

# MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

**Annex 2.5 to Applicants' Response to Deadline 3 submissions from Statutory Consultees and other organisation: Marine Management Organisation (REP3-085)**

**Deadline: Deadline 4**  
**Application Reference: EN020028**

**Document Numbers:**  
**MRCNS-J3303-JVW-19136**  
**MOR001-FLO-CON-CAG-RPT-0116**

**Document Reference: S\_D4\_2.5**

**8 August 2025**  
**F01**



**Document status**

Version	Purpose of document	Approved by	Date	Approved by	Date
F01	Deadline 4	HK	August 2025	IM	August 2025

**Prepared by:**

**Morgan Offshore Wind Limited,  
Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd**

**Prepared for:**

**Morgan Offshore Wind Limited,  
Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd**

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO IP SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 3.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Introduction .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO IPS' RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS (EXQ1) .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Marine management Organisation – ExQ1 responses .....	2
2.2	Marine Management Organisation - D3 responses .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>134</b>

## Tables

Table 2.1:	REP3 – 085 – Marine Management Organisation .....	2
Table 2.2:	REP3-085 – Marine Management Organisation comments on the SoCG .....	7
Table 2.3:	REP3-085 – Outstanding Comments on PDA-013 Applicant's response to Relevant Representations from Marine Management Organisation .....	13
Table 2.4:	REP3-085 – MMO comments on the updated DCO/DML .....	18
Table 2.5:	REP3-085 – MMO comments on additional revised documents .....	22
Table 2.6:	REP3-085 – MMO's comments on Annex 3.2 to Applicants' Response to WRs from Statutory Consultees: Marine Management Organisation .....	33
Table 2.7:	REP3-085 – MMO's comments on Annex 3.2 to Applicants' Response to WRs from Statutory Consultees: Marine Management Organisation .....	112
Table 2.8:	REP3-085 – Comments on stakeholder's deadline 2 submissions .....	126

# **1 Applicants' Response to IP submissions received at Deadline 3**

## **1.1 Introduction**

- 1.1.1.1 Following Deadline 3, Morgan Offshore Wind Limited ('Morgan OWL') and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited ('Morecambe OWL'), (together, 'the Applicants') reviewed each of the submissions received from stakeholders who registered as Interested Parties (IPs) in the Examination.
- 1.1.1.2 Details of the Applicants' response to Marine Management Organisation submissions received at Deadline 3 are set out in this annex.

## 2 Applicants' Response to IPs' response to Written Questions (ExQ1)

### 2.1 Marine management Organisation – ExQ1 responses

Table 2.1: REP3 – 085 – Marine Management Organisation

Reference	Question To	ExA Question	IP submission	Applicants' response
-	-	-	<p>(3.1) General comments</p> <p>(3.1.1) The MMO has reviewed all the questions posed and will maintain a watching brief on the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Q1.1.4, Q1.1.8 &amp; Q1.1.9</li> <li>•Q2.1.1, Q2.1.4 &amp; Q2.1.7</li> <li>•Q2.3.1</li> <li>•Q2.6.1</li> <li>•Q7.1.2 &amp; Q7.1.5</li> <li>•Q7.3.1 &amp; Q7.3.3</li> <li>•Q9.2.1</li> <li>•Q9.4.1 &amp; Q9.4.2</li> <li>•Q11.1.8</li> <li>•Q17.2.1, Q17.2.2 &amp; Q17.2.4</li> <li>•Q17.3.1 – Q17.3.5</li> </ul>	The Applicants note the MMO's comment.
Q1.1.13	The applicants, local authorities, statutory consultees and relevant statutory undertakers where a SoCG has been previously requested in the ExA's Rule 6 letter.	<p><b>Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)</b></p> <p>Deadline 3 (7 July 2025) includes the submission of updated SoCG, including summaries of the principal areas of disagreement and statement of commonality.</p> <p>Relevant parties where a SoCG has been requested should fully engage with the SoCG process. The ExA requests fully considered SoCGs including summaries of the principal areas of disagreement.</p> <p>For statutory undertakers, where there is documented evidence that matters, including protective provisions, are agreed and no other matters of disagreement remain, then a statement from parties to this effect would suffice. In the absence of such a statement, where protective provisions are being negotiated and even if agreement is expected to be reached, then a brief and focused SoCG or position paper should be progressed, focusing on the matters where differences remain between the respective parties, rather than an unnecessarily long SoCG. It is not sufficient for these to be just recorded in the applicants' Land Rights Tracker as this is not a document that is necessarily agreed with the relevant statutory undertaker.</p>	<p>(3.2) Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)</p> <p>(3.2.1) The MMO has engaged with the Applicants – please see comments in Section 1 of this response alongside the SoCG submitted by the Applicants.</p>	The Applicants and the MMO submitted an updated SoCG at Deadline 4 (S_D1_6.8/F03).
Q2.1.3	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	<b>"commence"</b> - The definition of "commence" has been amended by the applicants [REP2-005] with explanation provided in the Explanatory Memorandum [REP2-007].	<p>(3.3) Draft DCO</p> <p>(3.3.1) The Applicants have amended the definition of 'commence': "commence" means—</p>	The Applicants welcome the MMO's agreement on this point.

Reference	Question To	ExA Question	IP submission	Applicants' response
		Can the MMO confirm whether it is content with the revised wording. If not, provide reasoning for this and any alternative drafting as appropriate.	<p>(a) in relation to any activities licensed by licence 1 or licence 2, the first carrying out of those activities save for operations consisting of pre-construction surveys, monitoring surveys, unexploded ordnance surveys and clearance of low order unexploded ordnance approved under licence 1 or licence 2.</p> <p>(b) in respect of any other works, the first carrying out of any material operation (as defined in section 155 of the 2008 Act) forming part of the authorised project except for onshore site preparation works and the words “commence”, and “commencement” must be construed accordingly.”</p> <p>The MMO is content with the revised wording.</p>	
Q2.3.3	FBC, SRBC, PCC, LCC, Blackpool Borough Council, Natural England, Historic England, Environment Agency and any interested party	<p>Remaining issues relating to the requirements will be considered at a subsequent issue specific hearing on the dDCO and further written questions if required. In order to provide for the efficient use of hearing time, the local authorities and any other relevant party are requested to consider the drafting of the draft requirements in Schedule 2 (A and B) and provide details of any disagreed matters, along with alternative drafting where applicable and any suggested additional requirements.</p> <p>Where applicable this may be done within the Statement of Common Ground between the applicants and the relevant interested party.</p>	<p>(3.4) Draft DCO Schedules 2A &amp; 2B</p> <p>(3.4.1) The MMO notes that it has been requested to consider the drafting of the draft requirements in Schedule 2 (A and B) and provide details of any disagreed matters, along with alternative drafting where applicable and any suggested additional requirements. As most of these relate to onshore matter the MMO does not believe there will be many amendments required. The MMO has provided any comments on Schedule 2A &amp; 2B in Section 4.3.</p>	The Applicants note this response and have responded to these comments below.
Q2.5.1	The applicants, Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and Natural England (NE)	<p>The ExA acknowledges the submissions from the MMO, NE and other parties on the dDCO Marine Licences and the latest representations and responses made at D2.</p> <p>Noting that engagement on these matters is continuing between the parties, the ExA requests that the</p> <p>parties provide updates on their respective positions on the draft Marine Licences at D3, focusing on the remaining of areas of disagreement. The ExA will subsequently consider which matters require examination during an issue specific hearing on the draft development consent order in week commencing 28 July 2025.</p>	<p>(3.5.1) The MMO notes ExA acknowledgement regarding the submission from the MMO made at Deadline 2. The MMO also notes ExA requests that the MMO provides updates on their respective position on the draft Marine Licences at Deadline 3 – Please see Sections 4.5 – 4.8.</p>	The Applicants have responded to these comments below.
Q7.2.4	MMO	<p><b>Seasonal restrictions</b></p> <p>Please confirm that following the removal of high order Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance from the deemed marine licenses submitted by the applicants at D2 [REP2-004] you are now content that no seasonal restriction on construction activities is required during the cod and herring spawning seasons.</p>	<p>(3.6) Fish and Shellfish Seasonal Restrictions</p> <p>(3.6.1) The MMO agrees with the Applicants that the ranges for low order and low yield detonations are much reduced (&lt;147 metres) and therefore we are content that in the absence of high order detonations, significant impacts to fish receptors are likely to occur at a population level only.</p>	The Applicants welcome the MMO's agreement on this point and would like to further clarify that, due to the use of low-order UXO clearance only, effects would not be significant at a population level. This is reflected in MMO advice set out in response to Q7.2.4 below (and elsewhere by the MMO) which confirms seasonal restrictions are now not required to reduce effects on herring and cod spawning/populations.
Q7.2.4	MMO	<p><b>Seasonal restrictions</b></p> <p>Please confirm that following the removal of high order Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance from the deemed marine licenses submitted by the</p>	<p>(3.6) Fish and Shellfish Seasonal Restrictions</p> <p>(3.6.2) The MMO is content that no seasonal restriction is required as the applicant has reduced the noise at source and mitigation for low order and low</p>	The Applicants welcome the MMO's agreement on no seasonal restrictions being required.

Reference	Question To	ExA Question	IP submission	Applicants' response
		applicants at D2 [REP2-004] you are now content that no seasonal restriction on construction activities is required during the cod and herring spawning seasons.	yield detonation during the Cod and Herring spawning season is not required.	
			(3.6) Fish and Shellfish Seasonal Restrictions (3.6.3) The MMO has expressed concerns regarding the potential for cumulative impacts to fish from construction/piling noise, especially Cod and Herring during their spawning seasons. We note that the Applicants have stated there will be no piling associated with the Transmission Assets and therefore we have no concerns in relation to piling.	The Applicants welcome the MMO's agreement.
			(3.6) Fish and Shellfish Seasonal Restrictions (3.6.4) Should high order UXOs detonation be required, this would be licensed under a separate marine licence and further assessment will be undertaken at time of the licence application.	The Applicants agree that this is the process that would be followed (as noted in the Applicants' response to the MMO's submissions at Deadline 1 (see row REP1-086.7 of REP2-033)).
			(3.6) Fish and Shellfish Seasonal Restrictions (3.6.5) The MMO does highlight that it is our position that no UXO clearances should be within the DCO but welcome the removal of high order UXO from the DCO and is continuing to review all the information to ensure if low Order UXO remains on the DCO that there are mechanisms in place to ensure no impact.	The Applicants will continue to engage with the MMO on this issue, however it is the Applicants' position that it is appropriate and justified to include low-order UXO clearance activities within the DCO, noting that high-order UXO clearance has been removed from the draft DCO (REP3-009). The Applicants have included all necessary activities for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Transmission Assets in the application for development consent, to ensure a comprehensive application, and all such activities have been subject to a robust assessment process. This includes UXO clearance activities, with suitable mitigation secured (Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (REP2-026) and a commitment to not clearing UXO within the Liverpool Bay SPA between Nov – Mar (inclusive) as set out under CoT130 in Commitments Register (REP3-013)). Including only low order UXO clearance activities within the DCO, and appropriate controls under Condition 20 of Schedule 14 and 15 (REP3-009), ensures that potential impacts are appropriately mitigated and this is intended to remove the need to apply for and obtain a further licence post-consent and prior to construction, which could take some time, and therefore ensures the expeditious delivery of the Transmission Assets project is not hindered, such that the Transmission Assets can contribute to UK Government targets for Net Zero. This is consistent with the recently consented Mona Offshore Wind Project, as well as the Morgan Generation Assets DCO (for which a decision is expected prior to the close of this examination).
			(3.6) Fish and Shellfish Seasonal Restrictions (3.6.6) The MMO would also highlight that some low order UXO clearance campaigns have led to accidental high order explosions and would question if there is still confidence that all low order clearances will remain low order. If there was an accidental high order the MMO believes this would be a breach of the licence as the impacts are higher than what was assessed for low order impacts.	The Applicants discussed this matter with the MMO during a meeting on 21 July 2025. Condition 20(1)(a) of Schedule 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (REP3-009) requires that the Applicants submit a method statement for low order UXO clearance to the MMO for approval prior to commencement of clearance activities. It is the Applicants position that this matter is to be addressed in the method statement submitted to the MMO in advance of any UXO clearance.
Q7.3.2	MMO	<b>UXO clearance</b> The applicants have amended the dDCO [REP2-004] to include only for the removal of low order UXO clearance in the DMLs. The removal of high order UXO would be the subject of a standalone licence. Do the amendments to the DMLs address your concerns regarding UXO clearance?	(3.7) Marine Mammals – UXO Clearance: Do the amendments to the DMLs address your concerns regarding UXO clearance? (3.7.1) The MMO acknowledges that high order UXO detonation techniques have now been removed from the draft DCO, therefore only the mortality and potential mortal injury impact ranges for low order UXO detonation are now relevant to the assessment.	The Applicants note the MMO's response.

Reference	Question To	ExA Question	IP submission	Applicants' response
			<p>(3.7) Marine Mammals – UXO Clearance: Do the amendments to the DMLs address your concerns regarding UXO clearance?</p> <p>(3.7.2) The MMO believes suitable mitigation measures have been proposed, however, details of specific mitigation measures within the MMMP are still in discussion with the Applicants. Please see Section 5.5 in this document for further comments on MMMP and Section 6.1 (comment 086.39) in relation to the DML.</p>	<p>The Applicants note the MMO response. Following best practice for the industry, the Applicants have prepared an outline MMMP (REP2-026) and have secured under Condition 20 of Schedule 14 and 15 in the draft DCO (REP3-009) the submission of a detailed MMMP in accordance with the outline MMMP post-consent once the final details of the project are known. The Applicants confirm that the Outline MMMP has been further updated at Deadline 4 in response to detailed MMO comments, and the Applicants have provided additional responses to comments in section 5.5 of Table 2.5 of this document, and section 6.1 of Table 2.6 of this document.</p>
Q8.1.1e	The applicants (a-d), NE, Environment Agency (EA), Lancashire County Council (LCC), MMO (e)	<p><b>Commitments</b></p> <p>CoT119 [REP2-010] states: “Subject to landowner approval, at detailed design stage, hydrogeological risk assessment(s) will be undertaken at St Annes Old Links Golf Club (abstraction borehole ref: GWA_01), if necessary. The hydrogeological risk assessment(s) would be informed by ground investigation information, where relevant and practicable. If undertaken, the risk assessment(s) will inform a detailed site-specific crossing design for the installation of the offshore export cables beneath Lytham St Annes SSSI and the St Annes Old Links Golf Course.”</p> <p>Provide an update in relation to gaining landowner approval.</p> <p>As the condition states "if necessary" under what circumstances would the hydrogeological risk assessment not be considered necessary?</p> <p>In an event of not obtaining the landowners approval how will the hydrogeological risk assessment be informed?</p> <p>What does "where relevant and practical" mean in the context of assessing risks to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI?</p> <p>Do you have any comments if hydrological risk assessment can't be conducted at St Annes Old Links Golf Club. How could that impact production of a detailed site-specific crossing design for the installation of the offshore export cables beneath Lytham St Annes SSSI and the St Annes Old Links Golf Course?</p>	<p>(3.8) Commitment CoT119 – Hydrological Risk Assessment</p> <p>(3.8.1) The MMO notes that the works under the River Ribble are exempt from a marine licence and therefore not within the DML. The MMO defers comments on the ability of a hydrological risk assessment being conducted to the Environment Agency (EA) and NE.</p>	<p>The Applicants note the MMO's response and have responded to the EA and NE where appropriate on this point.</p>
Q8.1.3c	The applicants (a-b), NE, EA, LCC, MMO (c)	<p><b>Commitments</b></p> <p>CoT118 [REP2-010] states: “Where areas of potentially significant contamination (e.g. landfills) cannot be avoided within the Transmission Assets Order Limits, ground investigation or other appropriate measures (e.g. use Personal Protective Equipment and/or hazard signage) will be implemented to mitigate potential impacts to, or effects on sensitive receptors. Where ground investigation identifies potential risks to sensitive receptors from contamination, a remediation strategy</p>	<p>(3.9) Commitment CoT118 – Contaminated Land Risks</p> <p>(3.9.1) The MMO welcomes this commitment to work with the EA to ensure contaminated land risks are mitigated and managed. We defer final comment to the EA on its suitability.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome the agreement on the scope of this commitment.</p>

