for approval and must not commence any part of the offshore works until that</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML’s response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
	<p>approval is given in writing. Furthermore, the SoS must only approve that lease if he is satisfied that it contains adequate provision for aquaculture to take place within the (offshore) Order Limits and must, in deciding whether to approve the lease, have regard to Section 1.3.7 of the Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (OFLCP), which should set out that what is needed is either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a provision in the lease to sublet to BML for the purposes of aquaculture in an area comprising as a minimum the 5 blocks (for a peppercorn); 2) a provision enabling BML to call on the applicant to surrender its rights in an area comprising as a minimum the 5 blocks and enabling TCE to grant a new lease in respect of those areas to BML for aquaculture; or, 3) a provision enabling BML to call for the applicant to assign that part of its leasehold interest comprising as a minimum the 5 blocks. <p><i>'26(1)- No offshore works or ancillary works may commence until a draft form of lease between the undertaker and the Crown Estate in respect of the Crown land within the Order limits has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with Natural Resources Wales and the Secretary of State must ensure that:</i></p> <p><i>(a) the proposed lease must not have the effect of preventing or restricting any form of aquaculture activity being brought forward within the Order Limits; and,</i></p> <p><i>(b) the proposed lease is in compliance with the provisions of the paragraphs within the new section 1.3.7 of the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan secured under condition 18 of the deemed marine licence'.</i></p>	
REP6-140.78	<p>8 Commentary on Technical Engagement between BML and the Applicant Previous Engagement between the Applicant and BML</p> <p>88 The context of recent engagement with the aquaculture sector is set out at the beginning of Section 5 above and precedes the latter stages of this DCO process.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.79	<p>89 It is acknowledged that the Applicant has responded in writing to previous BML written submissions, as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants Response to Relevant Representations (BML's RR is RR-006 dated 6 May 2024) (PDA-008), Section 2.6 dated 25 June 2024; • Applicants Response to Deadline 1 submissions (BML's D1 submission is REP1-062 dated 7 August 2024), which is REP2-078 dated 27 August 2024; and, 20 • Applicant's Response to BML's ISH4 Post Hearing Submission, which is REP5-062 dated 3 December 2024, Section 2 and Table 2.1 dated 3 December 2024. BML's ISH4 Post Hearing submission is REP4-113 dated 4 November 2024. • Attendance and participation at ISH6 on 10 December 2024. 	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.80	<p>90 However, there were no responses by the Applicant to the following two BML submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deadline 2 submission of the Welsh National Marine Plan (REP2-101) dated 27 August 2024; • BML's Responses to ExQ2, notably 2.5.1, 2.5.6 and 2.5.7 (REP5-103) (although this will not be responded to by the Applicant until D6). 	<p>The Applicant notes that the referenced CEFAS report (REP2-101) has been thoroughly acknowledged and addressed on multiple occasions in response to BML's submissions. The Applicant refers BML to the following for more information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REP4-113.18 of the Applicant's response to BML's ISH4 Post Hearing Submission (REP5-062), to which the Applicant has responded and refers BML for further details. • REP1-062.7 of the Applicant's Response to Written Representations (REP2-078) • RR-006.1 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PDA-008), to which the Applicant has responded and refers BML for further details • REP5-103.25 to REP5-103.27 of REP5-103. <p>The Applicant refers BML to its responses in the BML Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ2) Submission (REP6-106).</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.81	<p>91 The Applicant has largely dealt with what it terms as a regional Fishing Industry Representative (FIR) and the Scottish Fisherman's Federation (SFF) in its dealing regarding commercial fishing and any mitigation, with its mitigation proposals being claimed as the 'Scallop Mitigation Zone' (SMZ) and within its 'Biodiversity Benefit and Green Infrastructure Statement' (APP-193) (which is not referred to within the MMS and therefore its securing mechanism is not clear), particularly Section 3.6.3. BML considers that neither of these are mitigation and fall well short of its obligations and especially exclude the bivalve/mussel and wider aquaculture sector. The reason is simply that the commercial fisheries measures being promoted in the MMS only relate to 'business as usual' scallop dredging and do not relate to opportunities to co-locate offshore aquaculture assets within the Order Limits. There is no (and not just no adequate) mitigation in respect of proposed co-located offshore aquaculture assets and as such there is a plain breach of the relevant policy requirements as set out above in Section 4 above.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that BML has previously raised these points in their submission. The Applicant has already provided responses to these matters and refers to those earlier responses for further detail.</p>
