



# **Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm**

## **Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations**

### **Deadline 1**

**Date: 24 October 2022**

**Revision: A**

Document Reference: 1.1

PINS Reference: N/A



REVISION	DATE	STATUS/ REASON FOR ISSUE	AUTHOR:	CHECKED BY:	APPROVED BY:
A	October 2022	Deadline 1	GoBe Consultants	RWE	RWE

[www.awelymor.cymru](http://www.awelymor.cymru)

RWE Renewables UK Swindon Limited

Windmill Hill Business Park

Whitehill Way

Swindon

Wiltshire SN5 6PB

T +44 (0)8456 720 090

[www.rwe.com](http://www.rwe.com)

Registered office:

RWE Renewables UK Swindon Limited

Windmill Hill Business Park

Whitehill Way

Swindon

# Contents

1	Introduction.....	6
2	Applicant's response to Relevant Representations.....	8
2.1	RR-001 – Denbighshire County Council .....	8
2.2	RR-002 – Conwy County Borough Council .....	9
2.3	RR-003 – Flintshire County Council .....	15
2.4	RR-005 – Awdurdod Cynllunio Lleol Cyngor Gwynedd (Gwynedd Council Local Planning Authority) .....	16
2.5	RR-006 – Snowdonia National Park.....	17
2.6	RR-007 – Llandudno Town Council .....	20
2.7	RR-008 – Betws yn Rhos and Llanellian yn Rhos Community Council ...	21
2.8	RR-009 – Llanddulas and Rhyd Y Foel Community Council .....	22
2.9	RR-010 – Trinity House.....	23
2.10	RR-011 – Maritime and Coastguard Agency .....	24
2.11	RR-012 – Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) .....	25
2.12	RR-014 – National Grid .....	26
2.13	RR-016 – The Crown Estate .....	28
2.14	RR-017 – Diamond Transmission Corporation .....	29
2.15	RR-018 – EirGrid.....	30
2.16	RR-019 – DLA Piper on Behalf of North Hoyle Wind Farm Limited .....	31
2.17	RR-020 – DLA Piper on behalf of Rhyl Flats Wind Farm limited .....	33
2.18	RR-021 – Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service .....	35
2.19	RR-022 – North Wales Wildlife Trust (Landscape) .....	36
2.20	RR-023 – North Wales Wildlife Trust (Marine) .....	37
2.21	RR-025 – National Air Traffic Services Ltd .....	38
2.22	RR-026 – UK Chamber of Shipping.....	39
2.23	RR-027 – Department of Infrastructure, Isle of Man Government on behalf of Mrs Emily Curphey, Chair, Territorial Sea Committee .....	40
2.24	RR-028 – Cadw – Welsh Government .....	42

2.25	RR-029 – National Trust .....	45
2.26	RR-030 – Memoria Ltd.....	49
2.27	RR-031 – Genesis Town Planning on Behalf of Memoria Ltd .....	50
2.28	RR-032 – Captain Haddock's Seafood .....	54
2.29	RR-033 – Manx Fish Producers Organisation.....	55
2.30	RR-034 – Envirowatch.EU .....	57
2.31	RR-035 – Glyndwr University on Behalf of Glyndwr Innovations Limited 58	
2.32	RR-036 – Sustainable Cymru .....	60
2.33	RR-037 – Wilson Fearnall on Behalf of GBL and IM Kerfoot Discretionary Trust 63	
2.34	RR-038 – DMPC on Behalf of Mr JB & Mrs E Evans.....	67
2.35	RR-039 – DMPC on Behalf of Mr HG & Mrs ME Hughes .....	68
2.36	RR-040 – DMPC on Behalf of The Estate of the Late Mr Wynford Davies 69	
2.37	RR-041 – DMPC on Behalf of Mr AEM Owen .....	70
2.38	RR-042 – Rostons on Behalf of Mr Ivor Beech .....	71
2.39	RR-043 – Rostons on Behalf of Mr Hugh Wynne-Davies .....	74
2.40	RR-044 – Rostons on Behalf of The Executor of the Estate of the Late George Edward Brookes .....	76
2.41	RR-045 – Rostons on Behalf of Kelly Proffitt .....	77
2.42	RR-046 – Rostons on Behalf of Toni Mayne .....	78
2.43	RR-047 – Rostons on Behalf of Helen Owen Proffitt .....	79
2.44	RR-048 – Rostons on Behalf of Richard David Proffitt .....	82
2.45	RR-049 – Rostons on Behalf of Rachel Georgina Hughes .....	83
2.46	RR-050 – Rostons on Behalf of Sandra Archdale .....	84
2.47	RR-051 – Rostons on Behalf of Janet Johnson.....	85
2.48	RR-052 – Ray Knight .....	86
2.49	RR-053 – Ros Griffiths-Williams .....	87
2.50	RR-054 – Martin Griffiths.....	88

2.51	RR-055 – Martyn Hussey .....	90
2.52	RR-056 – Chris Baines .....	91
2.53	RR-057 – Jodi Cook .....	92
2.54	RR-058 – William Beament .....	93
2.55	RR-059 – Jonathan F Dean .....	95
2.56	RR-060 – Carl Davies .....	96
2.57	AS-036 – Janet Finch Saunders MS .....	97
2.58	AS-038 – Network Rail .....	102
3	Appendix A – Applicant's response to Relevant Representations – RR-015 – Natural Resources Wales (NRW) .....	105
4	Appendix B – Applicant's response to Relevant Representations – RR-004 – Isle of Anglesey County Council (IACC) .....	132
5	Appendix C – Applicant's response to Relevant Representations – RR-013 – SP Energy Networks.....	138
6	Appendix D – Applicant's response to Relevant Representations – RR-024 – Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) .....	143
7	References .....	148

# 1 Introduction

- 1 Following closure of the statutory consultation period under Section 56 of the Planning Act 2008 for the Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm ('AyM'), Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Ltd ('the Applicant') has taken the opportunity to review each of the Relevant Representations (RRs) received from stakeholders who registered as Interested Parties in the examination. Details of the Applicant's response to each of those RRs received are set out in the subsequent sections of this document and its appendices.
- 2 For ease of referencing and to facilitate future cross-referencing, the Applicant has included references for the RRs:
  - Where RRs were broken down into numbered paragraphs or sections by the respondent, the Applicant has retained the existing references (e.g. paragraph 2.2.1 from the Natural Resources Wales (NRW) RR becomes RR-015-2.2.1);
  - Where these were not available, the Applicant has created a reference for each response by itemising the RR into paragraphs and giving these unique identifiers (e.g. RR-028-1); and
  - Where a breakdown of the RR into paragraphs was not necessary (e.g. in the case of short, single paragraph RRs, the RRs are simply referred to by their RR number (e.g. RR-001).
- 3 A total of 60 RRs were made during the representation period:
  - Six RRs from Local Planning Authorities (LPAs);
  - Three RRs from town/community councils;
  - 11 RRs from other statutory consultees;
  - 9 RRs from non-statutory consultees; and
  - 31 RRs from Members of the Public (MoP) and businesses.
- 4 Two additional RRs were made after the close of the representation period that were accepted as Additional Submissions at the discretion of PINS. The Applicant's responses to this submission is considered alongside the RRs in Section 2:
  - Janet Finch-Saunders MS (AS-036); and

- Network Rail (AS-038).
- 5 PINS received three responses from stakeholders confirming that they did not wish to register as Interested Parties (IPs) in the examination:
- Public Health Wales (PHW) (AS-034);
  - The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) (AS-035); and
  - Natural England (AS-037).
- 6 Where longer RRs have been made that cover multiple topics, the Applicant's response has been provided in the supporting appendices to this document as follows:
- Appendix A: RR-015 – Natural Resources Wales (NRW) (Section 3;
  - Appendix B: RR-004 – Isle of Anglesey County Council (Section 4);
  - Appendix C: RR-013 – SP Energy Networks (Section 5); and
  - Appendix D: RR-024 – Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) (Section 6).

# 2 Applicant's response to Relevant Representations

## 2.1 RR-001 – Denbighshire County Council

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-001	"Denbighshire CC as host authority for the onshore works (landfall, cable route and onshore substation) is currently reviewing the extensive application documents and coordinating an internal consultation with relevant technical officers so it is too premature to summarise the nature of the Council's representations at this time. However, for a reference, the Council's formal response to the developer's Pre-Application Consultation concentrated on the impact of the onshore construction works, in particular at the landfall and the interaction with coastal defences and the Rhyl golf course; and the operational impact associated with the onshore substation in terms of impact on visual amenity & landscape character (including cumulative effects) and setting of heritage assets."	<p>The Applicant has had regard to the comments received from Denbighshire Country Council (DCC) in their Section 42 consultation response, the detail of which can be found in the Consultation Report (APP-024).</p> <p>Specifically in relation to those matters raised in the Relevant Representation made by DCC, the Applicant can confirm the landfall has been refined to remove above ground impacts on the Rhyl Golf Club. The Applicant is liaising with the Central Prestatyn Coastal Defence Scheme, is confident that both schemes can co-exist and, will keep the ExA informed as discussions progress. The Applicant has included an alternative beach temporary construction compound location in its Development Consent Order (DCO) application to ensure that, should the two projects' construction timetables overlap, both can be delivered concurrently.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 2, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (AS-029) considers the potential for landscape and visual impacts (including cumulative effects) and Volume 3, Chapter 8, Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069) considers indirect effects on heritage assets. These chapters also set out the responses to DCC's pre-application comments.</p>

## 2.2 RR-002 – Conwy County Borough Council

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
R-002-1.1	<p>"The Council's response to the pre-application consultation was based on the proposal identified in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and focused on four main areas of concern:</p> <p>i) Seascape, landscape and visual impacts - The Council disagreed with the level of significance identified in the applicant's Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment, including from key settlements, the Wales Coastal Path, Seascape Character Areas and from the A55. Whilst the Council recognised that offshore wind energy would inevitably result in significant changes to coastal seascapes and views, it had concerns over the following impacts: First, the scale of both individual wind turbines and of the extent of the Awel y Môr array as a whole would result in a significantly greater visual impact from a number of viewpoints than views of the existing offshore wind farms. This in turn would cause the offshore wind farms to become the dominant feature in the seascape."</p>	<p>It is noted that the response from Conwy County Borough Council (CCBC) is based on an earlier iteration of the proposed scheme that was considered for the Statutory Consultation in August 2021, rather than the final proposals for which Development Consent is sought and are assessed within the final ES.</p> <p>Following comments received during the Section 42 consultation the proposed development was reviewed and revised through a 11% reduction in the array area (26% reduction from the scoping stage offshore site area) and the maximum number of turbines proposed (91 at PEIR reduced to 50). The west to east extent of the array area has reduced from 25.8 km to 16.4 km (a reduction of 36% from scoping) providing a clear reduction in extents in views from parts of Conwy located to the south. Lighting mitigation measures have also been included.</p> <p>Following comments relating to the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) methodology at the PEIR stage, a number of changes were made to the assessments, including further field work to address matters raised, as described in the SLVIA Consultation Record (APP-113). This included several additional visualisations representative of views from the A55 as requested by the Council.</p> <p>Significant effects have been assessed in the SLVIA for some viewpoints and visual receptors in Conwy as a result of the addition of AyM to the existing operational offshore wind farm context. However, following a review, which included further field work, preparation of visualisations and the reduction in the array area it was assessed in the SLVIA at ES stage that effects on the A55 would not be significant (AS-027).</p>
RR-002-1.2	<p>"Second, the proposed array would lie close to, and affect the setting of, a number of coastal landscape features, including the Great Orme (Heritage Coast and part of a Special Landscape Area and Historic Landscape) and the Little Orme (also part of a Special Landscape Area and Historic Landscape). It would significantly affect the seascape character, and detract from the appreciation of the coastal landscape feature."</p>	<p>The potential effects on the heritage value (in terms of their specific historic and archaeological interests etc., or their role as part of the setting for the individual heritage assets within them) of the Great Orme and Little Orme was considered in respect of their status as part of the Creuddyn and Conwy Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales, reported in ES Volume 3, Chapter 8 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069). No harm to heritage significance of these</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>designations was assessed as occurring given that the AyM Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) are not considered to jeopardise the basis of the registration as, nor change the value of, the Creuddyn and Conwy Historic Landscape of Wales (HLW) as a landscape of outstanding historic interest, the effect (notwithstanding the visibility of the turbines from points within and in views across the HLW) is considered to be of negligible magnitude upon an asset of high importance. This is assessed as an effect of negligible significance upon the heritage significance of the HLW, which is not significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms.</p> <p>The assessment of landscape character effects for Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) C10 - Great Orme and Creuddyn Peninsula is set out from paragraph 1139 of the SLVIA (AS-027). This LCA includes both the Great Orme and Little Orme. It considers the value and thereafter the sensitivity associated with the designation of different geographical areas of LCA C10 as a Sensitive Landscape Area and Heritage Coast.</p> <p>The assessment found that during the latter stages of construction, operation and the early stages of decommissioning the effect would be Moderate (Significant) adverse, at the coastal edge between the north-west point of Great Orme and Little Orme and from elevated locations on the Great Orme (extending inland from the north by approximately 1 km) and the north face of Little Orme. Elsewhere within the LCA the effect was found to be Moderate-Minor to Minor (Non-significant). This geographical extent would also apply to the Great Orme and Little Orme where they are concurrent with the Sensitive Landscape Area.</p> <p>The SLVIA primarily assesses the effects on the seascape character of the Great Orme and Little Orme in relation to Seascape Character Area A: Conwy Bay from paragraph 1165 (AS-027). The assessment finds that MDS A would have significant effects on this Seascape Character Area.</p> <p>Significant effects on landscape character and seascape character that are coincidental with the Great Orme Heritage Coast have been assessed from paragraph 1224 of the SLVIA (AS-027) at the coastal edge between the north-west point of Great Orme and the toll booth and from elevated</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>locations on the Great Orme (extending inland from the north by approximately 1 km) and the north face of Little Orme.</p> <p>The Great Orme and Little Orme would remain as key characteristics of views where these features are appreciated.</p>
RR-002-1.3	"Third, the proposal would cause both sequential and in-combination cumulative effects with other offshore wind farms, including existing offshore wind farms, and this would increase the dominance and duration of windfarms as a seascape feature."	<p>Offshore Wind Farms (OWFs) are an acknowledged feature of the seascape character off the North Wales coast. SLVIA Figure 25 (APP-227) illustrates that there are few areas within Conwy where AyM would be theoretically visible where existing offshore wind farms are not already theoretically visible. Many of the areas shown to have theoretical visibility of only AyM would not have actual visibility of it due to intervening features that are not included in the bare ground ZTV analysis. This suggests that the change would be incremental rather than a complete change, although it is acknowledged that the scale of the proposed WTGs proposals is larger than those of the existing OWFs and the overall spread of OWFs would be increased.</p> <p>The varying climatic conditions off the coast frequently changes the range of visibility out to sea and the prominence of the existing offshore WTGs. AyM would not always be the closest wind farm to the shore from the Conwy coast. From Little Orme Rhyl Flats OWF is the closest at approximately 8 km with other OWFs currently visible beyond. This suggests that from Little Orme Rhyl Flats OWF would be more frequently visible than AyM whilst from the Great Orme, Rhyl Flats and AyM would be visible at similar distances so may be visible over a similar duration.</p> <p>The addition of AyM OWF to the operational offshore wind farms is considered in the SLVIA (AS-027) and this accounts for some of the significant effects identified.</p>
RR-002-1.4	"Fourth, in the absence of a cumulative assessment with any future onshore wind farms (including those identified in Future Wales: The National Plan 2040), the SLVIA did not fully evaluate the cumulative effects."	<p>As described in Section 10.13 of the SLVIA chapter (AS-027) PINS Advice Note Seventeen sets out the criteria for defining the level of cumulative assessment required where projects are at pre-scoping or scoping stage and for policy areas such as that identified in Future Wales: The National Plan 2040.</p> <p>There is a high level of uncertainty associated with the potential onshore wind farm development within the Pre-assessed Areas for Wind Energy (PAWE) (geographical extent and location of WTGs as well as their</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>height and number). There is no actual development to consider in the cumulative assessment of AyM.</p> <p>Following a review of the information available at this time it has been determined that policy areas such as this are considered to have Tier 3 level of certainty within the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seventeen and as such, no assessment is included within the assessment chapter. Where onshore wind farm developments do come forward within the PAWE areas the applications would have to include AyM within their cumulative SLVIAs.</p>
RR-002-2	<p>"ii) Impacts on the tourism economy - It was unclear to what extent the conclusions in the PERI took account of the demographic profile of visitors to Llandudno and the County generally, or to the distinctive heritage and character which are critical in its attractiveness to that visitor profile. As such, the conclusions in relation to the magnitude of the impact were subject to a wide margin and uncertainty."</p>	<p>The assessment that is reported in the ES, Volume 3, Chapter 4; Tourism and recreation (APP-065) does take account of the characteristics of Conwy (and therefore Llandudno) and its surrounding areas, including its visitor offer, characteristics of visitors and reasons for visiting. Whilst the research (that is summarized within Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES (APP-065)), suggests offshore windfarms usually have no or limited impacts on visitor economies, of the inherent uncertainty (due to the scale of the development and the characteristics of the resort), is recognized in the assessment.</p> <p>Following Statutory Consultation in August to October 2021, an additional study was conducted by The Applicant which collected evidence on the tourism sector employment around several offshore Wind Farms across the UK (this is provided in Volume 5, Annex 4.2 (APP-124). The study found no evidence from the employment data that the development of large-scale offshore wind farms near to significant seaside towns is associated with a decline in tourism employment.</p>
RR-002-3	<p>"iii) Impacts on the built environment and heritage - including the setting of Llandudno Pier, Llandudno Conservation Area and the Great Orme. It concurred with the conclusions of Gwynedd Archaeological Trust in relation to impacts on these assets. Furthermore, as noted in point iii), the development could potential cause a decline in visitor numbers, and this could in turn lead to a reduction in the frequency and quality of maintenance of the built fabric. Over time, such a deterioration would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Llandudno Conservation Area and to the special features of interest of the listed buildings."</p>	<p>The Heritage Assessment that is presented in ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069) took account of potential effects upon the Llandudno Conservation Area's character and appearance and concluded that there was no harm to the significance (and ability to appreciate that significance) of the individual historic (listed or otherwise) buildings that it forms the primary setting for. However, specific consideration was given to the potential effect on the Grade II* Listed Llandudno Pier and it is assessed that this asset would be subject to a significant adverse effect (assessed as moderate and significant for EIA purposes), albeit fully reversible on decommissioning.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>The potential effect upon the Great Orme in respect of its status as part of a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales (hereafter HLW) was considered in the EIA (ES Volume 3, Chapter 8, Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, paragraphs 282 and following) (APP-069), and in relation to its heritage significance. The Orme is itself the setting for many of the assets upon it. Much of the heritage significance is invested in former mining activity dating back well into the prehistoric period and having no or limited surface expression. The headland is indeed a prominent landscape/ seascape feature, but this does not mean it is the reason for location of much of the activity that took place upon it. If those activities do not rely on a maritime expression or rely on any form of long-distance visibility (to or from) for understanding their heritage significance then this aspect of setting is not considered. It is further noted that assets without a maritime association were scoped out of the EIA in the PINS Scoping Opinion (see ID 4.14.1 in Section 4.14; APP-295). The assessment concluded that there was no adverse effect on the heritage value of the HLW, which retains its outstanding historic interest.</p>
RR-002-4	<p>"iv) Impacts arising from construction works on the amenity of residents and visitors- only one sensitive noise receptor was identified in the PEIR, and no background noise level surveys had been carried out. The draft Requirement lacked clarity in respect of the maximum noise levels, the periods during which they would apply, and the location of measurements. The Council will be reviewing its previous representations in the light of amendments to the scheme and the ES, and wishes to reserve the right to amplify or amend its representations."</p>	<p>The response from CCBC repeats the feedback that the council provided in response to the PEIR (August 2021). Following receipt of this feedback in October 2021, the Applicant has discussed the noise assessment with officers at CCBC and has undertaken additional noise monitoring and considered additional noise receptors within the noise assessment presented within Volume 3, Chapter 10: Airborne Noise and Vibration (APP-071) of the ES (Section 10.8.5 of Chapter 10 describes the additional monitoring which was undertaken). In addition, the wording of the noise Requirement within the DCO was amended in line with the Council's feedback following the response to Statutory Consultation from the council that was provided in October 2021.</p> <p>The noise limit within DCO R4 has been derived by Applicant in conjunction with the measured baseline ambient sound levels (during neutral weather conditions) and the relevant guidance contained in BS5228:2009+A1:2014.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued discussion with CCBC to clarify the full results of the Jan 2022 noise monitoring and calculation of the proposed threshold presented in the dDCO. The Applicant will continue to discuss</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		this issue with CCBC environmental health department and hopes that agreement can be reached on appropriate measures to put in place during any night time piling activity.

## 2.3 RR-003 – Flintshire County Council

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-003-1	“The proposal does not appear to involve any land take in Flintshire. The only impacts on Flintshire appear to be related to transport and transportation and seascape/landscape and visual impact. There could also be community benefits that could arise that Flintshire Communities could benefit from which are noted above. The proposed development site is over 20km from Flintshire and only likely to be visible from the very western coastal strip in Flintshire and also from higher ground. Therefore, due to the distance the proposed development is in relation to Flintshire, it is considered that the visual impact on Flintshire and its receptors would not be significant.”	<p>The Applicant confirms that the proposed development does not extend to any land within Flintshire County Council's administrative area.</p> <p>With regard to the potential for traffic impacts to occur, it is considered that construction traffic volume will have dissipated such that significant impacts on the wider highways network (including the A55) are not anticipated and Flintshire, as the Highways Authority, has previously stated that it does not intend to provide highway comment in regard of onshore operations.</p>
RR-003-2	“However, it is noted that the SLVIA does identify significant effects on seascape and landscape and visual receptors throughout the North Wales region. The SLVIA Report confirms that the Awel y Môr proposal at the scale and height proposed would be a major feature and substantial detractor to several special qualities associated with the designated landscapes of North Wales and the National Park. This may, in turn have an indirect negative effect on tourism for the region.”	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the identification of significant effects on seascape, landscape and visual resources in the North Wales region as assessed in the SLVIA (AS-027). Impacts on the tourism economy of the North Wales region have been considered within the tourism and recreation chapter (APP-065) including the potential for negative effects on tourism.</p>
RR-003-3	“Finally, it is noted that there could also be community benefits that could arise that Flintshire Communities could benefit from. The Council would welcome further engagement and consultation with RWE in relation to community benefits and would comment on further details as and when they are provided by the applicant.”	<p>The feedback on community benefit is noted and welcomed by the Applicant. The concept of a community benefit fund associated with the project has been consulted on, and Flintshire County Council (FCC) was engaged as part of that consultation. AyM will continue to engage FCC in these discussions, whilst noting that this fund would sit outside of any DCO requirements.</p> <p>The socio-economics chapter of the ES (AS-034) has predicted minor beneficial impacts to employment and the economy of North Wales during both the construction and operation of the proposed development. It is estimated that construction activity will contribute to between £8.7 to £15.7 million GVA (or up to £3.1 million per annum) to the North Wales economy over the Proposed Development's assumed five-year development and construction phase which is predicted to be significant in EIA terms.</p>

2.4 RR-005 – Awdurdod Cynllunio Lleol Cyngor Gwynedd (Gwynedd Council Local Planning Authority)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-005	<p>“Mae Awdurdod Cynllunio Lleol Cyngor Gwynedd o'r farn fod y prif faterion i'w ystyried o ran y datblygiad gerbron yn cynnwys effaith ar ardal a thirwedd yr Awdurdod, ac byddem yn darparu sylwadau pellach ar y materion yma ymhellach ymlaen yn y broses.”</p> <p>“Gwynedd Council Local Planning Authority believes that the main issues to be considered in relation to the development include an impact on the Authority's area and landscape, and we would provide further comments on these issues later in the process”</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant, who will continue to engage with all interested parties on this matter throughout the Examination.</p>

## 2.5 RR-006 – Snowdonia National Park

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-006-1	<p>"We as Snowdonia National Park intend to make representations, both on an individual basis, and as part of a wider north Wales Local Planning Authorities group basis. As part of the wider north Wales LPA group (and other NW LPAs will also raise their own points), we intend to raise points such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The under-reporting of significant effects, in terms of sensitivity of the landscape and magnitude of change</li> <li>➤ Lack of mitigation in terms of turbine height, array extent (although this has been reduced) etc</li> <li>➤ The project cannot be described as an extension due to the vast difference between it and the current wind farms (Gwynt y Mor, Rhyl Flats) in the bay. Gwynt y Mor for example consists of 160 turbines with a 133m blade tip height – vastly different from the project proposed under Awel y Môr</li> <li>➤ Concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the regional interests particularly associated with the landscape and visual impact of the proposal which may have an indirect negative impact on tourism for the region and associated socio-economic impacts.</li> <li>➤ The size and scale of the overall project"</li> </ul>	<p>The assessment included in the SLVIA was undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architects following the guidance contained in GLVIA 3.</p> <p>The S42 PEIR stage SLVIA (and LVIA) were reviewed by LUC (September 2021) on behalf of the North Wales Local Planning Authorities and concluded in relation to the methodology, scope and process that:</p> <p>'The SLVIA and LVIA have been carried out by experienced practitioners using a robust methodology based on established good practice. The scope of both assessments appears sufficient to capture all potentially significant effects.</p> <p>There is a clear record of consultation that indicates agreement with stakeholders on key points of the scope and Approach.'</p> <p>The revised assessment contained within the final ES (AS-027) took into account the comments made by the stakeholders in relation to the sensitivity and magnitude of change. Some levels of sensitivity were amended as a result or in some cases further justification was provided for why the levels of sensitivity were assessed as they were.</p> <p>The magnitude of change reduced as the result of a reduction in the horizontal extents of the array following the Section 42 consultation. Although in the majority of cases this did not reduce the reported level of magnitude it is a factor when considering the overall significance of the effects using professional judgement.</p> <p>Significant mitigation of array extent has been undertaken. Following comments received during the Section 42 consultation, the proposed development was reviewed and revised through a 11% reduction in the array area (26% reduction from scoping stage offshore site area) and the maximum number of turbines proposed (91 at PEIR reduced to 50). The west to east extent of the array area has reduced from 25.8 km to 16.4 km (a reduction of 36% from scoping) and this is a clear reduction in extents in views from Snowdonia National Park (SNP) to the south-west. Lighting mitigation measures have also been included (Section 10.9 of the SLVIA chapter (AS-027)).</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>The AyM Offshore Wind Farm has to be described as an extension to Gwynt y Mor since this was the basis on which AyM is being developed through The Crown Estate's (TCE's) Offshore Wind Extensions Round (2017).</p> <p>Many additions to existing wind farms, both onshore and offshore consist of turbines that are markedly taller and more widely spaced when compared with the development they are 'extending'. This is an implication of the evolving technology over time as evidenced by previous extensions of older wind farms (such as Walney Extension) and analogous Round 3 Extensions projects such as Rampion 2 and Five Estuaries.</p> <p>ES Volume 3, Chapter 4: Tourism and Recreation (APP-065) provides an assessment of the impact of the operational windfarm on the volume and value of tourism economy. Overall, the analysis presented in Section 4.10.4 of APP-065 suggests that wind farm developments do not have a significant effect on the overall volume and value of tourism activity. Various studies (such as University of the West of England (2004); Ipsos MORI (2014) and Glasgow Caledonian University (2008)) suggest that the majority of visitors do not expect their behaviour to be influenced (either positively or negatively) by the presence of wind farm developments.</p> <p>After considerable review throughout the iterative design process and in finalising the design envelope for Application, as described in the Site Selection and Alternatives chapter of the ES (APP-044), it is has not been possible for the Applicant to further reduce the WTG heights or the associated turbine numbers and array area and still have an economically viable and competitive scheme. This needs to take into account the potential for the AyM OWF to be built, which relies on the Applicant being able to successfully compete with other wind farm projects being taken to bidding under the Contract for Difference (CfD) auction process.</p>
RR-006-2	<p>"As an individual local planning authority, we as Snowdonia National Park intend to raise further, area specific points. These will include;</p> <p>▲ Visual impacts from specific points within the National Park, such as from Carnedd Llywelyn and the Carneddau as a whole</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>⬆ Adverse effects on landscape character areas within the National Park</p> <p>⬆ The general specifics of the project – i.e. the heights of turbines and cumulative effect due to the presence of offshore wind farms already”</p>	
RR-006-3	<p>“In terms of cumulative effects, from a National Park point of view there are concerns about the cumulative impact of turbines in the area and the increased disruption to the ‘cone of view’ from viewpoints within the Park. From certain areas it is likely that the sea horizon will be dominated by wind turbines adding to the growing cumulative effect and it could be asked at what point does the accumulation of turbines/cumulative effect become excessive.”</p>	<p>The closest parts of SNP to the AyM OWF array area are generally highly influenced by a developed coastal foreground and infrastructure as well as more distant offshore wind farms. It is from these locations that the cone of view affected by offshore wind farm development would be most increased by the addition of AyM OWF. An example of this is the view from Conwy Mountain (17.1 km from the proposed array area) where the AyM OWF would be apparent over 30 degrees of the wide panoramic views from the summit.</p> <p>The cone of view of AyM OWF in views from more distant locations within SNP reduces to 18 degrees of the 360-degree panoramic views available from Carnedd Llwyn (32.4 km from the proposed array area). From there existing offshore wind farms are less visible due to their lesser scale and longer separation distance and therefore the cumulative effect is frequently likely to not be apparent.</p> <p>The Welsh Government has, through Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 set out to encourage onshore wind farm development at closer proximity to SNP, when compared to AyM OWF, through the designation of PAWE areas to the east of SNP boundary.</p>
RR-006-4	<p>“As a general principle the National Park is supportive of a renewable energy project, which is crucial in the current climate emergency, however as noted there are numerous concerns with the project in its current form.”</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant.</p>

2.6 RR-007 – Llandudno Town Council

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-007	<p>"The development will have a significant impact on the Town of Llandudno. There are the visual aspects and the potential impacts on the tourism and the SSSI (Great Orme) to be considered. If this does go ahead as seems to be implied by the current situation, Llandudno Town Council wishes to ensure that the maximum benefit for the town and community is achieved. The Town Council would also want assurances about the carbon footprint, operational lifespan and end of life reparation for the development."</p>	<p>The comments are noted by the Applicant. The visual aspects of the development are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (AS-027) and Volume 3, Chapter 4: Tourism and Recreation (APP-065).</p> <p>The operations and decommissioning of the offshore aspects project is set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 1: Offshore Project Description (APP-047), and an offshore decommissioning programme and onshore decommissioning scheme are secured in the Draft Development Consent Order (AS-014), an update of which is provided in Document 1.8 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission.</p> <p>In response to the Examining Authority's first round of questions, the Applicant has confirmed that it will provide a carbon footprint and impact assessment during Examination.</p>

2.7 RR-008 – Betws yn Rhos and Llanelian yn Rhos Community Council

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-008	"The visibility of the windfarm to high ground coastal habitation within the Community Council area due to the size and diameter of the structures. Any compensatory grant available to the Community Council area."	<p>The visibility of the offshore array from onshore locations is set out in 6.2.10 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (AS-027).</p> <p>The concept of a community benefit fund associated with the project has been consulted on. AyM will continue to engage with consultees in these discussions, whilst noting that this fund would sit outside of any DCO requirements. The Applicant will review Betws yn Rhos and Llanelian yn Rhos Community Council's response to ExQ1.18.5 to understand if the representation differs from the Applicant's understanding of the issue.</p>

2.8 RR-009 – Llanddulas and Rhyd Y Foel Community Council

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-009	<p>"I have been asked by the Community Council to register our interest for the following reasons. 1. Although the Project is centered on the Rhyl area a significant number of the turbines will be built off the coast of Llanddulas village 2. The Project involves construction work along the A55 which is the main route for tourism into the area"</p>	<p>Volume 3, Chapter 4: Tourism and Recreation (APP-065) provides an assessment of the impact of the operational windfarm on the volume and value of tourism economy both during construction and operation phases of the windfarm. Overall, the analysis presented in Sections 4.10.4 and 4.11.4 of APP-065 suggests that wind farm developments do not have a significant effect on the overall volume and value of tourism activity.</p> <p>As set out in 6.3.1 Onshore Project Description (APP-062), the onshore export cable route will be installed using trenchless techniques beneath the A55. As presented in ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport (APP-070), there will therefore be no direct disruption to the A55 from construction works.</p> <p>With regard to the potential for impacts to occur upon the A55 from an increase in traffic generation, it is considered within ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport (APP-070) that construction traffic volume will have dissipated such that significant impacts on the wider highways network (including the A55) are not anticipated given the very large baseline traffic flows on the A55.</p>

2.9 RR-010 – Trinity House

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-010	"Dear Sir / Madam, We refer to the above application for development consent. Trinity House is the General Lighthouse Authority for England, Wales, the Channel Islands and Gibraltar with powers principally derived from the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 (as amended). The role of Trinity House as a General Lighthouse Authority under the Act includes the superintendence and management of all lighthouses, buoys and beacons within its area of jurisdiction. Trinity House wishes to be registered as an interested party due to the impact the development may have on navigation within Trinity House's area of jurisdiction. Trinity House is likely to have further comments to make on the application and the draft Order throughout the application process. Please address all correspondence regarding this matter to myself at (Redacted)@trinityhouse.co.uk and to Mr Steve Vanstone at navigation.directorate@trinityhouse.co.uk Yours faithfully, Russell Dunham ACII Legal Advisor"	This is noted by the Applicant who will continue to engage with Trinity House on the matter of navigation throughout the Examination.