Reference	Question To	ExA Question	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>would be prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency.”</p> <p>Explain what process will be followed when deciding if ground investigation is required or if other appropriate measures are sufficient?</p> <p>What specific ground investigation measures is the applicant committing to in areas of potentially significant contamination?</p> <p>Is this commitment sufficient to ensure contaminated land risks are adequately managed?</p>		
Q17.2.3	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	<p><b>Impacts on commercial fisheries</b></p> <p>Are you content with the applicants' response to your suggestion that there should be a programme to monitor the impact of the project on bass and other commercial fisheries pages 62 and 63 of [REP1-086]?</p>	<p>(3.10) Impacts on Commercial Fisheries</p> <p>(3.10.1) The greatest risk to fish, including Bass, comes from UXO clearance, vessel sound emissions, and cable burial works. The Applicants have committed to using low-order methods which will significantly reduce the range of impacts for fish mortality and injury.</p>	The Applicants note the MMO's response.
			<p>(3.10) Impacts on Commercial Fisheries</p> <p>(3.10.2) The MMO notes that the Applicants are in the process of developing an Underwater Sound Management Strategy (UWSMS) which will be finalised post-consent. Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) such as bubble curtains and piling dampeners may be used, but no additional NAS has been formally agreed at this stage.</p>	The Applicants would highlight that they have not committed to preparation of an underwater sound management strategy (UWSMS). The Morgan Generation Assets and Morecambe Generation Assets applications have included this commitment to manage underwater sound emissions associated with pile driving, which may include the use of NAS. However, no pile driving is required for the Transmission Assets project and therefore NAS is not being proposed for this project. As such, an underwater sound management strategy is not considered to be necessary.
			<p>(3.10) Impacts on Commercial Fisheries</p> <p>(3.10.3) The MMO highlights that the Applicants are working to facilitate co-existence with existing commercial fishing activity and minimise disruption as far as is practicably possible. Early and extensive engagement has been established with the National Federation of Fisherman's Organisations (NFFO) and other fisheries stakeholders, and a detailed Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence Plans (FCLP) will be developed by the Applicants through ongoing consultation with fisheries stakeholders.</p>	The Applicants note the MMO's response. Condition 18(f) of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (REP3-009) secures the preparation of detailed Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan(s) which must be accord with the outline FLCP (REP3-028).
			<p>(3.10) Impacts on Commercial Fisheries</p> <p>(3.10.4) The MMO would note that commercial fisheries impacts, including potential impacts to migratory routes, are generally being addressed through suitable means that other projects have also utilised. The MMO will continue to review the Applicants documents and Interested Parties comments on the suitability of any fisheries (NFFO, NWIFCA) and may provide further comments in due course.</p>	The Applicants note the MMO's response and welcome future engagement from the MMO and other interested parties on this matter.

## 2.2 Marine Management Organisation - D3 responses

**Table 2.2: REP3-085 – Marine Management Organisation comments on the SoCG**

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
<b>1.1 – General Comments</b>		
1.1.1	The MMO had a meeting with the Applicants on 23 June 2025 to discuss the outstanding concerns regarding the SoCG	An amended version of the SoCG was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-049) and has been updated further and submitted at Deadline 4 (S_D1_6.8/F03) to show the latest progress between the parties.
1.1.2	Following the meeting the MMO and the Applicants have updated several points of outstanding concerns and discussions. An amended version of the SoGC is due to be submitted at Deadline 3 by the Applicants.	
1.1.3	<p>The Applicants requested some clarification within the MMO's Deadline 1 response (para 9.7.8) regarding the Outline offshore operations and maintenance plan (OOOMP).</p> <p>"The MMO also requests if any other O&amp;M activity has been assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Marine Archaeology</li> <li>o Use of artificial lighting</li> <li>o Recovery of dropped objects</li> <li>o Seabed preparation activities as a result of jack-up operations"</li> </ul>	The Applicants note the MMO's response. These matters were discussed with the MMO on 21 July 2025. The Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) has been updated and submitted at Deadline 4 (J19/F02).
1.1.4	The MMO received a follow-up email from Applicants on 25 June 2025 confirming that Marine Archaeology has been assessed in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) & Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD) (APP-222). The MMO defers to Historic England (HE) regarding the suitability of this.	The Applicants note the MMO's response. Historic England have confirmed that all outstanding queries on the Outline WSI and PAD (REP3-030) have been closed out as shown in the updated Statement of Common Ground with Historic England submitted at Deadline 4 (S_D1_6.7/F03).
1.1.5	The Applicants noted that the recovery of dropped objects is covered within the DMLs. The MMO has reviewed the DML	This is noted by the Applicants. This wording was updated to the MMO's preferred wording at Deadline 2 in response to their point 086.67 in REP1-086.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	Conditions in APP-005 and as long as the procedure is followed throughout operation no changes are proposed.	
1.1.6	The Applicants asked for clarification on the scope of artificial lighting assessments. The MMO advised that the Applicants should consider worse-case scenarios in regard to the use of lumens and consideration of times of day/night. The assessment should focus on impacts to species identified in the area, and the assessment should be informed by the most up to date evidence. This clarification was passed to the Applicants via email on 30 June 2025 and we will review their submission and provide further comments, where necessary, at Deadline 4 or 5.	The Applicants discussed this matter with the MMO on 21 July 2025 noting that the only artificial lighting source during the O&M phase would be associated with vessels (noting that the Commitments Register has been updated at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05) with a new commitment under CoT135 which states that <i>"The Applicants will not plan routine O&amp;M activities in the original Liverpool Bay SPA (as designated in 2010), including a 2 km buffer between November and March (inclusive) unless in urgent circumstances"</i> . The MMO confirmed by email to the Applicants on 23 July 2025 that no further information is required from the Applicant on this matter. The Applicants therefore consider this matter closed.
1.1.7	The Applicants requested some clarification within the MMO's Deadline 1 response (para 9.8.3) regarding the Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP): "The MMO requests that any residual effects are included in the document."	The Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan (J20/F03) has been updated and submitted at Deadline 4. This now includes a statement for physical processes, benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology, commercial fisheries, and marine archaeology to confirm that following the application of measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets, residual effects are deemed to be of minor adverse or lower significance.
1.1.8	To clarify, following mitigation and compensation measures, will there be any remaining effects or consequence as a result of the construction and operational activities, and how will these be monitored? Your review should focus on marine physical processes, benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology, commercial fisheries, and marine archaeology. These effects could be adverse, moderate, minimal, or beneficial.	
1.1.9	The Applicants advised the MMO that an updated IPMP will be submitted at Deadline 3. The MMO will be reviewing this and provide further comments at Deadline 4 or 5.	
1.2 - Physical Processes		
1.2.1	The agreement log in Table 1.4.1 (Physical Processes) appears to contain no reference to past comments on beach landing cable burial depth. The MMO request clarification from the Applicant's on these matters.	An amended version of the SoCG was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-049) and has been updated further and submitted at Deadline 4 (S_D1_6.8/F03) to show the latest progress between the parties.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
1.2.2	Physical Process MMO.PP.8 to MMO.PP.13 are all listed as ongoing points of discussion awaiting further response at Deadline 3. Prior advice on the project Environmental Information Report and Environmental Statement (ES) raised a small number of points that were largely considered to have been addressed, or to not require further action. It was considered that critique of the cumulative effects assessment methods (PP.10a, b and PP.11a, b) would not lead to any substantial improvement in the quality of information that would be obtained; and no further objections to the assessment methodology were raised. Therefore, the MMO deems these comments to be resolved.	The Applicants note this comment.
1.2.3	MMO.PP.13 refers to mitigation and monitoring and the welcome reduction in overall impacts – this comment should remain open as further detailed cable burial risk assessments are signposted by the Applicants and are being reviewed to ensure that there is no substantial negative impact on the outline proposals.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>1.3 - Benthic</b>		
1.3.1	Regarding MMO.BE.13 the MMO considers it unlikely that there will be any significant adverse effects on benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology because of the installation of transmission assets when considered cumulatively with other plans and projects.	The Applicants note this comment and welcome the MMOs agreement regarding the conclusion of significance of Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology (APP-045). The Applicants would also highlight that the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan has been updated at Deadline 4 (J15/F03) to include for a new commitment that <i>"No cable/scour protection shall be permanently deployed in the intertidal area between Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) and Mean High Water Springs (MHWS)"</i> . This commitment has also been added to the updated Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05) as CoT133.
1.3.2	The MMO defers to Natural England (NE) regarding closing out those comments made in relation to the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) and other designated sites (e.g., MMO.BE.10, MMO.BE.11, MMO.BE.12).	The Applicants note this comment and will continue to engage with Natural England in relation to the Fylde MCZ and other designated sites. The Applicants would highlight that the Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan has been updated at Deadline 4 (J20/F03) to include a new commitment to benthic community recovery specific monitoring in the Fylde MCZ through pre and post construction benthic community sampling to monitor for temporal and spatial recovery and the potential

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		colonisation by INNS on and in the vicinity of any hard substrate within the Fylde MCZ.
<b>1.4 - Shellfisheries</b>		
1.4.1	<p>The MMO notes that there are no shellfish comments in the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MMO.FSF.6. LSE Screening</li> <li>• MMO.FSF.7. Assessment methodology</li> <li>• MMO.FSF.8. Assessment methodology</li> <li>• MMO.FSF.9. Baseline environment</li> <li>• MMO.FSF.10. CEA assessment methodology</li> <li>• MMO.FSF.11. Assessment of the effects from the Transmission Assets alone</li> <li>• MMO.FSF.12. Assessment of the effects from the Transmission Assets alone</li> </ul>	The Applicants note this comment.
1.4.2	For cumulative effects from the Transmission Assets, the MMO defers to NE in relation to Adverse Effects on site Integrity (AEoI) for Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and in-combination with other projects.	The Applicants note this comment.
1.4.3	The MMO agrees with the mitigation measures proposed throughout the Operation and Maintenance phases of the Project to allow the provision of valuable data to inform the assessment of potential impacts to shellfish. There are no further comments at this stage in relation to Shellfisheries mitigation and monitoring.	The Applicants welcome this agreement from the MMO.
<b>1.5 - Fisheries</b>		
1.5.1	The MMO confirms that the comments on fish ecology within can now be closed. However, we defer to NE for their comments relating to Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), with Annex I habitats and Annex II diadromous fish and SACs are	The Applicants note this comment.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	designated for fish features (reference to MMO.FSF.6, 11 and 13).	
1.5.2	The MMO has no outstanding concerns regarding the Outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA), the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP), or the Cable Statement in relation to fisheries impacts.	The Applicants note this comment. See also the Applicants response to row 1.3.1 above.
<b>1.6 - Underwater Noise (UWN)</b>		
1.6.1	The MMO notes that the SoCG addresses concerns regarding UXO clearance and the Applicants have focussed on mitigating noise impacts to protect marine life.	The Applicants note the comment.
1.6.2	The topic of underwater noise has been addressed as a critical environmental consideration due to potential impacts on marine mammals, fish, and shellfish, and specific mitigations measures have been outlined within the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP).	The Applicants note the comment.
1.6.3	The MMO believes under water noise impacts have been appropriately addressed within the SoCG. Moreover, specific mitigation measures have been outlined within the MMMP (see comments in Section 5.5 of this document).	The Applicants note and welcome the comment.
1.6.4	However, we defer to NE for their comments relating to the impact of UWN within MPAs.	The Applicants note the comment.
1.6.5	The only outstanding comments are in relation to the inclusion of UXO within the DCO Application which will remain a disagreed position. Noting that should the Secretary of State include UXO then we will ensure we are content with all the information within the DML and relevant plans. Further updates will be provided at Deadline 4.	The Applicants note the comment and the position taken by the MMO on this point. It is the Applicants' position that it is appropriate and justified to include UXO clearance (limited to low order clearance) activities within the draft DCO (REP3-009). The Applicants have included all necessary activities for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Transmission Assets in the application for development consent, in order to ensure a comprehensive application, and all such activities have been subject to a robust assessment process. This includes UXO clearance activities, with suitable mitigation secured (Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (REP2-026) and a commitment to not clearing UXO within the Liverpool Bay SPA between November – March (inclusive) as set out under CoT130 in Commitments Register (REP3-013)). Including only low order

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>UXO clearance activities within the DCO, and appropriate controls under Condition 20 of Schedule 14 and 15 (REP3-009), is intended to remove the need to apply for and obtain a further licence post-consent and prior to construction, assisting with the expeditious delivery of the Transmission Assets project, contributing to UK Government targets for Net Zero. This is consistent with the approach taken for the Morgan Generation project and the recently consented Mona Offshore Wind Farm Project.</p>

**Table 2.3: REP3-085 – Outstanding Comments on PDA-013 Applicant’s response to Relevant Representations from Marine Management Organisation**

Reference	IP submission	Applicants’ response
<b>2.1 - Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)</b>		
2.1.1	Comments have now been addressed by the Applicants, and our final stance has been outlined in our Deadline 2 response (REP2-066).	The Applicants note this response. See also, the Applicants response to row 1.6.5 in Table 2.2 above and the Applicants response to the MMO response to ExQ1 Q7.2.4 in Table 2.1 above.
2.1.2	The MMO also notes that an updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol was submitted by the Applicants at Deadline 2 (REP2-026), and we provide further comments on this in Section 5.5 of this document.	The Applicants note the response and have provided further responses to comments in section 5.5 of Table 2.5 of this document.
<b>2.2 - Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (Document reference J18)</b>		
2.2.1	The MMO acknowledges that an updated MMMP has been submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-026), and we provide further comment in Section 5.5 of this document.	The Applicants note the response and have provided further responses to comments in section 5.5 of Table 2.5 of this document.
<b>2.3 - Construction scenarios</b>		
2.3.1	The MMO notes that the Applicants state in their Construction Scenarios (AS-070) how sequential construction with a maximum gap of up to four years has been considered as part of the impact assessment of each ES topic.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants will update the relevant ES chapters at Deadline 5 to incorporate the information contained within AS-070 and REP1-060 regarding construction scenarios.
2.3.2	The MMO notes that the comments raised by the Applicants in AS-070 have not addressed NE’s concerns (see Deadline 1 response REP1-092).	The Applicants note this comment.
2.3.3	The Applicants submitted an updated Clarification Note Construction Scenarios_F01 (REP1-060) at Deadline 1. The MMO acknowledges that the construction scenarios do not have implications for the impacts or delivery of Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB). Additionally, NE had no further comments to make on this submission.	The Applicants note this comment.