REP6-140.82	<p>92 In reviewing the Applicant's Technical Engagement Plan (APP-041) and its Appendices (APP-042 – APP-044), it is clear that both BML and any aquaculture representatives are missing and have not been included. Furthermore, no engagement has taken place with such organisations, except two mentions of CEFAS. The Applicant, in its response to BML's REP1-062, stated in REP2-078 that there was no overlap with any existing aquaculture operations/resources and so nothing could benefit from co-location; and, further that the scale of nearby operations did not warrant support. Clearly, the Applicant's view is not in accordance with various policies that encourage support and enhancement for aquaculture operations (refer to Section 4 above)</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that BML has previously raised these points in their submission. The Applicant has already provided responses to these matters and refers to those earlier responses for further detail.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.83	<p>93 Mitigation Measures and Engagement – the proposed mitigation measures in respect of the operation and maintenance phase are set out in Section 1.3.6 of the OFLCP (APP-199 and REP3-017) only comprise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reservation of a 57km² (minimum) turbine-free Scallop Mitigation Zone ('SMZ') within the Mona Array Area (OFLCP paragraph 1.3.6.1); • Minimum infrastructure spacing within the Mona Array Area of 1,400m between and within rows (OFLCP paragraph 1.3.6.2); • Rough north to south turbine alignment (OFLCP paragraph 1.3.6.3); and, • Cable protection (OFLCP paragraph 1.3.6.4). <p>OFLCP paragraph 1.3.6.1 contends that the SMZ '<i>has been presented to and discussed with commercial fisheries stakeholders...</i>'. That contention is only half correct. The ExA should note that the Applicant has engaged extensively with the mobile gear (i.e. dredging) industry. It has, however, failed entirely to engage with BML and the aquaculture community based in North Wales and in particular those associated with the School of Ocean Sciences of Bangor University (which is the industry-leading source of research and technical development/innovation in this field) and Mr. James Wilson of DeepDock Ltd, who has carried out well documented (such as in the CEFAS Report, for example) successful trials of offshore bivalve aquaculture at OFWs in Welsh waters, and stands ready to support the delivery of an operational scheme at the Project. This lack of engagement occurred notwithstanding that, as set out above, the CEFAS Report indicates at p.18 that '<i>The mussel aquaculture sector appears to have the greatest current potential to be combined with offshore wind arrays, and thus meeting economic, environmental and technical requirements.</i>' (see Section 4 above).</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that BML has previously raised these points in their submission. The Applicant has already provided responses to these matters and refers to those earlier responses for further detail.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.84	<p>94 Consequently, it is notable that in all the BML written submissions and the Applicant's written responses no actual meeting has been requested by the Applicant or taken place with BML or other aquaculture representatives. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant prepared a draft presentation/agenda in October 2024 for a meeting that was never followed up by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The Applicant strongly refutes BML's assertion that no meetings have been requested or held with BML or other aquaculture representatives. As discussed above, the Applicant has actively sought to engage with BML on multiple occasions. Specifically, the Applicant arranged an initial meeting on 19 September 2024, which was attended by the Bodorgan Estate Manager. However, the representative present was unfamiliar with the Mona Offshore Wind Project and BML's Relevant or Written Representation submissions.</p> <p>Following this, the Applicant invited BML to two further meetings on 10 October 2024 and 15 October 2024, both of which were cancelled by BML on short notice. Despite these cancellations, the Applicant reached out to propose alternative dates, but no response was received from BML.