2.10 RR-011 – Maritime and Coastguard Agency

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-011	"MCA will be responding to the ExA on matters concerning the safety of maritime navigation and maritime Search and Rescue. MCA will provide comments on the Navigation Risk Assessment, Shipping & Navigation chapter of the EIA Report, and the content of the DCO and DML. The main issues for MCA are concerning vessel routeing, vessels' ability for continued safe passage, that risks to all vessels and craft are at an acceptable level, and the project is not at the detriment to the provision of Search and Rescue, and other emergency response."	This is noted by the Applicant, who will continue to engage with the MCA on matters of navigational safety and maritime Search and Rescue throughout the Examination.

2.11 RR-012 – Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-012	<p>"JNCC would like to be registered as an interested party for the Awel y Môr offshore windfarm DCO application/examination. JNCC are statutory advisors to the UK Government and devolved administrations on issues relating to nature conservation in UK offshore waters (beyond the territorial limit). Our key area of interest is the potential impact of the Awel y Môr development on North Anglesey SAC. This site includes territorial and offshore waters and is jointly managed by JNCC and NRW. The proposed development is approximately 15km from the North Anglesey SAC, designated for harbour porpoise. The design envelope includes mono piles as a foundation option; impact piling has the potential to impact the conservation objectives of this site. Natural England (NE) is authorised to exercise JNCC's functions as a statutory consultee in respect of certain applications for offshore waters adjacent to England (0-200 nm). As such, we defer to NE to input SNCB views regarding nature conservation advice relating to English offshore waters."</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant who will continue to engage with JNCC on this matter throughout the Examination.</p> <p>It is also noted that in relation to JNCC's deferral of advice relating to English offshore waters to Natural England, that Natural England have not registered as an interested party in the Examination.</p>

## 2.12 RR-014 – National Grid

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-014-1	<p>"APPLICATION BY AWEL Y MÔR OFFSHORE WIND FARM LIMITED FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE AWEL Y MÔR OFFSHORE WIND FARM PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: EN010112 RELEVANT REPRESENTATION BY NATIONAL GRID ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION</p> <p>This relevant representation is submitted on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc ("NGET") in respect of Awel Y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Limited's ("Promoter") application for a development consent order ("DCO") seeking powers for an offshore wind farm ("Project"). NGET has a substation, high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines and underground cables within or in close proximity to the proposed Order Limits. The substation, overhead line and underground cables form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. The details of the electricity assets are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Substation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Bodelwyddan 400kV Sub Station.</li> <li>▲ Associated overhead and underground apparatus including cables.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ Overhead Lines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ 4ZB 400kV OHL - Bodelwyddan - Deeside - Pentir 1 o Bodelwyddan - Deeside - Pentir 2</li> <li>▲ GM Route 400kV OHL Bodelwyddan - Deeside - Pentir 2</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ Cable Apparatus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Pentre-Mawr</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ Cable Compound <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Deeside - Pentir 1 Cable</li> <li>▲ Bodelwyddan4 St Asaph 132kv Cable Sections 01 And 02"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	This is noted by the Applicant.
RR-014-2	<p>"NGET will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus. NGET's rights of access to inspect, maintain, renew and repair such apparatus must also be maintained at all times and access to inspect and maintain such apparatus must not be restricted. Further, where the Promoter intends to acquire land or rights, or interfere with any of NGET's interests in land or apparatus, NGET will require appropriate protection. Further discussion is</p>	The Applicant is engaged with National Grid regarding protection of assets and land rights.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	required between NGET and the Promoter to ascertain the impact to NGET's apparatus and rights."	
RR-014-3	<p>"Protective Provisions</p> <p>NGET requires protective provisions to be included within the DCO to ensure that its interests are adequately protected and to ensure compliance with relevant safety standards. NGET is working with the Promoter in relation to the protective provisions for inclusion within the DCO, along with any supplementary agreements which may be required. NGET and the Promoter will keep the Examining Authority updated in relation to these discussions."</p>	<p>Protective Provisions in favour of National Grid are included in Part 3 of Schedule 9 of the Draft Development Consent Order (AS-014). An update of this document is provided in Document 1.8 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that further discussion on this matter is required and is actively engaged with National Grid in this regard.</p>
RR-014-4	<p>"Summary</p> <p>As a responsible statutory undertaker, NGET's primary concern is to meet its statutory obligations and ensure that any development does not impact in any adverse way upon those statutory obligations. NGET reserves the right to make further representations as part of the examination process but in the meantime will continue to work with the Promoter with a view to reaching a satisfactory agreement on all matters."</p>	<p>The commitment to work with the Applicant is noted and welcomed.</p>

2.13 RR-016 – The Crown Estate

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-016	"The Crown Estate requests to be registered as an Interested Party in the examination of the Awel y Môr Offshore Windfarm. Our interest in the project is that Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Ltd holds an Agreement for Lease from The Crown Estate."	This is noted and the Applicant will continue to engage with The Crown Estate throughout the examination.

2.14 RR-017 – Diamond Transmission Corporation

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-017	"As an owner of assets that will be crossed or affected through proximity of potential works both onshore and offshore, it is important for us to be consulted and be involved in the matter as an interested party."	This is noted by the Applicant. AyM continues to engage with Diamond Transmission Corporation with a view to reaching a proximity agreement before the close of DCO examination.

2.15 RR-018 – EirGrid

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-018	"I am Lead Cable Engineer for the East West Interconnector (EWIC) which is an asset owned by EirGrid and is considered a nationally critical piece of infrastructure. I am registering interest in order to ensure the integrity of the asset is upheld throughout."	This is noted by the Applicant who continues to engage with Eirgrid with a view to reaching a commercial agreement before the close of DCO examination.

## 2.16 RR-019 – DLA Piper on Behalf of North Hoyle Wind Farm Limited

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-019-1	<p>"RELEVANT REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF NORTH HOYLE WIND FARM LIMITED</p> <p>1. North Hoyle Wind Farm Limited ("NHWFL") operate the North Hoyle wind farm ("NH") to the south of the proposed Awel Y Mor wind farm ("AyM"). The location of NH can be seen on sheet 2 of the Works Plans.</p> <p>2. NHWFL raise the following objections to the DCO based on the impact of AyM on the operation of NH-"</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant who continues to engage with DLA Piper on behalf of North Hoyle Wind Farm Limited (NHWFL) with a view to resolving concerns by commercial agreement at the earliest opportunity.</p>
RR-019-2.1	<p>"2.1 The Works Plans shows that Work No.2 crosses the export cable of NH. Whilst an optioneering exercise was conducted in relation to the preferred cable route, there are alternative routes which would avoid the need to cross the North Hoyle cable. The Promoter has not satisfactorily explained why the two shortlisted cable routes (out of three) were rejected since at least one of these does not affect North Hoyle, whilst not affecting Constable Bank."</p>	<p>The Applicant considered a shortlist of three alternative cable routes and decided on the final route after undertaking a thorough and robust site selection process. This is set out in detail in the 'Site Selection and Alternatives' chapter of the Environmental Statement (doc ref 6.1.4) submitted with the application. In accordance with The Crown Estate's (TCE) Cable Route Protocol, (CRP) due consideration was given to the proximity of AyM to existing assets and minimising the number of cable crossings was a 'design principle' applied by the Applicant in undertaking its site selection and refinement.</p> <p>The final offshore cable route was informed by a number of technical and environmental factors (including cable crossings) as well as considering consultee feedback through the statutory and non-statutory processes. Importantly from an environmental perspective, the final route has avoided interaction with the Constable Bank sandbank feature and was the preferred route for hydromorphological aspects and biological elements.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in response to this representation in answer to the ExQ1.3.28.</p>
RR-019-2.2	<p>"2.2 The installation of the export cable in terms of Work No.2 has the potential to impact adversely on the export cable for NH. The Promoter has acknowledged the need for a cable crossing agreement but no protective provisions have been included in the DCO to this effect. The DCO should not be made without such provision."</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that a commercial agreement (discussion of which is in progress) will provide the security required by NHWFL, however, draft protective provisions have also been provided for review.</p>
RR-019-2.3	<p>"2.3 Work No.2 intrudes into the "Designated Area" for the NH export cable identified in the lease of the NH by the Crown Estate Commissioners to NH for the operation of NH. Within the Designated Area, there is provision in the Crown</p>	<p>The Applicant intends to resolve this by commercial agreement, discussion of which is in progress.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	Estate lease which protects the position of NH. The Crown Estate Commissioners have covenanted with NH not to grant any lease, licence or consent (other than where the lease requires that NH's consent is obtained) for the construction of any works within the restriction zone without NH's consent (not to be unreasonably withheld). There is provision in the lease for the Crown Estate Commissioners giving consent for the laying of conduits in the Designated Area but this is subject to agreement with NH on protection for the NH export cable both in relation to the original installation and future inspection, maintenance, repair or renewal work. NH has not been approached to provide such consent. This represents an impediment to delivery of the scheme."	
RR-019-2.4	"2.4 Protective provisions are required to ensure that the construction of the development, including its cable connection, does not interfere with NH or any planned works which might be required to NH, together with an indemnity for any impacts which are caused. Whilst there are protective provisions in Part 1 of Schedule 9 for electricity undertakers, these do not apply to the offshore works. Appropriate provision must be included in the DCO for the offshore works which may impact on NH."	The Applicant considers that a commercial agreement (discussion of which is in progress) will provide the security required by NHWFL, however, draft protective provisions have also been provided for review.
RR-019-3	"3. NHWFL would intend to engage with the Promoter with a view to reaching agreement on necessary changes to the DCO, including protective provisions and mitigation measures. However, pending resolution of such matters, development consent should not be granted."	This is noted by the Applicant.

## 2.17 RR-020 – DLA Piper on behalf of Rhyl Flats Wind Farm limited

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-020-1	<p>"RELEVANT REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF RHYL FLATS WIND FARM LIMITED 1.</p> <p>Rhyl Flats Wind Farm Limited ("RFWFL") operate the Rhyl Flats wind farm ("RF") to the south of the proposed Awel Y Mor wind farm ("AyM").</p> <p>The location of RF can be seen on sheet 2 of the Works Plans.</p> <p>2. RFWFL raise the following objections to the DCO based on the impact of AyM on the operation of RF:-"</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant who continues to engage with DLA Piper on behalf of Rhyl Flats Wind Farm Ltd (RFWFL) with a view to resolving concerns via protective provisions in the DCO.</p>
RR-020-2.1	<p>"2.1 The Works Plans show that Work No.2 intrudes into the area of the sea bed which is leased by the Crown Estate Commissioners to RFWFL for the operation of RF. RFWFL had understood that the rights sought by the promoter for cable installation would avoid the area leased to RFWFL. This is Crown Land over which RFWFL have an exclusive lease. Without prejudice to the other points in this submission, the area within the RF Crown Estate lease should be excluded from the proposed development."</p>	<p>The Applicant's Order Limits for Work No.2 cross the 250m restriction zone around Rhyl Flats (and therefore require the consent of RFWFL) but do not include any part of RFWFL's leased area. A plan has been sent to RFWFL to establish this fact more clearly than the scale of Works Plans allow (Document 1.46 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). The Applicant intends to resolve the crossing of the restriction zone by agreement with RFWFL before the close of DCO examination. Discussions are in progress.</p>
RR-020-2.2	<p>"2.2 The work plans show that Work No.2 also intrudes into the 250m restriction zone around the perimeter of the areas leased by the Crown Estate Commissioners to RFWFL for the operation of RF. The restriction zone exists to ensure that other proposed developments do not adversely affect the operation of RF. The Crown Estate Commissioners have covenanted with RF not to grant any lease, licence or consent (other than where the lease requires that RF's consent is obtained) for the construction of any works within the restriction zone. RF has not been approached to provide such consent, representing an impediment to delivery of the scheme."</p>	<p>The Applicant intends to resolve this by agreement with RFWFL at the earliest opportunity. Discussions are in progress.</p>
RR-020-2.3	<p>"2.3 Work No. 2 would permit construction activities in close proximity to the eastern-most RF turbine. Although AyM has indicated that best practice will be used during cable laying, this is not secured by the DCO. There are protective provisions in Part 1 of Schedule 9 for electricity undertakers but these do not apply to the offshore works. It is essential that the DCO provides protective provisions for the benefit of RFWFL. These require to include a mechanism for RFWFL approving the installation activities and the timing of the installation so as to avoid conflict with any maintenance activities which may be required on the</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant who continues to engage with DLA Piper on behalf of RFWFL with a view to resolving concerns via protective provisions in the DCO at the earliest opportunity.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	RF turbines. An indemnity is also required for any impacts which are caused by the installation process."	
RR-020-2.4	"2.4 The AyM turbines would lie to the north of the existing RF turbines. There is the potential for the AyM turbines to interfere with wind speed or wind direction and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the RF turbines. This requires to be assessed and mitigation proposed for any impact."	The Applicant intends to resolve this by agreement with RFWFL at the earliest opportunity. Discussions are in progress.
RR-020-3	"3. RFWFL would intend to engage with the Promoter with a view to reaching agreement on necessary changes to the DCO, including protective provisions and mitigation measures. However, pending resolution of such matters, development consent should not be granted."	The Applicant intends to resolve this by agreement with RFWFL at the earliest opportunity. Discussions are in progress.

2.18 RR-021 – Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-021	"Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service is the regional curatorial service responsible for advising on development and the historic environment in north-west Wales, and is a non-statutory consultee. We advise the local planning authorities of Gwynedd, Conwy, Anglesey and Snowdonia National Park. We also comment on applications affecting Registered Historic Landscapes on behalf of NRW. I have been part of the Expert Technical Group (ETG) meetings for Archaeology (Onshore and Offshore) and Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) and Cultural Heritage from the outset. No onshore works fall within our advisory region, therefore my representation will relate primarily to setting impacts. My advice to date has contributed to the respective local authority responses rather than being a separate submission. It is not yet confirmed whether this will be the case for the examination or whether we will be responding separately. I wish to register as an Interested Party to ensure I remain informed as to the progress of the application as well as to allow for the possibility of a separate response."	<p>AyM acknowledges the involvement of Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (GAPS) in an advisory capacity to the organisations listed. The advice and comments received through the PEIR and ETG consultation processes from GAPS has been taken into consideration in the preparation of ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that GAPS have since confirmed with the Applicant that they are content to provide advice via the Local Planning Authorities, as described in the Statement of Commonality (Document 1.11 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>

2.19 RR-022 – North Wales Wildlife Trust (Landscape)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-022	"I intend to make points relating to potential impacts on marine and terrestrial habitats and species as well as proposed mitigation measures."	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant can confirm that all information relating to potential impacts on marine habitats and associated mitigation measure commitments can be found in the relevant chapters of the ES (APP-050, APP-051, APP-052 and AS-026) and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) (APP-027). The Applicant can confirm that all information relating to potential impacts on terrestrial habitats and associated mitigation measure commitments can be found in APP-066. See also the Schedule of Mitigation (Document 1.18 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) and the updated version of the Marine Licence Principles (Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).

2.20 RR-023 – North Wales Wildlife Trust (Marine)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-023	"My representation will raise points with regard to: Impact on marine mammals and other marine/coastal habitats and species Mitigation measures"	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant can confirm that all information relating to potential impacts on marine mammals and associated mitigation measure commitments can be found in AS-026 for the EIA and in APP-027 for the RIAA. The Applicant can confirm that all information relating to potential impacts marine / coastal habitats and associated mitigation measure commitments can be found in APP-051 and APP-052 for the EIA and in APP-027 for the RIAA. See also the Schedule of Mitigation (Document 1.18 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) and the updated version of the Marine Licence Principles (Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).

2.21 RR-025 – National Air Traffic Services Ltd

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-025	<p>"Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm, Irish Sea off the coast of North Wales</p> <p>Dear Sirs, I refer to the Application quoted above, NATS has assessed the application and has identified an unacceptable impact on its infrastructure, specifically the St. Annes and Great Dun Fell Primary Surveillance Radars. No impact is anticipated on NATS's Clee Hill radar. NATS has been engaged with the Applicant over recent years and following its assessment, has proceeded to investigate mitigation measures. These technical measures are tangible and within NATS's control; negotiations are currently ongoing with the Applicant in order to secure their funding and implementation. While a formal agreement is not yet in place, NATS has no reason to believe that this will not be forthcoming in the very near future. While its position is that of objecting to the application, NATS is confident that it will soon be in a position to support planning conditions. As soon as formal agreement is reached with the Applicant, NATS will submit a further representation confirming this. Yours faithfully Mr Sacha Rossi For and on behalf of NATS En-Route plc"</p>	<p>The Applicant notes and shares NATS' confidence in reaching agreement and is continuing discussions accordingly.</p>

2.22 RR-026 – UK Chamber of Shipping

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-026	<p>"The UK Chamber of Shipping is the trade association for the UK shipping industry, representing some 200 members, operating 900 vessels equalling 18 million GT in capacity, trading around the UK and globally. The Chamber represents the full breadth of the industry, including dry and wet trades, passenger transport (cruise &amp; ferry), offshore supply and construction, towage and specialist, as well as professional service providers with shipping interests. The Chamber fully supports the Government's obligations to achieve Net Zero and welcomes the development of offshore renewable energy as a means to achieve. The ports and shipping industries play an essential role in enabling those targets to be achieved by providing bases and vessels for construction, operation &amp; maintenance, and decommissioning. The Chamber also asserts that the planning process and framework must support both the UK's offshore renewable goals for decarbonisation and the wider shipping industry to ensure that navigational safety is not compromised nor economic contribution from the shipping industry jeopardised, in accordance with the National Planning Statements. The Chamber seeks to ensure navigational safety is upheld and that developments are appropriately positioned to enable existing commercial navigation to continue safely and efficiently. Shipping is the greenest form of cargo transport and proposed offshore renewable developments must take fully into consideration the routing and operations of commercial shipping to enable this to continue. The Chamber has been closely involved in the planning process for Awel y Môr prior to DCO application, through PEIR, Hazard Workshops and the NRA, advocating for full consideration for navigation safety and environmental efficiency of commercial shipping. The Chamber wishes to have opportunity to provide further representation on navigation, where necessary."</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The Shipping and Navigation chapter can be found at APP-055 and the supporting Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) at APP-111.</p>

2.23 RR-027 – Department of Infrastructure, Isle of Man Government on behalf of Mrs Emily Curphey, Chair, Territorial Sea Committee

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-027-1	<p>"The Territorial Seas Committee (TSC) has previously submitted comments on this project, but comments in respect of offshore ornithology and commercial fisheries need to be raised again. Concern remains with regards the cumulative impact of all the proposed offshore windfarms within the Irish Sea area and the impact they could have on shipping and navigation. Offshore ornithology has been screened in within the transboundary screening report, however consideration of Manx conservation features has been inconsistent across the chapters of the Environmental Statement. The Isle of Man view on the ornithology scoping has been included, in full, within the revised Scoping Report, but the applicant's responses are not stated. We have previously noted the lack of reference to Manx sites that are likely to relate to this study area, specifically the Manx shearwater and the comments of the JNCC relating to remaining flight height risks and the possible need for CRM assessment, and we have requested evidence of the specific consideration of the Isle of Man in such respects."</p>	<p>Matters relating to ornithology and commercial fisheries are addressed in the paragraphs below. With regard to cumulative effects on commercial shipping, the Applicant confirms that the Shipping and Navigation assessment (APP-111) undertook a detailed assessment of cumulative effects based on the information that was publicly available at the time of writing. The Applicant recognises that future development is likely to come forward within the wider Irish Sea area, however, until those proposals have submitted meaningful information into the public domain there is a limit as to the extent to which they can be considered in a quantified assessment. The Applicant notes that these future projects will have to have due regard to the AyM project within their cumulative assessments.</p> <p>As agreed through the Evidence Plan Process (EPP) with NRW, (see the Evidence Plan Report and its supporting appendices (APP-301, APP-302 and APP-303, respectively) the Applicant agreed to assess Manx Shearwater on a precautionary basis for potential displacement effects only. Following this agreement, a quantitative analysis was carried out against the relevant Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scales (BDMPS) (which included Isle of Man population), and it was found that the maximum impact on Manx shearwater to be approximately a single mortality per annum. This is not a significant effect and would not lead to any material impact on the conservation status of Manx Shearwater from any site including, Isle of Man sites.</p> <p>With regard to collision risk, Manx shearwater were only observed occasionally within the site-specific digital aerial surveys (recorded in five out of the 24 surveys within the array area). Whilst the Applicant is aware that some concerns have been raised over the potential for collision risk, the current best available published literature indicates Manx shearwater are at low risk from collision (Furness and Wade 2012; Bradbury et al., 2014). Therefore, The Applicant's position follows guidance for this species and the agreement with NRW and therefore, no further consideration was required in regard to collision risk.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-027-2	<p>"We note that no 'significant effects' were found in the ornithological assessments, and therefore site attribution was not undertaken. Nevertheless, site related considerations have arisen in the process, but we have not found any comment on the Manx seabird colonies or Manx sources of migrant birds, lying within range on the Isle of Man, where they are a feature of a number of designated sites. In the offshore ornithology sections, despite the presence of relevant species of seabird on the Isle of Man, including regionally-relevant, breeding colonies and recovery programmes, there are only three, non-specific references to Isle of Man in the main chapter. With no references, or acknowledgement of the Manx protected sites, it is difficult to confirm that adequate consideration of Manx ornithological interest have been considered."</p>	<p>For the assessments undertaken within Volume 2, Chapter 4: Offshore Ornithology (APP-050) at the EIA level, the Applicant in line with the guidance documents set out in Section 4.1.3 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Offshore Ornithology (APP-050) has appropriately assessed against the most relevant BDMPS which accounts for birds from the Isle of Man. The finding of the ES for all seabird species were of no significant adverse effects for all offshore ornithological receptors, hence why there was no requirement to present the level of predicted impact attributed to any single colony. However, to provide clarity and confidence to the Isle of Man (IoM) government regarding the level of predicted impacts attributable to the Manx breeding colonies, in addition to consideration of Manx protected sites, the Applicant intends to present this information in a clarification note at Deadline 2 now that the detailed IoM response obtained via the parallel consultation on the Marine Licence has been received.</p>
RR-027-3	<p>"Commercial fisheries has been screened in as a transboundary impact assessment. As noted in the Isle of Man Government's response to the PEIR, and comments within 'Annex 8.2: commercial Fisheries Consultation Record', there are still only 3 non-specific references to the Isle of Man in Volume 4, Annex 8.1 Commercial Fisheries Baseline Final, and 5 non-specific references in Volume 2, Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries v Final. Given the overlap of the Fisheries Regional Study Area within Manx waters (ie. 36E5), the non-specific references make it difficult to determine whether the Isle of Man commercial fishing interests have been adequately considered. The responses outlined in the Consultation Record are typically generic, and not apparent that further attempts to quantify the fisheries baseline have been made by engagement with relevant Manx data sources nor specifically for any potential impact on the Isle of Man fleet. These examples do not provide reassurance that Manx commercial fishing interests have yet been adequately considered, regardless of the eventual conclusion of the assessment."</p>	<p>Engagement with Isle of Man fishing interests has been pursued by AyM. The Applicant held meetings with the Isle of Man Government on 16 December 2020 and 8 December 2021. In both meetings commercial fisheries impact assessment and stakeholder engagement were discussed. Comprehensive engagement in the form of fisheries group meetings and individual interviews (see Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109)) with fishermen has been undertaken to understand fishing activity within the AyM study area. The Manx Fish Producers' Organisation is included on the AyM fisheries stakeholder distribution list, with contact details confirmed as correct by the IoM Government and has been invited to attend both group meetings and individual interviews.</p>
RR-027-4	<p>"The TSC has a reasonable expectation of demonstrable consideration within the ES of issues relevant to Isle of Man interests, and this is not yet apparent within the Ornithological or Commercial Fisheries assessments."</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant, with respect to the detailed comments above. The Applicant will continue to engage with the TSC on these matters through the Examination.</p>

## 2.24 RR-028 – Cadw – Welsh Government

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-028-1	<p>"Cadw has serious concerns about the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which we note is incomplete. In particular, we note that 30% of the proposed walkover survey for terrestrial archaeology has not been completed and the survey on the intertidal area is also incomplete. The geophysical survey has also only been undertaken on some 65% of the area required. However, the results of this work are essential if any sub-surface archaeological sites are to be identified and the need for further investigative work, including archaeological evaluation, carried out. The failure to complete these aspects is contrary to section 5.8.10 of National Policy Statement EN-1 which states that any application should contain sufficient information to allow heritage significance to be understood. The surveys must therefore be completed so that the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment can be understood."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the response from Cadw is based on an earlier iteration of the proposed scheme and assessment that was provided within the PEIR as part of Statutory Consultation in August 2021.</p> <p>The supporting fieldwork survey completed to inform the final assessment as reported in the ES (ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069)) is substantially greater in extent than had been achieved when PEIR was submitted. The survey work included geophysical (magnetometer survey), field walkover of the final cable route and the intertidal zone has been visited on several occasions at low tide. Approximately 95% of the accessible onshore cable route (i.e. not including roads and the caravan park and railway at landfall) is covered by walkover survey and/ or geophysical survey. Some very limited trial trenching has been undertaken, however weather conditions over winter prevented the completion of a more comprehensive exercise. The scope and extent of the surveys (magnetometer and trial trenching) was agreed in consultation with Clwyd and Powys Archaeological Trust (CPAT) who were kept informed of progress throughout and agreed that the remainder of surveys could be undertaken post-consent as described in ES Volume 5, Annex 8.5: Onshore WSI (APP-147).</p> <p>The results of the intrusive and non-intrusive surveys are appended to the ES, Volume 3, Chapter 8: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069) and presented within ES Volume 5, Annex 8.5: Onshore WSI (APP-147) and have informed the submitted design of the onshore cable route and the development of mitigation proposals. The baseline data assembled, including the survey results, have informed the assessment presented in ES Volume 5, Annex 8.3: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report (APP-145) and ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069), and is considered an appropriate basis on which to base that assessment and to inform the decision-making with regard to the proposals.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-028-2	<p>"The proposed development will have an impact on (i) the settings of Beaumaris and Conwy Castles, which are both nationally important scheduled monuments and part of the Castles and Town Walls of King Edward in Gwynedd World Heritage Site and (ii) Penrhyn Castle which is a grade I listed building set in a Grade II* registered historic park and garden and part of the Slate Industry of Northwest Wales World Heritage Site. The proposed windfarm will be seen in identified significant views from all of these designated historic assets. Whilst these significant views are acknowledged in the respective assessments there is no explanation about the reasons why these views have been identified as significant and no full analysis of the impact of the windfarm in these views has been made. This failure appears to be due to the assessor considering that as the windfarm is some distance from the castles, their setting does not extend that far. This is incorrect as explained in Welsh Government TAN 24 Section 1.25 - the setting of an historic asset includes the surroundings in which it is understood, experienced and appreciated, embracing present and past relationships to the surrounding landscape. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Therefore, we consider that the full impact of the proposed development on the settings of these very highly significant historic assets has not been fully assessed leading to the effect being understated in the EIA. Consequently, the assessment of the impact of the proposed development on these historic assets along with the impact on the World Heritage Sites should be redone before the EIA is submitted with any application."</p>	<p>The assessment has been informed by Section 1.25 of TAN 24 which is specifically referenced in 8.4.3 of the ES chapter (ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069)).</p> <p>Whilst the key impact is likely to derive from visibility of the AyM WTGs from or in combination with these assets, this assessment proceeds from the position that it is whether there is an effect on the heritage significance of the assets (as derived from their various interests and values), which is being assessed, rather than the degree to which the WTGs may or may not be present in a given view. As part of the assessment, the extent of visibility has been considered in relation to whether a given view direction (and distance) is a contributor to heritage significance, in relation to the specific interests and value of an asset. In line with Cadw's guidance, the assessment takes the line that the importance of setting lies in what it contributes to the significance of a historic asset (Setting of Historic Assets in Wales 2017). Following on from this, simple intervisibility (at any distance) does not automatically mean that there is an adverse effect on the heritage significance of an asset. Setting, as it contributes to heritage significance and the ability to appreciate that heritage significance does not always extend as far as can be seen. The assessment considered whether there is specific harm to the heritage significance of the assets in question and what the setting of the asset is in its particular circumstances and which parts of that setting contribute to heritage significance (or the ability to appreciate it).</p> <p>Cadw's guidance in "Setting of Historic Assets in Wales, 2017" makes it clear that significance is the key issue, and the importance of "setting" is what it contributes to the heritage significance of a given asset. The guidance also clearly states that "setting" is not in and of itself an asset. The assessment presented in Volume 3, Chapter 8: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069) of the ES is consistent with the approach recommended by the relevant guidance and specifically sets out those elements of the setting which are considered to contribute to the significance of an asset (and how that significance is experienced).</p> <p>Views selected for Viewpoints were agreed in consultation. Reference to "significant" view, where made, refers to views highlighted in the relevant designations (in the WHS plans for example), or the agreed</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Viewpoints, or where the assessor considered a view important in judging a contribution made by setting to significance. The degree to which the windfarm is visible and whether this affects setting and the contribution made by setting to the significance of the assets is set out in the assessment text. The assessments presented within Volume 3, Chapter 8: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069) of the ES are considered to be appropriate, proportionate and in accordance with the guidance and policy as noted above, and in the methodology presented in the Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES (APP-069).</p> <p>We note that the IACC response (RR-004) refers to Cadw's advice (in relation to Beaumaris Castle and Menai Suspension Bridge). We assume that is based on the S42 response provided by Cadw in response to the PEIR. The Applicant's position remains as stated above (and referred to in the Applicant's response to RR-004) with regard to appropriate application of the methodology used in the assessment.</p>