2.3.4	The MMO will keep a watching brief over resolution developments between NE and the Applicants in relation to construction scenarios, and we will submit comments where necessary.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>2.4 - Fish ecology - Underwater Noise (UWN) Assessment for Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance</b>		
2.4.1	The MMO has provided further comments in Sections 1.6 and 2.8 of this document.	The Applicants note these comments and have responded in the relevant sections.
<b>2.5 - Fish Ecology – Fish mortality and seasonal restrictions</b>		
2.5.1	The MMO notes that this issue has now been resolved, and we provide further detail in Sections 1.5 and 3.4 of this document.	The Applicants welcome this issue being resolved.
<b>2.6 - Shellfish Ecology – mitigation and monitoring</b>		
2.6.1	The MMO notes that there are only minor points for consideration (outlined in Section 1.4 of this document). Nothing further to add in relation to Shellfish Ecology at this stage.	The Applicants note these comments and have responded in the relevant section.
<b>2.7 - Commercial Fisheries - Potential impacts to migratory routes</b>		
2.7.1	The MMO was waiting on information from our scientific advisors at Deadline 2. We have now received this, and we provide further comments in Section 1.5 and 3.8 of this document.	The Applicants acknowledge this response and refer the MMO to the relevant sections cited for further detail.
<b>2.8 - Underwater Noise - use of temporary threshold shift (TTS)</b>		
2.8.1	The MMO notes that for the range of effect from vessel and construction noise, groups 3 and 4 fishes were modelled together using the appropriate thresholds from Popper et al. (2014) for the impacts of recoverable injury and TTS using 170 dB rms for 48 hours and 158 dB rms for 12 hours, respectively.	The Applicants note this observation from the MMO.
2.8.2	The Applicants confirmed that Table 3.17 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology presents the modelled impact ranges for high and low order detonations for mortality and potential mortal injury in fish (all groups), rather than permanent	The Applicants note this observation from the MMO.

	threshold shift (PTS). The threshold of 229-234 dB peak used in the modelling is appropriate.	
2.8.3	The MMO has provided further comments in relation to cumulative effects of underwater noise within the MMMP (see Section 5.5 of this document).	The Applicants note this response and have responded in Section 5.5 of table 2.5 of this document.
<b>2.9 - Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP)</b>		
2.9.1	The MMO notes that an OOMP was submitted alongside the application (APP-224). No further updates have been submitted since then, and no further comments from other concerned Interested Parties have been raised.	The Applicants have submitted an updated Outline OOMP at Deadline 4 (J19/F02).
2.9.2	The MMO has reviewed this document. We note that the Applicants may adopt a staged approach to the approval of DCO requirements, enabling them to be approved in part or in whole, prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of works in accordance with whether staged approach is to be taken to the delivery of the each of the offshore wind farms.	The Applicants note this comment.
2.9.3	The Applicants acknowledges that this approach will be governed by the inclusion of condition 12 of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO, which requires a written scheme detailing the stages of construction for Project A or Project B to be submitted for approval by the MMO prior to the commencement of the licensed activities.	The Applicants note this comment.
2.9.4	The MMO would expect this to be very detailed and include a table of documents which shows if early engagement with interested parties will take place and when these will be submitted to the MMO for approval. The MMO would also highlight that consultees prefer a more holistic review of these documents and therefore the MMO may request certain documents to be submitted together to enable a smooth consultation. For example, but not limited to, the design plan and construction method statement should be submitted at the same time.	The Applicants note this comment.

2.9.5	The Applicants asked for clarification on the scope of artificial lighting assessments. The MMO advise that the Applicant should consider worse-case scenarios in regard to the use of lumens and consideration of times of day/night. The assessment should focus on impacts to species identified in the area, and the assessment should be informed by the most up to date evidence. This clarification was passed to the Applicant via email on 30 June 2025 and we will review this submission and provide further comments where necessary at Deadline 4 or 5.	See the Applicants response to row 1.1.6 in Table 2.2 above.
<b>2.10 - Offshore In-Principal Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (APP-225)</b>		
2.10.1	The MMO has been in discussion with the Applicants regarding some clarification on further assessments requested by the MMO at Deadline 1. We have provided comments in Section 1.1 of this document.	The Applicants note this comment and have provided response in Table 2.2 of this document.
2.10.2	The MMO notes that the Applicants will be providing an updated IPMP at Deadline 3 and we will keep a watching brief on updates and provide comments where required at future deadlines.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants have further updated the Offshore IPMP at Deadline 4 (J20/F03).
<b>2.11 - Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Assessment (APP-019)</b>		
2.11.1	The MMO defers to and supports NE as Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) regarding impacts to MCZs for the project.	The Applicants note this comment and continue to engage with Natural England in relation to the Fylde MCZ.
2.11.2	The MMO will maintain a watching brief on this document and discussions in relation to MCZs and would remind the Applicants that any mitigation secured through these assessments will need to be included within the conditions on the DML.	<p>The Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-013) contains details of how all the commitments relevant to the Fylde MCZ are secured through the draft DCO (REP3-009). This Applicants would highlight that this has been updated at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05) to include the following additional commitments for the Fylde MCZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new commitment in the Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan at Deadline 4 (J19/F02) to limit deployment of cable protection outside the Fylde MCZ to 10 years / limit of the cable protection Max Design Scenario – whichever is first. Following this, deployment of cable protection during the operation and maintenance phase would require a new marine licence application. Within the Fylde MCZ, the Applicants are committed to limiting the</li> </ul>

		<p>deployment of cable protection, without the requirement for a new marine licence, to the first two years of the operation and maintenance phase. The Applicants would highlight that this timing is required to allow for any 'snagging' / delays in construction phase deployment and to cover the Offshore Transmission Owner (OFTO) divestment period. Following this two year period, any further deployment of cable protection during the operation and maintenance phase within the Fylde MCZ would require a new marine licence application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new commitment within the Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan to benthic community recovery specific monitoring in the Fylde MCZ through pre and post construction benthic community sampling to monitor for <u>temporal and spatial</u> recovery and the potential colonisation by INNS on and in the vicinity of any hard substrate within the Fylde MCZ within the Offshore IPMP at updated at Deadline 4 (J20/F03).</li> <li>• Inclusion of a commitment to 'no rock dumping within Fylde MCZ' in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 4 (C1/F06).</li> <li>• A new commitment that should benthic compensation be required, the Marine Recovery Fund (MRF) will be the preferred and prioritised option, and the project-led options would only be considered where the MRF option is not made available to the Applicants (see Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register, F1.5.3/F05).</li> </ul>
2.11.3	The MMO does note that it does not appear that this document has been updated since September 2024.	<p>The Applicants confirm this is correct and that the MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019) has not yet been updated during examination. Clarifications regarding the MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019) have been provided in the errata documents (REP1-064, REP2-028, REP3-039). Additionally, the Applicants provided a Stage 2 MCZ Assessment, including a without prejudice, in-principle MEEB Plan, at Deadline 1 (REP1-059) which updated the MDS for long term habitat loss of each of the features to account for the cable crossing occurring only within the subtidal mud feature.</p> <p>The Applicants confirm that an updated MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019) to include these clarifications/updates will be submitted at Deadline 5.</p>

**Table 2.4: REP3-085 – MMO comments on the updated DCO/DML**

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
<b>4.1 - Summary of Revised documents</b>		
4.1.1	<p>The MMO notes that further revisions, relevant to the MMOs interest, have been submitted at Deadline 2. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REP2-004 - C1 Draft Development Consent Order (Clean) - Rev F04</li> <li>• REP2-051- S_S51_2 Schedule of Changes to the Draft Development Consent Order including Draft Deemed Marine Licenses - Rev F03</li> <li>• REP2-028 - S_D1_14_Errata - Rev F02</li> </ul>	The Applicants note this comment.
4.1.2	The MMO has reviewed these revisions and provide further comments below.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>4.2 - Schedule 1 Part 2 Article 6 Benefit of the Order</b>		
4.2.1	The MMO's stance on the Transfer of Benefit of the Order still stands. The MMO requests that all references to the MMO and DML should be removed from Article 6 for Transfer of Benefit of the Order of the DCO. All references to the MMO and DML should be removed from Article 6 for Transfer of Benefit of the Order of the DCO.	The Applicants' position on this remains unchanged and is as set out in PDA-013 and REP2-033. The Applicants also noted in their response to the Examining Authority's written questions (REP3-056) that they do not consider it likely the Applicants will reach agreement with the MMO on this point. The Applicants note that the recently consented Mona Offshore Wind Farm Order 2025 retained this drafting at article 7.
4.2.2	The MMO has pushed back on the inclusion of this provision for many of the DCOs and has continued to do so during the recent DCOs undergoing examination. With regards to Transfer of Benefit being included in other DCOs and setting a precedent, the MMO considers that this does not mean the provisions that are in other orders should be repeated here, especially if there is good reason why they should not be included. The MMO had model provisions, however we have moved away from them now as our stance has changed, and we have provided our reasoning why we are against this provision in RR-1414 and REP2-061.	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.

4.2.3	The MMO acknowledges the ExA and Secretary of State (SoS) made amendments in Hornsea Four OWF recommendation report/decision and notes the only reasoning provided was to keep them consistent with other consents and the SoS removed the ability to transfer part of the DML, which the MMO welcomed.	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.
4.2.4	The MMO has provided further reasoning since that Examination including counsel comments from Rampion 2 Examination, that were incorporated into its relevant and written representations alongside further comments on the Planning Act.	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.
4.2.5	The MMO does not agree that because there is a provision in other DCOs that this is reason enough to include it in this one, as the drafting process is iterative. Even if the Secretary of State (SoS) approves a transfer of benefit for the DML the SoS has no power under the Planning Act 2008 to change the DML once consented. As set out in Schedule 6 Paragraph 2 (13) and Paragraph 5 (6):	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.
4.2.6	"The power may not be exercised in relation to provision included in an order granting development consent by virtue of paragraph 30A or 30B of Schedule 5 (deemed marine licence under Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009)."	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.
4.2.7	Therefore, the transfer and variation completed by the MMO is the right and proper way to amend the DML.	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.
4.2.8	The MMO highlights that this issue is not agreed and is likely to be unresolved during examination, noting further comments may be provided throughout examination.	Please refer to the response at 4.2.1 above.
<b>4.3 - Schedule 2A &amp; Schedule 2B</b>		
4.3.1	The MMO is largely content with these schedules.	The Applicants note this comment.
4.3.2	Table 3 in Paragraph 2 outlines the design parameters as 4 cable circuits, 400kilometres (km) of export cables, 45 cable crossings, 465,500 square metres (m2) of cable protection, and	The Applicants note this comment.

	490,100 cubic metres (m3) volume of cable protection. The MMO notes these parameters match those within the DML.	
<b>4.4 - Offshore Decommissioning (Schedule 2A Para 21 and Schedule 2B Para 21)</b>		
4.4.1	The MMO notes that no Morgan or Morecambe offshore works may commence until a written decommissioning programme in compliance with any notice served upon the Undertaker by the Secretary of State (SoS) pursuant to section 105(2) of the 2004 Act has been submitted to the SoS. The MMO welcomes this, please see comments on decommissioning within RR-1414 and REP2-061 (Table 1).	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>4.5 - Schedules 14 &amp; 15 Condition 11 – Maintenance of the authorised scheme</b>		
4.5.1	The MMO welcomes the updates to this condition.	The Applicants welcome this comment.
<b>4.6 - Schedules 14 &amp; 15 Condition 14 – Notifications and inspections</b>		
4.6.1	The MMO welcomes the updates to this condition.	The Applicants welcome this comment.
<b>4.7 - Schedules 14,15, 16 &amp; 17: Condition 16 – Chemicals, drilling and debris</b>		
4.7.1	The MMO welcomes the updates to this condition.	The Applicants welcome this comment.
<b>4.8 - Schedule 14 &amp; 15 Part 2 Condition 17 / Schedule 16 &amp; 17 Part 2 Condition 15 – Force Majeure</b>		
4.8.1	The MMO maintains its position regarding Force Majeure, as it is not necessary to be included within the DMLs. It is not something that the MMO would include in standalone marine licences.	The Applicants' position on this remains unchanged and is as set out in PDA-013 and REP2-033. The Applicants also noted in their response to the Examining Authority's written questions (REP3-056) that they do not consider it likely the Applicants will reach agreement with the MMO on this point. The Applicants note that the recently consented Mona Offshore Wind Farm Order 2025 retained this drafting at condition 16 of Schedule 14.
4.8.2	The MMO understands that Force Majeure is about events, situations, and circumstances that arise which are outside of a person's control.	Please refer to the response at 4.8.1 above.

4.8.3	Currently the condition wording used is drafted to apply for stress of weather or any other cause which is very broad. It could cover anything, including causes which are entirely within the master's control such as negligence matters. Currently the MMO believes the condition does not meet the five tests as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Please refer to the response at 4.8.1 above.
4.8.4	The MMO has already raised these points in RR-1414 submissions and will not be repeated here. The MMO note that Applicants responded to our comments in PDA- 013 in which they disagree with our standpoint.	Please refer to the response at 4.8.1 above.
4.8.5	The MMO notes the additional sub-paragraph (2) which states "The unauthorised deposits must be removed at the expense of the undertaker unless written approval is obtained from the MMO." This may satisfy the enforcement test of the NPPF, however, the MMO still believes the Condition isn't Necessary, Precise, nor Reasonable (as set out in our reasonings in RR-1414).	Please refer to the response at 4.8.1 above.
4.8.6	The MMO believes this will continue to be an agree to disagree matter and may provide further explanatory comments throughout this examination.	Please refer to the response at 4.8.1 above.
<b>4.9 - Schedules 14 &amp; 15 Condition 18 – Pre-construction plans and documentation</b>		
4.9.1	The MMO welcomes the updates to this condition and the interpretations added to Part 1(1).	The Applicants welcome this comment.
<b>4.10 - Schedules 14 &amp; 15 Condition 23 – Reporting of engaged agents, contractors and vessels</b>		
4.10.1	The MMO welcomes the updates to this condition.	The Applicants welcome this comment.
<b>4.11 - Schedules 14 &amp; 15 Condition 28 – Completion of construction</b>		
4.11.1	The MMO welcomes the updates to this condition.	The Applicants welcome this comment.

**Table 2.5: REP3-085 – MMO comments on additional revised documents**

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
<b>5.1 - Environmental Statement Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register (REP2- 010)</b>		
5.1.1	The MMO notes a number of updates to the Applicant's commitments have been made, most of which are related to onshore works, for that reason we defer comment to the relevant Interested Parties.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants would note that the Commitments Register has been updated at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05) to include a number of new commitments (see the Applicants response to row 2.11.2 in Table 2.3 above).
5.1.2	The MMO notes that CoT44 Project Description (Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES) has been updated to reflect Project design changes post-PEIR, including crossing techniques. The MMO discusses this further within this document in Section 5.3.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.1.3	The Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CoT45, CoT47, CoT49, CoT54) has been updated to provide specific details on under keel clearance and to clarify that an outline plan has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. Detailed plan(s) will be prepared post-consent. In CoT47, the Applicants also provide specific details on sandwave clearance and cable protection parameters. The MMO provide further comments in Section 5.4 of this document.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.1.4	The MMO welcomes the commitments CoT50 and CoT62 to submit a detailed Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence Plan(s). The commitment has been updated to clarify that an outline plan has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The MMO notes the updates requested in REP1-086 will be updated in a new version of the document submitted at Deadline 3. The MMO will also review SoCGs submitted at Deadline 3 including any comments from the NFFO and Inshore fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCA).	The Applicants note this comment.
5.1.5	The MMO welcomes the updates to commitment CoT52 (appointment of a Company Fisheries Liaison Officer(s) (CFLO)) to ensure alignment with the Applicants' OWF	The Applicants note this comment.