</p> <p>This documented history of engagement contradicts BML's claim that the Applicant has never requested a meeting. Furthermore, following the initial unsuccessful meeting on 19 September 2024, where the Bodorgan Estate Manager attended but was unfamiliar with the Mona Offshore Wind Project or BML's submissions (as detailed in row REP6-140.36), the Applicant circulated a draft presentation and agenda at the Bodorgan Estate Manager's request. These were shared along with rescheduling invites for 10 October and 15 October 2024, meetings that BML ultimately did not attend. This highlights the Applicant's proactive approach to engagement, despite BML's lack of response or participation.</p> <p>As outlined above, the Applicant has made repeated efforts to meet with BML and remains open to further discussions post-consent, provided BML can supply the necessary detailed information about their proposals.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.85	<p>95 It is apparent from the main content of this draft agenda (which has not been submitted to the ExA by the Applicant, but is appended here for information in Annex 1) that the Applicant intended to stress that aquaculture operations are distant from the project site and located along the coast (which is a paradigm that BML and its partners wish to change) and that there is no overlap of operations with the application site. Furthermore, that aquaculture accounts for a minor amount of commercial fishing in the area and that scallop fisheries need protection. Within this draft agenda there appears to be no attempt to accede to any of BML or the aquaculture sector's requests/requirements/proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicant remains open to engaging in “without prejudice” discussions with BML post-consent as set out above in our response to REP6-140.5.</p>
REP6-140.86	<p>96 It should be noted that this draft agenda was circulated by the Applicant following ExA's confirmation of BML's attendance at Examination Hearings in October 2024.</p>	<p>The Applicant clarifies that the draft presentation and agenda were circulated following the initial failed meeting with BML, which was scheduled for 19 September 2024. At this meeting, the Bodorgan Estate Manager attended but was unfamiliar with the Mona Offshore Wind Project or BML's Relevant or Written Representation submissions (as detailed in row REP6-140.36 above). At the Bodorgan Estate Manager's request, the Applicant subsequently circulated the slide pack and agenda alongside the rescheduling invite for 10 October and 15 October 2024, meetings that BML ultimately did not attend.</p> <p>The purpose of the meeting was to address matters raised in BML's written representation submission, as the Applicant aimed to engage meaningfully on these issues. The agenda was not circulated due to BML's attendance at the Examination Hearings but to facilitate focused discussions on their submission and promote constructive dialogue.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.87	<p>97 The Applicant has now prepared a different agenda for the 19 December 2024 meeting, which BML has responded to in writing. The agenda prepared by the Applicant set out the following matters for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of the aquaculture apparatus • Potential physical interaction with our infrastructure (wind turbine generators / offshore substation platforms) • Discussions Bodorgan Marine have held with TCE or any programme for that • Marine Licence application programme <p>BML responded to the Applicant in writing by suggesting that the following matter be included: 'Next Steps – approach to D6 and DCO commitments in relation to the aquaculture sector'. However, the Applicant's response was not helpful by stating the following:</p> <p><i>'As per my previous email, our view of the purpose of this meeting is to better understand your proposal, the technology and how it would be operated. In our view it is imperative to understand these matters in the first instance in order to understand how our two operations could co-locate. We are also very keen to understand your development programme, engagement with The Crown Estate on leasing arrangements and the consenting process that you will have to undertake. We would therefore be very much in 'listening mode'. To manage your expectations, we see no requirement in policy for the inclusion of provisions in the DCO for co-location with a plan / project that we do (not, possibly a missing word here) have details for and for which there has been no meaningful engagement, in addition to the points that we made during the Mona Examination Issue Specific Hearing 6. As per my earlier email, we will not have legal representation present. Additionally, I would need to refer any discussion back to senior management'</i></p>	<p>The Applicant maintains that the agenda and email response for the 19 December 2024 meeting were both appropriate and justified, given the lack of prior meaningful engagement and the absence of sufficient detail regarding BML's proposals.