2.25 RR-029 – National Trust

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-029-1	"The National Trust owns a diverse range of property along the North Wales coast that will have views to the proposed wind farm. This includes coastal property in North Anglesey to the west, Penrhyn Castle, the Carneddau in Snowdonia, and Graig Fawr in the east. National Trust also owns Parc Farm near the summit of Pen y Gogarth/the Great Orme. The Trust has a statutory duty to promote the permanent preservation of these properties for benefit of the nation-for ever for everyone. The Trust does not object to the principle of Awel y Môr. Climate change is one of our key priorities, and we recognise the need to bring forward renewable energy generation at larger scale: including that at Awel y Môr. We welcome the opportunity for critical examination and scrutiny of the proposals. National Trust staff, visitors, and tenants will see the proposed scheme from our properties and future visitor experience will include this significant new feature of the landscape and seascape."	This is noted by the Applicant.
RR-029-2	"The key element for National Trust is the significance of change to the landscape and seascape. Our properties at Great Orme and Penrhyn Castle will be impacted most by the scheme-the most significant change in view for our visitors to consider. The nature of change and harm to the wider setting of the Great Orme Heritage Coast is a factor in our deliberations. Night lighting adds further to our consideration of landscape and seascape change from National Trust property. The identified residual effect during operation of the windfarm is the key concern from NT land ownership but given the length of construction our considerations also include the timelines relating to the latter end of construction and the decommissioning impacts."	<p>Potential effects for the Penrhyn Castle property (including the Listed buildings, surrounding parkland and in relation to its position with the North West Wales Slate Mining World Heritage Site) have been considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment presented in ES Volume 3, Chapter 8 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069). This concluded that, notwithstanding some intervisibility, the heritage interest from which the significance of these assets was derived would not receive any significant adverse effect, nor would the ability to appreciate that significance be reduced. The same was considered to apply to the Great Orme, with respect to its status as part of a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales.</p> <p>The effects on views from the Penrhyn Castle and Great Orme are also considered in the SLVIA at Section 10.11 with specific viewpoints assessed in Tables 9 and 12 respectively (AS-027).</p> <p>The effect on Viewpoint 17: Penrhyn Castle Terrace during the latter stages of construction, operation and the early stages of decommissioning is assessed as Moderate (Significant).</p> <p>The effect on Viewpoint 13: Great Orme near Summit Complex during the latter stages of construction, operation and the early stages of decommissioning is assessed as Moderate-Major (Significant)</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Significant effects on landscape character and seascape character that are coincidental with the Great Orme Heritage Coast have been assessed from paragraph 1224 of the SLVIA (AS-027) at the coastal edge between the north-west point of Great Orme and the toll booth and from elevated locations on the Great Orme (extending inland from the north by approximately 1 km) and the north face of Little Orme.</p> <p>The mitigation of the effects on the seascape, landscape and visual resource has been a key factor in the development of the AyM parameters since the scoping stage.</p> <p>Prior to the Section 42 consultation a reduction in the array area was introduced due to feedback from consultees as set out in the Evidence Plan and appendixes (APP-300-302).</p> <p>Following comments received during the Section 42 consultation the proposed development was reviewed and revised through a 11% reduction in the array area (26% reduction from scoping stage offshore site area) and the maximum number of turbines proposed (91 at PEIR reduced to 50). The west to east extent of the Agreement for Lease/ scoping boundary has reduced from 25.8 km to 16.4 km (a reduction of 36% from scoping) and this has resulted in a clear reduction in extents in views from Penrhyn Castle and the Great Orme.</p> <p>Although in the majority of cases this did not reduce the reported level of magnitude it is a factor when considering the overall significance of the effects using professional judgement.</p> <p>Lighting mitigation measures have also been included following Section 42 consultation.</p> <p>Night time effects are included in Section 10.12 of the SLVIA (AS-027). The night-time effects on locations within Gwynedd (including at Penrhyn Castle) were assessed as Minor (Non-significant) whilst the night-time effects on views from the summit and north-eastern parts of the Great Orme (Viewpoint 13) where light levels are lower, but the areas are also relatively accessible during twilight and at night are assessed as being Moderate (Significant).</p> <p>Further measures that could further reduce the night-time effects are set out in Table 16 of the SLVIA (APP-027) and in response to ExQ1.17.26.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		Section 10.8 of AS-027 sets out the current understanding of the construction and decommissioning timescales within the programme with particular reference to the duration over which OSPs and WTGs would be present within the array. Construction and decommissioning effects are considered in sections 10.11 and 10.12 of the SLVIA chapter (AS-027).
RR-029-3	<p>"National Trust note the very limited approach to offshore landscape mitigation, with one line (line 1 page 20 of 23 pages) given to the issue. National Trust consider that further mitigation from the scheme can be achieved to reduce the identified harm from land in our ownership. We hope the night-time lighting issue can be examined in detail with further options explored on reducing harm. We also consider there are opportunities to enhance designated landscapes as offset mitigation. No enhancement or landscape/visual compensation programme is identified within the submitted scheme. The submitted Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan should be examined in the wider context of offshore residual effects, rather than its current scope and definition with a limitation to onshore construction and operation."</p>	<p>Following comments received during the Section 42 consultation the proposed development was reviewed and revised through a 11% reduction in the array area (26% reduction from scoping stage offshore site area) and the maximum number of turbines proposed (91 at PEIR reduced to 50). The west to east extent of the array area has reduced from 25.8 km to 16.4 km (a reduction of 36% from scoping) and this is a clear reduction in extents in views from parts the Great Orme and Penrhyn Castle.</p> <p>Lighting mitigation measures have also been included in Section 10.9 of the SLVIA chapter (AS-027).</p> <p>The focus of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) (APP-305; Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) is on the area around the onshore substation where the Applicant can provide effective mitigation and enhancement for specific onshore effects.</p> <p>The Applicant is exploring potential opportunities for enhancement as part of compensation measures (with a general focus on designated areas) and will introduce these for discussion with stakeholders during the Examination process.</p>
RR-029-4	<p>"The project submission identifies the significance of the Great Orme in its impact on tourism and recreation. Para 301 within Chapter 10 (Tourism and Recreation) of the ES states "there are opportunities for AyM to manage the risks of a negative short-term impact on tourism due to construction activity and to potentially deliver a positive benefit to the tourism sector within Llandudno and Great Orme area, which will be explored with local stakeholders". No specific implementation mechanisms appear to be brought forward within the submission, nor the extension of this commitment to operational impacts, nor detailed exploration of this potential benefit."</p>	<p>As noted in ES Volume 3, Chapter 4 (APP-065), there are opportunities for AyM to potentially deliver a positive benefit to the tourism sector within Llandudno and Great Orme area which is subject to ongoing discussion with stakeholders, alongside ongoing discussion on a potential package of contributions to support the tourism industry (that would site outside of the planning process), and a potential package of landscape contributions.</p> <p>Potential measures could include the provision of information and interpretation (e.g. providing signage) and undertaking promotional</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>activities which would explain the construction and operation of AyM and its role in the renewable energy transition and addressing climate change. The provision of a tourism liaison officer would aid in the delivery of benefits to the tourism sector.</p> <p>The Applicant hopes to be in a position to update the ExA and Interested Parties on these discussions at a later point in the Examination.</p>
RR-029-5	<p>"The project submission recognises in its Planning Balance conclusion (para 888) the significance of the landscape and seascape impact. Para 890 of the Planning Statement indicates "It is also noted that all predicted significant effects have been mitigated as far as practicable". National Trust consider that the Planning Balance needs the further consideration of offshore landscape with a redefined Landscape Management Plan including a wider and specific package of offset mitigation and enhancement measures. National Trust wish to see consideration of this issue through Examination and potentially a Section 106 Agreement to secure the wider landscape enhancement alongside the management of tourism risk: both identified as key issues within the submitted scheme"</p>	<p>The Applicant is exploring potential opportunities for enhancement as part of offsetting/compensation measures (with a general focus on designated areas) and will introduce these for discussion with stakeholders during the Examination process.</p>

2.26 RR-030 – Memoria Ltd

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-030	"I represent Memoria Ltd. We are the 3rd largest operator of crematoria in the UK and the owners and operators of Denbighshire crematorium and memorial park. Our site is based near St Asaph, Denbighshire and according to the plans sent to us as part of this consultation process, it appears that the applicant is looking to occupy our site in the construction of this project. Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium is an important public service facility which is carrying out over 1,500 funeral services per annum. We also have over 100 memorials for departed local residents which are visited by bereaved families every day. The use associated with a crematorium is sensitive and requires a peaceful, tranquil environment to operate. The ground around the crematorium is consecrated given that cremated remains are buried across the site. Overall, we have in the region of 150,000 visitors every year. With all of this in mind, it is clear that the route planned for this project should be diverted away from this location. We provided this feedback to the developers during the pre-app process but we are dismayed to see that no adjustments have been made to this application. Given the importance to both the local and wider community, it is critical that our request for a diversion is discussed and actioned asap. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further. Best regards, Jamieson Hodgson Deputy CEO Memoria Ltd (Redacted)"	The Applicant confirms that there are no proposals to occupy the Denbighshire crematorium and memorial park at any point during construction. An explanation of the potentially affected land, and response to concerns regarding tranquility (noise), is provided within the response to Genesis Town Planning on behalf of Memoria Ltd (RR-031).

2.27 RR-031 – Genesis Town Planning on Behalf of Memoria Ltd

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-031-1	<p>"We act on behalf of Memoria Ltd who own and operate the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium, Glascoed Road, Saint Asaph, LL17 0LG. The crematorium and memorial park is directly impacted by the proposed development which would cause substantial harm to the operation of the facility resulting in the complete loss of the quiet and tranquil setting necessary for funerals to take place. Construction Traffic Temporary Access: Of particular concern is the routing of construction traffic to the proposed site of the sub station along Glascoed Road, passed the crematorium. The introduction of heavy vehicles and constant construction traffic movements within such close proximity to a sensitive receptor, such as a crematorium, would have a significant impact on the operation of the facility. The site of the crematorium was chosen because of its tranquil and peaceful setting, which is a necessary requirement to assist the bereaved in coming to terms with the loss of their loved ones. The proximity of Glascoed road and the use of it by construction traffic, would result in harm to this tranquil setting No amount of noise mitigation or landscaping would overcome the harm identified. Whilst the routing of construction traffic along Glascoed Road may have been the subject of detailed assessment and analysis we suggest that there has been no regard for the impact on the operation of the crematorium that would arise as a result."</p>	<p>The Project's Order Limits do not encroach into the respondent's registered property. Plot 431 is 104 square metres of public road and verge (being Glascoed Road, B5381). The respondent is listed as an Affected Person in respect of Plot 431 because the rule of 'ad medium filum' has been applied (this is the legal presumption that unless there is contrary evidence, the owner of land which abuts either a public or private road the title to the subsoil of which is not registered also owns the subsoil of the road, up to the mid or centre line). In addition to this and through due diligence undertaken by the Applicant's land agents, the respondent is also documented in the Book of Reference as holding rights of access over plots 438, 445, 447, 439 and 442. The respondent is the beneficiary of access rights across the neighboring registered land title for the purpose of upholding and maintaining the respondent's property boundary.</p> <p>The decision to use Glascoed Road for construction traffic associated with the substation was taken as a result of assessment and consultation following the publication of PEIR and statutory consultation, the detail of which can be found here (Report 5.1 Consultation Report (APP-024) and Volume 1 Chapter 4 Site Selection (APP-044). Feedback was received stating a preference for Glascoed Road to be used as the access route for the substation, also noting that construction traffic would use Glascoed Road to access the cable corridor construction works area irrespective of the substation construction access. Glascoed Road has been assessed under EIA regulations for the impacts of an increase in AyM construction vehicle movements. The assessment is based upon maximum trip generation forecasts for construction traffic and using worst-case parameters for the assignment of construction vehicle movements to construction accesses.</p> <p>The outcome of the assessment has not identified any significant effects. This assessment can be reviewed at Volume 3, Chapter 9 Traffic and Transport, (APP-070). This assessment has regard to Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium as a receptor and concludes that an</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>impact on driver severance and delay would be low and minor in significance.</p> <p>The potential for noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of AyM has been assessed in Volume 3 Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (APP-071). Noise impacts on a number of receptors, including Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium have been assessed using a number of worst-case parameters in order to provide a robust assessment. The assessment uses background noise levels measured at a number of locations, including Glascoed road, to establish the existing noise environment and assigns the crematorium the same level of sensitivity as a residential receptor when considering construction noise impacts.</p> <p>The predicted construction noise impact for Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium is assessed as negligible for both daytime and weekend noise levels during construction. Captured within the assessment was construction of the cable route, potential use of trenchless crossing techniques works beneath Glascoed Rd, site preparation associated with the establishment of construction compounds, groundworks within the substation and the potential for construction traffic noise from vehicles using Glascoed Road. The assessment also considers operational noise from the substation and again predicted this to be a negligible level of impact.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) which contains Appendix 7 Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (APP-319) setting out the principles that will be followed when managing construction traffic during the works to mitigate impacts on local receptors. A final version of the CoCP and CTMP will need to be approved by Denbighshire County Council, prior to construction commencing. The CoCP also contains Appendix 2, Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) (APP-314) which sets out mitigation measures that could be deployed to mitigate noise impacts from AyM construction. AyM has also committed to a Communications Plan (Outline CoCP Appendix 12 Outline Construction Communications Plan, APP-324) which sets out how it will communicate with local</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		residents and businesses during the construction phase. As with the CoCP and CTMP, the NVMP and Communications Plan will need to be revised, based on detailed design and approved by Denbighshire County Council before construction works can commence.
RR-031-2	<p>"The most sensible solution would be to utilise a construction and haul road serving the sub station site either from the north, close to interchange with the North Wales Expressway (A55), or alternatively from the east through St Asaph Business Park where existing commercial activities exist. It makes no sense to bring traffic along Glascoed Road when suitable access could be achieved from Llys Edmund Prys or from Carlton Close across open fields to the site. Here the road widths are adequate, and the junction designed to accommodate large articulated vehicles associated with the commercial use of the business park. The existing commercial occupiers of the business park are not as noise sensitive when compared to a crematorium use. This approach would also encourage construction and associated traffic to utilise the A55 rather than the narrower country lanes to the south."</p>	<p>The site selection undertaken for AyM included the assessment of different routing and siting options by technical and environmental experts as well as consultation with landowners, Statutory Stakeholders, Councils and other stakeholders (Report 5.1 Consultation Report (APP-024) and Volume 1 Chapter 4 Site Selection (APP-044)). Following stakeholder feedback received following issue of the PEIR, the conclusion drawn was that the southern access into the substation site from Glascoed Road would be progressed. No feedback was received from Denbighshire County Council, as relevant Highways Authority in response to the PEIR suggesting that the Northern access would be preferable to the Southern access. The Applicant had, however, received a preference for the southern access option (from Glascoed Road), from an affected landowner which was a consideration in the final decision on substation access. In addition, the site selection process has considered potential impacts to EIA receptors throughout the refinement process as options have been considered and optionality then reduced, the detail of which can be found in Volume 1 Chapter 4 Site Selection (APP-044). The potential to use Llys Edmund Prys or Carton Close was discounted early due to the presence of a Local Wildlife Site and the important habitats and species residing within.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 9 Traffic and Transport, (APP-070). and Volume 3, Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (APP-071) both consider impacts on the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium of the use of Glascoed Rd and impacts have been found to be not significant.</p> <p>The CTMP (which will comply with the outline version submitted as APP-319) will be agreed with DCC and sets out the routes permitted for construction traffic.</p>
RR-031-3	<p>"In addition, scope to access the proposed sub station from the south of the A55 interchange along Ffordd William Morgan should also be explored further. This would avoid any construction traffic impacting on St Asaph Business Park, Glascoed Road, or the crematorium. We therefore request that further</p>	<p>The site selection undertaken for AyM included assessment of the options by technical and environmental experts as well as consultation with affected landowners, Statutory Stakeholders, Councils and other stakeholders. (Report 5.1 Consultation Report (APP-024) and Volume 1</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	consideration be given to the location and routing of the construction access to the proposed sub station."	<p>Chapter 4 Site Selection (APP-044)). The conclusion drawn with regards to access to the substation was that following stakeholder feedback received at PEIR the southern access would be progressed. No feedback was received from Denbighshire County Council, as relevant Highways Authority in response to the PEIR suggesting that the Northern access would be preferable to the Southern access. The Applicant had, however, received a preference for the southern access option (from Glascoed Road), from an affected landowner which was a consideration in the final decision on substation access. In addition, the site selection process has considered potential impacts to EIA receptors throughout the refinement process as options have been considered and optionality then reduced, the detail of which can be found in Volume 1 Chapter 4 Site Selection (APP-044).</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 9 Traffic and Transport, (APP-070) considers impacts on the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium of the use of Glascoed Rd and impacts have been found to be not significant.</p>
RR-031-4	<p>"Maintenance Access to the East of the Crematorium: We note that the submitted details indicate the introduction of a maintenance access to serve the cable route. This access is located immediately to the west boundary of the site, adjacent to the existing crematorium and memorial gardens. This access follows a hedge line, utilising existing field gates into the field to the land to the south along the alignment of the cable route. We see no reason why this maintenance access cannot be repositioned to the western boundary of the same field. There is simply no necessity for it to 'hug' the crematorium boundary. Whilst we note that the use of this access may be infrequent, any activity of that nature along the route and in proximity to the building would impact on the quiet enjoyment of the facility by mourners. The crematorium is in constant use, and undertakes over 1,500 cremations per annum, in addition to bereaved families visiting the gardens of remembrance. To have vehicles operating so close to the site, with the associated, noise, activity and visual disruption would be harmful to the operation of the crematorium."</p>	<p>The operational access described would be used infrequently (typically 1-2 times a year) to access link boxes along the cable corridor. Access would likely to be taken in a small vehicle driving south along this route to access the cable route located well beyond the extend of the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium to the South. The disturbance associated with any routine works here would certainly be no more than the use of the existing agricultural access point and agricultural field within which this access is located or from existing traffic on the Glascoed Road which runs a similar distance away from the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium to the North. Operational access taken at this location will not cause any significant disturbance to a user of the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium.</p>

2.28 RR-032 – Captain Haddock’s Seafood

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT’S RESPONSE
RR-032	"I have been fishing in Liverpool Bay and the north Wales Coast for over 30 years, the wind farm will have a massive impact on my business just like the wind farms did in previous years. I need to be kept informed at all times. Regards Kevin Mckie"	<p>Noted. The Applicant is seeking to reach agreement with affected fishers via a Fisheries Cooperation Strategy (which was agreed in consultation with the fishing community). Discussions are now in progress.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking to reach agreement with affected fishers via a Fisheries Cooperation Strategy and Fisheries Liaison Plan (together, the Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (FLCEP, which was agreed in consultation with the fishing community). The FLCEP has been updated with a timeframe for reaching agreements and other matters in response to ExQ1.12.1 (Document 1.32 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). Discussions are now in progress with registered fishers with a view to agreeing cooperation payments at the appropriate time in accordance with the FLCEP.</p>

2.29 RR-033 – Manx Fish Producers Organisation

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-033	<p>"The Manx Fish Producers Organisation wishes to remain as an interested party in this development. Our members, which includes scallop fishermen, have interest in the immediate area and specifically the areas around the development which form the regional study area. In the past, Manx vessel data has not been fully included in the presented datasets for other windfarm presentations both within and outside the regional study area, as typically it is Seafish data for over 15m vessels. While we have 11 over 15m vessels in our organisation we also have 24 under 15m vessels which fish for scallops in the regional study area. While the fishing activity of Manx registered may be limited in the commercial fisheries study area it is significant in the regional study area. The issue facing us is one of cumulative impact. It may be only a small percentage of our activity in a specific area but when all of those areas are added together the impact can be high and this is seldom if ever taken into account."</p>	<p>The Manx Fish Producers Organisation is included on the AyM fisheries stakeholder list and will be kept informed of all project updates by the Applicant and/or their appointed Fisheries Liaison Officer. As noted in the Marine Licence Principles document (an updated version of which has been submitted as Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission), the marine licences required for the offshore aspects of AyM will include a condition to secure a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan. The Manx Fish Producers' Organisation were invited to attend group fisheries meetings and individual interviews to inform the commercial fisheries EIA for AyM.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that Isle of Man (IoM) commercial fishing interests have been considered in the application. As confirmed in Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 4, Annex 8.2 Commercial Fisheries Consultation Record (AS-007), Isle of Man fleet activity is described in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.7 and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109).</p> <p>As stated within the documents mentioned above, Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) (capturing activity by vessels 15m length and over) and landings (capturing landings by fishing vessels of all lengths) data sourced from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and presented in the commercial fisheries chapter of the ES (APP-054) include vessels registered to the following UK administrations and British crown dependencies: England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Isle of Man, Guernsey and Jersey. Isle of Man data has been incorporated into MMO UK databases since 2011. Commercial fishing vessels that are registered to the IoM are required to hold both IoM and UK fishing licences. The MMO data presented in the ES therefore provides commercial landing statistics for all vessels registered to UK administrations and crown dependencies. To confirm, the most recently available VMS and landings datasets have been accessed and used to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The extent of IoM-registered vessel activity in and around the study area is noted. Across all of ICES Division 7a (Irish Sea), the annual average</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>(2016-2020) landed value of scallops landed by IoM vessels was £3.8 million, based on MMO landings statistics. Landings from the AyM regional study area over the same period were £420,000 and from the AyM study area were £1,700. The potential for displacement of fishing activity is assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054)), Sections 8.10 to 8.12. Potential displacement of UK (including IoM) scallop dredge activity is assessed in the context of the wider Irish Sea, noting that scallop grounds extend across much of the Irish Sea and that vessels typically have large operating ranges. AyM has not been assessed as causing significant displacement of the scallop dredge fishery given key grounds are outside of the AyM area. The potential for cumulative effects on the scallop dredge fisheries is assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Sections 8.13. As stated above, the scallop dredging fleet target scallop across a relatively wide area offshore and vessels typically have large operating ranges. Scallop grounds extend far beyond the extent of AyM and the other projects relevant to the cumulative effects assessment. Cumulative effects on the scallop dredge fleet have been assessed as not significant in EIA terms.</p>

2.30 RR-034 – Envirowatch.EU

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-034	"1. Replacement of loss of land by sufficient compensatory replacement by tree/ shrub planting, 2. Wildlife, including insect provision, 3. Green connecting corridors, 4. Water bodies for the above"	<p>This is noted by the Applicant who will provide new benefits for biodiversity, through proposed enhancement measures, that are additional to those provided as part of mitigation or compensation measures, although they can be complementary.</p> <p>Proposals to provide biodiversity enhancement have been discussed with NRW and DCC and proposed within 8.4 the Outline Landscape and Ecology Mitigation plan (oLEMP) (APP-305. An updated version has been submitted as Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p> <p>Proposals for biodiversity enhancements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Creation of five additional ponds/ pools located to the south east of the Onshore Substation (OnSS) and ongoing management of the new ponds plus two existing ponds;</li><li>Creation of five reptile/amphibian hibernacula each measuring at least 1m³ and constructed from on-site materials including soil, logs, brash and stone.</li><li>Creation of twenty reptile/amphibian refugia, each comprising brash piles or log stacks, at least 0.25m³.</li><li>Erection of ten bat boxes (additional to those required as compensation for PRFs to be lost) and ten bird boxes, including two pole mounted barn owl boxes;</li><li>Scrub management to promote structurally diverse grassland habitat and benefit reptiles and amphibians;</li><li>Creation of 9.8ha of species-rich, lowland meadow Priority Habitat and 6.05ha of diverse neutral grassland, plus management thereafter to ensure its nature conservation interest is maintained; and</li><li>Creation of 2.96ha of locally native broadleaved woodland (refer to Section 2), including locally sourced black poplar <i>Populus nigra</i>.</li></ul>

## 2.31 RR-035 – Glyndwr University on Behalf of Glyndwr Innovations Limited

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-035-1	<p>"This Relevant Representation is made by Glyndwr University ("Respondent") as interested party and leaseholder of the building and land known as Optic Technology Centre ("Centre") located at Ffordd William, St Asaph Business Park, St Asaph, LL11 0JD. The Respondent has previously engaged with the Applicant providing a section 42 response to the earlier statutory consultation concerning the Project in 2021. It follows that as part of this process, the Respondent raised a number of concerns with the Applicant regarding both short and long-term adverse impact to the Respondent and its business operations from the noise and vibration implications arising from the proposed Project and identified within the Applicant's Preliminary Environmental Information Report. The nature of the Respondent and Centre's business operations predominantly consist of precision optical systems, including optical fabrication and surface metrology which relies on vibration-sensitive machinery."</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 10, Noise and Vibration (APP-071) concludes that any trenchless crossing techniques operations are likely to have a minor adverse level of effect, that would not be significant in EIA terms, on users of St Asaph Business Park.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Outline CoCP Appendix 2, APP-312) to be agreed with DCC prior to construction starting. This is secured via DCO R10.</p> <p>The Applicant has also committed to a Communication Plan (Outline CoCP Appendix 12 Outline Construction Communications Plan, APP-324) as part of its CoCP to ensure that local residents and businesses are kept informed as to when works such as trenchless crossing technique operations, any piling that might be required and large deliveries will be expected. This is also secured via DCO R10.</p>
RR-035-2	<p>"The Respondent's primary concern is and remains to be that low ground-born low frequency (sub-micron level) vibrations which are likely to arise out of the Project (including but not limited to the development of an onshore substation and corridor in close proximity to the Centre) would render machinery used by the Respondent for its processes unusable and substantially and detrimentally effect its undertakings at the Centre without reasonable and appropriate mitigation."</p>	
RR-035-3	<p>"The Respondent has reviewed the Applicant's Application together with accompanying documents including the Environmental Impact Assessment, Consultation Report and Noise and Vibration Mitigation Plan and remains concerned that these do not appropriately consider the nature of the area for which the proposed on-shore element of the development concerns such as St Asaph Business Park which consists of a high proportion of businesses similar to that of the Respondent who operate during the days and timings proposed by the Applicant with respect to the Applicant to undertake Project construction nor appropriately addresses the Respondent's earlier concerns outlined within its earlier section 42 response and possible options for mitigation for the Project as discussed between the Applicant and Respondent in October 2021 including consideration of such days and times the development could be undertaken in order that the impact on the Respondent, as a commercial enterprise, arising</p>	<p>As set out in Table 4 of 6.3.10 ES Volume 3, Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (APP-071), further to Section 42 correspondence and subsequent engagement between Glyndwr University and the Applicant the design was refined for the DCO application. At PEIR a wide area was consulted upon with regards to the most appropriate location to cross the A55. A crossing location to the west has been progressed which takes into account the feedback received from Glyndwr University and moves the trenchless crossing as far away from the receptor as AyM is able.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (8.13.2 Outline CoCP Appendix 2, (APP-314)) to be agreed with DCC prior to construction starting. This is secured via DCO R10.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	from any subsequent development by the Applicant could be reasonably and proportionately reduced."	The Applicant has also committed to a Communication Plan as part of its CoCP to ensure that local residents and businesses are kept informed as to when works such as trenchless crossing technique operations, any piling that might be required and large deliveries will be expected. This is secured via DCO R10.