	Generation Assets development consent applications. It has also been updated to change its mitigation measure category from secondary to embedded mitigation.	
5.1.6	Commitment CoT64 (submission of MMMP) has been updated to make the commitment more concise. It has also been amended to clarify that an outline plan has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. Detailed plan(s) will be prepared post-consent. The MMO provides further comments in Section 5.5 (Table 2.5) of this document.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>5.2 - Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (REP2-008)</b>		
5.2.1	The MMO welcomes the change from indicative maximum parameters to maximum parameters throughout the document for the transmission assets including the cable length, size of asset crossing outside of and within Fylde MCZ and pipe parameters.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.2.2	The MMO welcomes the inclusion of the statement that high order UXO clearance will not be authorised within the Development Consent Order, noting that if UXO clearance with the high order technique is required, the Applicants will apply for this under separate marine licence applications, post-consent. Please see comments in Sections 1.6 and 3.7 about UXO's remaining in the DML.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.2.3	The MMO welcomes the inclusion of the maximum design envelope in relation to vessels and vessel requirements.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>5.3 - J15 Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (REP2-022)</b>		
5.3.1	The MMO welcomes the timing restriction on all cable pull activities at landfall on Lytham St Annes beach between November and March (inclusive).	The Applicants note this comment.
5.3.2	The MMO notes that previous advice stated that the Applicants must ensure that target cable burial at the nearshore/landfall	In response to RR-1414-23 on page 21 of REP3-054, the Applicants set out that the detailed assessment of beach level variability, as set out in the Outline Cable

	<p>was defined with consideration for natural shoreline retreat and hence potential shoreline realignment (natural or managed). This is still unresolved and the MMO will maintain a watching brief.</p>	<p>Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA, APP-219), identifies intertidal variability of up to <math>\pm 1.5\text{m}</math>. Accordingly, the target Depth of Lowering (DoL) for cable burial has been conservatively established at 3.0 m below beach surface level. This ensures that even under conditions of maximum recorded variability, the minimum burial depth would remain at least 1.5m, sufficient to prevent cable exposure and associated risks.</p> <p>In terms of shoreline retreat, the analysis undertaken by the Applicants, to inform the CBRA also confirms a trend of sediment accumulation and dune migration seaward, rather than significant shoreline recession, at the selected landfall site. This indicates a limited likelihood of future shoreline retreat posing a risk to the buried cables.</p> <p>The Applicants confirm that the potential for future shoreline changes, including the scenario of natural realignment and retreat, has been factored into the burial depth design. The design approach adopted incorporates a conservative burial DoL of 3.0m to mitigate the risk of cable exposure due to future beach-level variations, including scenarios involving shoreline retreat.</p> <p>The Applicants have submitted the following document at Deadline 4 that supports the response above: <u>Annex to Applicants response to MMO and NE submission at Deadline 3: Assessment of Seabed Level Vertical Variability for Morgan Offshore Wind Farm - Appendix C at Deadline 4 (S_D4_19)</u></p>
5.3.3	<p>The MMO would also like to highlight that none of the revised documents supplied at Deadline 2 have been updated since the last round of advice (versions being dated September 2024).</p>	<p>The Applicants would note that the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (REP2-022) was updated at Deadline 2 to include, amongst other things, the commitment to the timing restriction preventing any cable pull activities at landfall on Lytham St Annes beach between November and March (inclusive), updates to the maximum design scenario set out in Table 2 to correspond with updates made to Volume 1: Project Description (REP2-008) made at Deadline 2 and updates to a number of the commitments set out in Table 5 to correspond with updates to the Commitments Register (REP3-013).</p> <p>Additionally, the Outline CSIP has been updated at Deadline 4 (REP2-022) to include the new commitment stating that “<i>No cable/scour protection shall be permanently deployed in the intertidal area between Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) and Mean High Water Springs (MHWS)</i>” (also see the Applicants response to 1.3.1 in Table 2.2 above).</p>
5.3.4	<p>The cable statement does not directly address the matter of depth criteria (the CSIP suggests that “detail on the direct pipe installation and associated maximum design parameters, is set</p>	<p>The information contained within the Cable Statement (APP-228) on the proposed cable corridors and cable installation methods is intended to be a summary of the</p>

	<p>out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES (document reference F1.3)". Commitment number CoT114 in Table 5 of the CSIP document refers to the outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) but also indicates that the target 3m burial is subject to further pre-construction surveys and production of Detailed CBRAs. The MMO interprets this as the outstanding comments remain unresolved.</p>	<p>information contained within the Project Description (REP2-008), the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (REP2-022) and Outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) (APP-219).</p> <p>The direct pipe installation refers to the installation of the direct pipe cable ducts under the sand dunes between the entry/exits pits in the intertidal (with a minimum 100 m offset distance seaward of the western boundary of the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI – commitment CoT44) to the transition joint bays (TJBs) onshore. The depth at which the direct pipes will be installed between the entry/exit pits in the intertidal to the TJBs is subject to pre-construction site investigation and final design. The depth of the entry/exit pits in the intertidal area will be a maximum of 3 m below bed level as set out in Table 3.3 of the Project Description (REP2-008).</p> <p>CoT114 places a commitment on the Applicant that the export cables in the intertidal between Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) and Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) (i.e. to the direct pipe entry/exit pits) to a target depth of 3 m, subject to further pre-construction surveys to be reported within the final CBRA, i.e. if the CBRA determines that a burial depth of, for example, 2.7 m is sufficient to maintain cable burial, that is what the Applicants would seek approval for prior to commencement of construction.</p>
5.3.5	<p>The risk assessment for the section KP0 - KP0.75 refers to a lack of geophysical survey coverage and notes that sediment morphology is to be confirmed, but "intertidal variability [is] understood to be +/-1.5m". The assessment then adds that a "minimum [depth of lowering of] 3.0m is considered adequate at this stage". The MMO interprets this reference of depth of lowering to mean burial depth, in which case, the assessment does not indicate any allowance for shoreline retreat at this location. However, this assessment may need to be clarified in the CBRA.</p>	<p>See the Applicants response to 5.3.2. above regarding how the target burial depth of 3 m in the intertidal area has taken account of intertidal variability.</p>
5.3.6	<p>The MMO recognises the mitigation detailed in the CSIP, and the Applicants are following the request from NE to apply the 'avoid, minimise, mitigate' hierarchy. Overall, mitigation includes minimising the volumes of sandwave clearance and cable protection required, plus methods to minimise the use of jack-up barges in the MCZ (paragraph 2.2.1.4). The CSIP also indicates asset integrity surveys every 4-5 years (paragraph</p>	<p>The Applicants highlight that the commitment set out under section 3.1.1.9 of the CSIP (REP2-022), to further reduce the potential need for cable protection, the detailed design process will include the use of micro-siting of the offshore export cables within the export cable corridor, where possible, where successful burial could pose a challenge or where a higher risk of remedial works (such as external cable protection) may be required has been added to the Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05).</p>

	8.1.1.1). All further efforts to remove impacts are welcome. The MMO would encourage the Applicants to take the opportunity to provide an assessment of the colonisation of any cable protection by benthic invertebrates at this time to determine any significant deviation from the current benthic assemblage (e.g., the presence of Invasive Non-Native Species).	<p>Regarding invasive non-native species, the Applicants have provided an assessment of increased risk of introduction and spread of invasive non-native species under section 2.11.7 of Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology (APP-045).</p> <p>In addition to the monitoring already proposed for the recovery of sediments and seedbed features in the Fylde MCZ, the Applicants have updated the Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan submitted at Deadline 4 (J19/F02) to also include a commitment to specific monitoring of the temporal and spatial recovery of benthic communities in the Fylde MCZ through pre and post construction benthic community sampling and of the potential colonisation by Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) following construction activities within the Fylde MCZ.</p>
5.3.7	The MMO notes that there is no discussion of how licensing of further protection or burial works would be addressed if the eventual requirement exceeds the stated limits of the initial licence.	This matter is appropriately addressed in the Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) which has been updated and submitted at Deadline 4 (J19/F02). Briefly, the draft DCO (REP3-009) would allow for cable/scour protection works, cable reburial, repair or replacement up to the maximum design scenario (MDS) set out in the Project Description (REP2-008) and Outline OOMP (J19/F02). Any works which go beyond what has been consented would be subject to a separate marine licence application. Furthermore, with specific reference to cable/scour protection, the Applicants have made a commitment in the updated Outline OOMP (J19/F02) to limit the development of cable/scour protection in the O&M phase to the first 10 years / limit of the MDS (whichever is first) outside the Fylde MCZ and the first 2 years inside the MCZ. Finally, the Applicants have also made a commitment at Deadline 4 to no deployment of cable/scour protection in the intertidal area between MLWS and MHWS (F1.5.3/F05).
5.3.8	Overall, the characterisation is generally adequate, but the specific details of the cable route remain to be determined by detailed surveying and risk assessment for cable laying.	The Applicants note this comment and highlight that refinement of export cable routes within an export cable corridor post-consent, following acquisition of site investigation data is standard industry practice.
5.3.9	The MMO believes that major impacts from cable installation are not likely to occur, while recognising that specific detailed risk assessments may identify localised areas of concern. However, we recognise that this document does not explicitly consider impact assessment.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.3.10	The MMO notes that the document includes relevant information regarding the maximum design parameters for the	The Applicants note that the MMO will defer to the relevant SNCB on matters relating to the protected features of the Fylde MCZ. The Applicants can confirm

	<p>offshore export cables in addition to measures adopted to mitigate impacts on the Fylde MCZ. While the MMO defers to the relevant SNCB regarding any impacts on the protected features on designated sites, the MMO considers that the Applicants have included several relevant measures to reduce the magnitude of benthic impact within the Fylde MCZ. It is the MMO's understanding that the contingency for cable protection will be limited to a maximum of 3% of the offshore cable route within the Fylde MCZ (a reduction from 15 % and 20 % for the Morecambe and Morgan cables, respectively), and that external cable protection will be used at cable crossings or where adequate cable burial or reburial is not possible. The MMO welcomes with this approach.</p>	<p>that the contingency for cable protection will be limited to a maximum of 3% of the offshore cable route within the Fylde MCZ (a reduction from 15 % and 20 % for the Morecambe and Morgan cables, respectively), and that external cable protection will be used at cable crossings or where adequate cable burial or reburial is not possible. Furthermore, as set out under section 3.1.1.9 of the CSIP (REP2-022), to further reduce the potential need for cable protection, the detailed design process, will include the use of micro-siting of the offshore export cables within the export cable corridor, where possible, where successful burial could pose a challenge or where a higher risk of remedial works (such as external cable protection) may be required. This commitment in the CSIP has been added to the Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05).</p>
5.3.11	<p>The MMO notes that material arising from sandwave clearance will be retained within the Fylde MCZ boundary and it is the MMO's understanding that this is to facilitate the natural recovery of the impacted seabed to pre-construction conditions and reduce the potential for loss of this protected feature from the MCZ. The MMO questions if all material will be of a nature to be disposed of within areas of similar nature?</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that within the Fylde MCZ, the Control Flow Excavator will be the only method used for sandwave clearance. The Applicants will update the Outline cable specification and installation plan (REP2-022), Project Description (REP2-008) and the Dredging and disposal - site characterisation plan (APP-227) at Deadline 5 to remove reference to 'dredging' as a sandwave clearance method in the Fylde MCZ.</p> <p>The Outline CSIP (APP-220) provides an outline strategy for the treatment of sandwaves in section 6.5. This highlights that controlled flow excavation is the intended means by which sandwaves will be reshaped. Controlled flow excavation works by propelling water at high velocity but low-pressure, using the force of the water to erode the material. The sediment is generally mobilised between 1 – 5 m from the tool head. Mobilised sediment typically stays close to the tool head where water jet velocity is highest ensuring that sediment remains in the immediately adjacent vicinity as indicated in CoT116 (i.e. this is within meters so does not risk altering sediment character at any given location). CoT116 and the methods highlighted in the Outline CSIP (APP-220) means that material will naturally be deposited locally in areas of similar sediment type. The Applicants note that it is not in their interests to move the sediment further than necessary from its original location and, therefore, consider that the Outline CSIP and existing commitment (CoT116) should be sufficient to provide Natural England with the necessary comfort that sediment will be deposited in areas of similar sediment character.</p>

5.3.12	The MMO agrees with the measures to reduce the magnitude of benthic impacts, including benthic shellfish impacts within the Fylde MCZ.	The Applicants welcome this comment.
5.3.13	The MMO has no outstanding concerns regarding the Outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment, the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan, or the Cable Statement in relation to fisheries impacts.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>5.4 - J16 Measures to minimise disturbance to marine mammals and rafting birds from vessels (REP2-024)</b>		
5.4.1	The MMO notes that further consideration must be made to address the overall disturbance from elevated underwater sound due to other sound producing activities within the Offshore Environmental Management Plan, as the mitigation measure to minimise disturbance to marine mammals are only relevant to the transiting vessel.	Following a meeting between the Applicants and the MMO on 21 July 2025, the MMO confirmed by email on 23 July 2025 that this matter can be closed and that the MMO will confirm this in their Deadline 4 submission.
5.4.2	The MMO welcomes the Applicants inclusion of pre-construction unexploded ordnance (UXO) surveys.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.4.3	The MMO notes the Applicants commitment to using low order techniques, where possible and that separate marine licence would be required for high order clearances.	The Applicants note this comment.
<b>5.5 - J18 Outline marine mammal mitigation protocol (REP2-026)</b>		
5.5.1	The MMO notes that the Applicants have confirmed that high order UXO clearance will not be authorised under the draft DCO. The MMMP contains the results of underwater noise modelling based on high order detonation methods (as well as low order methods). The MMMP should be updated to reflect the Applicant's commitment to using low order UXO clearance methods only.	<p>The Applicants confirm that the outline MMMP does not contain the results of underwater noise modelling related to high order UXO; the outline MMMP was updated at Deadline 2 (REP2-026) to remove the results of underwater noise modelling related to high order UXO clearance. In particular, see Table 1.3 and Table 1.4 of the Outline MMMP (REP2-026).</p> <p>Appendix A (Secondary mitigation measures for high order UXO clearance) of the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) provides a summary of measures currently available or likely to be available in the future, which could be applicable to further reducing residual effects from underwater sound from high order UXO clearance if required. It is set out in the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) that <i>"If high order UXO clearance techniques are required a separate marine licence will be applied for and therefore secondary mitigation measures will be considered post consent within the MMMPs to support a separate marine licence for high order UXO clearance."</i> No further</p>

		changes have been made to the Outline MMMP in response to this comment at Deadline 4, however the Outline MMMP has been further updated at Deadline 4 (J18/F03) to address a comment relating to seals (see 5.5.4. below).
5.5.2	The MMO also notes that the Applicants have confirmed that no clearance of UXO will be undertaken within Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA between November and March (inclusive).	The Applicants note this comment.
5.5.3	The MMO also notes that the Applicants have also aligned this Outline MMMP with the new Defra policy on reducing underwater noise, the updated Joint UXO position statement and the latest Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) guidelines for mitigating the risk of injury to marine mammals from UXO clearance.	The Applicants note this comment.
5.5.4	The MMO welcomes the inclusion of the relevant legislation and guidance. The MMO notes that cetaceans have been included within this section, however, the MMO requests that Seals are also included. From 0 to 12 nautical miles (nm) seals are protected under the Conservation of Seals Act 1970 and regulation 45 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR). When within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where they are listed as a feature of special interest, seals are protected from disturbance under section 28P(6A) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	The Applicants confirm that the Outline MMMP has been updated at Deadline 4 to include seals under section 1.2: Legislation and Guidance, as per the MMO's request (J18/F03).
5.5.5	The MMO notes that the MMMP focusses primarily on mitigating underwater noise impacts from UXO clearance. Mitigating measures include Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADDs), Marine Mammal Observers (MMOs), and Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM), soft start procedures, and post-detonation searches to check for injury. These measures appear well-aligned with established guidelines, particularly for low-order clearance.	The Applicants welcome the MMO's comments on this subject.
5.5.6	The inclusion of high-order clearance scenarios within Table 1.5, and the potential need for secondary mitigation (e.g.NAS)	The Applicants believe that the MMO is referring to Table 1.5 (Potential impact (PTS) ranges for high order UXO detonation) of the Outline MMMP (APP-223) as originally submitted. The Applicants highlight that the Outline MMMP was updated at Deadline 2 to remove results of underwater noise modelling relating to high

	indicates that further refinement will be required for larger UXOs.	order UXO clearance. The equivalent table in the Outline MMMP submitted at Deadline 2 is Table 1.3 (Potential impact (PTS) ranges for low order and low yield UXO clearance activities) (REP2-026). No further changes have been made to the Outline MMMP in response to this comment at Deadline 4.
5.5.7	The MMO acknowledges the Applicant's assessments of the use of ADDs within the MMMP. Table 1.6 outlines ADD durations, distance calculations, and species-specific swim speeds and exposure thresholds. There are concerns regarding environmental variability and ADD habituation, however, the short-term temporal parameters of UXO clearance activities should minimise these risks.	<p>The Applicants note the MMO's comments that the short-term temporal parameters of UXO clearance activities should minimise the risks associated with environmental variability and ADD habituation.</p> <p>The Applicants also highlight that the Outline MMMP was updated at Deadline 2 to remove results of underwater noise modelling relating to high order UXO; Table 1.6 (Minimum ADD duration for high order UXO clearance and associated displacement distance, showing whether the individual can move away from the injury range during ADD activation) as presented in the original Outline MMMP (APP-223) was replaced by Table 1.4 (Minimum ADD duration for low order UXO clearance and associated displacement distance, showing whether the individual can move away from the injury range during ADD activation) in the updated Outline MMMP submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-026).</p> <p>Appendix A (Secondary mitigation measures for high order UXO clearance) of the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) provides a summary of measures currently available or likely to be available in the future, which could be applicable to further reducing residual effects from underwater sound from high order UXO clearance if required. It is clearly set out in the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) that "If high order UXO clearance techniques are required a separate marine licence will be applied for and therefore secondary mitigation measures will be considered post consent within the MMMPs to support a separate marine licence for high order UXO clearance."</p> <p>No further changes have been made to the Outline MMMP (J18/F03) in response to this comment at Deadline 4.</p>
5.5.8	Based on the literature, there is evidence supporting the use of ADDs as effective deterrence to distances that are relevant to the present case, in particularly for harbour porpoises, with studies like Brandt et al. (2013), also reported by the Scottish Government (2014) showing effectiveness up to 7.5km	The Applicants note the MMO's comments. The Applicants highlight that with the removal of high order UXO clearance from the DCO, the greatest modelled impact (PTS) ranges are for Very High frequency (VHF) cetaceans of 2,290 m, which therefore fall well within the range of 7.5 km as identified in Brandt <i>et al.</i> (2013).
5.5.9	The MMO notes that the displacement distances presented in Table 1.6 suggest that the animals can move away from the injury zone during the ADD activation period, with the notable	As stated in the Applicants' response to 5.5.7, the Applicants highlight that the Outline MMMP was updated at Deadline 2 to remove results of underwater noise modelling relating to high order UXO; Table 1.6 (Minimum ADD duration for high