</p> <p>The agenda prepared by the Applicant focused on key technical and operational considerations, including the design of aquaculture apparatus, potential physical interactions with OWF infrastructure, and BML's marine licensing programme. These topics were necessary to establish a foundational understanding of BML's proposals and initially assess their feasibility within the Mona Array Area.</p> <p>The Applicant's email response further clarified the purpose of the meeting, to gain a better understanding of BML's proposal, including its technology, operational requirements, and development timeline. The response emphasised that this information is essential before any discussions on next steps could take place. Without such details, it would not be possible to determine how the two operations could feasibly co-locate.</p> <p>The Applicant also reiterated its position that there is no policy requirement for DCO provisions to accommodate co-location with a plan or project that lacks substantive details or meaningful prior engagement. This point was already raised during Issue Specific Hearing 6 and remains valid.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the Applicant was not made aware that BML would submit correspondence from the Applicant into the Examination, the Applicant's approach reflected its willingness to listen and gather the necessary information to assess the potential for co-location, while managing expectations about the current stage of discussions and the absence of legal representation during the meeting.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Applicant's agenda and email response were proportionate and focused on establishing a clear framework for discussions, given the limited information provided by BML to date. The Applicant remains open to further engagement post-consent, provided BML can supply more detailed information about their proposals.</p>
REP6-140.88	<p>98 The outcomes from the meeting are set out below for the ExA's consideration.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.89	<p>Recent and Current Engagement between the Applicant and BML</p> <p>99 BML is keen to engage further with the Applicant and the Welsh Government with respect to the matters set out in Section 5, 6 and 7 above and respectfully requests that the ExA issue further written questions, seek further information and/or hold an ISH in respect of the issues raised herein, so that the detailed issues in respect of the imperative for the Project to accommodate the co-existence and co-location of sustainable industry can be fully explored and understood and appropriate arrangements for co-located bivalve aquaculture secured.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.90	<p>100 A meeting between the Applicant was finally held on Thursday, 19 December 2024. The meeting summary (below in bullets) and then action points/next steps are set out below; with correspondence exchanges prior to the meeting set out above. It should be noted that the meeting was both cordial and potentially positive, subject to the Applicant's senior management's decisions on matters discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant stressed that it is just listening but was not clear for what purpose, but stressed that they need to understand BML's proposals before going forward and required BML to engage with TCE; • The Applicant asks if current examples overseas of aquaculture are commercial and just pilots, which BML stated that they are often EU funded with a significant investment, but are in a different policy and legal framework; • BML set out its technical proposals for design and physical interaction, which are also set out in Sections 5 and 6 above for completeness, thereby demonstrating that such aquaculture provision has minimal impact on the operation or maintenance of this project. The Applicant stated that the 1,400 metres spacing of the turbines was to allow the potting and scallop fisherman access to their areas; • BML stressed that its proposals will help to decarbonise food production; • The Applicant stated that the TCE Lease Agreement would be for the production of wind energy and was unsure it a variation to its use could be undertaken; • BML explained that some discussions had taken place between Mr. Wilson and TCE, but nothing specific regarding this proposal had been discussed, but requested that the Applicant support such further discussions; 	<p>The meeting summary provided here by BML was not provided to the Applicant prior to this recent submission. Therefore, the Applicant did not have an opportunity to review them to ensure an accurate representation of discussions has been presented.</p> <p>To highlight this point, the Applicant does not recall stating that BML would be "required" to engage with TCE. Rather, and as stated previously, the Applicant has suggested that the question of leasing seabed rights for aquaculture should start with engagement between BML and The Crown Estate.