## 2.32 RR-036 – Sustainable Cymru

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-036-1	"Denbighshire Residents Health - Large Asbestos Water pipe adjacent to the development. Should it be replaced at a cost to RWE safely before the start construction? Who will manage / monitor the disturbance and water testing of the Asbestos Water pipe during construction/ ground works (vibrations etc.) and any future interference via electric magnet."	The Applicant is in consultation with Dwr Cymru with regards to proximity to its assets.
RR-036-2	"Denbighshire Residents Consultation was conducted during Covid (restricting information access to important community stakeholders, such as the Vulnerable and the Elderly). - Majority of Denbighshire Vulnerable/Elderly residents were not able to go to a group setting to view plans and ask questions - Many not able to use computers to access/view documents online"	<p>The Consultation Report (Report 5.1 Consultation Report (APP-024)) outlines the approach taken to consultation by the project which has included a variety of approaches including but not limited to online interactive sessions, in person consultation and newsletters. The approach to consultation was agreed with DCC and other local authorities in the Statement of Community Consultation (Appendix D3.1 to the consultation report (APP-025)).</p> <p>DCC were asked by the Planning Inspectorate to confirm the adequacy of consultation which they did and their response can be found in (AoC-003).</p>
RR-036-3	<p>"Denbighshire Natural Environmental Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ St Asaph nature Bridle path access to Resident will be blocked</li> <li>➤ Established hedgerows will be destroyed to make way for lines and construction access.</li> <li>➤ Rare Welsh "Ridge and furrow Fields" site will be destroyed</li> <li>➤ Proposed concrete site abuts a Public Nature Reserve that houses rare and protected Newts, Voles, Bats, Owls, and many other wildlife and fauna.</li> <li>➤ The other side abuts to Bodelwyddan Castle estate that consist of large ponds and established woods where birds and wildlife breed.</li> <li>➤ The proposed site is currently on food producing agricultural green land.</li> <li>➤ Noise pollution: Electric Humming of the transformers and magnetic nuisance impact on wildlife breeding. Future Economic impact to St Asaph Business Park</li> <li>➤ Regionally significant enterprise site in an area of outstanding natural beauty, offering work life balance and economic, environmental, social and cultural well-being – NOT AN INDUSTRIAL POWER STATION HUB!</li> </ul>	<p>Information on Public Rights of Way (PROW) can be found in the Outline CoCP Appendix 8 Outline Public Access Management Plan (APP-320) which sets out how access to PROWs will be managed during construction. The Applicant is not seeking any permanent PROW closures.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) (APP-305. An update of which is provided as Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) sets out how habitats will be managed and reinstated after construction. Hedgerows will be reinstated at their original location (or as close as possible), new hedgerows will be located so as to re-establish links and maintain the network. In all cases the hedgerows will comprise a locally appropriate mixture of at least seven woody species and including heavy standard trees at a 3:1 ratio for any lost.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 8 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069) considers the impact of AyM on ridge and furrow. Ridge and furrow was identified from LiDAR survey within the southern section of the Onshore Export Cable Corridor (ECC). The ridge and furrow in these</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>➤ What will happen to current and future tenants? Expansion to the site will be restricted by a one substation to the East – two to the south and now a proposed super substation to the West.</p> <p>➤ Substation will take 2 years to build, after which access to the site will be severely restricted."</p>	<p>areas could not be identified during the walkover survey although remains exist below ground. The ridge and furrow is expected to be of medieval or post-medieval date and should remain exist, would be considered to be of low heritage significance on the basis that these are well understood remains of agricultural function. The construction of the onshore ECC would not affect the entirety of the areas identified for ridge and furrow although the magnitude of impact is considered to be high adverse upon a receptor of low heritage significance. This would result in a minor adverse effect prior to mitigation which is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 5 Onshore Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (APP-066) assesses the impacts of AyM on ecology in the area and the oLEMP (APP-305. An update of which is provided as Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) sets out the mitigation that will be delivered by AyM. The oLEMP sets out good working practices to avoid impacts on retained habitats. Working areas adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites will be kept to the minimum area necessary and enclosed with temporary fencing to avoid inadvertent damage to adjacent habitats.</p> <p>A number of biodiversity enhancements will be provided as part of the project in accordance with planning policy. Initial proposals for biodiversity enhancements (subject to agreement with DCC and NRW) include the creation of five additional ponds located south east of the OnSS; creation of five reptile/amphibian hibernacula, creation of twenty reptile/amphibian refugia; erection of ten bat boxes and ten bird boxes including two barn owl boxes; scrub management to promote structurally diverse grassland habitat; creation of species-rich lowland meadow Priority habitat and the creation of locally native broadleaved woodland. The detail of enhancement can be found in the oLEMP A detailed routing and siting appraisal was undertaken in order to determine the location of onshore infrastructure for AyM (see Volume 1, Chapter 4 (APP-044). This routing avoided high quality agricultural land where possible, with the majority of the route on Grade 3b (moderate soils).</p> <p>The route has also been assessed using Agricultural Land Classification as the majority of the route crosses farming land. The Agricultural Land</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Classification provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. It is the only approved system for grading agricultural land quality in England and Wales. The majority of the route is dominated by Grade 3a and 3b Agricultural Land Classification and is therefore considered to be of moderate to good quality. Impacts on best and most versatile land have been minimised where possible through site selection and the adherence to a soil management plan (APP-316) during both construction works and the reinstatement of the cable corridor following cable installation.</p> <p>The construction methodology chosen ensures that the direct impacts on soil resulting from excavation will be limited spatially to the onshore ECC and temporally to a one-off process of excavation, storage and replacement. Given the overall scale of the agricultural resource and chosen construction methodology, the impact from the cable connection works is assessed to be short term and of low magnitude.</p> <p>Whilst there is predicted to be a temporary impact upon agricultural land during the construction phase of the onshore cable works, the reinstatement of land above the buried cable will allow agricultural cultivation to re-commence once the cable has been installed. Field drainage will be reinstated and the indicative minimum burial depth (from ground surface to the top of the cable ducting), will allow cultivation of land. Measures to reduce the impact of construction works upon agricultural operations are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission)) along with a Soil Management Plan (SMP)(APP-316). The SMP provides details of mitigation measures and best practice handling techniques to safeguard soil resources by ensuring their protection, conservation and appropriate reinstatement during the construction of the onshore works.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (APP-071) considers the potential for noise impacts arising from the proposed development. The Applicant has also committed to a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (APP-314) to be approved by DCC prior to construction starting.</p>

## 2.33 RR-037 – Wilson Fearnall on Behalf of GBL and IM Kerfoot Discretionary Trust

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-037-1	<p>"The Trustees of the GBL &amp; IM Kerfoot Discretionary Trust wish to make the following representations to RWE's application for the Awel Y Mor Offshore Wind Farm Order.</p> <p>Inadequate Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The applicant has failed to engage and communicate effectively over key design issues including the cable route, temporary mitigation areas and permanent access rights;</li> <li>➤ The applicant has not provided sufficient responses to s42 consultation feedback (as referenced in the SoCC) and has failed to fully consider suitable alternative proposals to mitigate;</li> <li>➤ The material provided for consultation with regard to construction timescales and methodology is inconsistent with land rights being requested." </li></ul>	<p>Construction timescales are set out in (Volume 2, Chapter 1: onshore Project Description (APP-062)) with equivalent information on the establishment and maintenance of ecological mitigation areas being set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (APP-305). The Applicant will endeavor to keep the Respondent informed of proposals to undertake any pre-construction surveys or enabling works, the timings for which at the present time are unknown.</p> <p>The Applicant and the Respondent are currently negotiating an agreement in respect of the land rights required. The parties have freedom of contract to agree terms which are agreeable to both parties and will continue to discuss the extent of rights required and timescales during which those rights can be exercised.</p>
RR-037-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ "EIA &amp; Designs</li> <li>➤ The applicant has not fully assessed the impact of their proposals in connection with emerging spatial development requirements of the Denbighshire Replacement Local Development Plan 2018-2033.</li> <li>➤ Inadequate provision of land rights included for the permanent and temporary diversion of footpaths and utilities.</li> <li>➤ Rights are being sought via negotiation that will support and allow development not included with the application. Indicates insufficient design confidence at application stage."</li> </ul>	<p>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives (APP-044) sets out that the Applicant has engaged with the Planning Policy team at DCC regarding allocations within the current and emerging Local Development Plans. This included consideration of potential interaction with Local Development Plan candidate sites to the east and south of Rhyl. Following consultation with DCC, and recognition that development opportunities in Rhyl were constrained by flood zones, The Applicant incorporated an offset into the project design resulting in an eastward shift from candidate sites at the south-east of Rhyl.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that suitable rights are sought for the diversion of utilities both within the rights being sought compulsorily and those being negotiated voluntarily. Where a particular concern exists with a specific utility, it would be of assistance if details could be provided to the Applicant who would be happy to discuss that.</p> <p>As set out in the tourism and recreation chapter of the ES (APP-065) all potentially affected rights of way (including footpaths) have been fully considered. The draft DCO (AS-014; Document 1.8 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) lists the rights of way to be temporarily restricted in DCO S4. Having considered each affected right of way, the Applicant is confident that all necessary land rights are being sought. No permanent diversions are sought. Wherever practicable, any temporary</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>diversion will be within the order limits and may be located on more than one route as works progress. All necessary rights to provide such routes through the order limits during construction would be granted by the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant and the Respondent are currently negotiating an agreement in respect of the land rights required. The parties have freedom of contract to agree terms which are agreeable to both parties and will continue to discuss the extent of rights required. The inclusion of clauses of the nature described by the Respondent is commonplace in commercial agreements and does not indicate insufficient confidence in the design. A detailed description of the rationale for the route of cabling and installation of ecological mitigation at this location is set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP (Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>
RR-037-3	<p>▲ "Compulsory Acquisition of Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The applicant has failed to adequately consider reasonable alternatives and suggested modifications to the design;</li> <li>▲ The applicant is unable to clearly demonstrate that rights sought are proportionate and reasonable for the delivery of the project. Permanent rights are being sought for 'Temporary Mitigation Areas' and cable easements with time limited operational periods;</li> <li>▲ The applicant cannot demonstrate a clear use, or necessary locational requirement for 'Temporary Mitigation Areas';</li> <li>▲ The applicant has not made sufficient attempts to acquire the land required by agreement and the Statement of Reason does not accurately reflect progress and engagement to date;</li> </ul> <p>The applicant has not fully considered the balance between public and private rights and is unable to demonstrate in many cases that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of land."</p>	<p>As noted in Report 5.1: Consultation Report (APP-024), the chosen route has been selected as a compromise between all constraints in the region including combined with engineering, ecological, landscape and visual interaction and PRoW management. Nature conservation designations and sensitive ecological features located to the east of the onshore cable corridor meant that the requested re-location to the east was not adopted by The Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out why the rights sought are proportionate and necessary in the statement of reasons submitted as part of the Application (APP-021). Rights are sought in preference to acquisition of the freehold wherever possible in order to minimise the impact on the landowner. These rights are 'permanent' as there is no ability in law to acquire a 'temporary' right of this nature for the period required; the period for which the rights are required substantially exceeds the period within which 'temporary' powers under the DCO could be relied upon.</p> <p>With regard to the Temporary Mitigation Areas, these are proposed as mitigation for temporary loss of foraging areas for great crested newt along the onshore ECC. Following the principles set out in the outline landscape and ecology management plan (APP-305; Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission), the mitigation areas are provided as close as possible to the area that is temporarily lost and</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>accessible to the nearest breeding ponds (noting there are ponds either side of the cable corridor in this location).</p> <p>The Applicant has noted in the statement of reasons (APP-021; Document 1.45 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) at 10.1.7 that "It is intended that the exercise of mitigation rights and effect of restrictive covenants will be time limited to the period required to deliver the mitigation secured in the Order, after which only access rights will be exercised.". This is sought to be achieved by linking the power to obligations under requirements, in order that once the plan approved under requirements has been complied with to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, the authority can confirm that in writing. The intention is to provide a clear end point to the exercise of this right, giving affected landowners certainty as to when the temporary use ceases and that the exercise of the right will not be later resumed. This is proposed precisely to minimise the practical impact. Land take will also be minimised through detailed design.</p> <p>The Applicant has fully considered the balance between public and private interests and has set out the compelling case in the public interest in the statement of reasons submitted as part of the Application (APP-021). The land, and other interests required to be subject to compulsory acquisition represents the minimum level of interference reasonably required to facilitate the Project.</p> <p>The purpose of the powers of compulsory acquisition are to enable the delivery of AyM which is needed both locally and nationally, has numerous benefits and has substantial policy support. The need for the Project, suitability of the Order Land and the support for such projects in the National Policy Statements demonstrates that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily.</p> <p>The Applicant's appointed land agents have previously and continue to engage with the Respondent's appointed agent in order to progress a voluntary agreement. Heads of Terms were issued to the Respondent's appointed agent on 23 December 2021 with the agent subsequently attending meetings with the Applicants agents on 20 January 2022, 11 February 2022 and 12 May 2022 to discuss the proposed documentation. Further iterations of the Heads of Terms have been issued to the</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Respondent's agent on 10 May 2022 and 12 August 2022 which reflect general changes emanating from the discussions with agents during the course of 2022. The Applicant is awaiting detailed comments on the latest suite of documents that have been issued and will continue to proactively engage with the Respondent's appointed agent to progress negotiations.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that the Statement of Reasons (an updated version of which has been provided by the Applicant in Document 1.45 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) is an accurate representation of the status of landowner negotiations at the time of drafting. An update on the status of negotiations has been provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 (Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>

2.34 RR-038 – DMPC on Behalf of Mr JB & Mrs E Evans

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-038	"Concerns the substantial adverse impact of the proposed scheme acquisition (and ancillary works) on the viability of our client's agricultural enterprise (taking into account the extent of the mitigation area earmarked for the siting of the substation) , together with screening measures proposed and the lasting detrimental effect on the retained property."	The proposals set out in 8.4 the outline landscape and ecology management plan (oLEMP) (APP-305; Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission), are required to reduce, mitigate or compensate for potential impacts on landscape and biodiversity resources arising from the development of the onshore substation as well measures intended to provide biodiversity enhancements as required by national and local planning policy.

2.35 RR-039 – DMPC on Behalf of Mr HG & Mrs ME Hughes

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-039	"Concerns the adverse impact of the proposed cabling works in respect of our land and associated reinstatement standards."	Measures to reduce the impact of construction works upon agricultural operations are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (outline CoCP) (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) along with a Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-316) (an update of which has been provided in Document 1.37 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission. The SMP provides details of mitigation measures and best practice handling techniques to safeguard soil resources by ensuring their protection, conservation and appropriate reinstatement during the construction of the onshore works. Whilst there is predicted to be a temporary impact upon agricultural land during the construction phase of the onshore cable works, the reinstatement of land above the buried cable will allow agricultural cultivation to re-commence once the cable has been installed. Field drainage will be reinstated and the indicative minimum burial depth (from ground surface to the top of the cable ducting), will allow cultivation of land. Reinstatement in accordance with details approved by DCC is secured under DCO R17. Approval of a final CCP and SMP are secured via DCO R10 (see Document 1.8 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).

2.36 RR-040 – DMPC on Behalf of The Estate of the Late Mr Wynford Davies

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-040	"Concerns the potential adverse impact of the proposed cabling /ancillary works in respect of our client's land and associated reinstatement standards."	See Applicant's response to RR-039. See also the outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), a version of which has been provided in Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).

2.37 RR-041 – DMPC on Behalf of Mr AEM Owen

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-041	"Concerns the potential adverse impact of the proposed cabling /ancillary works in respect of land farmed by our client and associated reinstatement standards"	See Applicant's response to RR-039. See also the outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), a version of which has been provided in Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission.

2.38 RR-042 – Rostons on Behalf of Mr Ivor Beech

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-042	"We have concerns regarding the following issues: - A significant amount of land occupied and farmed by Mr Beech is to be affected, during and after the works have been completed, this will greatly affect the productive capacity of the land to produce food and is a concern with regards to food security. - The additional traffic accessing the construction compounds on the A547 & Bodelwyddan Road will cause significant congestion as it accesses the A525. - The presence of the construction compounds in close proximity to residential properties has the potential to cause significant stress and health issues to those living at the properties."	<p>A detailed routing and siting appraisal was undertaken in order to determine the location of onshore infrastructure for AyM (see Volume 1, Chapter 4 (APP-044)). This routing avoided high quality agricultural land where possible, with the majority of the route on Grade 3b (moderate soils).</p> <p>The route has also been assessed using Agricultural Land Classification as the majority of the route crosses farming land. The Agricultural Land Classification provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. It is the only approved system for grading agricultural land quality in England and Wales. The majority of the route is dominated by Grade 3a and 3b Agricultural Land Classification and is therefore considered to be of moderate to good quality.</p> <p>The construction methodology chosen ensures that the direct impacts on soil resulting from excavation will be limited spatially to the onshore ECC and temporally to a one-off process of excavation, storage and replacement. Given the overall scale of the agricultural resource and chosen construction methodology, the impact from the cable connection works is assessed in ES Volume 3, Chapter 6: Ground Conditions and Land Use (APP-067) to be short term and of low magnitude.</p> <p>Measures to reduce the impact of construction works upon agricultural operations are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (outline CoCP) (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) along with a Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-316; Document 1.37 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). The SMP provides details of mitigation measures and best practice handling techniques to safeguard soil resources by ensuring their protection, conservation and appropriate reinstatement during the construction of the onshore works. Whilst there is predicted to be a temporary impact upon agricultural land during the construction phase of the onshore cable works, the reinstatement of land above the buried cable will allow agricultural cultivation to re-commence once the cable has been</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>installed. Field drainage will be reinstated and the indicative minimum burial depth (from ground surface to the top of the cable ducting as set out in ES Volume 3, Chapter 1: Onshore Project Description (APP-062)), will allow cultivation of land. Reinstatement in accordance with details approved by DCC is secured under DCO R17.</p> <p>With regards to construction traffic, the Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential traffic impacts that could occur as a result of the onshore elements of proposed wind farm that is presented in ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport (APP-070). The assessment includes consideration of potential delays for existing road users and is based upon maximum trip generation forecasts for construction traffic alongside worst-case parameters for the assignment of construction vehicle movements to construction accesses including those on the A547 &amp; Bodelwyddan Road. The assessment concludes that any adverse impact on driver severance and delay on all highway links (other than B5381 Glascoed Road) would be minor and any resulting effect would not be significant.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an Outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) which contains Appendix 7 Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (319) setting out the principles that will be followed when managing construction traffic during the works to mitigate impacts on local receptors. A final version of the CoCP and CTMP will need to be approved by Denbighshire County Council, prior to construction commencing as secured by DCO R10</p> <p>An assessment of the potential noise impacts arising during the construction and operation of AyM on residential receptors is provided in the Airborne Noise and Vibration Chapter of the ES (APP-071). Further consideration of the potential effects on public health are summarised in ES Volume 3, Chapter 12: Public Health (APP-073) which concludes effects to be negligible and not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The assessments are based on realistic worst-case assumptions and conclude that the proposed noise management measures (that will be finalised in a Noise and Vibration Management Plan and approved by Denbighshire County Council as secured under DCO R10), mean that</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		the impact of noise from construction activity, including noise from the construction compounds, will not be significant.

2.39 RR-043 – Rostons on Behalf of Mr Hugh Wynne-Davies

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-043	"We are concerned in principle about the amount of agricultural land being acquired for the scheme and its impacts on food security, principally the amount of land required for contemporary construction compounds and ensuring that the land is returned in a proper and productive condition. We are also concerned about the additional traffic using Dyserth Road and the hazards it will cause for other road users and pedestrians."	<p>A detailed routing and siting appraisal was undertaken in order to determine the location of onshore infrastructure for AyM (see Volume 1, Chapter 4 (APP-044)). This routing avoided high quality agricultural land where possible, with the majority of the route on Grade 3b (moderate soils).</p> <p>The route has also been assessed using Agricultural Land Classification as the majority of the route crosses farming land. The Agricultural Land Classification provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. It is the only approved system for grading agricultural land quality in England and Wales. The majority of the route is dominated by Grade 3a and 3b Agricultural Land Classification and is therefore considered to be of moderate to good quality.</p> <p>The construction methodology chosen ensures that the direct impacts on soil resulting from excavation will be limited spatially to the onshore ECC and temporally to a one-off process of excavation, storage and replacement. Given the overall scale of the agricultural resource and chosen construction methodology, the impact from the cable connection works is assessed in ES Volume 3, Chapter 6: Ground Conditions and Land Use (APP-067) to be short term and of low magnitude.</p> <p>Measures to reduce the impact of construction works upon agricultural operations are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (outline CoCP) (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) along with a Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-316; Document 1.37 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). The SMP provides details of mitigation measures and best practice handling techniques to safeguard soil resources by ensuring their protection, conservation and appropriate reinstatement during the construction of the onshore works.</p> <p>Whilst there is predicted to be a temporary impact upon agricultural land during the construction phase of the onshore cable works, the reinstatement of land above the buried cable will allow agricultural</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>cultivation to re-commence once the cable has been installed. Field drainage will be reinstated and the indicative minimum burial depth (from ground surface to the top of the cable ducting), as set out in ES Volume 3, Chapter 1: Onshore Project Description (APP-062)), will allow cultivation of land. Reinstatement in accordance with details approved by DCC is secured under DCO R17.</p> <p>With regards to construction traffic, the Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential traffic impacts that could occur as a result of the onshore elements of proposed wind farm. that is presented in ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport (APP-070). The assessment includes consideration of potential delays for existing road users and is based upon maximum trip generation forecasts for construction traffic alongside worst-case parameters for the assignment of construction vehicle movements to construction accesses including those on the Dyserth Road. The assessment concludes that any adverse impact on driver severance and delay on all highway links (other than B5381 Glascoed Road) would be minor and any resulting effect would not be significant.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an Outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) which contains Appendix 7 Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (APP-319) setting out the principles that will be followed when managing construction traffic during the works to mitigate impacts on local receptors. A final version of the CoCP and CTMP will need to be approved by Denbighshire County Council, prior to construction commencing as secured by DCO R10.</p>

2.40 RR-044 – Rostons on Behalf of The Executor of the Estate of the Late George Edward Brookes

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-044	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.41 RR-045 – Rostons on Behalf of Kelly Proffitt

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-045	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.42 RR-046 – Rostons on Behalf of Toni Mayne

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-046	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.43 RR-047 – Rostons on Behalf of Helen Owen Proffitt

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-047	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions.</li></ul>	<p>With regards to construction traffic, The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential traffic impacts that could occur as a result of the onshore elements of proposed wind farm that is presented in ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Traffic and transport (APP-070). The assessment includes consideration of road safety and is based upon maximum trip generation forecasts for construction traffic alongside worst-case parameters for the assignment of construction vehicle movements to construction accesses. The percentage increase of total forecast construction traffic flows against the 2026 baseline is 0.9% on Bodelwyddan Road which represents a negligible impact and any resulting effect would not be significant.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) which contains Appendix 7 Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (APP-319) setting out the principles that will be followed when managing construction traffic during the works to mitigate impacts on local receptors. A final version of the CoCP and CTMP will be approved by Denbighshire County Council, prior to construction commencing as secured via DCO R10. Notwithstanding the limited level of impact predicted for road safety, the mitigation including the Outline CTMP (APP-319) will ensure any potential impacts of vulnerable road users and road safety would be considered fully.</p> <p>With regard to the impacts to the local economy, ES Volume 3, Chapter 3: Socio Economics (AS-034) identifies minor beneficial impacts to employment and the economy of North Wales are predicted during both the construction and operation of the proposed development. It is estimated that construction activity will contribute to between £8.7 to £15.7 million GVA (or up to £3.1 million per annum) to the North Wales economy over the Proposed Development's assumed five-year development and construction phase.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Respondent on the enjoyment of land which is not directly affected by the proposed works with particular focus on the use of this land for equine purposes. The</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Applicant shall consider any amendments to the Outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) arising from these discussions and will update as necessary in due course. An assessment of the potential noise impacts arising during the construction and operation of AyM on residential receptors is provided in the ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration (APP-071). The assessment is based on realistic worst-case assumptions and conclude that the proposed noise management measures (that will be finalised in a Noise and Vibration Management Plan and approved by Denbighshire County Council as secured via DCO R10), mean that the impact of noise from construction activity, including noise from the construction compounds, will not be significant.</p> <p>With regard to dust, appropriate mitigation measures will be finalised and agreed with Denbighshire County Council via an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) (APP-315) that will be included as part of the overall CoCP and will adhere to construction industry good practice guidance for control measures and dust management.</p> <p>Measures to reduce the impact of construction works upon agricultural operations are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (outline CoCP) (AP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) along with a Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-316; Document 1.37 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). The SMP provides details of mitigation measures and best practice handling techniques to safeguard soil resources by ensuring their protection, conservation and appropriate reinstatement during the construction of the onshore works. Approval of a final CoCP and SMP are secured via DCO R10</p> <p>Whilst there is predicted to be a temporary impact upon agricultural land during the construction phase of the onshore cable works, the reinstatement of land above the buried cable will allow agricultural cultivation to re-commence once the cable has been installed. Field drainage will be reinstated and the indicative minimum burial depth (from ground surface to the top of the cable ducting), will allow cultivation of land. Reinstatement in accordance with details approved by DCC is secured under DCO R17. As noted in the Consultation Report</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		(APP-024), The Cwbyr Partnership provided a plan referring to access to a TCC and expressed preference for the A525 entrance to be used to gain access so as to reduce disturbance and inconvenience to the day-to-day operations of the business. A preference for use of the A525 entrance was also expressed by DCC Highways team during discussion around construction site accesses.

2.44 RR-048 – Rostons on Behalf of Richard David Proffitt

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-048	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.45 RR-049 – Rostons on Behalf of Rachel Georgina Hughes

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-049	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.46 RR-050 – Rostons on Behalf of Sandra Archdale

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-050	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.47 RR-051 – Rostons on Behalf of Janet Johnson

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-051	<p>"We wish to raise concerns about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are due be significant vehicle movements and associated traffic measures on Bodelwyddan Road as construction traffic seeks to access the construction compound located at Fferm, off Bodelwyddan Road. This road is notoriously fast and has a number of accidents and near misses, we are concerned that the works will increase the risk of such accidents, particularly when entering and exiting the property.</li><li>We gave concerns that the presence of the construction compound, less than 200m from the main dwelling will have on the residents well being in the form of noise, light and dust pollution.</li><li>We have concerns that the removal of land from agricultural production, and the time that it take to return to full productivity will have an impact upon food security.</li><li>The property is used by the whole family, particularly the children for horse riding and this will not be able to take place during construction for health and safety reasons, causing the family to miss out on opportunities that cannot be repeated.</li><li>We are concerned about the impact of the construction compound at Cwybr Fawr on site residents due to noise, dust and light pollution, the most recent letting of a residential property attracted in the region of 60 applicants, highlighting the demand for property in the area and the conditions that applicants would be subjected to for the duration for the works.</li><li>Cwybr Fawr is a diversified business and supports a number of local businesses, we are concerned that the presence of the compound and works will have a wider impact on the local economy.</li><li>The compound and working areas are accessed off the A525 which is a primary access route between Rhyl and Rhuddlan, the dual carriageway is prone to congestion and it is feared that the works will exacerbate the issue and raise the risk of collisions."</li></ul>	See Applicant's response to RR-047.

2.48 RR-052 – Ray Knight

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-052	"I would like to support this project because I feel very strongly about renewable energy being produced in the UK. I believe the plans look agreeable and do not detract from an area. I would like to understand how the scheme could benefit local communities."	The comments are noted and welcomed.  Socioeconomic benefits of the project are set out in Section 6.3.3 of the ES, Volume 3, Chapter 3: Socio Economics (AS-034).

2.49 RR-053 – Ros Griffiths-Williams

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-053	"Impact on the environment and wildlife. Number of homes accessing renewable energy generated - effectiveness of proposed turbines in relation to other forms of renewable energy. Impact on target of net zero."	<p>Impacts on the environment and wildlife are detailed through the Environmental Statement (ES) submitted as part of the DCO application and specifically in ES Volume 2, Chapters 4 to 7 (APP-050 to APP-053) and ES Volume 3, Chapter 5: Onshore Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (APP-066).</p> <p>The need case for offshore wind is set out in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN1 and EN3, and relevant aspects of these NPSs are set out in 6.1.2 Policy and Legislation (APP-040) and the Planning Statement (APP-298).</p> <p>As set out in 8.1 Planning Statement (APP-298) AyM has the potential to make a substantial contribution to UK 2030 energy targets, providing in the region of 1.4% of the 40 GW target. Moreover, the proposed AyM project would have a direct positive benefit by providing a secure renewable energy supply for approximately 500,000 UK homes.</p>

## 2.50 RR-054 – Martin Griffiths

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-054-1	<p>"Hi RWE, I submitted a basic response to the Awel Y Mor consultation previously (06/09/21) but upon further reading of the documentation provided I would like to offer some further information from a residents point of view please.</p> <p>(REDACTED) Within the documentation there are several references to the 30mph speed limit along Glascoed Rd B5381. Unfortunately this assumption is incorrect, upon leaving St Asaph Business Park (heading West) the limit changes to a national speed limit (clearly signed) 60mph and remains so beyond the crematorium as well as the houses adjacent to the proposed substation access points."</p>	<p>The Applicant would like to clarify that the reference to the 30-mph speed limit was for the change in speed limit to the east of St. Asaph Business Park in the vicinity of the access for the existing National Grid substation, as set out in ES Volume 5, Annex 9.1: Traffic and transport Baseline Report (APP-148).</p>
RR-054-2	<p>"I also note that the detriment to the view from the properties is scored as low because 'high' hedges are alongside the road, this may be the case during the brief period that the hedges are in full leaf (maximum 3 1/2 months per annum) but as they are not evergreen and are also regularly trimmed down to approx 4-5 foot high, therefore the substation shall be much more visible for the majority of the year than is reported. This is also the case with regard properties number 7 &amp; 8, there is very few trees in the garden of the lodge opposite and as they are again only in full leaf for short periods of the year (none are evergreen) this will allow the substation to be seen for a substantial period of the year. Although the report / documentation seems comprehensive much of the information contained could be interpreted as trying to 'pull the wool over peoples eyes' with regard the impact that it will have on our quality of life. Computer generated images of hedgerows are (imo) nowhere near being true representations."</p>	<p>The assessment considers a worst-case position in its assessment of effects i.e. trees and hedges not in leaf. Photography was captured when trees and hedgerows were not in leaf and therefore represents a worst-case situation in relation to potential visual effects. It should also be noted that the hedgerows on Glascoed Rd appear to have been trimmed not long before the photography used within the LVIA chapter of the ES (APP-063) was captured. The photography was captured in winter reflecting a worst-case position and the assessment presented in the LVIA chapter reflects this and includes the following: 'Residential receptors have views over the tops of nearby hedgerows on account of the slight elevation of the properties. The view north east from these properties is from the front of the properties and the view towards the OnSS is regarded to form a part of their principal view. Susceptibility to change for residential receptors to the OnSS is considered to be high.'</p>
RR-054-3	<p>"Photographs taken of the area have been taken from the lowest possible level (some 2 metres below the doorways of the lowest property in our row) they therefore do not give a true representation of the visual impact which we will be forced to endure."</p>	<p>The assessment has assumed a worst-case position that the view from the properties is unhindered by the presence of hedgerows. It is the view from Glascoed Road itself which is screened by the hedgerow, which is relevant to consideration of road users by the assessment.</p>
RR-054-4	<p>Although we understand devaluing our property is not deemed a legitimate planning concern we believe that the c£50k that we have invested in our property is now wasted. The equity that we have build is lost and the views / vistas from the front of our property (which include a full aspect of the Northern end of The Clwydian Range) will be ruined forever. At present we see mountains, woodland and green farmland (genuine pictures available upon</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential visual impacts arising from the substation on residential receptors is provided in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Chapter of the ES (AS-029). Although significant visual effects are predicted during operation of the substation in year 1, once mitigation planting has matured the level of effect is not predicted to be significant.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	request) which seems soon to be replaced by a monstrous civil engineering project that will result in a constant drone of noise from the transformers as well as high levels of light pollution."	<p>An assessment of the potential noise impacts arising during the operation of the substation on residential receptors is provided in the Airborne Noise and Vibration Chapter of the ES (APP-071). The assessment utilizes noise modelling that has been undertaken on the basis of the type, quantity and size of plant that is likely to be required at a Substation of the size in the application. It should, however, be noted that the final design of the Substation has not been determined and so a maximum envelope has been assessed. The assessment concludes that, with appropriate mitigation in place, the operational noise from the substation would not be significant.</p> <p>With regard to lighting, the substation will not be manned, and lighting will only be required during operation and maintenance activities. Directional lighting will be needed for safety and security. Task-specific lighting will be needed externally, however, this will only be required on a very infrequent basis.</p> <p>While the Applicant notes the concern, the assessment referenced above demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact from noise or light spill from the substation. The landscape impacts are set out in the Landscape and Visual Assessment Chapter of the ES (AS-029), and the Applicant submits that, with the screening proposed these will have a moderate to minor level of effect that is not considered to be significant.</p>
RR-054-5	"The proposed substation will sit almost parallel with the 8ft wall which surrounds Bodelwyddan Castles protected parkland but as we notice the lighting for the new site will be 18mtrs high its safe to say that the features of the new construction will have a significant visual impact on all surroundings. The proposed substation will be a blight on the landscape, the local wildlife and furthermore a blight on our lives, although we understand the need for further transition to renewable energy the significant impact that this chosen location will have on our small residential community is high and seems unacceptable. Kind Regards, MG (REDACTED)"	The Applicant notes that the reference to 18m tall structures within the ES (such as in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Onshore Project description (AS-029)) relates to lightning, rather than lighting, masts.