	<p>exception of the VHF cetaceans (Harbour porpoise), where the swim distance within 1 hour (5,400m) is less than the maximum PTS range of 8,045m for UXOs in the size category of 26-130kg. Since the additional mitigation techniques such as NAS will be considered as an option only for UXO size larger than 130kg, it is not entirely clear that the currently proposed mitigation measures, including soft start procedures, will be sufficient to mitigate the risk of injury for Harbour porpoise. The MMO notes that the soft start procedures will also be agreed with us post-consent. Please can the applicant clarify this as there is well established soft start procedures and JNCC guidance available now.</p>	<p>order UXO clearance and associated displacement distance, showing whether the individual can move away from the injury range during ADD activation) as presented in the original Outline MMMP (APP-223) was replaced by Table 1.4 (Minimum ADD duration for low order UXO clearance and associated displacement distance, showing whether the individual can move away from the injury range during ADD activation) in the updated Outline MMMP submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-026). Table 1.4 of REP2-026 shows that (with the removal of high Order UXO clearance from the DCO) the maximum PTS range for VHF cetaceans is 2,290 m and therefore with 30 minutes activation of ADD harbour porpoise are able to swim outside of the PTS risk zone; the swim distance of harbour porpoise over 30 minutes is considered to be 2,700 m. Therefore, the Applicants are confident that the currently proposed mitigation measures (which no longer include soft starts, with the removal of high order UXO clearance from the draft DCO (REP3-009)) will be sufficient to mitigate the risk of injury for harbour porpoise.</p> <p>Appendix A (Secondary mitigation measures for high order UXO clearance) of the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) provides a summary of measures currently available or likely to be available in the future, which could be applicable to further reducing residual effects from underwater sound from high order UXO clearance if required. It is clearly set out in the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) that "If high order UXO clearance techniques are required a separate marine licence will be applied for and therefore secondary mitigation measures will be considered post consent within the MMMPs to support a separate marine licence for high order UXO clearance."</p> <p>No further changes have been made to the Outline MMMP in response to this comment at Deadline 4.</p>
5.5.10	<p>In relation to the use of additional noise abatement the MMO would highlight that it should be clear that NAS will be considered for use within the MMMP and that justification will need to be provided if this is not possible.</p> <p>Overall, the MMMP provides a solid framework for mitigating underwater noise impacts, but its full adequacy will depend on the detailed MMMPs and the MMO's approval post-consent.</p>	<p>The Applicants confirm that the use of NAS will be considered if high order UXO clearance cannot be avoided. Appendix A (Secondary mitigation measures for high order UXO clearance) of the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) provides a summary of measures currently available or likely to be available in the future, which could be applicable to further reducing residual effects from underwater sound from high order UXO clearance if required. If high order UXO clearance techniques are required a separate marine licence will be applied for and therefore secondary mitigation measures will be considered post consent within the MMMPs to support a separate marine licence application for high order UXO clearance.</p>

		The Applicants welcome the MMO's comments on the Outline MMMP (REP2-026) providing a solid framework for mitigating underwater noise impacts and confirm that they will continue to work with the MMO to agree the finalisation of the detailed MMMP(s).
--	--	--

**Table 2.6: REP3-085 – MMO’s comments on Annex 3.2 to Applicants’ Response to WRs from Statutory Consultees: Marine Management Organisation**

**6.1 - Table 1: MMO Response of the Applicants’ response to MMOs deadline 1 comments. Comments in blue indicate where MMO will provide comments at Deadline 4.**

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants’ response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.1	<p><b>2. Comments on Relevant Representations from other Interested Parties</b></p> <p><b>2.1 General Comments</b></p> <p>1.1.1 The MMO has reviewed the Relevant Representations (RR) of a number of parties and provided initial comments below. The MMO notes that a number of comments have been raised in relation to development location, cable routing, and impact to other industries. The MMO hopes the Applicants can resolve these comments and defers to the Interested Parties. The MMO will maintain a watching brief for any concerns where Deemed Marine Licence (DML) conditions may be required.</p> <p>1.2.1 The MMO has reviewed the responses to Relevant Representations at Procedural Deadline A to Natural England (NE) (PDA-014), Environment Agency (EA) (PDA-010, and the Local Councils (PDA-011, PDA-026, and PDA-030), and provided our initial comments below.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.2	<p><b>2.2 Natural England (RR-1601)</b></p> <p>2.2.1 The MMO notes within paragraph 5.10 that NE has concerns in regard to worse-case construction scenarios. Construction Scenario 3b states that there could be sequential construction with a gap of up to four years between the completion of construction of the transmission assets for the first project (i.e. Morgan), and commencement of construction for the second project (i.e. Morecambe). However, it is NEs opinion that the gap of up to four years has not been considered within the Project Description or within the MDS and impact assessments for the topic areas. The MMO would also question how this would work in practice as it was our understanding that the transmission assets to be delivered together. This approach would mean that the activities would be completed at different times.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants refer to their response to Natural England's Relevant Representation (PDA- 014) and the Applicants Rule 9 – ES assessment of Construction Scenarios (AS-070) and Clarification Note: Construction Scenarios (REP1-060) in relation to these matters. Further the Applicants refer to Sections 7 and 8 of the Applicants ' Response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 &amp; 28 (REP1-039) which provides further detail on how Morgan OWL and Morecambe OWL have coordinated and will continue to coordinate to deliver the Transmission Assets and the rationale for and need to retain the ability within the draft DCO for the projects to construct either sequentially or concurrently.</p>	<p>The MMO has reviewed the Clarification Note: Construction Scenarios (REP1-060), Rule 9 - ES Assessment of Construction Scenarios (AS-070), and Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan (APP-039). The MMO notes that the Applicants reasonings state: <i>"Exact dates for start of construction of other projects are generally unknown, therefore a conservative assumption has been made that all other projects would have a temporal overlap. For clarification purposes, both the construction and operational phases of other projects have been assessed in combination with all phases of the Transmission Assets if the construction timeline is not readily available (where relevant)."</i></p> <p>The MMO welcomes this clarification, however, we will be keeping a watching brief on Natural England's response to this.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.3	<p>2.2.2 NE highlighted within paragraph 5.11 that the Applicants have stated that the Transmission Assets may adopt a staged approach to the approval of DCO requirements to allow flexibility. Whilst the MMO is not opposed in principle to partial discharge, we are concerned that this will not allow for the implications to be considered holistically or against the findings of the Environmental Statement (ES), noting NE raised concerns on the potential to hinder positive nature conservation outcomes that can be developed and adopted collaboratively, including strategic mitigation measures.</p> <p>The MMO recognises that the Applicants responded to this query at Procedural Deadline A (PDA-014), stating <i>"The Applicants note that Natural England is not opposed in principle to partial discharge of DCO requirements. Providing a mechanism for a staged approach to discharge of requirements is entirely proportionate and a reasonable approach to take for long linear projects where works have to be completed in stages along the route. For this reason, the draft DCO (AS-004) includes Requirement 3 in Schedule 2A and 2B, which provides for each project to submit details in relation to differing stages of development, and the subsequent development of each project must be carried out in compliance with those details as approved."</i> The MMO</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants also refer the MMO to ISH1_23 in the Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 (REP1- 037) which provides further clarity with regards to the Applicant's staged approach to construction of the Transmission Assets.</p>	<p>The MMO has reviewed the Applicant's Hearing Action Points due at DL1 (REP1-037), paragraph ISH1-23.</p> <p>The MMO welcomes the clarification around staging of works and the use of the term in the draft Development Consent Order.</p> <p>The MMO has no further comments at this stage, but we will keep a watching brief over Natural England's response to this topic.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	notes this commitment and will keep a watching brief.			
REP1-086 086	<p>NE noted in paragraph 5.12 that it is stated multiple times that named plans will be provided twice (i.e. once for each project), but it is not clear that they will be "carbon copies".</p> <p>Therefore, it seems unclear to what extent the transmission assets are intended to be delivered together or strategically.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment and refer the MMO to REP1-086.2 and REP1-086.3 above. In particular, the Applicants refer to paragraph 7.2.3.3 of Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 &amp; 28 (REP1-039) with regards to the Applicants' approach to outline and detailed management plans.</p>	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.5	2.2.5 NE welcomed the coordinated cable route approach for the two OWF, however NE is concerned that in the post-consent phase, coordination appears to cease, with separate post- consent condition discharge streams envisaged for each project (paragraph 5.13). The MMO would like to see a firm commitment to continuing the current coordinated approach into the post-consent phase. The MMO was under the understanding that a joint DCO would mean that the project would reduce the impacts and construction time frame overall, but it seems that this project could be constructing for longer than two separate applications.	The Applicants refer to their response to Natural England's Relevant Representation (PDA-014). Further, the Applicants refer to Sections 7 and 8 of the Applicants ' Response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 (REP1-039) which provides further detail on how Morgan OWL and Morecambe OWL have coordinated and will continue to coordinate to deliver the Transmission Assets and the rationale for and need to retain the ability within the draft DCO for the projects to construct either sequentially or concurrently.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.6	2.2.6 NE highlighted that several of the commitments are equivocal in nature e.g. where possible', where practicable' within paragraph 5.14. Where this is the case, and where the commitment is not reinforced by a more concrete condition in the DCO/DML, NE can only place limited confidence on these commitments providing appropriate mitigation measures. The MMO recommends that the commitments should be strengthened to make them unequivocal statements and that the DCO is updated to include firm commitments.	The Applicants note this comment which relates to Natural England's comments on the Commitments Register (AS-030). The Applicants have provided an updated Commitments Register at Deadline 2 (F1.5.3/F03). The draft Development Consent Order (C1/F04) requirements and conditions are clearly and precisely drafted to deliver the mitigation measures required for the Transmission Assets.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>The Applicants do not therefore consider that the draft Development Consent Order (C1/F04) requires any further updating in this regard.</p>		
REP1-086 086.7	<p>2.2.7 The MMO agrees with NEs comments in paragraph 5.15 on updating documents based on the updated UXO Joint Position Statement and new Mitigation Outlines:</p> <p>An updated Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Joint Position Statement, which can be found here - Marine environment: unexploded ordnance clearance Joint Position Statement - GOV.UK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UXO clearance supporting guidance providing more detail for Supporting minimising environmental impacts from unexploded ordnance clearance - GOV.UK</li> <li>• JNCC guidelines for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance in the marine environment   JNCC Resource Hub</li> </ul> <p>The Applicants should review the content of these documents and ensure their assessment and mitigation measures are</p>	<p>The Applicants highlight that the Outline MMMP (J18/F02) has been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 to account for the publication of the updated UXO Joint Position Statement and new Mitigation Outlines (as highlighted by the MMO here, and Natural England in their Relevant Representations).</p> <p>As set out in PDA-014 (Procedural deadline A Submission - Annex 3.2.7 to Response to RR - Natural England (RR- 1601)) the Applicants will follow a mitigation hierarchy for UXO clearance with the preferred approach being to avoid UXOs if possible, then clear using low order techniques if avoidance is not possible.</p>	<p>The MMO has provided further comments in Sections 5.4 &amp; 5.5 of this document.</p>	<p>The Applicants have responded to further comments in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 under Table 2.5 of this document.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	aligned.	<p>The Applicants removed high order UXO detonation from the draft DCO (Document reference C1) at Deadline 1. Should high order UXO clearance be required, authorisation would be sought through a separate marine licence. Removal of high order UXO clearance from this DCO is reflected in the updated drafting of the deemed marine licences (DML) in Schedules 14 &amp; 15, Condition 20(1)(b) in the draft DCO (Document reference C1).</p> <p>The Commitments Register (F1.5.3/F03)) has also been updated at Deadline 2 to reflect these changes (see CoT64). The updates also include amendments to make clear that no high order UXO clearance is permitted and to specify the maximum number of low order UXO clearances authorised by each DML.</p> <p>The Applicants highlight that whilst the updated UXO Joint Position Statement and new Mitigation Outlines have been taken into account with regards to mitigation, the publication of these documents makes no material difference to the impact</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>assessment carried out for the assessment of Injury and disturbance from elevated underwater sound during UXO clearance, as set out in Volume 2,</p> <p>Chapter 4: Marine mammals (APP-050).</p>		
REP1-086 086.8	<p><b>2.3 Environment Agency (RR-0677)</b></p> <p>2.3.1 The MMO notes that many of the EA concerns have now been responded to at Procedural Deadline A (PDA-010), the MMO will provide further comments where we deem necessary.</p> <p>2.3.2 The EA raised concerns about electromagnetic field (EMF) generation on the impact of fish receptors. The Applicants have responded “<i>EMFs occur naturally as well as being produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. For the Ribble Estuary crossing, the much greater cable burial depth will mean that EMFs will be negligible at the riverbed and as such smelt will not be capable of detecting these and therefore there is no impact. No specific EMF monitoring is proposed in Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology</i> (APP-048) as the potential impact of EMF on fish is assessed as a minor adverse effect, which is considered not significant in</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome the MMO's representation confirming that the majority of the Environment Agency concerns have been responded to at Procedural Deadline A (PDA-010).</p> <p>The EA has confirmed the response provided by the Applicants regarding effects of EMF is appropriate and has closed this issue with the Applicants (REP1-076, 076.4).</p>	The MMO has no further comments and regards this issue resolved.	The Applicants welcome the resolution of this issue.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<i>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms."</i>			
REP1-086 086.9	2.3.3 The EA requested amendments to the wording of Requirement 12 (Ecological Management Plan) to include that approval by the local planning authority is in consultation with the EA. The Applicants have acknowledged this, and they have confirmed they are engaging with EA to discuss their concerns. An update will be provided at Deadline 1. The MMO will maintain a watching brief.	The Applicants confirm that Requirement 12 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1) has been updated to include the EA as a named consultee.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.10	2.3.4 The EA noted that only one Otter survey was completed in the area south of River Ribble and highlighted that this is potential under-recording of this protected species resulting in inadequate mitigation. The Applicants responded that the surveys were undertaken in accordance with the agreed methodology agreed with the EWG and are reported in Volume 3, Annex 3.12: Otter Survey Technical Report (APP-086). Pre- construction surveys for European	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO is of the understanding that discussions are ongoing between the Applicants and the EA/NE on these matters. <i>The MMO will maintain a watching brief over developments at Deadline 3 &amp; 4.</i>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	Protected Species (including otters) will be undertaken (as secured in Requirement 13 of Schedules 2A & 2B of the draft DCO (AS-004). The MMO will maintain a watching brief over this matter, and defers to EA.			
REP1-086 086.11	2.3.5 The MMO notes that EA will provide further comments through their Written Representation for any other matters that are relevant to the water environment. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on this.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants note that they have provided a response at Deadline 2 to the Environment Agency's Written Representation in Table 2.1 (REP1-076) of the Applicants' Response to Written Representations of Statutory Consultees(S_D2_3).	The MMO notes these submissions. <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of EA's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.12	<b>2.4 Historic England (RR-0839)</b> 2.4.1 The MMO notes that Historic England (HE) mentions that the Applicants ES relies on embedded mitigation to avoid significant impacts to archaeological features. The determination of residual effects, and the reliance on embedded mitigation measures, such as recording archaeology before any loss, would not reduce harm or magnitude of impact. HE therefore does not agree with the	The Applicants have provided a detailed response on this in The Applicants ' Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 at reference RR-0839 839.2 (PDA- 007). The Applicants have also responded on this matter at Deadline 2 in response to the Historic England written representation (see the Applicants response in	The MMO notes these submissions. <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of HE's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	downgrading of residual impact and concluding residual effects as "not significant" in EIA terms. The MMO hopes this issue will be addressed during Examination.	Table 2.7 in row 082.8 of (S_D2_3)).		
REP1-086 086.13	2.4.2 HE has concerns that the Applicants do not appear to confirm that submission/consent and pre-construction surveys will be undertaken. Although "commitments" and the production of a "post-consent detailed offshore WSI(s) for archaeology..." (Chapter 8, Table 8.21) have been referenced, HE recommends that there should be obligations within the dDCO, including DMLs, for delivery of appropriate mitigation measures inclusive of in-situ avoidance. The MMO is in support of this.	As stated in The Applicants ' Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 at reference RR-0839 839.4 (PDA-007), this is noted by the Applicants. It is acknowledged that action to record sites cannot remove the magnitude of the impact on marine archaeological receptors and therefore the significance of effect. However, the primary project mitigation will be avoidance, which would be achieved for known receptors through the implementation of AEZs and for unknown receptors and low potential anomalies through pre-construction site investigation surveys, micro siting, and other mitigation such as the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries	The MMO notes these submissions. <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of HE's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		and Temporary AEZs. These are set out and will be secured within the Outline Offshore WSI and PAD (APP-222) and will be implemented through the detailed Offshore WSI and PAD for archaeology, as secured within Conditions 18(1)(g) and (2) within the deemed marine licences in the draft DCO (Document reference C1).		
REP1-086 086.14	2.4.3 The MMO notes that HE will provide further comment on the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) for archaeology submitted by the Applicants (APP-222) and confirm that the production of a scheme specific Offshore WSI is required, as conditioned within the deemed Marine Licences (Schedules 14 and 15) of the draft Development Consent Order (APP-005). The MMO will keep a watching brief on any updates and comments.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants note that they have responded to all comments raised in the Historic England written representation (REP1- 082) in The Applicants response to Historic England's written representation at Deadline 2 (S_D2_3).	The MMO notes these submissions. <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of HE's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.15	<u>Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 5</u> 1.14.11 Para. 5.11.2 highlights the potential for works to disturb deposits of geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental interest. Further geoarchaeological programs will help outline the significance of these deposits and help to mitigate loss or harm. Identified sensitive areas to dewatering should be avoided and mitigated against.	The Applicants note that this comment relates to comments by Historic England against the onshore historic environment. The Applicants has responded to all comments raised in the Historic England written representation (REP1-082) in The Applicants response to Historic England's written representation at Deadline 2	The MMO notes these submissions. <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of HE's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>1.14.12 The MMO notes that HE will provide further comments through their Written Representation for any other matters that are relevant to the historic environment. The MMO will keep a watching brief on these.</p> <p>1.14.13 The MMO notes that there doesn't seem to be a specific response from the Applicants to this RR at Procedural Deadline</p> <p>A. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination.</p>	(S_D2_3).		
REP1-086 086.16	<p><b>2.5 The Crown Estate (RR-2169)</b></p> <p>The MMO notes that the Crown Estate hold Agreements for Lease from 'The Crown Estate for the associated Generation assets' and 'Agreements for Lease of the Transmission Assets'; these are progressing with an expectation to enter these ahead of the close of the examination. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	N/A	N/A
REP1-086 086.17	<p><b>2.6 The Wildlife Trusts (RR-1655 &amp; RR-2180)</b></p> <p>2.6.1 The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside, and Northwest Wildlife Trust (hereon collectively referred to as The Wildlife Trusts (TWT), have both raised significant concerns arising from substantial</p>	Matters raised by the Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside in their written representation (REP1-210) (noting the Northwest Wildlife Trusts did not submit a written representation) regarding the	<p>The MMO notes these submissions.</p> <p><a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of TWT's Deadline 3 submissions.</a></p>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>deficiencies in the content and clarity of the Applicants submission, compounded by (i) significant errors and omissions that have undermined confidence in its credibility. The assessment lacks the critical detail and data necessary to conduct a thorough and reliable evaluation of the potential impacts.</p>	<p>offshore environment below mean high water springs relate to the following:</p> <p>Fylde Marine Conservation Zone and the need for the Applicants to prepare an in-principal Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) – The Applicants submitted an in-principle MEEB at Deadline 1 (see Stage 2 MCZ Assessment (REP1-059)).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subsea Construction Noise, where the Wildlife Trusts welcome the Applicants commitments to employing mitigation in line with the latest Government guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>All other matters raised by the Wildlife Trusts in REP1-210 relate to the onshore environment. The Applicants have responded to REP1-210 at Deadline 2 (S_D2_3.5).</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.18	2.6.2 The MMO notes that TWT raise concerns in relation to spatial overlap between transmission assets and Flyde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ). The MMO defers to NE in relation to the inclusion of an in-principal Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB).	The Applicants note this comment and that the MMO will defer to NE in relation to the inclusion of an in-principle MEEB, which the Applicants submitted into the Examination at Deadline 1 (REP1- 059).	The MMO notes a MEEB was submitted at Deadline 1 (REP1-059, Appendix A1). The MMO will maintain a watching brief of NE's comments on the suitability of the MEEB.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.19	2.6.3 TWT are concerned about the impact of subsea construction noise on marine life, particularly cetaceans. The assessment and proposed mitigation and management of underwater noise disturbance impacts on marine mammals during the construction, operation, and decommissioning will be carried out in accordance with new legislation (as mentioned in paragraph 1.2.7 of this response).	The Applicants have provided a detailed response on this subject within The Applicants ' Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 at reference RR- 1655 1655.4 (PDA-007). Additionally, please note the Applicants response to REP1-086 086.17 above.	The MMO notes these submissions.  The MMO will maintain a watching brief of TWTs Deadline 3 submissions.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.20	2.6.4 For UXO clearance, low noise methods should be the default method and there should be adequate monitoring in place for a UXO clearance licence. The MMO agrees with this and provided comments on UXO in our RR (RR-1414-27) will be keeping a watching brief over UXO matters.	The Applicants note that the MMO will be keeping a watching brief over UXO matters.  Please see the response above to REP1- 086 086.7 regarding the Applicants' approach to mitigation for UXO clearance. The Applicants highlight that this is in line with their response to the MMO's RR (RR- 1414) (see PDA-013 - Procedural deadline A Submission -	The MMO has addressed these concerns in Section 5 and has no further comments to make at this stage.	The Applicants note this response and have responded to the MMO concerns in Section 5 (Table 2.5).