</p> <p>Additionally, BML did not set out a technical proposal. Rather they presented an infographic (included in Section 6 of their submission at Deadline 6 (REP6-140)) and several and several 'concept' photos. Whilst the infographic (and concept photos) provide excellent visualisations of how an offshore wind farm and aquaculture project might co-locate, they do not present a technical proposal.</p> <p>As stated previously, the Applicant remains open to further engagement post-consent, provided BML can supply more detailed information about their proposals.</p> <p>Regarding the Applicant's engagement with the aquaculture sector to date, the Applicant confirms that the Mona Offshore Wind Project Fisheries Industry Representative (FIR) established, through early dialogue commencing in 2021 with a representative of the Menai West Fishery Order Applicants (who also owns a mussel aquaculture company and a mussel dredge vessel), that no aquaculture activities overlap with or are located in the vicinity of the Mona Offshore Wind Project. Furthermore, no concerns were raised by the aquaculture industry</p>

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant stated that they had submitted a dML (for outside the 12-mile limit) and a Marine Licence (ML) (for within the 12-mile limit); • BML stated that they wanted a positive involvement in the dML and in Schedule 14 of the draft Order and especially additional drafting within the OFLCP to prevent sterilisation of 300km² of the Order Limits for any aquaculture development and requested the Applicant's support and active involvement • BML requested the Applicant provide further details of their engagement with the aquaculture sector, beyond the broad statements in the Technical Engagement Plan and its Appendices (APP-041 – APP-044) • BML outlined its proposed additional drafting of the OFLCP, Schedule 14 and a new Requirement (which is set out in detail in Section 8 above); 	<p>regarding the proposal (as outlined in the Applicant's response to BML's Deadline 4 submissions (paragraph REP4-113.5 of REP5-062)).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that this particular representative of the Menai West Fishery Order Applicants, who is also an active member of the Welsh Fisherman's Association (WFA), North West Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (IFCA) and the Menai Strait Fishery Order Management Association, has been actively engaged as a commercial fisheries stakeholder throughout the Mona Offshore Wind Project since 2021. The representative has been included on the Mona Offshore Wind Project's stakeholder distribution list and has received all relevant project-related information, including notices to mariners and invitations to stakeholder meetings</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the representative of the Menai West Fishery Order Applicants attended a meeting on 25 November 2022 with Conwy commercial fishermen but joined the Teams meeting late and was subsequently not included as an attendee in the Minutes of Meeting (MoM) (see minutes in Appendix H15.1 of Technical Engagement Plan Appendices (APP-043)). The representative has been invited to all other meetings but did not attend, reflecting the apparent lack of concern from the aquaculture sector regarding the Mona Offshore Wind Project. This engagement history underscores the conclusion that the Applicant had drawn that the aquaculture industry does not perceive the project as presenting any significant issues or concerns.</p> <p>The Applicant highlights that as part of the Mona Offshore Wind Project's engagement programme initiated in 2021, consultations were also conducted with the Welsh Government to incorporate relevant stakeholder input and ensure thorough consideration of all key issues. These consultations included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29 March 2022: Prior to the statutory consultation on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), a meeting was held with Welsh Government specifically in relation to commercial fisheries matters. Attendees included the head of the shore-based enforcement team, a marine enforcement officer, and a member of the science/enforcement team (see minutes in Appendix H9.1 of Technical Engagement Plan Appendices (APP-043)). The minutes note an action for the Welsh Government attendees to "review the (consultee) list and

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
		<p>advise if any organisations/groups are missing,” and no such suggestions were made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 November 2022: Welsh Government Marine and Fisheries were invited to attend a post-scoping meeting with Conwy fishermen (H.15.1 of APP-042). • October to November 2022 and March to April 2023: Welsh Government Marine and Fisheries and Welsh Government Marine Enforcement Officers were subsequently included in the statutory consultation on the PEIR. <p>This engagement demonstrates the Applicant's proactive efforts to ensure robust stakeholder involvement, which did not highlight any concerns from the aquaculture sector regarding the proposal or the potential for co-location of aquaculture within the Mona Array Area.</p>
