

15th January 2025

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd

Via email only: monaoffshorewindproject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

**MONA OFF SHORE WIND FARM G LLOYD EVANS & SONS, BRYN HEN,
GROESFFORDD MARLI, LL22 9ED
SUBMISSION ON OUTSTANDING ISSUES
REGISTRATION ID: 20048549**

Following on from our written submission of 6th December, the Compulsory acquisition hearing number two (CAH2) on 11th December, NFU CAH2 and written submissions and Applicants responses of 20th December, please see further comments.

- We are disappointed that the Applicants have not agreed to our request for a meeting. Therefore, there has been very limited progress since the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing No 2.
- Throughout this process, we have attempted to work with the Applicants to explain the potential catastrophic impact the scheme will have on our clients, and this included the appointment of an independent expert. Unfortunately, we still have reservations as to the Applicants grasp and understanding of our clients' business and day to day farming operations.
- The Applicant, in their response (REP6-125) has listed the 11 reasons why we consider the 450m continuous length is critical. However, they only consider points 4 & 5 to be relevant. We do not agree with this and consider all the points are relevant and valid and, by undergrounding of 450m in one continuous length, this will aid and assist with all these points and ultimately, cause the least disruption to our clients' business.
- For clarity, some of the Applicants comments on these points are incorrect. For example, we have never stated that reducing the trenched area would prevent the forced sale of cows. Whichever option is used, our clients will be required to sell cows, but our preferred option would significantly reduce the number of cows that have to be sold. Likewise, what evidence is there to show that, by using trenchless techniques for 650m over a 950m stretch, the overall grazing platform land take would be less than a single 450m length (of the 650m commitment), when the detailed design has not been completed
- It is our understanding that a degree of reasonableness should be applied to these negotiations, which we have tried to do throughout. We have confirmed that if the Applicant committed to using trenchless techniques on a continuous 450m length out of the total length of 650m and there were some "exceptional engineering circumstances" as to why they couldn't drill, then we would work with them and accept this would be a valid reason to not undertake the 450m length in one go.
- We have not been provided with any satisfactory reasons why the 450m length cannot be agreed, given that longer lengths of drilling have been committed to elsewhere.
- We, therefore, fail to see a valid reason why this will not be agreed upon, with the belief it is solely down to financial implications. We do not believe this is acceptable.

- In conclusion, we need a commitment in writing to include within the 650m, this specific single 450m length, in both the Heads of Terms and DCO documents, to also include wording, excepting if there is good engineering reason as to why an area could not be direct drilled, that G Lloyd Evans and Sons would be flexible and work with the project and they have already agreed to this in the hearing
- Without a written commitment, compelling reasons not to drill this specific single length section, a failure to grasp and understand the impact on the business, our objection remains, and a Development Consent Order should not be granted.

Yours faithfully

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