2.51 RR-055 – Martyn Hussey

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-055	"An Integral part of this development is the requirement to connect to the National Grid. The plan is to do this via National Grid's substation at Boddlewyddan, however, in order to facillitate this, National Grid require enabling works, including extension and new sections of overhead lines. My question therefore is how can this development be objectively considered without knowing the extent of the modifications necessary to the National Grid substation at Boddlewyddan. Secondly I question the size of the proposed onshore substation. The developers alraedy operate an onshore substation in the same area for the Gwynt y Mor wind farm, this is a larger renewable energy source which utilises 6.92 acres of rural land. The Awel y Môr proposal may take up to 12.35 acres of fresh rural land so having a larger environmental impact"	<p>Details of the proposed extension of the National Grid substation are set out in APP-062 Onshore Project Description. As a planning application has yet to be made by National Grid for this extension the Applicant included a description of the scheme based on the information available at the time. The Applicant understands the extension to National Grid's substation includes connection works for projects other than Awel y Môr, and therefore the Applicant is not in a position to understand the full extent of the works until an application is made. As noted in APP-042 Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodology, cumulative effects with the extension works have been assessed within relevant chapters of the ES.</p> <p>As set out in APP-062 Onshore Project Description, the land area required for the onshore substation, as well as the size and type of buildings and equipment within the substation, is affected by the choice of switchgear employed- either Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) or Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS). The choice of AIS or GIS will be part of the detailed design process and a decision will be made post-consent prior to construction commencing.</p> <p>The planning consent for Gwynt y Môr also included provision for both AIS and GIS technology to be employed, with GIS ultimately being utilised. The footprint of an onshore substation depends on many factors including the voltage, quantity of circuits, rating, technology, drainage design and environmental conditions. It is not linearly proportional to any single factor and often different manufacturers will require different areas for substation designs that are otherwise functionally identical.</p> <p>The proposed size of the AyM onshore substation is larger than the two existing proximal substations, but its size matches other substations nationally (both proposed and existing). This increase in size is primarily driven by a trend towards higher voltages (amongst other factors), which create more efficient transmission networks. Greater detail on the factors influencing substation sizes can be found in the Applicant's response to ExQ1.5.1 in Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission.</p>

2.52 RR-056 – Chris Baines

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-056	"I wish to see the proposed array as the physical basis for sea bed ecological restoration and proactive marine nature conservation. I would also like to see this and the other arrays in Liverpool bay as a protected route for seabed transmission cable connections between Anglesey (Wylfa) and Deeside (Connah's Quay. This option would avoid the need for new towers and transmission lines across the Anglesey AONB, the Menai Straights, Snowdonia National Park and the Clwydian Hills AONB"	<p>The Marine Licence, and associated management plans for the construction, operation and decomissioning of the project, will inform the monitoring and mitigations required by the project, and will be approved by NRW through the Marine Licence process.</p> <p>Decisions on future strategy and routing for national transmission assets, for instance the use of offshore 'bootstraps' (or cables connecting 2 onshore locations using an offshore routed cable) versus onshore overhead lines across the Anglesey AONB, the Menai Straights, Snowdonia National Park and the Clwydian Hills AONB, sits outside the scope of this application.</p>

2.53 RR-057 – Jodi Cook

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-057	"I wish to object to this proposal on the grounds of the potential adverse impact it will have on tourism in Llandudno, a vital source of income not just for Llandudno residents but for Conwy County. Llandudno has preserved so much of its Victorian architectural history and because of this, attracts a great many tourists from the UK and beyond. The construction of more wind turbines stretching right across the bay would jar with the town's pride in its preservation of history and make it even more difficult to attract tourists than it presently is. I recognise the need for renewable energy generation but I question why such a picturesque and sensitive location needs has been chosen for this project, and have seen nothing to justify why this location is so perfect for the turbines. "	<p>The points raised are noted and are considered to be addressed through the application.</p> <p>The suitability of the site for an offshore wind farm is addressed in 6.1.4 Site Selection and Alternatives (APP-044). The impact on visual receptors is addressed in 6.2.10 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact (AS-027), the impact on cultural heritage is addressed in 6.3.8 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069), and the impact on tourism in 6.3.4 Tourism and Recreation (APP-065).</p>

2.54 RR-058 – William Beament

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-058	<p>"I object to this development on the grounds that Awel-y-Mor has not confirmed they will not be using SF6 gas in their instillation. SF6 is is an extremely potent greenhouse gas. Until Awel-y-Mor confirm they will not use SF6, I would like my objection to be registered."</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges Mr Beament's representation and comments. The Applicant engaged with Mr Beament on email in several exchanges in October and November 2021, regarding his queries and concerns around the use of SF6 (sulfur hexafluoride gas) in renewables projects like Awel y Môr.</p> <p>SF6 is commonly found in onshore substations, offshore substations and in the switchgear located on certain wind turbines. Were Awel y Môr to consider SF6 use, it would be restricted to these locations and equipment.</p> <p>Detailed design decisions, including those regarding the project's onshore substation (OnSS), will be made post-consent and based on the best technologies available at the time. Switchgear technology is evolving, and SF6 is commonly used in GIS (gas insulated switchgear) technologies; one of the options being considered for Awel y Môr. Alternatively, the project may use AIS (air insulated switchgear), which would not involve the use of SF6, but does have other disadvantages, such as an increased land area used onshore and larger structures offshore. The project may also opt to use GIS technology with a different gas. Please refer to Section 1.7.4 of the project's Onshore Project Description (APP-062), for further information. SF6 gas has many advantages but also several disadvantages (including a climate change impact if it is accidentally released) and, for this reason, the use of SF6 is tightly controlled and regulated. Despite its own disadvantages (namely increased land take and increased maintenance), AIS switchgear was used at the onshore substation of RWE's recent offshore wind farm construction, Triton Knoll.</p> <p>The potency of SF6 is well understood by industry experts and the project team, which also serves to explain why the use of SF6 is tightly controlled and regulated (including its manufacture, distribution and eventual disposal), to minimise the risk of any release into the environment. The quantity used would depend on multiple design aspects that would not be finalised until after consent, however it is likely to be broadly similar to other windfarms. Relative to existing windfarms, Awel y Môr would have</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>fewer (more powerful) turbines, and hence less switchgear would be required.</p> <p>Manufacturers such as Siemens continue to look for alternatives to SF6 given potential environmental impacts. These alternatives are at an early stage of development and their suitability and compatibility with AyM's turbine technology cannot be confirmed at this stage.</p> <p>Substations for other electricity generation technologies (conventional power stations) also employ SF6, consequently this is not currently a consideration associated exclusively with offshore wind farms.</p> <p>Regardless, Awel y Môr will be in a position to confirm its decision to use SF6 post-consent, and during the detailed design stage.</p>

2.55 RR-059 – Jonathan F Dean

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-059	<p>"I am broadly in support of Awel y Môr offshore wind farm. My concern is about how it will connect to the grid</p> <p>Using subsea cables and buried cables to the substation is excellent, taken in isolation, but the wider impacts on the grid are not fully considered The Ofgem Offshore Transmission Network Review is not yet published, and the impact of this offshore generating asset on the onshore transmission network not fully understood. There are many changes to the north Wales generation and transmission landscape, either "in flight" or in discussion, that may render a shore connection in north Wales inappropriate. The following are all likely to happen within the next decade: Mona and Morgan offshore wind farms, Môrlais tidal off Ynys Cybi, multiple solar farms on Ynys Môn, SMR nuclear at Trawsfynydd, large nuclear or several SMRs at Wylfa plus further offshore potential west of Ynys Môn. This mix of offshore and onshore may mean the better route for Awel y Môr is via an offshore grid rather than use the constrained onshore grid. Committing to an onshore connection "locks in" that capacity making it unavailable to onshore generation. This in turn would create additional cost and disturbance onshore that could be avoided by early commitment to an offshore route"</p>	<p>The comments are noted. The Applicant's position regards the Offshore Transmission Network Review is set out in 7.1 Grid Connection and Cable Details Statement (APP-296).</p>

2.56 RR-060 – Carl Davies

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-060	<p>"Charter Skipper/Commercial fisherman Conwy based. Our sector was included in the scoping process during a few meetings with RWE, Gobi Consultants and the Fishery Liason Officer, which was much appreciated. Many concerns were flagged, concerning the effects Awel y Môr construction and post construction on finfish and shellfish, after reading the scoping report and PIER. The charter vessel industry along the North Wales coast has extensive experience of the effects of other wind farms on finfish. However, I am concerned to note that in the EIS many of these concerns have not been addressed. Best Regards, Carl Davies REDACTED"</p>	<p>The Applicant discussed these points in detail with the respondent during consultations in 2021. The Applicant has reviewed the published information in response to the feedback and considers that these issues have been appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking to reach agreement with affected fishers via a Fisheries Cooperation Strategy and Fisheries Liaison Plan (together, the Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (FLCEP, which was agreed in consultation with the fishing community). The FLCEP has been updated with a timeframe for reaching agreements and other matters in response to ExQ1.12.1 (Document 1.32 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). Discussions are now in progress with registered fishers with a view to agreeing cooperation payments at the appropriate time in accordance with the FLCEP (Document 1.32 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>

## 2.57 AS-036 – Janet Finch Saunders MS

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
AS-036-1	<p>I am writing in regard to your ongoing work in relation to the planning application submitted by RWE for their Awel y Môr offshore wind farm site, a proposal that could dramatically alter the local marine environment and bring serious consequences to the coastal communities of Aberconwy, a constituency that I am proud to represent in the Welsh Parliament.</p> <p>Given the significant impact that this development could have on Aberconwy, its people and economy, I formally request that I be noted as an interested party in relation to this application. This development has the potential to change the seascape and local environment for Llandudno and the surrounding coastal areas across Aberconwy. Please find enclosed my formal objection letter to this development, submitted to the Marine Licensing Team within Natural Resources Wales.</p> <p>I trust that my views will be given careful consideration by the Planning Inspectorate and that I be noted as an interested party in relation to this application.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant, who will continue to engage with all Interested Parties through the Examination process.</p>
AS-036-2	<p>Having considered the documentation, I wish to formally object to the granting of a licence. Please find below the reasons below:</p> <p>I understand that the geophysical assessment of the interlink area between AyM and Gwynt y Môr is reliant solely on a previous assessment undertaken by Wessex Archaeology. However, the survey data for that previous assessment did not cover the entire interlink area. As such, and as is noted in the document entitled 'Category 6: Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 11: Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage' the potential remains for unidentified features of archaeological potential to be present within the interlink area. As such I think it reasonable to suggest that a geophysical assessment be undertaken of the whole interlink area;</p>	<p>The data gap in this area is acknowledged by the Applicant in paragraph 51 of the Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage chapter (APP-057), however it should be noted that it is considered the existing data collected in the interlink area for the Gwynt y Mor (GyM) site is considered adequate for characterising the receiving environment for EIA purposes, as characterised by the Offshore Archaeology Desk Based Assessment (APP-117).</p> <p>Addressing this data gap is addressed within the mitigation section of the assessment chapter, specifically under Section 11.10.4, which recommends that in line with the draft Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), archaeologists be involved during the post-consent phase of the interlink area to ensure a full assessment of the area is achieved pre-construction. It is anticipated that NRW will include a WSI as a condition in the Marine Licence. The Applicant has recognised this in the Marine Licence Principles document (Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>
AS-036-3	<p>It is my understanding that although the proposed development is confined to the Site Investigation Boundary, the exact layout of the proposed turbines, other</p>	<p>In line with the 'Design Envelope' approach (see Section 1.2 of the Offshore Project Description chapter (APP-047), at this stage in the AyM</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	structures and cable route have not been confirmed. As such, there is no clear Maximum Design Scenario for assessing potential adverse impacts on offshore archaeological and cultural heritage receptors. Therefore, I am concerned that the worst-case scenario approach does not properly ensure that any difference in layout has been fully captured as part of the assessment in the Environmental Statement.	development process, decisions on exact locations of infrastructure and the precise technologies and construction methods employed cannot be made. Therefore, the ES at this stage sets out the main components and parameters of the project and the design envelope approach (often referred to as the 'Rochdale Envelope') has been used to provide certainty that the final project as built will not exceed these parameters, whilst providing the necessary flexibility to accommodate further project refinement during the detailed design phase post-consent. This approach is accepted within the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), for example in paragraph 2.6.42.
AS-036-4	There is a risk of total or partial loss of archaeological receptors during the decommissioning phase due to the draw-down of sediments. I understand that the draw-down of sediment into voids left by removed turbine foundations could lead to loss of sediment, destabilizing archaeological sites and contexts, and exposing such material to natural, chemical or biological processes, and causing or accelerating loss of the same. Even more concerning, is that RWE have tried to justify this by explaining that currently only general locations of known wrecks and obstructions are available, with the position and extent of the marine archaeological resources not yet established, and therefore that mitigation will include a review of the geophysical survey and monitoring data throughout the life of the project to gain a greater understanding of the archaeological resource and the long-term effect of the development. I think it unacceptable for the project to proceed until such a time that there is complete certainty as to the position and extent of the marine archaeological resources. Indeed, whilst I acknowledge that there is an intention to report unexpected finds, this provides no certainty that the risk of total or partial loss of the archaeological receptor can or will be mitigated.	This is noted by the Applicant, however it is considered that the mitigation proposed, such as archaeological review of post-consent monitoring data in addition to the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD) in relation to unexpected finds, will reduce potential adverse effects to non-significant levels. Furthermore, it is considered that should there be increased sedimentation resulting in the burial of archaeological material, there could be a minor beneficial effect. This approach is outlined in the Outline Offshore WSI (APP-304).
AS-036-5	According to RIAA Annex 5: Ornithology Apportioning Note there is the potential for offshore wind farms to have a negative effect on the integrity of Special Protection Areas within foraging range of the offshore wind farm site during the breeding season.	The Applicant has produced a thorough Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) (APP-027), inclusive of designated ornithological interests, the methodology for which has been widely discussed and agreed with the relevant statutory nature conservation bodies via the Evidence Plan process (see the Evidence Plan Report and supporting appendices (APP-301, APP-302 and APP-303)). The RIAA has concluded that there will be no Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) on any of the SPAs screened-in to the assessment process.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
AS-036-6	The document entitled '6.2.7_AyM_ES_Volume2_Chapter7_MarineMammals_vFinal' seems to be unavailable for download and study by interested parties.	The marine mammals chapter is available on the PINS website (APP-053). Minor typographical errors were noted in this document which is now superseded by a revised version (AS-026). Additional errors have been corrected in the Errata list, Document 1.4 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission.
AS-036-7	The applicant has not been able to carry out a quantitative assessment of the magnitude or significance of the impact of temporary threshold shift (TTS) on marine mammals. Whilst such an approach has been agreed with Natural England, the MMO and CEFAS and, as such, recent projects have not presented an assessment of magnitude, sensitivity or resulting significance for TTS-onset, I am unclear as to the NRW stance on the matter.	As described within the marine mammals chapter (AS-026), full details of the underwater noise modelling and the resulting TTS-onset impact areas and ranges are detailed in Volume 4, Annex 6.2: Subsea Noise Technical Report (APP-105). However, there are no thresholds to determine a biologically significant effect from TTS onset, therefore the predicted ranges and area for the onset of TTS are presented, but no assessment of the number of animals, magnitude, sensitivity or significance of effect is given. This approach was agreed with members of Marine Mammals & Marine Ecology Expert Topic Group (which included NRW) through the Evidence Plan process (21st September 2020) and follows the advice provided in the Scoping Opinion. Further to this, the Applicant has engaged with NRW in post-application consultation and provided a clarification note which is replicated for Deadline 1 (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).
AS-036-8	The commercial fisheries stakeholder group meeting held on September 2020 saw concerns raised about underwater noise and effects of fish resources; potential for extension of the Traffic Separation Scheme north of AyM; long term effects from construction and operation; and cumulative effects from other projects. I believe that further dialogue is required with the stakeholder group so to ensure that they are content with proposals before granting a licence.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with commercial fishermen and fisheries groups throughout the pre-application phase, as described in the commercial fisheries consultation record (APP-110). The Applicant is committed to ongoing liaison with fishermen throughout all stages of the project and has appointed a Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO) to maintain effective communications between the Applicant and fishermen. The Applicant has provided an updated FLCEP (Document 1.32 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).
AS-036-9	The Welsh Fishermen's Association have highlighted that while it is acknowledged that there is no statutory location data on most 12m and under vessels, due to current VMS rules, the National Policy Statement EN-3 says 'Robust baseline data should have been collected and studies conducted as part of the assessment'. I agree with the Association that such missing vessel location information is of serious concern, and as such I would be grateful if you could ascertain whether the applicant has or will complete the data set as part of the assessment. The majority, approximately 90%, of the Welsh fleet are	Commercial fisheries activity is described in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.7 and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109).  All available baseline data sources have been collected and analysed, as described in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.7 and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109).

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	vessels 12m and under in length. As such, I agree with the suggestion that the information gap makes the impact pathway assessment conclusions unreliable with respect to the impacts on commercial fisheries from all aspects of the development. This seem to be the case when considering that RWE have noted that VMS data available to the applicant does not include vessels <15m length.	<p>VMS data available to the Applicant does not include vessels &lt;15m length. VMS data sourced from MMO displays the value of catches by different gear types and covers UK registered vessels ≥15m length.</p> <p>VMS data from 2017 was presented at PEIR as it represented the most recent data made publicly available by the MMO at the time of PEIR publication. Data for 2018/19 is now available and has been presented in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.7 and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109).</p> <p>Fisheries landings statistics sourced from the MMO include landings made by vessels of both under and over 10m length. Limitations associated with data sources are clearly identified in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.4.5 and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109). Comprehensive engagement in the form of fisheries group meetings and individual interviews with fishermen has been undertaken to understand fishing activity within the AyM area; findings have been incorporated into the description of existing fishing activity presented in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.7, and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109). The Consultation Report (APP-024) provides a detailed account of all consultation undertaken during the AyM project evolution, including consultation with the commercial and recreational charter fishing interests.</p>
AS-036-10	Lack of consideration given to the impact on proposals for large areas of integrated multi trophic aquaculture development close to the proposed AyM site.	As described in the commercial fisheries consultation record (APP-110), it is acknowledged that whilst the Welsh National Marine Plan identifies potential for the future development of aquaculture production, that shellfish farming is currently undertaken within the Menai Strait, and there exist initial proposals for the development of three shellfish cultivation sites off the North Wales coast, no existing or future development locations were identified within proximity to the AyM boundaries within the planning system. The Applicant has discussed the project with Deepdock Aquaculture who have future plans for long-line aquaculture in the region. The Applicant would welcome any more specific information from Janet Finch-Saunders on this matter.
AS-036-11	Concern that the fishers in the area have been reporting changes in fish abundance and diversity in this local area for many years, since the construction of the North Hoyle, Rhyl Flats and Gwynt y Môr windfarms that	Trends in commercial landings have been described in Volume 2, Chapter 8 (APP-054), Section 8.7 and Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109). In interviews with fishermen, a question was

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>have impacted their livelihoods. There needs to be complete clarity that the development would not result in a negative impact on the livelihoods of fishers and changes in fish abundance before a licence is granted.</p> <p>I trust that my submission will receive careful consideration.</p>	<p>asked around observed trends in catches. Trends are understood to be influenced by a number of factors, as described in Annex 8.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report (APP-109).</p>

## 2.58 AS-038 – Network Rail

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
AS-038-0.1	We are instructed by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited ("Network Rail") in relation to the development consent application made by Awel y Môr Wind Farm Ltd ("the Promoter") for the development of an array of offshore Wind Turbine Generators and supporting infrastructure. We are conscious that this is a late submission of a representation of Network Rail's interests, which can be explained by long term illness. Please accept this submission as a section 56 Representation, made on behalf of Network Rail. I hope in the circumstances, which are exceptional, this late section 56 Representation is accepted.	The Applicant notes the role of Network Rail and its headline position with regard to the Project.
AS-038-0.2	Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns and operates Great Britain's railway network and has statutory and regulatory obligations in respect of it.	
AS-038-0.3	Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure and therefore any proposed development which is adjacent to and interfaces with the railway network or potentially affects Network Rail's land interest will be carefully considered.	
AS-038-0.4	The proposal for a Windfarm development which interfaces with the railway network will require certain standard protections for the benefit of the railway. Network Rail's requirements for the protection of the railway infrastructure are set out in further detail in this representation.	
AS-038-1.1	There are references in the Book of Reference to land owned by and rights for the benefit of Network Rail. Whilst Network Rail does not object in principle to the DCO, Network Rail does object to the permanent compulsory acquisition of rights over land or subsoil under Network Rail's operational land.	
AS-038-1.2	Network Rail recognises that the DCO Scheme requires the use of subsoil under Network Rail's operational railway. However, Network Rail would expect the necessary subsoil rights or other rights to be acquired through an agreed easement rather than through the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers. This approach must be adapted to ensure that Network Rail can comply with its statutory duties to maintain the safe, efficient and economic operation of the railway and to ensure such rights do not affect the continued use of the railway by train and freight operators. Network Rail therefore requests the Promoter	<p>The Applicant has been in discussions with Network Rail with regards to the railway line crossing. The Applicant has secured Business Clearance and Technical Clearance from Network Rail and has agreed a Basic Asset Protection Agreement.</p> <p>Discussions regarding the required land rights are at an early stage with a meeting having been held between the Applicant's appointed land agents and a representative from Network Rail on 14 October 2022. During the course of this meeting a roadmap setting out a proposed</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	enters into discussions with Network Rail as soon as possible to seek to agree the necessary rights required for the DCO Scheme.	route to agreement was set out and follow up actions agreed. The Applicant will endeavour to undertake those follow up actions and continue to proactively engage with Network Rail with a view to securing a voluntary agreement.
AS-038-2.1	Network Rail also objects to the seeking of powers to carry out works for the DCO Scheme in the vicinity of the operational railway without first securing appropriate protections for Network Rail's statutory undertaking, which the draft of the Order for the DCO Scheme does not contain.	The Applicant is working with Network Rail to ensure that appropriate protections are in place for the railway.
AS-038-2.2	Protective provisions for the benefit of Network Rail are well precedented within numerous DCO and TWA Orders. Network Rail welcomes the form of protective provisions for the protection of Network Rail's operations which are included on the face of the DCO as applied for (Schedule 9, Part 6). However, those protective provisions are inadequate insofar as they do not protect Network Rail from the powers in the DCO to use compulsory powers over land, as well as in other respects. Network Rail submits that, in order to effectively protect its assets, those powers should be qualified in respect of Network Rail's operational property and used only where Network Rail consents to such use (such consent not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed). Accordingly, at present Network Rail objects to the draft Order on the basis that it does not include protective provisions in Network Rail's standard form. If necessary, Network Rail will both in written representations and in submissions at hearings press the need for such protective provisions to be included in the Order where Network Rail's operational infrastructure is proposed to be affected.	The Applicant welcomes engagement from Network Rail on the matter of protective provisions. Protective provisions have been included within the DCO for the benefit of Network Rail but the Applicant will review additional provisions as provided by Network Rail for inclusion in the Order.
AS-038-2.3	In addition to protective provisions for the benefit of Network Rail being included in the Order, Network Rail reserves the right to require the Promoter to enter into an asset protection agreement to ensure the appropriate and necessary technical, engineering and safety requirements for working on or near Network Rail's operational railway are applied to the DCO Scheme, if necessary.	The Applicant has agreed a Basic Asset Protection Agreement (BAPA) with Network Rail for the purpose of design work required pre-construction.
AS-038-3.1	It is acknowledged that discussions with the Promoter to date are on-going. If the following criteria are met, then it is anticipated that Network Rail would be in a position to withdraw the objections made above:-  i. Network Rail's standard protective provisions are to be included in the Order for the DCO Scheme;	The Applicant welcomes engagement from Network Rail on the matter of protective provisions. Protective provisions have been included within the DCO for the benefit of Network Rail but the Applicant will review additional provisions as provided by Network Rail for inclusion in the Order.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
AS-038-3.2	ii. the Promoter enters into a Deed of Undertaking/Framework Agreement to provide formal protection for Network Rail's statutory undertaking;	The Applicant welcomes engagement from Network Rail on the matter of a Deed of Undertaking/Framework Agreement. The Application is engaged with Network Rail with regards to putting the necessary agreements in place to ensure the railway is protected.
AS-038-3.3	iii. any required easement and asset protection agreements or any other required agreements are entered into in respect of the acquisition of addressing both the acquisition of rights over Network Rail's operational land and carrying out of works on or adjacent to NR's operational land; and	As noted above, commercial negotiations are at an early stage but the Applicant is hopeful that the required rights can be secured within a voluntary agreement.
AS-038-3.4	iv. Network Rail is provided clearance to enter into any of the agreements referred to above following internal consultation with affected stakeholders across the business.	This is noted by the Applicant.
AS-038-3.5	Network Rail would like to reserves its position, both in representation and in submissions at hearings, to seek the amendments to the draft Order to ensure protective provisions are inserted for the benefit of Network Rail's operational infrastructure, which is affected by the DCO Scheme.	This is noted by the Applicant
AS-038-3.6	Once again, please accept our apologies for the lateness of this Relevant Representation which, as explained, is a consequence of long term illness. I hope that Network Rail's position and statutory duty to protect the operational land and railway justifies and acceptance in these unique circumstances. Network Rail is in discussion with the Promoter to agree acceptable terms, which if successful will enable the withdrawal of the Representation.	This is noted by the Applicant.