<p>REP6-140.91</p>	<p>101 The Action Points/Next Steps from the meeting were, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant to check if TCE can be varied to include provision for aquaculture; • Applicant to check if the TCE lease can be shared with BML, subject to a signed NDA; • Applicant to check if it can help facilitate changes to the DML to assist BML; • Both parties agreed to shared D6 submissions (in advance of their upload to the PINS Examination Library) – BML will share its D6 submission and the Applicant will share its responses to REP5-103 and to the ExA’s Action Point 5 from ISH6; and, • Applicant will check if a further meeting to discuss all these matters following D6 and before D7 was supported by the Applicant’s senior management and then can be diarised. 	<p>The action points/next steps provided here by BML were not provided to the Applicant prior to this recent submission. Therefore, the Applicant has not had a chance to review them to ensure an accurate representation of the actions recorded.</p> <p>Action 1 and 2: The Applicant recorded the first two actions as a single action where BML asked whether the Applicant would agree to share The Crown Estate agreement for lease, under a non-disclosure agreement (NDA), as BML explained they were keen to determine whether the lease can be varied to include provision for aquaculture. As stated above in response to REP6-140.75, the Agreement for Lease is a commercially sensitive document that the Applicant is not prepared to share with BML even under an NDA.</p> <p>Action 3: As set out in the Applicant response to REP6-140.76 above, we see no reason to further revise the deemed marine licence included under schedule 14 of the draft DCO (C1 F08).</p> <p>Action 4: No longer relevant.</p> <p>Action 5: With the impact of the holiday period and the considerable number of activities required to complete for Deadline 7, the Applicant did not have the capacity for a further meeting prior to the end of the Examination.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.92	<p>Recommendations</p> <p>102 BML stressed that the requested support and provision for aquaculture within the DCO be seen by the Applicant as a very positive proposal and one win which the Applicant could be considered a 'Pathfinder' for UK practice to then be emulated on other projects. The Applicant offered no reaction to this idea.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>
REP6-140.93	<p>103 During the meeting BML pointed out that NGET had just requested an additional Hearing to discuss specific matters to their interests BML then suggested that given their previous submissions, the content of this joint discussion and their forthcoming D6 submission that it would be appropriate to hold a Hearing to specifically discuss all these matters related to aquaculture and that if the ExA grant this additional Hearing to NGET that they would also grant a 'Part 2' related to these aquaculture matters. The Applicant offered no comments</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges BML's response.</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate Ref. No.	Written Submission Comment	Applicant's response
REP6-140.94	<p>9 Final Conclusions</p> <p>104 In consideration of all the information and commentary above, it is considered helpful here to distil, summarise and set out the 5 main principles that either require the Applicant's response or further action from the ExA. These are considered to be the following:</p> <p>1 Policy Compliance – given the Applicant's views on policy compliance (set out in paragraph 97 above and BML's views in Section 4 above), there is clear disagreement that requires resolution.</p> <p>2 Provision for Aquaculture within the DCO – the BML recommendations for straightforward additional drafting within the OFLCP, Schedule 14 and a new Requirement require positive consideration. The consequence of this not being delivered is the sterilisation of 300km² for this project alone, preventing the valuable aquaculture sector from developing offshore.</p> <p>3 Acknowledgement and Support by the Applicant of the 'Technical Ask' from BML – this is set out clearly and in detail in Sections 5 and 6 above, but it requires the Applicant's written support and further actions as set out in Sections 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>4 Further Technical Engagement from the Applicant – the lack of real technical engagement by the Applicant with the aquaculture sector is evident. However, now technical discussions have commenced they should continue during the Examination to resolve outstanding issue.</p> <p>5 Additional Hearing or part-Hearing between D6 and D7 to discuss aquaculture issues – there has been limited consideration of co-location for aquaculture during the Examination, with the exception of ISH6. As recommended above a further Hearing or part-Hearing is requested and warranted given the content of this D6 submission.</p>	<p>The Applicant thanks BML for their continued engagement and detailed submission. All concluding points raised by BML have been addressed above.</p>