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>Annex 3.2.6 to Response to RR - Marine Management Organisation(RR-1414) at reference RR-141 141.27).</p> <p>The Applicants highlight that as set out in the Outline MMMP (J18/F02), dedicated and trained Marine Mammal Observers will be used to survey the mitigation zone and conduct 'pre-start searches' and 'post clearance searches' for any UXO clearance (using low order techniques). If required, Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) will also be conducted during pre-start and post-clearance searches (the requirement for PAM will be agreed with the MMO post-consent once relevant activity parameters are known and will be set out in the detailed MMMP(s).and will</p> <p>Monitoring will be undertaken in line with the latest JNCC guidelines for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from UXO clearance (JNCC, 2025).</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.21	2.6.5 TWT welcomes adherence to a Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) but would like to see a commitment to the use of mitigation options available such as bubble curtains, timing of piling, or piling methods in accordance with industry best practice. The MMO supports this.	<p>The Applicants have removed high order UXO clearance from the draft DCO (Document reference C1) (see response above to REP1-086 086.7 for further details). Further, please see the response above to REP1-086 086.7 regarding the Applicants' approach to mitigation for UXO clearance. As such, further mitigation (e.g. bubble curtains) is not required for low order UXO clearance activities.</p> <p>The Applicants highlight that piling is not an activity that will be licenced under the draft DCO (Document reference C1) and was therefore not assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment. As such the Applicants have given no further consideration to the mitigation suggestions related to piling ("timing of piling or piling methods in accordance with industry best practice").</p>	The MMO has addressed these concerns within Section 5 and has no further comments to make at this stage.	The Applicants note this response and have responded to the MMO concerns in Section 5 (Table 2.5).