### 3 Appendix A – Applicant’s response to Relevant Representations – RR-015 – Natural Resources Wales (NRW)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-1	<p>PROPOSED AWEL Y MÔR OFFSHORE WINDFARM PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: EN010112</p> <p>RELEVANT REPRESENTATION FROM NATURAL RESOURCES WALES (NRW)</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>NRW have identified key concerns relating to the following matters, which have been split into offshore and onshore as set out in the Environmental Statement (ES):</p> <p>OFFSHORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marine mammals</li> </ul> <p>ONSHORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Flood Risk (Flood Risk Activity Permit)</li> <li>➤ Designated Landscapes</li> </ul> <p>The above matters are those that require amendments to the scheme, substantial additional information, or a revised Development Consent Order ('DCO'). The topic heading for these matters are marked "Key Concern" in the relevant sections below.</p> <p>We also provide comments below on matters that may need minor amendments and/ or clarification. These are matters that we can provide further details on in our Written Representations and / or can be addressed in our on-going dialogue with the Applicant in the preparation of our Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</p> <p>NRW shall continue to provide advice to the Applicant on all the required matters, through correspondence and meetings, with the aim of reaching as many positions of agreement and common ground as possible prior to the examination of the proposals. Our Relevant Representation is based solely on the information provided within the application documents. Any changes in our position will be reflected in our full Written Representation and SoCG.</p>	<p>NRW's role, and the distinction between comments made on behalf of NRW Advisory and NRW Regulation and Permitting Service, is noted.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes NRW's Representation, and is pleased to note that NRW consider the application to be comprehensive and of a good quality.</p> <p>The Applicant also welcomes NRW's comments that many previous concerns, as raised during the pre-application process, have been appropriately addressed. The Applicant would like to note the engagement from NRW through the pre-application stage of the project, both through non-statutory engagement and responses to formal consultation. NRW have presented clear written or verbal advice, which has helped shape the project through the pre-application process.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that since receipt of the Relevant Representation, NRW has provided more detailed technical consultation advice in relation to the Marine Licence application. That technical consultation advice covers substantively the same areas of concern of the Relevant representation, however in more detail in most cases. The Applicant anticipates that NRW's Written Representation will largely replicate that advice in relation to the marine aspects of AyM, and the Applicant has continued to engage with NRW on that basis as it develops the SoCG with NRW.</p> <p>The Applicant notes NRW's position with regards SoCG and is continuing to engage with NRW on the development of the document(s).</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>NRW has reviewed the DCO submission and, notwithstanding our key concerns and other issues raised in this representation, consider the submission, on balance, to be comprehensive and of a good quality. NRW is pleased to note that many of our previous concerns, as raised during the pre-application process, have been appropriately addressed.</p> <p>Our comments are made without prejudice to any further comments NRW may wish to make in relation to this application and examination whether in relation to the ES, provisions of the draft DCO and its Requirements, SoCG or other evidence and documents provided by RWE and their consultants ('the Applicant'), the Examining Authority or other interested parties. The following paragraphs comprise our Relevant Representation as a Statutory Party under the Planning Act 2008 and Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties) Regulations 2015 and as an 'interested party' under s102(1) of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>In addition to being an interested party under the Planning Act 2008, NRW exercises functions under distinct legislation including (but not limited to) the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (EPR) 2016 (as amended) and the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MACAA) 2009. NRW has received applications for a Marine Licence under the MACAA 2009. For the purpose of clarity, comments from NRW Regulation and Permitting Service are titled as such, and include comments in Annex A. We provide a comment on NRW's general purpose in section 4.</p>	
RR-015-2.1	<p>OFFSHORE</p> <p>Marine Mammals – KEY CONCERN</p> <p>The proposal has the potential to impact marine mammal Annex II and European Protected Species (EPS) and we consider that impacts such as auditory injury and associated disturbance have not been adequately assessed.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant, see responses to the key points in the rows below.
RR-015-2.1.2i	<p>NRW considers that the assessment of impacts of underwater noise on marine mammals is inadequate.</p> <p>I. There is inadequate justification for the absence of assessment of cumulative Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA); as such we consider that the assessment is incomplete.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant, see responses to the specific points in the rows below. The Applicant has also provided a clarification note on this point (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) which provides further information.</p> <p>This note provides further information on the key conservatisms in cumulative PTS modelling, and concludes that the final MMMP will</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>presents an updated assessment of cumulative PTS impact ranges and mitigation measures reflecting the state of knowledge and best modelling practice available at the time.</p> <p>Thus, the Applicant can confirm that cumulative PTS will be mitigated in the final MMMP if guidance and evidence at the time suggest that it is appropriate to do so. This will ensure that the potential risk of PTS is reduced to negligible levels for all species.</p>
RR-015-2.1.2ii	<p>II. There are insufficient grounds to conclude that PTS-onset risk has a negligible impact on harbour porpoise when cumulative PTS-onset has been excluded from the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) (APP-107);</p>	<p>Please see the Marine Mammal Clarification Note (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) which provides further justification for the Applicant's position.</p> <p>The Applicant will maintain awareness of current research and maintain ongoing dialogue with NRW post-consent to ensure that the final MMMP presents an updated assessment of cumulative PTS impact ranges and mitigation measures reflecting the state of knowledge and best modelling practice available at the time. Thus, the Applicant can confirm that cumulative PTS will be mitigated in the final MMMP if guidance and evidence at the time suggest that it is appropriate to do so. Therefore, it is expected that the magnitude of PTS impact is negligible to all marine mammal species.</p>
RR-015-2.1.2iii	<p>III. In order to allow a more comprehensive analysis of PTS and disturbance, NRW considers that additional modelling should be carried out and additional model details provided in order to inform assessments of underwater noise and PTS onset. This includes carrying out Interim Population Consequences of Disturbance (iPCoD) modelling for harbour porpoise disturbance and PTS injury, including modelling parameters used.</p>	<p>Please see the Marine Mammal Clarification Note (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). The Applicant will maintain awareness of current research and maintain ongoing dialogue with NRW post-consent to ensure that the final MMMP presents an updated assessment of cumulative PTS impact ranges and mitigation measures reflecting the state of knowledge and best modelling practice available at the time. Thus, the Applicant can confirm that cumulative PTS will be mitigated in the final MMMP if guidance and evidence at the time suggest that it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>Therefore, it is expected that the magnitude of PTS impact is negligible to all marine mammal species.</p> <p>Population modelling for disturbance has already been included in the marine mammals ES chapter (APP-053) for all species where the proportion of the MU disturbed was &gt;1%. For completeness, the Marine Mammal Clarification Note (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		1 submission) presents the iPCoD modelling results using the highly precautionary SWF density estimate for harbour porpoise. This did not change the conclusion of the impact assessment for harbour porpoise (APP-053).
RR-015-2.1.2iv	IV. NRW does not recommend the use of dose/response curves to conduct an area-based assessment to estimate area of harbour porpoise habitat disturbed. Given that disturbance for harbour porpoise Special Area of Conservation (SACs) is defined through spatial and temporal thresholds of 20% daily and 10% seasonal disturbance, as set out in the supporting advice for the disturbance conservation objective (CO2) for porpoise sites, we advise that an area-based assessment should be carried out where the extent of habitat that is insonified to a level that might produce significant disturbance is determined. Although there is a strong link between area lost and numbers disturbed, directly equating the probability of population response to loss of habitat / loss of habitat quality (i.e. using a dose response curve to calculate habitat loss) is currently not possible.	<p>Please see the Marine Mammal Clarification Note (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a selection of different disturbance criteria that could be applied to expand the assessment presented in the RIAA. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the ~50% response threshold using the dose-response curve approach (Graham et al., 2017),</li> <li>the 26 km EDR (JNCC,2020),</li> <li>the Southall et al (2019) TTS-onset 140 dB re 1 <math>\mu</math> Pa2s SELcum threshold (as a proxy for disturbance),</li> <li>the Lucke et al. (2009) 145 dB re 1 <math>\mu</math> Pa2s SELss threshold for consistent aversive behavioural reactions,</li> <li>the Brandt et al (2018) and Heinis et al (2019) 143 dB re 1 <math>\mu</math> Pa<sup>2</sup>s SELss threshold for a decline in porpoise detection rates from the first seven OWF in German waters, and</li> <li>the ASCOBANS (2014) 140 dB re 1 <math>\mu</math> Pa2s SELss threshold.</li> </ul> <p>Across these different thresholds, the maximum overlap with the North Anglesey Marine SAC area is 3.7%. This is significantly below the 20% area threshold for significant noise disturbance within an SAC. Given the minimal overlap between disturbance ranges and the SAC (no matter which approach to assessing disturbance is considered), there is no potential for an Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEol) to the conservation objectives of the harbour porpoise feature.</p>
RR-015-2.1.3	There is insufficient justification to support a conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect from vessel collision for bottlenose dolphin, grey seal or harbour porpoise features of relevant SACs.	The Applicant notes that the issue of concern here is the fact that the Applicant used the commitment to best practice vessel handling protocols to scope out Likely Significant Effect (LSE). NRW have highlighted that commitment to embedded mitigation cannot be used to scope out an impact from LSE. Thus, additional text is provided

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>in the Marine Mammal Clarification Note (Document 1.2 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p> <p>The risk of collision can be lowered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ reducing vessel speed: increasing likelihood of detection and avoidance by either marine mammals or vessel operator, while also likely decreasing the severity of any blunt force trauma should a strike occur;</li> <li>▲ increasing predictability of vessel movements (simple direct repeated path at reduced speeds likely reduce collision risk); and</li> <li>▲ minimizing transits after dark.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has committed to embedded mitigation in the form of the adoption of best practice vessel handling protocols during construction to minimise the potential for any impact. Therefore, given this commitment, the risk of vessel collisions occurring is of negligible adverse magnitude. As such, there is no potential for an AEoI to the conservation objectives of any of the marine mammal SACs included in the RIAA.</p>
RR-015-2.1.4	A number of figures in the revised marine mammal Chapter 7 (AS-026) appear to be incorrect. For example, Figure 21 is supplied in place of Figure 19, and Figure 21 does not contain all the necessary data layers either time it is presented. Corrected figures should be supplied alongside confirmation of the nature of any revisions from the original version (APP-053).	The Applicant has reviewed the revised Marine Mammal chapter (AS-026) and has provided a description of the errors in these figures along with corrected versions in Document 1.4 of the Deadline 1 submission.
RR-015-2.2.1	<p>Marine Ornithology</p> <p>NRW advises that a detailed assessment of the potential impacts of the project on the breeding seabird features of Pen-y-Gogarth / Great Orme's Head Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (guillemots, razorbills and kittiwakes) should be undertaken, as currently this has not been done sufficiently to assess effects on these features.</p>	The Applicant's assessment within the offshore ornithology chapter of the ES (APP-050) was based on relevant BDMPs for each species (as agreed through the EPP). Therefore, birds from this SSSI were inherently considered. Notwithstanding this, and in light of the specific comment raised by NRW, the Applicant has provided further clarification on the specific impacts at Pen-y-Gogarth / Great Orme's Head SSSI in Document 1.16 of its Deadline 1 submission.
RR-015-2.2.2-4	From the evidence provided, it does appear that the extent of the supporting habitat for red-throated diver (RTD) within the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) will be maintained if the project is constructed and therefore there will be no adverse effect on the RTD feature of Liverpool Bay SPA from loss of habitat.	The Applicant welcomes NRW's agreement that an AEoI can be ruled out in relation to the extent of supporting habitat being maintained for red-throated diver, and that high displacement levels observed for other red-throated diver wintering areas within the UK and Europe are not applicable to the Liverpool Bay SPA. The Applicant will engage

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>However, we note that the displacement of RTD in this part of Liverpool Bay SPA is not consistent with what has been observed in other areas of Liverpool Bay SPA, as well as in other areas of the UK and Europe.</p> <p>Given this anomaly in observation, NRW advises that comprehensive validation monitoring before, during, and after construction is needed to confirm that it is the case that supporting habitat (as identified in the sites conservation objectives) has not been lost.</p>	with NRW (as part of the separate but parallel Marine Licencing process) on the need for, and the requirements of, any potential post-consent monitoring and/ or methods.
RR-015-2.2.5	NRW agrees that a vessel traffic management plan, using measures such as, but not limited to, restricting vessel movements to existing navigation routes, is necessary in order to avoid or reduce disturbance, and therefore displacement. As requested by the Applicant, we will work with the Applicant to produce and implement the plan. NRW considers that a vessel traffic management plan could be secured as a condition in the marine licence.	The Applicant welcomes NRW's agreement that a vessel traffic management plan could be secured as a condition in the Marine Licence.
RR-015-2.2.6	NRW notes that the Furness et al (2015) stable age structure assessment method has been applied. Whilst NRW would have preferred that stable age structure is calculated from the local surveys, or, by adopting a precautionary approach by counting all birds as adults, we do not consider that this impacts the final assessments. Therefore, NRW agree with the conclusions presented.	The Applicant welcomes this agreement with NRW.
RR-015-2.2.7	By looking at the range of figures presented for displacement and mortality, NRW were able to make an assessment (on a precautionary level) at higher levels of displacement and mortality than were chosen by the Applicant. By looking at the full range of variability of displacement and mortality, we do not consider this to be an issue.	The Applicant welcomes NRW's agreement that a significant adverse effect can be ruled out in relation to red-throated diver displacement impacts.
RR-015-2.3.1	<p>Physical Processes</p> <p>NRW agrees with the baseline description, numerical modelling approaches, assessment methodology, and the assessment conclusions with respect to the potential impacts of the Awel-y-Môr project on physical processes, as outlined in the ES.</p>	This agreement is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.
RR-015-2.3.2	NRW notes that the local dimensions of secondary scour are highly dependent upon the specific shape, design and placement of the scour protection. These parameters are highly variable and so there is no clear quantitative method or evidence base for accurately predicting the dimensions of secondary scour. Given the uncertainty regarding the spatial extent and volume of secondary scour, we therefore advise that post-construction monitoring should be	This is acknowledged by the Applicant. It is anticipated that post-construction monitoring would be secured as a condition of the Marine Licence (as provided for under "Environmental Monitoring" within the Marine Licence Principles document (Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	considered. Clarity is required on the most appropriate regulatory mechanism needed to secure it. We acknowledge that the assessment of primary scour has been undertaken using recognised empirical equations supported by knowledge of the foundation design dimensions, and we agree with the assessment as presented.	
RR-015-2.4.1-3	<p>Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology</p> <p>NRW agrees that the data collected through the site-specific surveys, through the desktop review of existing literature, and data sources are sufficient to appropriately characterise the benthic ecology throughout the array and export cable corridor (ECC). We also agree with the assessment methodology and the assessment conclusions with respect to the potential impacts of the project on benthic receptors, as outlined in the ES.</p> <p>We agree with the conclusion of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) that, provided the mitigation measures outlined are adhered to, the project will not have an adverse effect on site integrity (AEOSI) and therefore will not undermine the conservation objectives of the benthic designated features of the Dee Estuary SAC and the Menai Strait and Conwy Bay SAC.</p> <p>From the evidence presented, the areas of low resemblance stony reef do not meet the strong justification criteria in terms of biological communities that NRW would expect within an Annex I feature. NRW therefore agrees with the conclusion presented that the discrete patches of stony habitats found in the ECC area do not qualify as Annex I stony reef.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges and welcomes these agreements.
RR-015-2.4.4	<p>NRW considers that the magnitude of impact from the potential introduction of marine invasive non-native species (mINNS) should be presented as Low (and not negligible) as there is a continuous risk of mINNS being introduced.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, we consider that the significance of the impact would still be minor and therefore not significant in EIA terms.</p>	The Applicant welcomes agreement that the significance of the impact would be minor and therefore not significant in EIA terms.
RR-015-2.4.5	We acknowledge the commitment of the Applicant to produce a biosecurity risk assessment to be conditioned within the marine licence, as outlined in the Schedule of Mitigation (APP-310) and the Marine Licence Principles document (AS-023). NRW recommends that the marine biosecurity plan is a free-standing document kept separate to the terrestrial plan provided in the Outline INNS Management Plan (APP-323). NRW should be consulted on the suitability of a marine biosecurity risk assessment and plan ahead of commencement of	It is anticipated that a biosecurity risk assessment be conditioned in the Marine Licence for agreement with NRW in the pre-construction phase (as provided for under "Biosecurity" within the Marine Licence Principles document (Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	activities. Clarity is required on the most appropriate regulatory mechanism needed to secure it.	
RR-015-2.5.1	<p>Saltmarsh</p> <p>Clwyd Estuary</p> <p>We note that the onshore cable will intersect Atlantic salt meadow at the Clwyd Estuary. Whilst the Clwyd Estuary is not a SAC or SSSI, saltmarsh is a section 7 habitat under the Environment (Wales) Act 2016. We note that there is a commitment in the Crossing Schedule (APP-121) for the use of trenchless techniques (for example, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD)) underneath the Clwyd Estuary. However, we require confirmation regarding how the cable will cross the river if it is undergrounded, that the techniques employed will be deep enough to avoid the saltmarsh and minimise cable exposure, and that appropriate entry and exit sites (pits) are identified. Such detail should be specified in the Outline Construction Method Statement (APP-313).</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that trenchless crossing techniques (such as HDD), will be used for the installation of cables beneath the River Clwyd with above ground construction works located to the east and west of the existing flood defence embankments (and therefore outwith the area identified as saltmarsh within Annex 5.2: Habitat and Hedgerow Survey Report (APP-125)). This is confirmed in Figure 11 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Project description (AP-066) where the proposed entry and exit pit locations are shown. Although construction works within the saltmarsh area would be underground, there could be a requirement for personnel to access the saltmarsh area on foot in order to monitor and guide the HDD (or other underground equipment).</p> <p>With regard to the River Clwyd, the Applicant has discussed the main river watercourse crossings with NRW and has proposed an additional DCO Requirement setting out the information that would be provided (see response to RR-015-3.2.1). In addition, since the Relevant Representation was provided by NRW, the Applicant will provide the NRW Marine Licensing Team with the additional information it needs regarding the trenchless crossing beneath the River Clwyd (see Document 1.14 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>
RR-015-2.6.1-3	<p>Fish and Shellfish Ecology</p> <p>NRW considers that a robust assessment has been carried out to support the overall conclusions of no significant impacts on fish and shellfish receptors.</p> <p>NRW agrees that the data collected through the site-specific surveys, through the desktop review of existing literature, and data sources are sufficient to appropriately characterise the fish and shellfish ecology throughout the array and export cable corridor.</p> <p>NRW agrees with the conclusion of the RIAA that the project will not undermine the conservation objectives of the designated migratory fish features of the River Dee and Bala Lake SAC and Dee Estuary SAC.</p>	<p>This is welcomed and noted by the Applicant.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-2.6.4	The assessment asserts that Atlantic salmon do not pass through the array area and are therefore unlikely to be exposed to potential impacts from noise. However, we note that evidence supporting this assertion is not available. Nonetheless, NRW agrees that Atlantic salmon are not considered to be very sensitive to underwater noise impacts and furthermore, will only be transient in the array area. Therefore, NRW agrees with the overall conclusion of no AEOSI on the River Dee and Bala Lake SAC.	This is welcomed and noted by the Applicant.
RR-015-2.6.5	NRW agrees with the assessment methodology and the assessment conclusions of the potential impacts on fish and shellfish receptors. There are, however, some inaccuracies in the assessment, for example: there appears to be an error used in the calculation of affected spawning area for sandeel (Table 18, in Chapter 6: (APP- 052)), where the figure from Worst-case Scenario (WCS) monopile piling NW location scenario has been adopted, rather than temporal Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for multi-leg foundation modelling at the NW location. Furthermore, we do not consider that the assumptions used when modelling spawning fish as fleeing receptors are realistic, for example, we do not consider a sustained swim speed of 1.5m/s-1 is realistic for spawning sole. Consequently, it is our view that the figures presented for the Valued Ecological Receptor (VER) affected spawning potential do not represent realistic scenarios for some fish receptors, such as sole, plaice, cod and whiting. Nonetheless, NRW recognises that regardless of this, the resulting area impacted by noise from piling activities remains minor, when compared to the wide available spawning habitat in the region. NRW agrees that the significance of effect on VERs remain 'minor adverse' and are therefore not significant in EIA terms.	The Applicant directs NRW to the Fish and Shellfish Clarification Note (Document 1.3 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission), which presents revised spawning potential calculations in respect of these errors identified. The Applicant welcomes NRW's agreement that the significance of effect remains minor adverse and therefore not significant in EIA terms.
RR-015-2.6.6-7	NRW notes the cumulative environmental assessment (CEA) undertaken for fish receptors and requires further information on how the cumulative impacts to fish populations over multiple spawning seasons from underwater noise arising from consecutive construction activity from several offshore windfarm projects in Liverpool Bay has been considered.  NRW agrees with the conclusions that the project will not impact Water Framework Directive (WFD) fish status in the affected Transitional waterbodies.	This agreement is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-2.7.1	Marine Water and Sediment Quality (MW&SQ)  NRW agrees that there is no impact on Bathing Waters from elevated suspended sediment, during the construction phase.	This agreement is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.
RR-015-2.7.2	We do not agree with the conclusions made in relation to sediment bound contaminants, as further information is required to support the conclusion. Where data is available, the Applicant should report all data in the context of Centre for the Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Sciences (CEFAS) Action Levels. Once the above information has been updated and provided, we advise that the RIAA is updated to reflect this new information.	<p>The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and have submitted a clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). It is understood that the matter is now agreed and this will be confirmed via the SoCG process.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided the site-specific metal contaminants against the CEFAS Action Levels (CAL) in Tables 10 and 12 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049). As concluded in paragraphs 80 and 91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049), there are no exceedances of CAL1 for metal contaminants in any of the sediment samples collected.</p> <p>As there are no specific CALs for individual Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon (PAHs), the Applicant sought to present these concentrations against the Canadian sediment quality guidelines (Threshold Effect Levels (TELs) and Probable Effect Levels (PELs)). This approach was considered to be in accordance with the advice in the NRW Scoping Opinion consultation response (see Table 2 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049)).</p> <p>As presented in Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049), all of the sampled stations in the offshore ECC had PAHs below the TEL threshold. In addition, they are all below 0.1 mg/kg (the CAL1 for PAHs). As presented in Table 9 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049) eight of the nine sampling stations in the array did not exceed the TEL levels for individual PAHs. However, as noted in paragraph 76 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049), concentrations in sample MA_ST12 were between TEL and PEL<sup>i</sup> for three individual PAHs (Acenaphthene, Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene and</p>