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.22	2.6.6 The MMO notes that TWT are disappointed that a future monitoring plan of many of the ecological receptors has not been embedded into the project to validate predictions in the DCO and inform future projects. The MMO will maintain a watching brief in relation to the required monitoring.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants refer to Table 2.86 row RR-1655 1655.5 of The Applicants Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 – Affected parties and statutory consultees (PDA-007) which confirms how appropriate monitoring, including for ecological receptors, has been secured through the draft Development Consent Order (C1/F04).	The MMO notes these submissions.  <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of TWT's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.23	2.6.7 The MMO notes that there doesn't seem to be a specific response to this Relevant Rep at Procedural Deadline A. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination.	The Applicants responded to the Wildlife Trusts relevant representations in Table 2.86 (The Northwest Wildlife Trust) and Table 2.119 (The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside) of Procedural deadline A Submission - 3.2 The Applicants ' Response to Relevant Representations  Part 2 - Affected parties and statutory consultees (PDA-007).	The MMO notes these submissions.  <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of TWT's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.24	<p><b>2.7 Corporation of Trinity House of Deptford Strond (RR- 0442)</b></p> <p>The MMO notes that Trinity House may have further comments to make on the Application and the draft DCO. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination.</p>	The Applicants have addressed comments submitted by Trinity House at Deadline 1 (REP1-209) within the Applicants Response to Written Representations from Statutory Consultees (S_D2_3) at Deadline 2.	<p>The MMO notes these submissions.</p> <p><i>The MMO will maintain a watching brief of Trinity House's Deadline 3 submissions.</i></p>	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.25	<p><b>2.8 Maritime and Coastguard Agency (RR-1418)</b></p> <p>(ii) The MMO notes that the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) do not have significant concerns to raise on the Navigation Risk Assessment and Shipping &amp; Navigation chapter of the EIA Report, however, they will be requesting amendments to the DML conditions. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination and will provide further comments at Deadline 3.</p>	The Applicants have addressed comments submitted by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency at Deadline 1 (REP1-088) within the Applicants Response to Written Representations from Statutory Consultees (S_D2_3) at Deadline 2.	<p>The MMO notes these submissions.</p> <p><i>The MMO will maintain a watching brief of MCA's Deadline 3 submissions.</i></p>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.26	<p><b>2.9 Morecambe Wind Limited (RR-1558), Walney (UK) Offshore Windfarms Limited (RR-2266) &amp; Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited (RR-2303)</b></p> <p>2.9.1 The MMO notes that Morecambe Wind Limited, Walney Offshore Windfarms Limited, and Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited have concerns regarding the assessment of environmental impacts, noting several discrepancies, and a lack of certainty of the compensation measures in respect of Red-throated divers. The MMO notes that there doesn't seem to be a specific response to this Relevant Rep at Procedural Deadline A, however, the MMO will defer opinion to NE as the leading Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) on these matters.</p>	<p>The Applicants specific responses to RR- 1558, RR-2266 and RR-2303 were provided within PDA-007 'The Applicants ' Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 - Affected parties and statutory consultees. The Applicants have also provided a response to these entities within their response to the Orsted IPs written representation (REP1-188) in the Applicants Response to Written Representations from Statutory Consultees (S_D2_3) at Deadline 2.</p>	<p>The MMO notes these submissions.</p> <p><i>The MMO will maintain a watching brief of MCA's Deadline 3 submissions.</i></p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>
REP1-086 086.27	<p><b>2.10 Newton and Freckleton Marshowners (RR-1611)</b></p> <p>2.10.1 The MMO notes that the Newton and Freckleton Marshowners, who are responsible for the land management of the marsh land at Freckleton, have concerns regarding impacts to Black-tailed Godwits, and other sensitive marshland and wetland birds. The MMO notes that there doesn't seem to be a specific response to this Relevant Rep at Procedural Deadline A, however, the MMO defers to NE as the leading SNCB on these matters.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants responded to the relevant representation from Newton and Freckleton Marshowners at Table 2.84 within The Applicants Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 – Affected parties and statutory consultees (PDA- 007).</p>	<p>The MMO will continue to review representations but defers to NE as the SNCB on ornithology matters.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.28	<p><b>2.11 Flyde Borough Council (RR-0705) &amp; South Ribble Borough Council (RR-2027)</b></p> <p>2.11.1 The MMO notes that both Flyde Borough Council (FBC) and South Ribble Council (SRC) highlight that the Seascape, Landscape, and Visual Resources Assessment (SLVA) (APP- 123 – APP-127) is limited to onshore elements of the generation development, therefore lacking in offshore transmission assessment. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any SLVA comments that may impact the licensable activities. The Applicant's responded in PDA-026 and PDA-030, respectively: <i>"Paragraph 10.4.1.2 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Resources of the Environmental Statement (APP-123) states that the study area is defined by the four main elements of the Transmission Assets, which are noted as the onshore substations, the landfall and the onshore export cable corridor/400 kV grid connection corridor. The Applicants refers to the Council to the Glossary of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Resources of the Environmental Statement (APP-123)</i></p> <p><i>– presented on pages v to vii – which defines each of these Transmission Asset elements at the outset of the Chapter".</i> The MMO notes this statement and has no further comments to make at this time.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.29	2.11.2 Both Councils raise concerns about separating the generation and transmission impacts. They suggest that the in-combination effects of both the generation and transmission infrastructure must be considered to properly assess the impact on seascape, landscape and visual resources. The Applicant's responded in PDA-026 and PDA-030, respectively: " <i>The Applicants confirm that they have considered the in-combination effects of the Transmission Assets and the Generation Assets. The Applicants refer the Council to Volume 4, Chapter 3: Inter- relationships of the Environmental Statement (APP-143), which summarises the likely significant inter-related effects in Table 3.24.</i> " The MMO notes this commitment and has no further comments to make at this time.	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.30	<b>2.12 Preston City Council (RR-1775)</b> The MMO notes that Preston City Council will be deferring their ecology comments to the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit who act as the Council's Ecology advisors. The MMO will keep a watching brief over any intertidal matters.	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.31	<p><b>2.13 Lancashire County Council (RR-1262)</b></p> <p>2.13.1 The MMO recognises that Lancashire County Council (LCC) are concerned that impacts on over-wintering birds associated with coastal European level wildlife sites have not been fully assessed or have insufficient mitigation/compensation measures identified within the ES and the dDCO. The MMO defers to NE as the leading SNCB on these matters.</p> <p>The MMO notes that the Applicants responded to these concerns at Procedural deadline A (PDA-012). The Applicants state that <i>"The majority of potential impacts associated with the construction of the Transmission Assets will be temporary and minimal, with some permanent habitat loss which will be mitigated through the provision of a permanent high tide roost at Fairhaven saltmarsh and permanent mitigation area south of Newton-with-Scales (for waders and farmland birds. These are outlined in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (EMP) (APP- 212)". "Detailed Ecological Management Plan(s) will be implemented by the Applicants as approved by relevant local authorities in consultation with Natural England, as appropriate". Therefore, the MMO defers to NE.</i></p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.32	<p><b>2.14 Canal &amp; River Trust (RR-0287)</b></p> <p>The MMO notes that the Canal &amp; River Trust (CRT) have identified that works number 25A and 25B [cable circuits and associated cable ducts laid underground; construction compounds and permanent access] have the potential to directly affect the Ribble Link where those works cross the Ribble Link. All works near to the Ribble Link also have the potential to affect the waterway by factors such as silt or chemical run-offs during the construction phase or maintenance activities during the operational phase. CRT have noted that their preference would be for the underground Ribble Link crossing to be installed using horizontal directional drilling with the launch pit and reception pit set well away from the waterway corridor.</p> <p>2.14.2 The MMO notes that CRT has noted that to enable CRT to assess whether any discharge could impact navigational safety, they would need to understand existing and proposed peak flows and peak velocities from the outfalls affected. CRT wishes to understand details of the discharges sought from the Ribble Link (if any), to ensure that the principle of this would be acceptable.</p> <p>The MMO notes that CRT have noted that it is not clear at this stage what mitigation is proposed within Lea Marsh County Wildlife Site, that appears as a temporary</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants responded to the relevant representation from the Canal &amp; River Trust at Table 2.16 within The Applicants Response to Relevant Representations Part 2 – Affected parties and statutory consultees (PDA-007). The Applicants have also responded to the Canal &amp; River Trust's written representation within the Applicants' Response to Written Representations from Statutory Consultees and other organisations (S_D2_3)] at Deadline 2 and are continuing to engage positively with the Canal &amp; River Trust on the matters they have raised.</p>	<p>The MMO notes these submissions.</p> <p><a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of Canal and River Trust's Deadline 3 submissions.</a></p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	construction mitigation area. CRT have highlighted that it is essential that any tree planting here is offset from the Ribble Link by a minimum of 5m to ensure that the roots of the trees do not interfere with the watercourse and cause leakage or undermine the stability of the Ribble Link.			
REP1-086 086.33	2.14.4 The MMO notes that CRT have highlighted that Construction Environment Management Plans (CEMP) should include details of how materials fuels, chemicals and wastes will be stored and where; measures for the prevention of dust generation and windblown litter and debris; measures to prevent run off into the Brook and connecting ditches, pollution response emergency procedures (including training of individuals, reporting as well as the physical mitigation and incident clean up); measures to be taken to ensure noise and vibration from drilling would not affect waterway users; and details of any oil interceptors and spill kits and the steps to be taken if any unknown contamination is encountered during the works. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any updates made to the CEMP.	The Applicants note this comment. Please refer to the response to REP1-086 086.32 above.	The MMO notes these submissions. <a href="#">The MMO will maintain a watching brief of Canal and River Trust's Deadline 3 submissions.</a>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.34	2.14.5 The MMO notes that CRT have highlighted that the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP-211) and associated Access to Works Plan (APP-157) do not appear to include any crossings of the Trust owned bridges. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination.	The Applicants note this comment. Please refer to the response to REP1-086 086.32 above.	The MMO notes these submissions.  The MMO will maintain a watching brief of Canal and River Trust's Deadline 3 submissions.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.35	2.14.6 The MMO notes that CRT have highlighted that with regards to temporary construction activities associated with the cable corridor, the sensitivity of the receptors is assessed as high but overall, the magnitude is assessed as negligible. There would be some temporary localised impacts associated with the construction works but given that the crossing of the Ribble Link would be underground and carried out via a horizontal directional drilling technique (or similar) then the impact on the immediate environs of the waterway and its users should be limited. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any future comments throughout examination.	The Applicants note this comment. Please refer to the response to REP1-086 086.32 above.	The MMO notes these submissions.  The MMO will maintain a watching brief of Canal and River Trust's Deadline 3 submissions.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.36	<p><b>3. Comments on Pre-Examination Procedural Deadline submissions</b></p> <p><b>3.1 PDA-013 The Applicant's Response to Marine Management Organisation</b></p> <p>The MMO acknowledges the submission of this response and will provide further comments at Deadline 2 or 3 and throughout the examination process. The MMO has added initial comments in Table1 for ease of viewing. We have highlighted in blue text where we will provide further comments at Deadline 2 or 3.</p>	The Applicants note this comment. See Appendix A of this document for the Applicants' Deadline 2 response to MMO's Deadline 1 response set out in Table 1 of MMO Written Representations (REP1- 086).	The MMO has reviewed Appendix A of REP2-033. The MMO has provided further updates in Section 2 of this document.	The Applicants note this response and have responded in Section 2 of this document.
REP1-086 086.37	<p><b>4. Notification by Statutory Parties of their wish to be considered as an IP by the ExA</b></p> <p>4.1.1 The MMO wishes to be considered as an interested party by the ExA.</p> <p><b>5. Artificial Intelligence (AI)</b></p> <p>5.1.1 The MMO confirms that no AI has been or will be used to create or alter any part of our documents submitted to the ExA.</p> <p><b>6. Notification of wish to have future correspondence received electronically</b></p> <p>6.1.1 The following people request future correspondence is received electronically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="mailto:Jordana.Chell@marinemanagement.org.uk">Jordana.Chell@marinemanagement.org.uk</a></li> <li>• <a href="mailto:Helen.Gunton@marinemanagement.org.uk">Helen.Gunton@marinemanagement.org.uk</a></li> </ul>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="mailto:Rebecca.reed@marinemanagement.org.uk">Rebecca.reed@marinemanagement.org.uk</a></li> </ul>			
REP1-086 086.38	<p><b>7. Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)</b></p> <p>7.1.1 The MMO is working with the Applicants to prepare a SoCG which will be submitted by the Applicants at Deadline 1, this will not fully reflect the up-to-date agreed position within this document based on the timescales of review, response to the Applicants.</p> <p>7.1.2 The MMO and the Applicants will review the SoCG and may submit another SoCG as per the Rule 6 letter to assist the Examining Authority in highlighting the major outstanding issues.</p> <p>7.1.3 The MMO will continue to work with the Applicants outside of the written process to ensure issues are being moved to resolution where possible.</p>	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants and the MMO submitted an initial SoCG at Deadline 1 (REP1-053).	The MMO has provided further updates in Section 1 of this document.	The Applicants note this response and have responded in Section 1 of this document.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.39	<p><b>8. Comments from ISH1</b></p> <p>8.1.1 The MMO has reviewed 'EV4-018 Action points arising from issue specific hearing 1 on 30 April and 1 May 2025' and notes that there are no action points for the MMO.</p> <p>8.1.2 The MMO notes that the Applicants commented on the seasonal restrictions with regards to herring spawning season from the 1 of September to the 31 of October and the cod spawning season from the 1 of January to the 30 April inclusive. The MMO notes that the Applicants stated that the main impacts from UXO clearance is from injury and mortality rather than disturbance, which occurs over a period of seconds, and doesn't lead to significant behavioural effects. Please note that the MMO requested mitigation of 'no clearance of UXO during the herring and cod spawning seasons' is no longer required under the DML as set out within Table 1 Section RR-1414-24 of this document. However, should high order UXO detonation be required, this will fall under a separate marine licence and further assessment will be undertaken at time of the licence application.</p> <p>8.1.3 The MMO notes that the Applicants is intending to remove high order UXO clearance from the DCO application. The MMO welcomes this. The MMO notes</p>	<p>The Applicants confirm that high order UXO clearance was removed from the DCO through amendments to the deemed marine licences in Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 (Document reference C1).</p>	<p>The MMO welcomes this amendment and has no further comments at this stage.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	that the Applicants recognises that separate marine licences will be required should they need high order UXO clearance.			
REP1-086 086.40	8.1.4 The MMO welcomes the inclusion of a note explaining the use of indicative in the context of the Rochdale envelope and how various elements of that are secured elsewhere and how they apply to various elements of the work and how they will be managed through the DCO.	The Applicants note this comment. As set out against ISH1_22 in the Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 (REP1-037), Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the Environmental Statement has been updated and has been submitted at Deadline 2 (F1.3/F03).	The MMO is satisfied this comment is resolved and has no further comments to make at this stage.	The Applicants note this response and welcome the resolution of this comment.
REP1-086 086.41	8.1.5 The MMO welcomes the inclusion of a table showing what the total time frames program would be with a four-year gap.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants refer to Appendix B of the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 (REP1-037).	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.42	8.1.6 The MMO notes that the Applicants have stated that the measures of equivalent ecological benefit are not required for the transmission assets due to the small-scale, long-term habitat loss, as a result of that which is 0.012% for Fylde Marine Conservation Zone. The MMO defers to NE and will continue to maintain a watching brief on this topic. The MMO notes that Fylde MCZ does not yet have management in place, which can be classed as material consideration, however, this activity could potentially impede future protection activity. The MMO may provide further comments in due course.	The Applicants note this comment. See also, the Applicants response to row REP1-086 086.18.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.43	8.1.7 The MMO welcomes the inclusion of an indicative plan with regards to the exit pit locations and cofferdam locations and the graphical representation.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants refer to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 13, 14, 16, 17 (REP1-040).	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.44	<p><b>9. Additional Application Documents</b></p> <p><b>APP-218 J13 Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (FLCP)</b></p> <p>9.1.1 The MMO welcomes the Applicants' commitment to following the fisheries liaison and co-existence plan within the DMLs.</p> <p>9.1.2 The MMO welcomes the Applicants confirming that the removal of static fishing gear has been included as a licensable activity within the deemed marine licences. The MMO would highlight that this should be agreed with the relevant fishing parties.</p> <p>9.1.3 The MMO is satisfied that the implementation of FLCPs has been committed to within the DCO Schedules 14 &amp; 15 (CoT62).</p> <p>9.1.4 The MMO notes that information on key topics specific to commercial fisheries raised during consultation and how these topics have been considered in the production of the Outline FLCP is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial fisheries of the ES (document reference F2.6).</p> <p>9.1.5 The MMO welcomes the implementation of an appropriate communication and information distribution strategy to minimise interference with the fishing industry and to promote co-existence and co-location between the</p>	<p>9.1.1 The Applicants acknowledge and welcome the MMO's support for the commitment to follow the Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (FLCP) as secured within the draft DCO (Document reference C1). The Applicants remain committed to implementing the FLCP in line with best practice to support continued engagement and co-existence with the commercial fisheries sector.</p> <p>9.1.2 The Applicants acknowledge the MMO's support regarding the inclusion of the removal of static fishing gear as a licensable activity within the draft DCO (Document reference C1). The Applicants confirm that, as set out in Section 1.4.4 of the Outline FLCP (APP-218), any such activity will be undertaken in accordance with the Fishing Liaison with Offshore Wind and Wet Renewables Group (FLOWW) guidance and in consultation with relevant commercial fisheries stakeholders.</p> <p>9.1.3 The Applicants welcome the MMO's confirmation</p>	<p>Applicants are providing updates at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The MMO will review the updated document and interested parties' comments and provide confirmation at Deadline 4.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and welcome comments at Deadline 4.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>Transmission Assets and commercial fishing interests. The Applicants have</p> <p>9.1.6 committed to proactively engaging with fisheries stakeholders.</p> <p>9.1.7 The MMO requests that it is made clear within the FLCP that the MMO will not act as an arbitrator in relation to compensation.</p> <p>9.1.8 The MMO notes National Federation of Fisherman's Organisation (NFFO), and other relevant interested parties are providing comments throughout this process and will maintain a watching brief. The MMO does not want to be in a position post consent where the MMO cannot discharge the FLCP due to disagreements between parties that should have been resolved during the consenting decision process.</p>	<p>that the commitment to implement FLCPs is satisfactorily secured within the draft DCO (Document reference C1) under Schedules 14 and 15.</p> <p>9.1.4 The Applicants acknowledge the MMO's comment and welcomes its recognition that key topics specific to commercial fisheries, raised during consultation, have been addressed and considered in the development of the Outline FLCP (APP-218) as detailed in Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the Environmental Statement (APP 054).</p> <p>9.1.5</p> <p>9.1.6 The Applicants acknowledge and welcomes the MMO's support for the proposed communication and information distribution strategy within the Outline FLCP (APP-218). As noted above in response to 9.1.1, the Applicants are committed to proactive and transparent engagement with commercial fisheries stakeholders to minimise potential interference, promote co- existence and support continued access, where safe</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>and practicable. These principles are embedded within the Outline FLCP (APP-218).</p> <p>9.1.7 The Applicants acknowledge the MMO's request and can confirm that the following wording will be included within Section 1.4.3 "Co-existence Procedures" of the Outline FLCP as a new paragraph</p> <p>9.1.8 (1.4.3.2) at Deadline 3:  <i>"The MMO will not act as an arbitrator or be involved in any commercial negotiations with any association, organisation and/or individual fisheries stakeholders".</i></p> <p>9.1.9 9.1.7 The Applicants acknowledge the MMO's position and welcome continued engagement and input from the NFFO and</p> <p>9.1.10 other relevant interested parties throughout the Examination process.</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.45	<p><b>9.2 APP-219 J14 Outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment</b></p> <p>9.2.1 The MMO notes that several Relevant Representatives raised concerns regarding cable burials and locations. The MMO will maintain a watching brief of the Applicants responses to these issues and hopes that a resolution can be made.</p> <p>The MMO is still reviewing this document and will provide further comments at Deadline 3.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has provided further comments in Sections 1.2, 1.5, 3.8 and 5.3 of this document.	Please refer to the Applicants' responses to comments in Sections 1.2, 1.5, 3.8 and 5.3 of this document.