<sup>i</sup> Defined as the possible effect range within which adverse effects occasionally occur.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Fluoranthene). MA_ST12 exceeded the CAL1 for both Fluoranthene and Pyrene. However, the Applicant maintains that the rationale for the magnitude of impact and so the conclusions of assessment presented in Section 3.10.3 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049) remain valid. Therefore, it is the Applicant's position that the release of sediment bound contaminants is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. The Applicant has sought to reduce duplication within the DCO Application as is standard practice. Appropriate sign-posting and cross references have been provided in the RIAA to the associated ES chapters and technical reports and, therefore, the Applicant does not feel that it would have been appropriate to replicate the data in the RIAA. Furthermore, the findings of the RIAA remain valid as they were based on information presented in Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049) which remains valid.</p>
RR-015-2.7.3	<p>We do not agree with the approach to assessing impacts to phytoplankton, as the assessment is focussed on nutrients rather than light limitation caused by elevated suspended sediments in the water column. We therefore disagree with the conclusion presented. The main impact pathway arising from the construction phase to phytoplankton is elevated suspended sediment and therefore this is what the assessment should focus on.</p>	<p>The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and have submitted a clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). It is understood that the matter is now agreed and this will be confirmed via the SoCG process.</p> <p>As acknowledged in paragraph 108 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049), "Increases in SSC and so turbidity may result in a decrease in the depth to which natural light can penetrate into the water column. This in turn may result in a reduction in primary productivity and/or an increase in bacterial growth". Paragraph 111 summarises the elevated suspended sediments in the water column. Whilst not explicitly stated for phytoplankton the conclusions of paragraph 113 remain valid for light limitation in the water column, including the predicted dilution levels, the temporary nature of the activities, and SSC dispersion from tidal currents in the water column would be in the order of days. These potential changes are within the natural variation of the marine environment in the study area during high energy low frequency events and the high observed concentrations which coincide with the NOA. Therefore, effects on light limitation caused by elevated SSC in</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		the water column from the proposed activities is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
RR-015-2.7.4	We do not agree with the approach to assessing Dissolved oxygen (DO) as the assessment is focussed on nutrients rather than suspended sediments. DO can be impacted by the remobilisation of anoxic sediments or sediments with organic content and associated bacteria. We therefore disagree with the conclusion presented, and we recommend that this is clarified.	<p>The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and have submitted a clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). It is understood that the matter is now agreed and this will be confirmed via the SoCG process.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledged that dissolved oxygen levels can decrease due to various factors, including release of anoxic sediments, rapid changes in temperature and salinity, as well as from the respiration of organic matter. The dissolved oxygen assessment was focused on the potential for nutrient inputs into the water column. This was considered the most likely potential pathway by which dissolved oxygen could be impacted as a result of the proposed activities.</p> <p>Section 3.10.1 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049) provides a summary of the project specific modelling of SSC. Full details are provided in Volume 4, Annex 2.3: Physical Processes Modelling Results (APP-077). As demonstrated by the project specific modelling any disturbed anoxic sediments are predicted to be rapidly diluted and dispersed. It should also be noted that the water column will be oxygenated and will oxidise any anoxic sediments rapidly. As such, if anoxic sediments were present the proposed activities are not expected to cause a measurable reduction in the dissolved oxygen in the water column. Therefore, effects of the release of anoxic sediments (if present and disturbed) from the proposed activities would not be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.</p>
RR-015-2.7.5	We disagree with the Applicant's conclusion that potential spills will only cause temporary issues as these chemicals can persist in the environment for long periods. We consider that the impact should be 'medium adverse' rather than 'negligible adverse' as presented in the ES, as the ability to meet Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) could be compromised (Table 6, Page 59: Chapter 3 (APP- 049)). However, we note the mitigation commitments presented to produce a Project Environment Management Plan (PEMP) and Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP) as part of the marine licence condition. Providing	<p>The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and have submitted a clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). It is understood that the matter is now agreed and this will be confirmed via the SoCG process.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to consult with NRW to ensure that the provision of a PEMP and MPCP are conditioned within the Marine</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	these conditions are secured and delivered, we can agree that the risk is mitigated to an acceptable level.	<p>Licence (Condition 12 of the Marine Licence Principles Document (Document 1.24 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission)).</p> <p>It is the Applicant's position that the maximum sensitivity of relevant receptors (waterbodies and non-designated waters) would be Low (paragraphs 129 and 130 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049)). Therefore, even if the magnitude was considered to be Medium adverse in the absence of the aforementioned embedded mitigation, then the significance would be Minor adverse and would not be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.</p>
RR-015-2.7.6	A number of inter-relationships between MW&SQ and other receptors have been overlooked, including but not limited to elevated bacterial counts and their ability to impact human health, which would be of relevance under the Bathing Waters Directive.	<p>The potential impact on human health has been assessed by the Applicant through ensuring compliance with the Bathing Waters Directive. The classifications of bathing water performance, as set out in the Bathing Water Directive, were designed to manage and reduce the health risk to users of bathing waters. The Applicant has assessed the potential for elevated bacterial counts (see Section 3.10.2 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-049)) and concluded that the potential for changes to bacterial abundance, and thus impacts to Bathing Water classifications, is considered negligible for Rhyl, Rhyl East and Prestatyn Bathing Waters.</p> <p>The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and understand NRW will be providing further advice in their Written Representation. Nevertheless it is understood that no major issues remain and agreement is expected to come via the SoCG process.</p>
RR-015-2.7.7-8	<p>We agree with the conclusions in the ES with respect to suspended sediment in Water Framework Directive (WFD) water bodies (Chapter 3 Para 129 &amp; 132 (APP- 049)). However, for the purposes of the WFD Compliance Assessment (CA), please see comment below (comment 2.8.3).</p> <p>We consider that the relationships between marine water quality and the onshore works have been considered appropriately and therefore agree with the conclusions and mitigation suggested.</p>	This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant. See also the Applicant's response to RR-015-2.8.3.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-2.8.1-2	<p>Water Framework Directive (WFD) (Coastal and Transitional Water Bodies)</p> <p>North Wales Coastal Water Body</p> <p>NRW agrees with the assessment of the potential impacts upon the hydromorphology resulting from the presence of physical structures as provided in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes (APP-048). We therefore agree with the conclusion of the WFD CA (APP-094) for the hydromorphology element – that the proposed activities will not result in deterioration of status of the water body or jeopardise the attainment of its objectives.</p> <p>NRW agrees with the characterisation of the biology, assessment methodology and the assessment conclusions of the potential impacts on benthic receptors as outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology (APP-051). NRW therefore agrees with the conclusions of the WFD CA for biology: habitats within the water body - that the biological elements associated with this would not be at risk of deterioration as a result of the project.</p>	This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.
RR-015-2.8.3	<p>In relation to water quality, we note that the information presented in the MW&amp;SQ chapter has not been transposed into the WFD CA with respect to water clarity (suspended sediment) and contaminated sediment, and as such, we cannot agree with the conclusions of the CA with respect to those aspects of the assessment at present.</p>	<p>The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and have submitted a clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). It is understood that the matter is now agreed and this will be confirmed via the SoCG process.</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to reduce duplication within the DCO Application as is standard practice. Appropriate sign-posting and cross references have been provided to the ES chapters and technical reports which present information which informed the WFD compliance assessment. The WFD compliance assessment should be read in conjunction with these documents as noted in Volume 4, Annex 3.1: Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (APP-094).</p> <p>With the provision of the clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) and engagement via post-application consultation, the Applicant understands that this matter is considered suitably addressed by NRW, which is expected to be confirmed by Written Representations and the SoCG process.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-2.8.4	In relation to water quality, we do not agree with the conclusions with respect to phytoplankton and dissolved oxygen (DO) as the assessment focusses on nutrients rather than water clarity (please see comments 2.7.3 and 2.7.4 above). Water clarity is the main impact pathway arising from the proposed works which could affect the phytoplankton and DO status of the North Wales water body and therefore the assessment should focus on this.	The Applicant has since engaged with NRW on this matter via post-application consultation and have submitted a clarification note (Document 1.15 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). It is understood that the matter is now agreed and this will be confirmed via the SoCG process.
RR-015-2.8.5-7	<p>Clwyd Transitional Water body</p> <p>Based on the statement made at para 128 and in Table 9 of Volume 4 - Annex 3.1 (APP-094) that "there are no current intentions to install structures which may alter the hydromorphology of the Clwyd transitional waterbody", NRW agrees with the conclusions of the WFD CA for the hydromorphology element within the Clwyd water body.</p> <p>NRW agrees with the WFD CA conclusions for biology – habitats within the water body, that provided that no direct interaction with the biological habitats in the Clwyd transitional waterbody will occur due to the proposed trenchless techniques, the project will not cause deterioration to the biological elements within the water body, or jeopardise the attainment of Good Ecological Potential.</p> <p>NRW agrees with the WFD CA conclusions for water quality within the water body, that due to the trenchless techniques proposed, the project will not cause deterioration to the water quality within the water body or jeopardise the attainment of Good Ecological Potential.</p>	This is welcomed by the Applicant.
RR-015-2.8.8	We note that there is a commitment in the Crossing Schedule (APP-121) for the use of trenchless technique (e.g. HDD) underneath the Clwyd. However, we seek confirmation regarding how the cable will be brought across the river if it is undergrounded; that the techniques employed will be deep enough to avoid the saltmarsh and minimise cable exposure, and that appropriate entry and exit sites(pits) are identified. We advise that this information should be included in the Outline Construction Method Statement (APP-313). We advise that if the proposal to employ trenchless techniques changes, then the WFD CA will need to be revisited and any impacts properly assessed.	See Applicant's response to RR-015-2.5.1.
RR-015-2.8.9	NRW agrees with the proposal to produce a biosecurity risk assessment and for it to be secured as a condition of the marine licence.	This is welcomed by the Applicant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-2.9	<p>Decommissioning - Offshore</p> <p>We acknowledge the commitment to produce a Decommissioning Plan under section 105 of the Energy Act 2004 and as identified under Requirement 21 of the draft DCO (AS-014) and in the Marine Licence Principles (AS-023).</p> <p>We note, from the ES, the intention to completely remove all infrastructure at the end of the operational lifetime of the project, unless, closer to the time of decommissioning it is decided that removal would lead to a greater environmental impact than leaving some components in situ.</p> <p>NRW considers that offshore renewable projects should produce decommissioning plans that retain all decommissioning options (maintain, full removal and partial removal); the options for which can be assessed and refined closer to the time of decommissioning itself in consultation with NRW. NRW reserves its position until a draft plan is submitted at which point we will provide further advice.</p> <p>NRW advises that the Applicant will need to submit a marine licence application at the point of decommissioning to remove infrastructure.</p> <p>We advise that the Applicant follows the industry decommissioning guidance produced by BEIS.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant.</p>
RR-015-2.9.6	<p>Draft Development Consent Order: Requirements</p> <p>There are notable differences between the proposed timings of submission for the offshore and onshore decommissioning plans, as drafted in the DCO (Requirements 20 and 21 respectively) (AS-014)) and associated parts of the ES. For example, we note that an onshore plan is to be submitted at least 6 months prior to any decommissioning works commencing, and an offshore plan is to be submitted 4 months prior to commencement of construction. We recommend that the reasons for such discrepancies are clarified. In addition, it would be prudent to understand how decommissioning plans for both the offshore and onshore aspects of this project will be dealt with. Clarity is required on what the appropriate regulatory mechanism would be to secure decommissioning plans, unless it is considered that the DCO needs to address both aspects because the consent is ultimately for the project which includes both offshore and onshore elements.</p>	<p>The offshore plan must be submitted in accordance with the legal requirements of the Energy Act 2004. DCO R21 therefore secures that no offshore works can commence until this has been complied with. The offshore decommissioning plan will have to be reviewed prior to decommissioning being carried out in order to ensure it complies or is updated to comply with the then applicable standards and requirements. The onshore decommissioning plan is to be submitted six months prior to decommissioning works commencing (DCO R22) so that it is current to the circumstances, legislation and requirements applicable at that time. The onshore plan has been scheduled for the time it is actually required in order to prevent unnecessary work being undertaken on a plan which would be out of date by the time it is required where that work is not a statutory necessity.</p> <p>The DCO needs to cover both aspects to ensure it is compliant with the requirements of the Energy Act in relation to offshore</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		decommissioning and that the onshore decommissioning is secured at the end of the lifetime of AyM.
RR-015-2.10	<p>Schedule of Mitigation and the Marine Licence Principles</p> <p>There are a number of inconsistencies between the Schedule of Mitigation (APP- 310) and the Marine Licence Principles document (AS-023) that require clarification. For example, the Schedule of Mitigation refers to a Cable Specification and Installation Plan to be secured as part of the marine licence, but which is not recognised in the Marine Licence Principles document as a specific document (albeit cable management plans are noted). This potentially results in confusion as to the exact measures that are to be secured as part of the project mitigation.</p>	The Marine Licence Principles document is necessarily at high level and has been produced to assist in understanding the interaction between the DCO and the separate Marine Licences (ML) from NRW. Unlike the DCO, the responsibility for drafting the MLs is with NRW, and the Applicant has been mindful of that in setting out its suggested approach. The Applicant expects there to be further discussion during both the DCO examination and the ML determination on the drafting of the DCO and the MLs to ensure all mitigation is secured in the appropriate consent without unnecessary overlap or duplication.
RR-015-3.1.1	<p>ONSHORE</p> <p>Designated Landscapes – KEY CONCERN</p> <p>The ES chapter Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (AS-027) acknowledges that the proposal will have significant effects on a number of viewpoints. Based on the ES and supporting ES Appendices, NRW advises that the offshore works are likely to have numerous and extensive significant adverse effects on seascape, landscape and visual receptors within the Isle of Anglesey Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Snowdonia National Park (NP) and within their settings. Special Qualities set out in the respective management plans for the areas which support the designations, would be adversely affected. These concerns relate to all Maximum Design Scenarios (MDS) i.e. those relating to MDS of the smaller number of Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) and the MDS relating to the larger number of WTGs as detailed in the offshore project descriptions (APP-047)</p>	<p>The adverse effects on the Isle of Anglesey AONB and SNP occur only as a result of impacts occurring within their settings through changes in views and not through any direct changes to these designated areas.</p> <p>Assessments of the effects on the Special Qualities of the Isle of Anglesey AONB and SNP as set out in the respective management plans are set out in Section 10.11 of the SLVIA (AS-027).</p> <p>As requested by stakeholders via the Evidence Plan process (see the Evidence Plan Report and its supporting appendices (APP-301, APP-302 and APP-303) the Applicant assessed two Maximum Design Scenarios (MDS) A and B within the SLVIA (AS-027). The first includes the smallest number of the largest WTGs proposed (MDS A) and the second includes the largest number of the smallest WTGs proposed (MDS B). It is recognised that NRW's concerns apply equally to either MDS.</p>
RR-015-3.1.2-3	<p>NRW are concerned that the proposal will result in unacceptable adverse effects on the Isle of Anglesey AONB and Snowdonia NP designated landscapes through conflict with the purpose of conservation and enhancement of natural beauty, which is enshrined in the purposes of these designated landscapes.</p> <p>In addition, NRW considers that there would be non-significant, but adverse effects on the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB as well as other non-significant but adverse effects on the Isle of Anglesey AONB and Snowdonia NP.</p>	<p>The unacceptability, or otherwise, of AyM OWF is a matter for the planning balance through the decision-making process. Adverse effects on seascape or visual amenity must be considered alongside the benefits of the proposed scheme (EN-3 paragraph 2.6.208) such as the urgent need for new renewable energy and the benefits of climate change mitigation. Further information and assessment of this matter is included in the Planning Statement (APP-298).</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that any form of large-scale built development visible from the Isle of Anglesey AONB or SNP would be considered to</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		meet the criteria of conservation or enhancement within these designated areas.
RR-015-3.1.4	NRW considers that there has been an under-estimation of some seascape, landscape and visual effects on designated landscape receptors within the Seascape Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA).	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant also notes that NRW has provided further detail on this in its technical consultation response to the Marine License application and the Applicant assumes that this detail will be forthcoming in the Written Representation from NRW at Deadline 1.
RR-015-3.1.5-6	<p>Whilst we acknowledge the embedded mitigation of the reduced western extent of the array, and that a reduction in the number of WTGs has been applied, we do not consider it sufficient to reduce the likely significant effects at the numerous viewpoints within Isle of Anglesey AONB and Snowdonia NP. The visual impacts will lead to significant adverse effects on landscape character within these Nationally Designated Landscapes and within their seascape settings.</p> <p>In terms of mitigation, a further substantial reduction in array area and/or scale or number of turbines would be required to minimise adverse effects on the Isle of Anglesey AONB and Snowdonia NP. Further consideration of NRW's evidence base "Seascape &amp; visual sensitivity to offshore wind farms in Wales: Strategic assessment and guidance" would assist in informing an appropriate reduction.</p>	<p>Following comments received during the statutory consultation on the PEIR, the proposed development was reviewed and revised through an 11% reduction in the array area (26% reduction from scoping stage offshore site area) and the maximum number of turbines proposed (91 at PEIR, reduced to 50). The west to east extent of the array area has reduced from 25.8 km to 16.4 km (a reduction of 36% from scoping) and this is a clear reduction in extents in views from SNP.</p> <p>In addition, the distance from the Isle of Anglesey coast and AONB to the west is increased. At Viewpoint 2: Point Lynas on the north-east coast of Anglesey, the Agreement for Lease/ scoping boundary was 20.2 km distant. The array area assessed in the ES has moved 8.5 km further away at 28.7 km. Increased distance reduces the scale of wind turbines in views from the Isle of Anglesey AONB with the most marked difference occurring in the north.</p> <p>The reduced horizontal field of view and number of wind turbines leads to a reduction in impacts on both the Anglesey AONB and SNP.</p> <p>Lighting mitigation measures have also been included.</p> <p>The White Report "Seascape &amp; visual sensitivity to offshore wind farms in Wales: Strategic assessment and guidance" has been considered by the Applicant alongside other technical and environmental factors (See also Volume 1, Chapter 4 Site Selection Alternatives (APP-044)).</p> <p>In particular, the embedded mitigation removes the array area from the area shown in the Guidance as Zone No 3: North Wales and North Anglesey Inshore, which is identified as having a high sensitivity. The array area is now proposed entirely within the zones, which are defined in the NRW evidence base report as being of medium and medium/low sensitivity.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>NRW has made the point previously in its response (reference RR-015-3.1.1) that even the smallest (282m) turbines proposed would not allay its concerns. It is therefore understood that a suitable reduction in WTG scale would require even smaller WTGs as well as a substantial reduction in the array area.</p> <p>The White Report suggests that a WTG height of 145m may be suitable at a minimum distance of 22.6km from an AONB or National Park designation. The Applicant is unable to achieve these thresholds. WTGs of this small scale will no longer be in production when the AyM OWF is in its planned development phase.</p> <p>After considerable review it is has not been possible for the Applicant to further reduce the WTG heights or the associated turbine numbers and array area from those assessed in the ES and still have an economically viable and competitive scheme. This needs to take into account the potential for the AyM OWF to be built, which relies on the Applicant being able to successfully compete with other wind farm projects being taken to bidding under the Contract for Difference (CfD) auction process.</p>
RR-015-3.1.7	NRW advises that opportunities for enhancement of the designated landscapes should be considered in accordance with Welsh National Marine Plan Policy SOC_06: Designated Landscapes. NRW considers enhancements represent compensation and/or offsetting and not mitigation for adverse effects, as any enhancements would not be directly related to the impacts.	The Applicant is exploring potential opportunities for enhancement as part of compensation measures (with a general focus on designated areas) and will look to explore these with stakeholders during the Examination process.
RR-015-3.1.8	Whilst NRW considers that the landscape and visual effects of the onshore substation on the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB are unlikely to be significant, adverse effects should nevertheless be minimised and the materials and colours of the proposed buildings and infrastructure should be designed to minimise visual impacts. We note the intention to secure such detail under DCO Requirement 6, but advise that this also needs to be considered from a landscape and visual perspective.	The Applicant notes agreement with ES Volume 3, Chapter 2: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (AS-029) which considers in Table 12 that there is no potential for significant effects from the AONB due to distance and intervening landscape elements (woodlands, trees and SABP), which combine to limit visibility of the Onshore ECC and OnSS.
RR-015-3.1.9	The proposals are likely to have adverse night-time visual effects on the Isle of Anglesey AONB and Snowdonia NP. Dark skies are a noted feature of the Peace & Tranquillity Special Quality within the Anglesey AONB.	This is noted by the Applicant. It was confirmed by NRW at a post application consultation meeting that it does not consider the effects on the Isle of Anglesey AONB or Snowdonia National Park would be significant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>The SLVIA (AS-027) notes that dark skies are a component of the Anglesey AONB Special Quality of Peace &amp; Tranquility in Table 7, which refers to the assessment of night time visual effects set out in Section 10.12.5.</p> <p>In relation to dark skies, it is noted that lighting mitigation measures have been included in the proposals in Section 10.9 of the SLVIA chapter of the ES (AS-027). This reduced the night-time effects on all receptors in the Isle of Anglesey to non-significant as set out from paragraph 1445 of the SLVIA (AS-027). Night-time effects on Snowdonia National Park are assessed from paragraph 1458 and were also considered to be non-significant.</p>
RR-015-3.1.10	NRW are concerned that adverse incremental, combined cumulative seascape, landscape and visual effects may arise on the Isle of Anglesey AONB and Snowdonia NP because of plan and projects both offshore and onshore.	This is noted by the Applicant.
RR-015-3.2.1	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>▲ Flood Risk Activity Permit – KEY CONCERN</p> <p>NRW does not consent to the Applicant's request for the DCO to include a provision to remove the requirement for a prescribed consent to be granted (namely Flood Risk Activity Permits (FRAP) (as detailed in the Consents and Licences Required Under Other Legislation document (APP-037)) under s150 Planning Act 2008. NRW considers that a FRAP application should be made for each main river crossing (and associated flood defences) in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 (EPR 2016).</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the concern that NRW has regarding the disapplication of FRAPs via the DCO and is in ongoing dialogue with NRW regarding the feedback NRW has provided.</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed an additional Requirement within the DCO that relates specifically to watercourse crossings. The proposed DCO Requirement sets out the post consent information that the Applicant would provide for each watercourse crossing, reflecting the information that would be included in a typical FRAP application. NRW is currently reviewing the principal of whether a dedicated watercourse crossing DCO Requirement would remove NRW's resistance to disapplication of FRAP via the DCO.</p>
RR-015-3.2.2	The Outline Construction Method Statement (APP-313) advises (paragraph 69) that "...the depth of each cable at every watercourse or flood defence crossing will be determined through the Crossing Schedule in consultation and agreement with the relevant authority on a case-by case basis in collaboration with the respective...". It also advises in the same document (paragraph 70) that "...Options for open cut or trenchless crossing of watercourses will be finalised following ground investigation...". For a number of crossings, it has not been confirmed which crossings will be open cut and whilst accepting that	See response to RR-015-3.2.1

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	they are likely to be on the smaller watercourses it should be ensured that open cut crossings of main rivers be subject to a bespoke application.	
RR-015-3.2.3-4	<p>A bespoke FRAP application would usually be required for each new crossing beneath a main river which includes both the permanent works and the temporary works. A permanent application would include details such as depth of cover beneath the bed of the main river and level of pipe/cable within an 8m/16m distance from the banks of the main river/toe of any associated flood defence structures. A temporary works application would consider the cable's installation method be it open cut or trenchless crossing.</p> <p>It should be noted that service crossings below the bed of a main river (by trenchless techniques) can be registered as an exempt flood risk activity under the Regulations provided that certain key conditions can be met as per part 4 of Schedule 3 of the EPR 2016.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant and the potential for the disapplication of FRAPs via the DCO is the subject of ongoing discussion with NRW.</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed to include an additional Requirement within the DCO that relates specifically to watercourse crossings. The proposed DCO Requirement sets out the post consent information that The Applicant would provide for each watercourse crossing, reflecting the information that would be included in a typical FRAP application. NRW is currently reviewing the principal of whether a dedicated watercourse crossing DCO Requirement would remove NRW's resistance to disapplication of FRAP via the DCO.</p>
RR-015-3.2.5	<p>▲ Flood Consequence Assessments</p> <p>The Export Cable Corridor is located within zone C1 of the Development Advice Map (DAM) contained in Technical Advice Note (TAN)15, along with minor works in C2. The Flood Consequence Assessment refers to the Flood Risk Assessment Wales maps. The Flood Risk Assessment Wales maps should not be used for planning purposes; NRW advises the Flood Map for Planning (FMfP) represents more up-to-date information for assessing flood risk. However, in view of the works proposed, and as a final Construction Method Statement will be approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) (Requirement 10), NRW considers that flood risk can be appropriately/adequately mitigated. However, whilst consultation with NRW is specifically stated for the discharge of some Requirements (e.g. Requirement 7, 13 and 14), we note that this is not included for Requirement 10. For the avoidance of doubt, we recommend that the Draft DCO (AS-014) is updated to ensure that NRW should be consulted by the LPA prior to the discharge of Requirement 10.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a revised version of the FCAs for the Onshore ECC (APP-137; Document 1.41 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) and OnSS (APP-138; Document 1.43 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) to include Flood Map for Planning (FMfP).</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes confirmation from NRW that flood risk can be appropriately/ adequately mitigated via the Construction Method Statement that will be approved by Denbighshire County Council under DCO R10.</p> <p>NRW will be added to DCO R10 as a consultee as requested.</p>
RR-015-3.2.6	NRW also notes that there are works in C2 which are not assessed in the Flood Consequence Assessment (APP-137). The works include an operational access track and a temporary mitigation area. It should be ensured that any tracks or temporary mitigation areas within zones C1/C2 or within 8m of a designated main river does not interfere with access to maintain the watercourse or impact on flood risk. Such proposals would be subject to a bespoke FRAP from NRW.	<p>The Applicant has provided a revised version of the FCA for the Onshore ECC (APP-137; Document 1.41 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) to include consideration of works within C2.</p> <p>The areas of the DOL that are located within C2 comprise an operational access (which utilises an existing access track and field</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>access points), and area of temporary mitigation for watervole and otter and part of an access point into a TCC from the A525</p> <p>The temporary mitigation areas within C2 represent an area with temporary relaxation of/ changes to agricultural grassland management and operational access will utilise existing farm accesses and existing farm tracks. Therefore, the Applicant can confirm that the presence of operational accesses or temporary mitigation areas associated with Awel y Môr that are either within zones C1/C2 or within 8m of a designated main river will not interfere with access by NRW to maintain the watercourse or impact on flood risk.</p>
RR-015-3.2.7	<p>With regard to the Onshore Sub-Station, the supporting Flood Consequence Assessment has not referred to the FMfP. However, NRW is satisfied that the FMfP/DAM shows that the site is not at risk of flooding from the sea or fluvially. Some parts of the site is at risk from flooding surface water and small watercourses according to the FMfP. The Lead Local Flood Authority (Denbighshire County Council) is the appropriate body to advise with regard to the acceptability of surface water flood risk.</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant. The Applicant has provided a revised version of the FCAs for the Onshore ECC (APP-137; Document 1.41 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) and OnSS (APP-138; Document 1.43 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) to include Flood Map for Planning (FMfP).</p> <p>DCO R16 states that construction of the Onshore Substation must not commence until a written surface and foul water drainage plan (including details of any watercourse crossings and proposals for management and maintenance) have undergone consultation with NRW and then been submitted to, and approved by, Denbighshire County Council. The surface and foul water drainage plan must be substantially in accordance with the principles set out in the outline drainage strategy.</p>
RR-015-3.3.1	<p>Protected Species (Terrestrial)</p> <p>NRW considers the survey and assessment to be satisfactory in respect of great crested newts (GCNs), bats, otters, dormice, water voles and barn owls. Water voles and barn owls are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). GCNs, bats, otters and dormice are also European Protected Species which are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.</p>
RR-015-3.3.2	<p>NRW agrees with the conclusions in the ES and the recommendations and proposed principles for mitigation in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (APP-305). We also note that the final LEMP will be approved by the LPA following consultation with NRW. NRW agrees with this</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant. In response to the Relevant Representation from NRW, the Applicant and NRW have undertaken further discussion and NRW has provided further details on the suggested amendments to the oLEMP.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>approach. However, NRW considers that amendments to the Outline LEMP should be made to ensure that the final LEMP is based on a more robust Outline LEMP (e.g. the need for an external Ecological Compliance Audit, revised details regarding long-term monitoring and management).</p>	<p>These have been fully incorporated and an amended version of the document has been provided at Deadline 1 (Document 1.33 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).</p>
RR-015-3.4	<p>Fish (Freshwater)</p> <p>We note that mitigation for fish (eels) is included in the Outline LEMP and that the final version will be approved by the LPA, in consultation with NRW. We agree with this approach.</p> <p>NRW also notes the ES chapter Onshore Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (APP-066) discusses the declining trend of salmonids within the river Clwyd. Whilst the statement is true, the conclusions of "Not Significant" should not be based on the fact that populations are declining and numbers are low. However, NRW can agree with the conclusion based on the developer undertaking HDD under the river Clwyd which mitigate disturbance to fish.</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.</p>
RR-015-3.5	<p>Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) (Terrestrial)</p> <p>NRW notes that the final (terrestrial) INNS Management Plan will be approved by the LPA (Requirement 10). NRW agrees with this approach and consider that INNS will be appropriately managed. However, as highlighted above (comment 3.2.5) we advise that NRW is consulted prior to the discharge of Requirement 10. NRW also considers that minor amendments to the Outline INNS Management Plan (APP-323) should be made in order to ensure that the final version of the plan is based on a more robust Outline version (e.g. the need for the Plan to consider landscape planting, diseases that may affect protected species, and preventive techniques). In addition, although the Outline version refers to species listed under the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), NRW advises that it should also refer to the provisions under the Invasive Alien Species (Enforcement and Permitting) Order 2019.</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant. In response to the Relevant Representation from NRW, the Applicant and NRW have undertaken further discussion and NRW has provided further details on the suggested amendments to the oINNSMP (1.39 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission). These have been fully incorporated and an amended version of the document has been provided at Deadline 1.</p> <p>NRW have been added to DCO R10 (the CoCP) as a consultee. (The parts and sub-plans upon which NRW are to be consulted are specified in Table 1 of the outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission)).</p>
RR-015-3.6	<p>Water Quality (Freshwater)</p> <p>NRW notes that the final Code of Construction Practice and the underpinning Method Statements and Management Plans must be submitted to and approved by the LPA (Requirement 10). NRW agrees with this approach and consider that impacts on water quality (both surface and groundwater) will be</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant. If NRW can provide further detail on the proposed amendments these can be reviewed and considered for inclusion in the document.</p> <p>NRW have been added to DCO R10 (the CoCP) as a consultee. (The parts and sub-plans upon which NRW are to be consulted are</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>appropriately managed. However, as highlighted above (comment 3.2.5) we advise that NRW is consulted prior to the discharge of Requirement 10.</p> <p>NRW also considers that minor amendments to the Outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan (APP-318) be made in order to ensure that the final version of the plan is based on a more robust Outline version (e.g. confirmation that no discharge of contaminated water occurs (including contamination with sediments) without the relevant exemption or Permit, not refuelling within 10m of a watercourse rather than the 5m stated)</p>	specified in Table 1 of the outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission)).
RR-015-3.7.1-2	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>NRW agrees with the conclusions in the ES (Chapter 11) (AS-030) that construction and operational onshore traffic is unlikely to have significant effects on any designated nature conservation site (SSSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar site).</p> <p>NRW notes that the works will be within the proximity of Ancient Woodland. Planning Policy Wales recognises the significant value of ancient woodlands and makes provision for their protection against damage or loss. Our standing advice to all planning proposals that may affect (directly or indirectly) ancient woodland can be found at Natural Resources Wales / Advice to planning authorities considering proposals affecting ancient woodland. The LPA will be able to advise with respect to the acceptability of the proposals in terms of Ancient Woodland.</p>	This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.
RR-015-3.7.3	<p>However, we note that there is no assessment of any air quality impacts arising from marine vessel emissions. It is unclear whether marine vessels will operate within proximity to sensitive coastal onshore habitat (that may support features of SSSIs/SACs/Ramsar). We advise the Applicant provides additional information to demonstrate that there will not be significant impacts from marine vessel emissions.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response and has provided a clarification note directly to NRW on the matter of emissions from marine vessels. This note is also provided in Document 1.20 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission. The Applicant will continue to liaise with NRW on this matter and seek to reach agreement via the SoCG process.</p>
RR-015-3.8.1-2	<p>Water Framework Directive (WFD) (Freshwater)</p> <p>The conclusions of the WFD Compliance Assessment will be reliant on securing appropriate mitigation, including the final Code of Construction Practice and the underpinning Method Statements and Management Plans which must be submitted to and approved by the LPA. We agree with this approach.</p> <p>We note that there are matters that will be confirmed following detailed design (e.g. as to specifically which watercourses that trenchless or trenching</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	techniques will be employed, and exact haul road crossings). As highlighted above (comment 3.2.5), NRW should be consulted on the final Method Statements and Management Plans prior to discharge of Requirement 10.	
RR-015-3.8.3	We also have minor comments regarding the methodology/scoping undertaken. As an example, we consider that INNS should have been scoped into the impact assessment stage as there is a risk of introduction of INNS. However, as stated above (comment 3.5.1), we are satisfied that INNS will be appropriately managed as the final (terrestrial) INNS Management Plan will be approved by the LPA.	See Applicant's response to RR-015-3.5.
RR-015-3.8.4	We also note that the WFD CA is based on the 2015 Western Wales River Basin Management Plan however the Applicant has been able to incorporate 2021 classification data published earlier this year into the assessment. The Examining Authority should be aware that the updated Western Wales River Basin Management Plan 2021-2027 will be published on 18th July 2022 and will be available on the NRW website here.	This update is welcomed by the Applicant. The Applicant would welcome discussions with NRW to understand if the updated Western Wales River Basin Management Plan 2021-2027 and associated data would have any material changes to the findings of the WFD compliance assessment.
RR-015-3.9	Materials and Waste  We note that the final Site Waste Management Plan will be approved by the LPA. We agree with this approach and consider that waste will be appropriately managed. As highlighted above (comment 3.2.5), NRW should be consulted on the final Site Waste Management Plan prior to discharge of Requirement 10.	This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.  NRW have been added to DCO R10 (the CoCP) as a consultee. (The parts and sub-plans upon which NRW are to be consulted are specified in Table 1 of the outline CoCP (APP-312; Document 1.49 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission).
RR-015-4	NRW'S GENERAL PUPROSE  NRW is satisfied that this advice is consistent with its general purpose of pursuing the sustainable management of natural resources in relation to Wales, and applying the principles of sustainable management of natural resources. In particular, NRW acknowledges that the principles of sustainable management include taking account of all relevant evidence and gathering evidence in respect of uncertainties, and taking account of the short, medium and long term consequences of actions. NRW further acknowledges that it is an objective of sustainable management to maintain and enhance the resilience of ecosystems and the benefits they provide and, in so doing meet the needs of present generations of people without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and contribute to the achievement of the	This is noted by the Applicant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	well-being goals in section 4 of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015.	
RR-015-A.1.1	<p>ANNEX A – NRW Regulation and Permitting Services</p> <p>Marine Licensing: Regulatory Response</p> <p>The works proposed under the DCO that are within Welsh Waters require a marine licence under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, for which NRW is the licensing authority. An application for a marine licence was submitted by the developer on 30 May 2022 to NRW Permitting Service (NRW PS). The application was validated on 20 June 2022. We commenced consultation with relevant consultation bodies who have until the 3 August to provide any comment. The public will also be consulted on the application in due course. Should PINS require copies of the consultation responses these can be made available on request. It is anticipated that the marine licence application will be determined concurrently with the DCO examination, although it is currently not possible to provide an indicative timescale in respect of the determination. Although there are issues that substantively overlap between the determination of the DCO and Marine Licence, it should be noted that the respective consents are determined under separate and distinct legislative processes.</p>	<p>This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant, in particular the anticipation that the Marine Licence application will be determined concurrently with the DCO examination.</p> <p>The Applicant is working closely with NRW Regulation and Permitting Services to ensure the Marine Licence process and DCO process progress in a co-ordinated and collaborative manner.</p>
RR-015-A.1.2	It is stated in the Explanatory Memorandum, that the draft DCO submitted in support of the application 'does not contain powers or controls which sit within the marine licencing regime'. NRW PS endorses this approach and considers that the DCO should not seek to duplicate controls within the DCO which can be placed within the Marine Licence, to avoid regulatory overlap.	This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.
RR-015-A.1.3	NRW PS, acting in its marine licensing function, has determined that an environmental impact assessment is not required in relation to the marine licence in reliance on Regulation 10 of the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended). This is on the basis that NRW PS is satisfied that an EIA assessment in respect of the project is to be carried out by the Secretary of State and that such assessment will be sufficient to meet the requirements of the EIA Directive.	This is noted and welcomed by the Applicant.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-015-A.1.4	The above comments are made without prejudice to any further comments that NRW PS, acting in its marine licensing function, may wish to make during the DCO examination.	This is noted by the Applicant.

## 4 Appendix B – Applicant's response to Relevant Representations – RR-004 – Isle of Anglesey County Council (IACC)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-004-1	"Awel Y Mor Offshore Wind Farm Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010112 Isle of Anglesey County Council Written Representation Thank you for the invitation to become an Interest Party with respect to the Awel y Môr (AyM) Offshore Wind Farm application for Development Consent Order (DCO). This representation by the Isle of Anglesey County Council (IACC) includes an outline of the principle submission we wish to make in relation to the application as submitted. The IACC acknowledges that there is a recognised need and support for renewable energy technology through UK, Welsh and Local Planning policy and this development would contribute towards the targets set for both the UK and Wales's greenhouse gas emission reduction and increasing the country's energy supply from renewable sources.	This is noted by the Applicant.
RR-004-2	<p>Landscape and Visual Impacts</p> <p>The IoACC have assessed the Environmental Statement Report Volume 2, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which presents the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the onshore elements of the proposed development. It is considered that the development will have a significant adverse impacts on views of the seascape from the Ynys Môn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a harmful effect on a number of AONB special qualities. It is not considered that the development would be consistent with the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty. Adverse effects on the designated landscape and seascape as a setting and feature of the Ynys Môn AONB, relate to the likely visibility of the proposed Offshore Wind Farm (OWF) alone and cumulatively with other OWFs. The introduction following pre-application consultation of design mitigation to reduce the extent of the horizontal and vertical field of view and number of turbines has reduced the area and number of receptors from which significant adverse effects would be experienced; however, significant effects are predicted for a substantial portion of the east coast, recreational routes within such as the Wales Coast Path and properties within coastal communities.</p>	<p>The Applicant assumes that the IACC is referring to the seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA) and not the onshore LVIA as the onshore works will not be visible from the Isle of Anglesey.</p> <p>The effects on the seascape, landscape and visual receptors as well as the special qualities of the Isle of Anglesey AONB are assessed in Section 10.11 of the SLVIA (AS-027).</p> <p>Noted that IACC agrees that the area and number of receptors where significant effects may be experienced is reduced as a result of this mitigation. Following comments received during the Section 42 consultation, the proposed development was reviewed and revised through a 11% reduction in the array area (26% reduction from scoping stage offshore site area) and the maximum number of turbines proposed (91 at PEIR reduced to 50). The west to east extent of the array boundary has reduced from 25.8 km to 16.4 km (a reduction of 36% from scoping).</p> <p>As a result, the distance from the Isle of Anglesey coast and AONB to the west was increased. At Viewpoint 2: Point Lynas on the north-east coast of Anglesey the Agreement for Lease/ scoping boundary was 20.2 km distant. The array area assessed in the ES has moved 8.5 km further away at 28.7 km. Increased distance reduces the scale of wind turbines in</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>views from the Isle of Anglesey AONB with the most marked difference occurring in the north.</p> <p>The White Report "Seascape &amp; visual sensitivity to offshore wind farms in Wales: Strategic assessment and guidance" has been considered by the Applicant alongside other technical and environmental factors (See also Volume 1, Chapter 4 Site Selection Alternatives (APP-044)).</p> <p>In particular, the embedded mitigation removes the array area from the area shown in the Guidance as Zone No 3: North Wales and North Anglesey Inshore, which is identified as having a high sensitivity. The array area is now proposed entirely within the zones, which are defined in the NRW evidence base report as being of medium and medium/low sensitivity.</p> <p>The White Report suggests that a WTG height of 145m may be suitable at a minimum distance of 22.6km from an AONB or National Park designation. The Applicant is unable to achieve these thresholds. WTGs of this small scale will no longer be in production when the AyM OWF is in its planned development phase.</p> <p>After considerable review it has not been possible for the Applicant to further reduce the WTG heights or the associated turbine numbers and array area from those assessed in the ES and still have an economically viable and competitive scheme. This needs to take into account the potential for the AyM OWF to be built, which relies on the Applicant being able to successfully compete with other wind farm projects being taken to bidding under the Contract for Difference (CfD) auction process.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes the opportunity to discuss opportunities for enhancement of the designated landscapes as compensation/ or offsetting with the IACC. It is in receipt of the draft document recently submitted by the North Wales Local Planning Authorities entitled 'Awel y Môr Landscape, Conservation and Enhancement contribution' and looks forward to discussing this in due course.</p>
RR-004-3	<p>Archaeology &amp; Heritage Assets</p> <p>The Council has consulted with Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (GAPS) the regional curator with regulatory and advisory functions and the</p>	<p>Potential effects on heritage significance have been considered within ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-069).</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>Council's advisor with regards to matters concerning archaeology. It is considered that the archaeological impacts of the proposal relevant to the Isle of Anglesey are confined to the possible loss of significance to terrestrial historic assets, due to change in their setting. These historic assets include Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Penmon Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest and most importantly Beaumaris Castle World Heritage Site. Visual and physical connection to the sea is an important aspect of many of these sites. Visual intrusion of the new turbines may impair this connection and unacceptably reduce the significance of one or more assets. It would appear that the impacts the proposed wind farm would have on the setting of some Listed Building's have been under assessed. These include the Grade II* Trwyn Du, or Black Point, Lighthouse (CADW Record No. 21615) and the Grade II Telegraph Station (former) (5529). Additionally, the impacts upon the setting of the Grade II listed Pilot's Cottage (former) No 1 &amp; 2 and Enclosure walls at former pilots' cottages for Trwyn Du, or Black Point, Lighthouse (CADW Record No.'s 5515, 26757 and 21616) have not been assessed. The proposed development could damage the important visual and physical connection between many of the above heritage assets and the sea and by doing so lessen their significance. The IACC also refers PINS to the comments received by CADW in relation to Beaumaris Castle World Heritage Site and the Menai Suspension Bridge, which are considered of high historical architectural value and are popular tourism attractions on Anglesey.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not agree with the position of IACC that the potential effects on the "setting" of some assets has been under assessed. The assessment presented in the ES acknowledges that the proposed WTGs will be visible from, or in combination with, many of the heritage assets under consideration. The methodology presented in the ES has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance, including 'Setting of Historic Assets in Wales' (Cadw 2017), and by staff experienced in assessment of settings and the impacts of renewable development, including wind turbine development (offshore and onshore). The methodology is predicated on consideration of whether this visual change so affects the contribution made to heritage significance from an asset's setting such that the heritage significance of an asset's setting is consequently reduced. In conducting this exercise, consideration is given to the interest from which an asset derives its heritage significance, and the specific contribution made to that significance from its setting. In line with Cadw's guidance simple intervisibility between an asset and the WTGs, or the presence of the Proposed Development in a view which contains an asset, is not considered in and of itself to be harmful; there must be a specific effect on the elements from which heritage significance is derived or a reduction in the ability to experience or appreciate that significance. Setting is not an asset in its own right, in line with the relevant technical guidance (Setting of Historic Assets in Wales, Cadw 2017). The assessments presented in the ES are compliant with that guidance and in accordance with good practice.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the reference to the Grade II Listed Pilot's Cottage and acknowledge that this was not specifically and separately considered, although it was referred to in the assessment presented for the Grade II* Trwyn Du lighthouse, and in connection with views from the Penmon Point headland looking at the lighthouse and past Puffin Island (a view in which the proposed WTGs would be visible). The viewpoint presented in support of the assessment (Viewpoint 7, Figure 34, Volume 6, Annex 10.5 (APP-236)) was located immediately north of the walls of Pilot's Cottage, and this view is considered to be a reasonable proxy for the view experienced at the property itself. Much of the assessment presented for the lighthouse would be the same for the Pilot's Cottage</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>(the Applicant acknowledges this was not made explicit). The Applicant's assessment did not consider that the various interests from which the lighthouse derives its significance would be adversely affected, notwithstanding the visibility of the proposed WTGs in the background of views from the mainland shore (at a distance of approx. 18 km) in which the lighthouse is visible. The essential relationship of the lighthouse to the coast, and to the waters surrounding Penmon Point and Puffin Island, leading to the eastern end of the Menai Straits is unaffected (the effect is assessed as negligible in EIA terms). The Applicant considers that the same explicit maritime relationship defines the setting and its contribution to the historic significance for the Pilot's Cottage, and does not consider its significance (in terms of its historic interest, its coastal location, its relation to the lighthouse and the navigational function it served, nor in terms of its architectural arrangements) to be harmed (and no significant effect would occur for purposes of the EIA Regulations). The Applicant does not consider the heritage significance of the assets named to be adversely affected (in each case the effect has been assessed as negligible in EIA terms). It is noted that the currently proposed design has taken into account IACC's concerns as expressed at Scoping and to the PEIR, and the closest proposed WTGs will be sited further to the east than was the case with the array shown at Scoping.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that IACC refers to the comments made by Cadw (which are assumed related to the position set out by Cadw in its S42 response which was repeated within Cadw's relevant representation (see RR-028)). The Applicant's response to Cadw is provided in this document (response to RR-028). In summary, the Applicant considers that the assessment has appropriately applied a recognised assessment methodology, which is compliant with, and takes due regard of, the relevant technical guidance and is in line with good practice.</p>
RR-004-4	<p>Socio-Economic</p> <p>The IOCC have assessed the Environmental Statement Report Volume 3, Chapter 3: Socio –economics which presents the result of the assessment of the likely significant effect of the development with respect to socio-economic including jobs and economic output. - Local Employment &amp; Supply Chain Opportunities Future Wales acknowledges that large-scale renewable and low</p>	<p>AyM understands the importance of developing the supply chain and associated skills in the region, both for the benefit of the region and for the offshore wind sector and other marine industries. As noted in the DCO application (e.g. the Consultation Report (APP-024)), RWE has looked to upskill the future generation through the creation of its Wind Turbine Apprenticeship Programme in partnership with Coleg Llandrillo, Grŵp Llandrillo Menai. The Programme was officially launched in 2012</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>carbon energy schemes can generate direct social and economic benefit to local communities and that developers should explore how infrastructure improvements associated with a development be utilised by the host communities to bring additional, non-planning related benefits. The Council notes the confirmation that the opportunity to maximise local socio-economic benefits will be explored and presented in more detail post- consent. It is noted that this includes the requirement under requirement of any DCO given for the development to submit for approval a 'Skills and Employment Strategy'. Similarly, local companies need to be made aware of the potential supply chain opportunities that will be made available during all stages of the project to allow them to plan accordingly and ensure that they can capitalise on the opportunities presented. The Council would also promote the development of a Supply Chain Action Plan'. It appears that the DCO Requirements as currently drafted does not include a suitable worded requirement that requires the approval of a 'Skills and Employment Strategy'. It is best practice to prepare and submit an outline of such plans as part of the DCO application documentation in order to ensure that such discussions take place early and during the consenting process, with engagement taking place with key stakeholders and that the final plans to be approved under condition is based on the outline plans. Key stakeholders including Welsh Government, North Wales Regional Skills Partnership, Ambition North Wales, M-Sparc, local education providers (including Bangor University and Group Llandrillo Menai) and relevant Local Authorities (including Economic Development Teams). It is noted from the assessment that the jobs which are likely to be generated include port related activities, chartered and operation of non-specialist vessels and civil works related to installation of onshore infrastructure. The Council would encourage RWE to consider these opportunities now and to identify how much of these skills are available locally in order to enable local people and companies to train or upskill to capitalise on these opportunities. Given the potential for other major offshore wind projects to take place in North Wales such as the Mona Offshore Wind Farm, the Council very much considers that there is potential for collaboration in order to ensure that the potential socio-economic benefits are maximised for the region.</p>	<p>and has trained over 30 new apprentices to date, with ten additional recruits in the 2021/22 academic year. The programme has consistently produced high quality technicians who are primarily deployed on RWE's offshore and onshore wind farms.</p> <p>RWE has also been the sector champion developing a new supply chain cluster in the region, The Offshore Energy Alliance (OEA). The OEA pulls together the activities of offshore wind and other low carbon energy projects along the North Wales coast, all for the benefit of the local supply chain.</p> <p>As noted in Issue Specific Hearing 1 on the dDCO (Document 1.6 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) the Applicant will include a Requirement in the dDCO securing a Skills and Employment Strategy. The updated dDCO submitted at Deadline 1 (Document 1.8 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission) includes a new Requirement securing a Skills and Employment Strategy, to be approved by the relevant LPA (DCC) in accordance with the outline Skills and Employment Strategy.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently engaging with relevant IPs and other bodies on the content of the outline Skills and Employment Strategy and will submit the outline strategy into the DCO examination once suitably advanced.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-004-5	<p>Potential of Holyhead Port and Amlwch Port</p> <p>It is noted that the submission does not specify either a construction or operational port that will facilitate the project. The Council understands that the port development will not be part of either the DCO or marine licence application and that any port upgrade works would be delivered through separate requests for consents. It is noted and welcomed that Holyhead Port is included on the long list of ports that have been identified as part of the EIA process. Other ports on Anglesey which could support the delivery of the project include Amlwch Port. We are aware that you have undertaken a port study and have already commenced engagement with Stena Line Ports. IACC would recommend for this engagement to continue in particular to gain an up to date understanding of the proposed future investment for the Port. The Council notes that the ES assessment splits the construction phase into scenarios which is dependent on the proposed port locations – a 'no local construction port scenario' and a 'local port construction scenario'. This approach provides a clear indication that in the event that a local construction port is located on Anglesey, it would have greater impact upon the local economy by increasing local sourcing and employment. Even with the port being located locally, the magnitude of impact upon the economy together with employment opportunities for North Wales has been assessed as 'negligible' and that the residual effects as 'minor beneficial' during both the construction and operational phase. The Council confirms the port selection has the potential to offer socio-economic benefits for the region at all project phases and that use of a port local to the development should be fully explored. Furthermore, the Council believes that suitable land located close to the port could be available to support the construction and operation of the AyM project. The IACC is happy to discuss this further with the developer in order to understand their requirements as the project develops. - Marine Licence The IACC notes that a separate Marine Licence application has been submitted to Natural Resources Wales (NRW). The IACC confirms that it will be making separate submissions to NRW."</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that any upgrades needed to port infrastructure would be delivered through separate consents and led by that respective port (and not the offshore wind farm developer) as is standard practice within this sector.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes ongoing engagement with relevant organisations, on Anglesey and elsewhere, regarding port opportunities for both construction and operation, and can confirm that since the DCO application was submitted, and on an ongoing basis, discussions are continuing. The details of which are commercial in nature.</p>

## 5 Appendix C – Applicant's response to Relevant Representations – RR-013 – SP Energy Networks

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-013-1	<p>Thank you for the above planning consultation.</p> <p>I have reviewed the proposals and provide comments for SP Energy Networks who operate and manage the electricity network up to 132kV on behalf of the licenced network operator, SP Manweb, for the area including the application site. In general, SP Energy Networks has no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to required measures to protect SP Manweb network assets and ensure safe working around the affected network. It is suggested the application plans include a plan showing this network to enable further advice to be provided in terms of where particular care will need to be taken to avoid these assets.</p>	<p>The Applicant is pleased that SP Energy Networks (SPEN) do not have an objection in principle the proposed development.</p> <p>Insofar as protection to SPEN assets are concerned, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN in Part 4 of Schedule 9 of the 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order, with detail discussions ongoing to reach agreed wording with SPEN.</p> <p>Application plans are being shared with SPEN including information on SPEN key assets, to enable further advice and discussion.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-2	<p>"Where SP Manweb assets are affected, there will need to be protective provisions in place to ensure construction and operations which directly affect the network or are in close proximity do not undermine the safe operation of this network. Until the protective provisions are drafted and discussed and agreed with SP Manweb, then objection is raised to there being no provision in the application to such measures. It is noted works package 33 includes reference to associated electricity supply works and it needs to be clarified if these works cover all necessary diversions of existing assets and new connections network to provide the required supply. Required works should then be included in the Works Plans. It is noted that the works plans do not appear to refer to works package 33 in the correct locations for where SP Manweb assets may be affected."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern.</p> <p>Further discussions are ongoing with SPEN which will include clarification of works package 33.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-3	<p>"Further studies and proposals for avoiding or diverting SP Manweb assets are required and should be referenced in Volume 3 of the PEIR Chapter 1. Furthermore, SP Manweb assets will be installed with appropriate land rights and these will need to be reviewed as part of new rights being sought and SP Manweb will be a land interest in this matter which to date has not been the case. Mitigation proposals will also need to take account of SP Manweb assets and the operational requirements. The applicant is encouraged to discuss the</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	above and any further matters which may arise following ongoing review of the proposals with SP manweb representatives as soon as possible. Regards Steve Edwards" Note: SP Energy Networks attached two plans showing electricity network assets in the vicinity of the Awel y Môr Order Limits.	
RR-013-4	"Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above recently accepted DCO. I have reviewed the submission and on the basis of my review to date, I have the following comments. Please note that the general point to these comments is as I have previously commented (see attached), to avoid SPM assets and to engage as much as possible where this is unavoidable. For this current consultation response, I have grouped my comments into key areas of the DCO submission as below: General These comments are made by SP Energy Networks which acts on behalf of SP Manweb, the licenced Distribution Network Operator (DNO) for the area covered by the onshore elements of the proposed scheme. SP Energy Networks operate and manage the electricity network up to 132kV. This electricity network in the area of the proposed development is shown on the attached plans. In general, SP Energy Networks has no objection in principle to the proposed renewable energy scheme, however, it must ensure the avoidance of any adverse impact on its network as we all drive to maintain a network that is capable of meeting the increase in demand from an all-electric economy. SP Energy Networks has started a process of developing investment targets from 2023 to 2028 to meet the UK and devolved Governments ambitious decarbonisation targets for Net Zero. The next decade will be crucial in preparing the grid for these changes and this is why we are very interested in being able to comment on the proposals which may undermine maintaining and developing a suitable future grid network."	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-5	"In relation to this scheme, to date, SP Energy Networks has initiated engagement on various matters relating to the impact of the proposals on its network assets including the s42 stage and so considers to be at the early stages of working with the applicant to avoid impacts on its network. This engagement is helpfully recorded in the Consultation Report in para 385 (where reference is made to SP Energy rather than SP Energy Networks). SP Energy Networks commented on the scoping report in 2020 and these comments are repeated in the Scoping Opinion. However, SP Energy Networks requests the applicant to engage further to agree as much as possible at these earlier stages of the DCO process."	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-013-6	<p>"SPM Network assets SP Energy Networks has over the course of the past year or so sought to obtain from the applicant detailed plans showing where crossover points are between the existing SPM assets and the proposed AyM development. Whilst the applicant has provided a plan showing crossover points, it is unclear to SPM what these crossover points are and if they are all points of contact where there will be an impact on SPM assets. The current position is that SP Energy Networks has recently asked the applicant to provide an overlay plan showing SPM assets and the proposed DCO limits, which seems the clearest way of showing these crossover points with a schedule explaining what the crossover is, and is seeking detailed discussion on the information included in the DCO (Figures 5 to 14 in Chapter 1 of Vol 3 of the EDS and the Crossings Schedule in Vol 3 Annex 1.1) to better understand the referencing system and identify crossover points. It is unclear from the information presented in these references to the ES as to what the reference in the legend 'Crossing Schedule (excluding utilities)' means and what the obstacle ID refers to as there are some differences between SPM assets listed in the schedule and what is shown in the figures, and whether the schedule includes all the SPM assets affected. In addition, it is not clear how the obstacles might be affected. It would help if there is an assumed centre line that indicates the likely route of the proposed cable installation."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-7	<p>"Having reviewed the submitted plans, the key pinch points are south of B5119, A547, River Clywd, north of A55, Glascoed Road and south of Glascoed Road. SP Energy Networks would like to resolve matters as much as possible and would like to see clarification on the crossover points/SPM assets as soon as further details can be provided. Noting the reference to SP Energy Networks network assets in the scoping opinion and the crossover schedule, no regard is given in the Environmental Statement to the impact of the AyM scheme on existing electricity network assets. Therefore it is identified what environmental impacts there might be where network has to be diverted and whether any required consents and further environmental assessment for diverted network is needed. This matter should be resolved and included in the AyM scheme. SPM does not want to be left with having to consent and assess environmental impacts for network diverted outside of the order limits or not included in the order limits."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-013-9	<p>"Impacts and consenting</p> <p>SP Energy Networks needs assurances that any affected network requiring to be diverted is, once identified, included in the EIA and properly assessed and reported. Where necessary, any related consents for diverting network is included in the DCO. It is noted no reference is made to such consents in the Other Consents and Licences Report. The applicant should clarify these matters as soon as possible."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-9	<p>"Grid Connection</p> <p>No reference is made in the Grid Connection statement to impacts on the existing electricity network and how proposed measures for working with SPM assets will ensure the existing network is able to operate and deliver the power that the proposed AyM scheme will provide."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-10	<p>"Measures for agreed working (DCO)</p> <p>Having carried out an initial review of the draft protective provisions in Schedule 9 of the draft DCO, these are not consistent with the provisions SP Energy Networks has provided to the applicant. As such, the applicant is asked to continue to work with SP Energy Networks and agree as many areas of possible through the application stages."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-11	<p>"Land Rights SP</p> <p>Energy Networks will require all SPM land rights affected by the AyM scheme that need to be amended to be agreed in full agreement with SPM. Reference is made to the Book of Reference where SP Manweb interests are included. Reviewing the BoR and confirming existing and proposed rights is likely to be an expansive task and the applicant is asked to engage with SPM regarding a timetable and cost undertakings to support working with SP Energy Networks in this regard."</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p> <p>See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.</p>
RR-013-12	<p>"There are a number of key areas to resolve in relation to SPM network, which is critical to protect as it is this network that will be relied upon to distribute the generation into local homes and businesses. Any adverse impacts on the SPM network that need to be resolved by SPM would impact on the benefits of delivering this proposed scheme. The applicant should discuss the above with</p>	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of SPEN, with detail discussions ongoing to address point of SPEN concern. Further discussions on these Protected Provisions and detail on specific concerns are included in these ongoing discussions.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	SP Energy Networks as soon as possible as they have been requested to do for over the past year but without making much progress. Given the extent of the information prepared and submitted, it is a reasonable expectation for there to be a plan produced showing the SPM asset as likely to be most affected and how, and an SPM network diversions worksheet that outlines how this network will be managed within the proposed development."	See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.
RR-013-13	"SP Energy Networks will continue to review the DCO application and may wish to raise further matters in due course. Lastly, on an administrative note, please note that in order to assist in mail outs, you can delete SP Distribution Plc from the database as this is the SP Energy Networks distribution licence holder in southern Scotland and the entry for SP Manweb Plc, as this is covered by the 'S Edwards, :and Land Planning SP Energy Networks' entry."	Noted. See also Appendix C to Document 1.7 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission which provides an update on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers and other utilities.

# 6 Appendix D – Applicant’s response to Relevant Representations – RR-024 – Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-024-1	<p>"Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Development Consent Order Application Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010112 Text of Relevant Representation from the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) 6 July 2022</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The RSPB supports the deployment of renewable energy projects, providing that they are sited in appropriate places and designed to avoid potential adverse impacts on wildlife. We are grateful for the constructive pre-application discussions that have taken place with Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Limited in respect of this proposal, particularly through the Evidence Plan process. While methodological concerns remain, progress towards resolving a number of issues was made during the pre-application discussions for this project. We continue to have significant concerns relating to the project's in-combination and cumulative collision risk and displacement impacts including their assessment.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
RR-024-2	<p>OFFSHORE ORNITHOLOGY IMPACTS - SUMMARY OF RSPB POSITION</p> <p>We have significant concerns regarding the findings of some of the impact assessments. As a result of the methodological concerns, set out below, the RSPB considers that the impacts have not been adequately assessed and, as such consider that an adverse effect on the integrity (AEOI) on the following qualifying feature of the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) cannot be ruled out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Project alone – RSPB AEOI conclusions Impact on the following feature of the Liverpool Bay SPA: - The impact of displacement on the red throated diver population</li> <li>➤ Project in combination with other plans and projects – RSPB AEOI conclusions In-combination impacts on the following feature of the Liverpool Bay SPA: - The impact of displacement on the red throated diver population</li> </ul> <p>We also have methodological concerns and consider that it is not currently possible to rule out adverse impacts upon other SPA species occurring within the study area, in particular: - Manx shearwater - Gannet</p>	The Applicant has provided individual responses to the concerns raised below.

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
RR-024-3	<p>RED THROATED DIVER DISPLACEMENT</p> <p>The conservation objectives for the Liverpool Bay SPA are: Ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the aims of the Wild Birds Directive, by maintaining or restoring: - The extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features - The structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features - The supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely - The population of each of the qualifying features, and, - The distribution of the qualifying features within the site. There is clear evidence of the displacement of red-throated diver from offshore wind farms (e.g. Furness et al. 2013, Mendel et al., 2019) with a significant effect detectable 10-15km from the wind farm (Heinänen et al. 2020). The Awel y Môr proposed development directly abuts the Liverpool Bay SPA. The numbers of red throated diver, their distribution within the SPA and their ability to use all suitable habitat contained in the SPA are relevant to the SPA conservation objectives but are not considered by the Applicant. If red throated diver are displaced from part of the SPA which would otherwise be suitable for them the effect is to reduce the functional size of the SPA, contravening the conservation objectives. The RSPB therefore cannot rule the impact of displacement on the integrity of the Liverpool Bay SPA, arising through the project alone and in combination. Other SPA species of concern present on site Manx shearwater are BoCC5 Amber listed (Stanbury et al., 2021) and are a Birds Directive Migratory Species. Awel y Môr is within the mean-max foraging range (1,347 km, Woodward et al., 2019) of seven SPAs of which they are a qualifying feature (Copeland Islands, Irish Sea Front, Rum, St Kilda, Outer Firth of Forth and St Andrews Bay Complex, Glannau Aberdaron ac Ynys Enlli/ Aberdaron Coast and Bardsey Island, and Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro). Gannet is Amber listed in BoCC5 (Stanbury et al., 2021). Gannet is a qualifying feature of Grassholm SPA and also known to breed in Ireland's Eye SPA and Lambay Island SPA, all of which are within mean-max foraging range of Awel y Môr (Woodward et al., 2019).</p>	<p>The Applicant and NRW are in agreement (RR-015-2.2.7) that there is no AEol on the red-throated diver qualifying feature of the Liverpool Bay SPA. NRW were able to come to this conclusion based on a precautionary assessment of the information provided by the Applicant and contained within the RIAA (APP-027). Furthermore, NRW agreed with the Applicant that the behaviour exhibited by red-throated divers from the Liverpool SPA is inconsistent with other areas of sea, and is therefore agreed with the displacement buffers applied (RR-015-2.2.2-4).</p>
RR-024-4	<p>IMPACT ASSESSMENT – METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS</p> <p>The RSPB's key concerns are with the baseline survey methodology, the scoping out of collision impacts for Manx shearwater, the use of avoidance rates in</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided individual responses to the concerns raised below.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	gannet collision risk modelling, lack of consideration of impacts compounded by HPAI Baseline surveys.	
RR-024-5	The RSPB are content that digital aerial surveys can provide useful data in order to provide baseline characterisation of an offshore wind farm footprint. However full methodological detail needs to be provided alongside the outputs and the details the Applicant has provided are scant. In particular, but not exclusively there is - insufficient consideration of potential biases in the survey and analysis methods - there is no consideration of potential response of birds to disturbance arising from the survey e.g. from aircraft shadow - there is no detail provided as to how autocorrelation has been evaluated and if necessary accounted for, - there is no rationale provided as to why a grid rather than transect survey design has been used - there is no detail given of any independent validation of identification and detection rates.	<p>The level of methodological detail the Applicant has provided within the Offshore Ornithology Baseline Characterisation Report (APP-095), matches that provided by other recently consented projects such as EA1N (SPR, 2019) and Norfolk Boreas (Vattenfall, 2019).</p> <p>The robust survey method for offshore ornithological baseline survey collection was consulted on and agreed upon during the early stages of the evidence plan process (see the Evidence Plan Report and its supporting appendices (APP-301, APP-302 and APP-303). If required, the Applicant is happy to have further discussion relating to the survey methodology with RSPB.</p>
RR-024-6	Manx shearwater: The Applicant has scoped out Manx Shearwater as being a receptor at risk of collision impacts. We disagree with this approach and consider there to be risk of collision. Fundamental to the consideration of collision risk for this species is the extent to which nocturnally active seabirds, such as Manx shearwaters, may be attracted to the illuminations required for turbines, support vessels and the construction or expansion of ports. Such attraction will cause behaviour change, which could in turn increase collision risk, for example if birds fly higher when attracted to lights. There is also abundant evidence of light-induced disorientation of Manx shearwaters. This evidence includes the grounding of fledglings in lit areas (Miles et al., 2010) and collision with lighthouses and other illuminated structures (Guilford et al., 2019, Archer et al., 2015). If light-induced disorientation leads to individual birds circling the navigation lights on the nacelle or tower of turbines for protracted periods (as has been reported for birds disorientated by lighthouses or gas flares) the probability of collision with turbine blades or other surfaces is vastly increased. Manx shearwater can be active throughout the day and night and with different levels of activity at different times. For example for birds tracked from Skomer, diving occurred during the day and peaked in the evening (Shoji et al., 2016), while nocturnal foraging was observed from tracking of birds from High Island, Ireland (Kane et al., 2020). These diel variations in activity mean that the somewhat limited amount of time aerial surveys were carried out, restricted to the hours of full light are unlikely to properly characterise the activity of Manx shearwater at the Application site. these have generally taken place between	<p>The assessment of Manx Shearwater was discussed and agreed upon during the evidence plan process, which concluded that, on a precautionary basis, Manx Shearwater would be assessed for displacement effects only. Manx Shearwater was scoped out for assessment of collision risk as agreed with NRW (see the Evidence Plan Report and its supporting appendices (APP-301, APP-302 and APP-303, respectively).</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	mid-morning and mid-afternoon. For these reasons the RSPB does not have confidence in the baseline densities of Manx shearwater presented, and therefore it is impossible to make any conclusions as to the significance of impacts.	
RR-024-7	<p>Gannet: Avoidance Rates</p> <p>For collision risk modelling, the Applicant has presented Avoidance Rates as recommended by the SNCBs (JNCC et al, 2014) Whilst the RSPB agrees with almost all of the SNCB's recommended rates, we differ with regard to gannet. We are content that 98.9% is suitable for non-breeding birds, but do not agree that this figure should be applied to the breeding season due to the lack of available evidence relating to breeding birds. Furthermore, GPS tracking of gannets breeding on the Bass Rock between has shown variation in the two-dimensional foraging behaviour of birds across the breeding season (prior to chick-rearing, and during chick-rearing), between sexes, and between years (Cleasby et al. 2015a, Lane et al. 2020, Lane and Hamer 2021). Three-dimensional tracking of gannets during chick-rearing has revealed that flight height and flight speed both vary according to behaviour, sex and wind conditions (Cleasby et al. 2015b, Lane et al. 2019, Lane et al. 2020,) and similar patterns have been recorded in other seabirds (Masden et al. 2021). As the misspecification of these parameters contributes to the model error component of avoidance rate (Johnston et al., 2021) such variability should result in differential avoidance rates. As such we recommend the use of the default seabird avoidance rate of 98% for gannet during the breeding season. The Applicant has also, in Appendix 4 of <i>Volume 4, Annex 4.3: Offshore Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling</i> reduced the density of birds inputted into collision risk modelling by 70% to take into account macro avoidance. This approach follows suggestions in Cook (2021), the recommendations from which have not yet been adopted by the SNCBs. Cook (2021) is currently being reviewed and revised by two projects, one funded by JNCC and one by Natural England. Until these projects have reported, the RSPB do not accept this approach.</p>	<p>Input parameters for collision risk assessment were consulted upon and agreed during the evidence plan process. It was concluded that in relation to avoidance rates the Applicant should follow Joint SNCB (2014) guidance, which is to assess gannet using an avoidance rate of 98.9% for all seasons.</p> <p>In relation to macro avoidance, the Applicant was aware during the preparation of the ES that guidance documents were being drafted in relation to updated guidance on the inclusion of macro avoidance within collision risk assessments for gannet. The Applicant therefore consulted with SNCBs during the evidence plan process on a suitable approach to inclusion of macro avoidance, in case the guidance was issued before submission of the ES. The conclusion of this was to present an assessment of gannet based on reduced densities to account for macro avoidance as presented within Appendix 4 of Volume 4, Annex 4.3: Offshore Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling (APP-097).</p>
RR-024-8	<p>Population Viability Analysis</p> <p>The Applicant did not carry out Population Viability Analysis for gannet. The RSPB would prefer that this was now carried out, to take into account the likely mortality arising from the outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza o the local and regional populations</p>	<p>The Applicant agreed with NRW and the RSPB via the Evidence Plan process (see the Evidence Plan Report and its supporting appendices (APP-301, APP-302 and APP-303, respectively) that the basis for assessment for gannet should be undertaken in relation to possible displacement effects and collision risk at differing population scales.</p>

REFERENCE	RELEVANT REPRESENTATION COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<p>Those potential effects were concluded as negligible at all population scales and therefore there was no requirement for Population Viability Analysis (PVA) to be undertaken for gannet predicted impacts alone and cumulatively/ in-combination with other plans and projects.</p> <p>At present, The Applicant is unaware of any methods to incorporate consideration of Avian Influenza and it's impacts on local and regional populations within PVA.</p>
RR-024-9	Finally, the RSPB reserves the right to add to and/or amend its position in light of changes to or any new information submitted by the Applicant.	<p>This is noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>Note: The RSPB also helpfully provided a list of references in support of their Relevant Representation, which are not repeated here. However they are available to view on the Relevant Representations page of the project PINS website.</p>

## 7 References

- Bradbury, G., Trinder, M., Furness, B., Banks, A.N., Caldow, R.W.G. and Hume, D. (2014). Mapping seabird sensitivity to offshore wind farms. PLoS ONE 9:e106366.
- Furness, B. and Wade, H. (2012). Vulnerability of Scottish Seabirds to Offshore Wind Turbines. Report for Marine Scotland, The Scottish Government.
- University of the West of England (2004) Fullabrook Wind Farm Proposal Evidence of the impact of wind farms on tourism numbers and tourist experience for North Devon Wind Power.
- Ipsos MORI (2014) Public Attitudes to Science Report by Ipsos MORI for the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Economic Social Research Council.
- Glasgow Caledonian University (2008) The Economic Impact of Wind Farms on Scottish Tourism: A report for the Scottish Government.
- Joint SNCBs (2014) Joint Response from the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies to the Marine Scotland Science Avoidance Rate Review.
- Scottish Power Renewables (2019). East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm. Appendix 12.2 Ornithology Technical Appendix.
- Vattenfall (2019). Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm. Appendix 13.1 Ornithology Technical Appendix.



RWE Renewables UK Swindon Limited

Windmill Hill Business Park  
Whitehill Way  
Swindon  
Wiltshire SN5 6PB  
T +44 (0)8456 720 090  
[www.rwe.com](http://www.rwe.com)

Registered office:  
RWE Renewables UK Swindon Limited  
Windmill Hill Business Park  
Whitehill Way  
Swindon