REP1-086 086.46	<p><b>9.3 APP-220 J15 Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan</b></p> <p>The MMO welcome further information on dredge and disposal activities regarding Fylde MCZ. The Application states that disposal activities including sandwave clearance will be conducted throughout the Transmission Assets Order Limits but that no commitments have been proposed to mitigate impacts either within or outside of benthic designated sites.</p> <p>(i) The MMO is unable to provide advice on the full impacts of cable protection as there are several references to cable protection in the nearshore, but a worst-case scenario based on extent, type and location of cable protection is not assessed in the ES chapters. The MMO notes that mitigation has been referenced within APP-</p>	<p>9.3.1 : With regards to the MMO's comments relating to the mitigation of impacts within and outside benthic designated sites, the Applicants would highlight that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied throughout the pre-application process of design, scoping, Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and Expert Working Group (EWG) consultations. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied to avoid and reduce impacts to benthic habitats, including designated features of the Fylde MCZ as detailed in Table 1.13 within the MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-</p>	The MMO has provided further comments in Sections 1.5, 5.1, and 5.3 of this document.	Please refer to the Applicants' responses to comments 1.5.1 and 1.5.2, 5.1.1 to 5.1.6 and 5.3.1 to 5.3.13.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>220, however, these have not been secured within the DCO/DMLs.</p> <p>(ii) The MMO is concerned about the potential physical processes and benthic impacts from the distance between the cable c</p> <p>ossing, as this indicates separation in cable protection making one linear line of protection. The MMO requests that the worst case is clarified.</p> <p>(iii) The MMO may provide further comments at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>019). The Applicants refer the MMO to Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the Environmental Statement (F1.5.3/F03), which documents the mitigation measures (Commitments') identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. These measures, adopted by the Applicants seek to avoid, reduce or mitigate potential impacts, where possible. As outlined in the Outline offshore CSIP (J15/F02), and specifically with regards to disposal activities, include these commitments to limit sandwave clearance to up to 5% of the offshore export cable corridor route within the Fylde MCZ (CoT47). The commitments set out in the Outline CSIP are secured through Part 2 - Condition18(1)(e) (Pre-construction plans and documentation) of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1), which requires that the construction method</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>statement includes details of cable specification, installation and monitoring in accordance with the outline CSIP. Additionally, the Applicants have committed to depositing any material arising from sandwave clearance within the Transmission Assets Order Limits in close proximity to the works and within the licensed disposal sites within the Order Limits, as detailed in the Dredging and Disposal - Site Characterisation Plan (APP-227)</p> <p>CoT116). This is secured through paragraph 2(g), Part 1 of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1).</p> <p>Furthermore, the requirements for sandwave clearance will be informed through the undertaking of survey works pre-construction (CoT47).</p> <p>9.3.2 : With regards to the MMO's point regarding cable protection in the nearshore, the Applicants have provided further information relating to</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>this at RR- 1601 1601.B.17 of the Applicants' response to the Natural England's Relevant Representation (PDA-016).</p> <p>9.3.3 : With regards to the MMO's comment relating to cable protection making one linear line of protection, the Applicants have provided further information relating to this at RR-1601 1601.C.17 of the Applicants' response to the Natural England's Relevant Representation (PDA-017). Section 7.2 of the Outline offshore CSIP (J15/F02) states that some of the crossings are in proximity such as the Havhingsten and Lanis crossings, which may make it difficult to bury the cable in between crossing points, leadin</p> <p>to the potential need for continuous hard protection.</p> <p>The requirements for additional cable protection at crossings are subject to crossing and proximity agreements with existing asset owners, and the Applicants will seek to reduce</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>the exclusion zone around existing cables for burial tools and trenches in consultation with the asset owners to reduce the risk for additional cable protection at these locations, wherever practicable.</p> <p>The MDS for long term habitat loss associated with cable protection for crossings (and ground conditions) is fully assessed in section 2.11.5 of Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology (APP-045).</p> <p>Additionally, the Applicants have provided further information relating to the seabed mobility and provision of cable protection at RR-1601 1601.B.16 of the Applicants' response to the Natural England's Relevant Representation (PDA-016). It was outlined that cable protection measures will be tailored to the specific location and installed to ensure compliance with CoT45 (J15/F02) and Condition 2(2) of Schedules</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>14 and 15 to the draft DCO (Document reference C1) to limit change in water depth to 5% (unless</p> <p>therwise approved by the MMO in consultation with the Maritime Coastguard Agency). This commitment will therefore also ensure that any cable protection (including crossings) is of a sufficiently low height in relation to the water column to cause minimal changes to wave climate and tidal flow which are the driving forces of sediment transport and allow sediment transport to continue.</p> <p>To address concerns by Natural England on the Fylde MCZ, the Applicants have updated the Outline offshore CSIP at Deadline 2</p> <p>(J15/F02) to remove the 'rock dump' option from the cable protection types. Accordingly, Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the Environmental Statement has also been updated at Deadline 2 (F1.3/F03) to reflect this new commitment.</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		9.3.4: The Applicants note this comment.		
REP1-086 086.47	<p><b>9.4 APP-221 J16 Measures to minimise disturbance to rine mammals and rafting birds from vessels</b></p> <p>9.4.1 The MMO notes that the Applicants have considered the adoption of a staged approach to the approval of DCO requirements.</p> <p>9.4.2 The MMO requests that unexploded ordnance investigation is clearly defined within pre-construction surveys within 1.2.1.4.</p> <p>9.4.3 The MMO notes that further consideration must be made to address the overall disturbance from elevated underwater sound due to other sound producing activities within the Offshore Environmental Management Plan, as the mitigation measure to minimise disturbance to marine mammals are only relevant to the transiting vessels.</p>	Measures to minimise disturbance to marine mammals and rafting birds from vessels (J16/F02) has been updated to clearly define UXO investigation as part of the pre-construction surveys, as submitted at Deadline 2.	The MMO has provided further comment in Section 5.4 of this document.	Please refer to the Applicants response in Section 5.4 of this document.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	The MMO notes NE and Natural resources Wales raised comments on this topic and will maintain a watching brief in relation to this document.			
REP1-086 086.48	<p><b>9.5 APP-222 J17 Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries</b></p> <p>The MMO defers to Historic England and maintains a watching brief on any DML updates required.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response.
REP1-086 086.49	<p><b>9.6 APP-223 J18 Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol</b></p> <p>9.6.1 The MMO has some minor requests in relation to the layout of the document, so those sections are clearly defined:</p> <p>Relevant legislation and any updated guidance should be referred to within this document as part of a separate section.</p> <p>Noise Abatement Measures are considered in their own section. Applicants reporting</p>	<p>The Outline MMMP has been updated at Deadline 2 (J18/F02), and the Applicants have considered these additional requests from the MMO. The Applicants have provided responses to the individual requests below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Relevant legislation and any updated guidance should be</li> </ul>	The MMO has provided further comment in Section 5.5 of this document.	The Applicants note the response and have provided further comments in Section 5.5 (Table 2.5) of this document.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>should be a standalone section; and Injury to marine mammals from elevated underwater sound should also be a standalone section.</p> <p>The MMO notes in point 1.5.6.2, the Applicants mention the necessary lines of communication for implementing the Outline MMMP for high order UXO clearance may be varied and updated post-consent in the detailed MMMP(s). The MMO welcomes early engagement on any possible marine licence variations.</p>	<p><i>referred to within this document as part of a separate section</i></p> <p>The Applicants confirm that relevant legislation and guidance has been clearly set out in section 1.2 of the Outline MMMP (updated at Deadline 2).</p> <p><i>"Noise Abatement Measures are considered in their own section":</i> The Outline MMMP has been updated at Deadline 2 to include <i>"Secondary mitigation measures for high order UXO clearance"</i> under Appendix A. This section of the Outline MMMP provides a summary of measures currently available or likely to be available in the future, which could be applicable to further reducing residual effects from underwater sound from high order UXO clearance if required under separate marine licences. Please see the response above to REP1-086.086.7 regarding the removal of high order UXO clearance from the draft DCO (Document reference C1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Applicants reporting should be a standalone section":</i> The Applicants confirm that the section "Reporting" sets out the</li> </ul>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>approach to submission of the mitigation compliance report to the MMO, and an overview of the details that will be included in this report. The Applicants have set out this section as a standalone section in section 1.7 of the Outline MMMP (updated at Deadline 2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Injury to marine mammals from elevated underwater sound should also be a standalone section”: The Applicants highlight that technical background information regarding the potential for injury from elevated underwater sound during UXO clearance has been set out in section 4.11.2 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the Environmental Statement (APP-050). This has been signposted to in paragraph 1.1.3.3 of the updated Outline MMMP (updated at Deadline 2). The Applicants believe therefore that to repeat this information in the Outline MMMP is unnecessary, and would take away from the key focus of the Outline MMMP (to set out the protocol for mitigation at the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms:</li> </ul>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>Transmission Assets). this information in the Outline MMMP is unnecessary, and would take away from the key focus of the Outline MMMP (to set out Further, the Applicants highlight that Figure 1.2 of the Outline MMMP provides an example of a sequence of events and the necessary lines of communication for implementing the Outline MMMP for UXO clearance. The approach to communication will be reviewed and finalised post-consent and set out in the detailed MMMP(s). However, this would not be considered a variation to the marine licence, and therefore the wording (set out in paragraph 1.5.6.2 of the Outline MMMP (J18/F02), and paragraph 1.6.6.2 of the updated Outline MMMP (updated at Deadline 2)) has been updated to remove any potential confusion on this.</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.50	<p><b>9.7 APP-224 J19 Outline offshore operations and maintenance plan</b></p> <p>9.7.1 Please see comments relating to Condition 11 in Section 10.5 of this document.</p> <p>9.7.2 The MMO notes that in the event of unexpected maintenance activities that are not included in Table 1.1, the Applicants have stated they would discuss the marine licence requirements and work with the MMO to determine if the works required are listed under the marine licence as submitted by the Applicants for the Transmission Assets Application, or if a new marine licence would be required. The MMO welcomes this recognition.</p> <p>Table 1.1 should be updated to make it clear where the activity was assessed within the ES, where a marine licence is required or not and where consultation is required with MMO/any other statutory bodies/interested parties.</p> <p>9.7.4 The MMO notes that unexploded ordnance is not part of the O&amp;M activities is this correct. If so, please make it clear within Table 1.1.</p> <p>9.7.5 For any cable repairs the maximum volume and footprint should also be included in Table 1.1.</p>	<p>9.7.1 : The Applicants note this comment. 9.7.2, 9.7.3 and 9.7.5 – 9.7.8: The Applicants note these comments and will engage with the MMO on the updates required to the Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) (APP-224) with the aim of submitting an updated Outline OOMP at Deadline 3.</p> <p>9.7.4: Clearance of unexploded ordnance (UXO) has not been assessed as an O&amp;M activity. This will be made clear in the updated Outline OOMP at Deadline 3.</p> <p>9.7.2 9.7.8 (Marine Archaeology): Marine archaeology activities have not been assessed as O&amp;M activities. Most of the archaeological work set out in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (APP- 222) will be undertaken in the pre-construction and construction phases. Monitoring of Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) undertaken in the O&amp;M phase, where required, would typically use</p>	<p>The MMO has provided further comments in Section 1.1 and 2.9 of this document.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicants response in Table 2.2; Sections 1.1 and 2.9 of this document.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>9.7.6 The MMO requests confirmation within Table 1.1 of the impact from jack up barges including footprint for the jack up and any anchoring.</p> <p>9.7.7 The maximum parameters of the cable protection should be stated within Table 1.1 and not just referred to in other documents. The MMO advice that the MDS parameters for the project should be revised to only include cable/scour protection anticipated to be installed during construction within the MCZ, and within 10 years of construction outside the MCZ. All other cable protection after this date, within the MCZ require a new marine licence.</p> <p>9.7.8 The MMO also requests if any other O&amp;M activity has been assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine Archaeology</li> <li>• Use of artificial lighting</li> <li>• Recovery of dropped objects</li> <li>• Seabed preparation activities as a result of jack-up operation</li> </ul>	<p>geophysical survey data captured for other purposes and may be considered exempt from requiring a marine licence. If there is an unforeseen archaeological activity that takes place during the O&amp;M phase, for instance following the discovery of an unknown archaeological receptor that requires further investigation, the Applicants would discuss any marine licence requirements with the MMO.</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.51	<p><b>9.8 APP-225 J20 Offshore In Principal Monitoring Plan (IPMP)</b></p> <p>9.8.1 The MMO has reviewed the commitments made by the Applicants in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 and welcomes the inclusion of these commitments within the DCO Schedule conditions.</p> <p>The MMO is largely content with the proposed monitoring but will maintain a watching brief on monitoring discussions with other interested parties.</p> <p>9.8.3 The MMO requests that any residual effects are included in the document.</p> <p>9.8.4 The MMO requests an update to make clear, along with justification that no monitoring is planned for Applicants' fish and shellfish ecology, marine mammals.</p> <p>9.8.5 A commitment should be made to sharing data, including submitting monitoring reports to the Marine Data Exchange as part of Section 1.4.2.</p> <p>9.8.6 Section 1.5.2 should be expanded to include the</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment and will engage with the MMO on the updates required to the Offshore In-principal Monitoring Plan with the aim of submitting an updated Offshore In-principal Monitoring Plan at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The MMO notes that an updated IPMP will be submitted at Deadline 3 and we will review this submission and provide a response at Deadline 4 or 5.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response and welcome comments at Deadline 4 or 5.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>different stages of the project (e.g. pre- construction, construction and O&amp;M phase etc.).</p> <p>The MMO also requests that the tables are updated to include the phase of the project where the monitoring will take place.</p>			
REP1-086 086.52	<p>9.8.8 In addition to the comments regarding the IPMP, the MMO would like further information included within the IPMP.</p> <p>9.8.9 The MMO is currently undertaking a project on the standardisation of offshore wind post-consent monitoring data. This project aims to standardise the collecting and reporting of offshore wind environmental monitoring data in English waters, for receptors/monitoring techniques where a widely recognised standard for monitoring already exists, and to implement this approach in post-consent monitoring for wind farms in English waters.</p> <p>9.8.10 The MMO has engaged a range of stakeholders, including SNCB's, industry, and Renewable UK to identify standards, and are currently finalising a list of agreed standards across 6 receptors: marine mammals, underwater noise, ornithology,</p>	See the Applicants response to row REP1- 086 086.51 above.	<a href="#">The MMO notes that an updated IPMP will be submitted at Deadline 3 and we will review this submission and provide a response at Deadline 4 or 5.</a>	The Applicants note the MMO's response to the offshore IPMP (REP3-032) and highlight the additional updates made to the offshore IPMP and submitted at Deadline 4 (J20/F02). The Applicants welcome the MMO's comments at Deadline 5.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>fish and shellfish, benthic and geophysical monitoring.</p> <p>This will make it easier to compare and collate monitoring data from different projects, and ensure we get the most value out of monitoring. It will also ensure that developers know what is expected of them in terms of monitoring and add weight to previously agreed standards (e.g. NEs Best Practice Guidance). Standardisation will only be applied where an agreed standard already exists, and standardisation will deliver benefits.</p> <p>9.8.12 The final list of standards is expected to be agreed in 2025. These will then become the default approach to post-consent monitoring of these receptors. We request that the IPMP be updated to reference this project, where any of these 6 receptors are applicable. The project can be referenced as (MMO Standardisation of Offshore Wind Post-Consent Monitoring, forthcoming). This should be included in section 1.4.2.</p> <p>9.8.13 The MMO also requests that section 1.4.2 includes a general commitment to ensuring that any standards or best practice adhered to during monitoring is outlined clearly within the relevant monitoring reports.</p> <p>The MMO will engage with the Applicants to ensure that this</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	reference is included, and agreement can be made prior to the next deadline.			
REP1-086 086.53	<p><b>9.9 APP-226 J21 Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan</b></p> <p>9.9.1 The MMO defers to the MCA and NE in relation to their statutory duties on the information within this document and will keep a watching brief on any concerns raised.</p> <p>9.9.2 The MMO notes that within Chapter 3, the maximum number of vessels for the maximum design parameter for tug and anchor is 3, however, within APP-227, the maximum number of vessels is 4. Please can the Applicants confirm the maximum number of vessels for the maximum design parameter.</p> <p>The MMO notes that within Chapter 3, the design envelope considers helicopters and inspection drones, however, these are not included within Table 1.2 or Table 1.3. Please can the Applicants confirm the vessel requirements during offshore operation and maintenance phase.</p>	<p>The Applicants note that the MMO defers to the MCA and Trinity House as the statutory consultees for shipping and navigation matters.</p> <p>The Applicants have responded to each of the MMO points below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9.9.2: the Applicants confirm that the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for number of tug / anchor handling vessels is three, comprising two for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and one for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm. Document J21 Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (APP-226) Table 1.2 mistakenly indicates the MDS is four tug / anchor</li> </ul>	<p>The MMO will maintain a watching brief of comments submitted by Trinity House and MCA at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>9.9.4 The Applicants have stated up to a total of 30 construction vessels on site at any one time (including tug/anchor handlers, cable lay vessels, guard vessels, survey vessels, seabed preparation vessels, Crew Transfer Vessels (CTVs) and cable protection installation vessels), however, the maximum number of vessels is 31. Please can the Applicants confirm the total number of construction vessels on site at any one time.</p>	<p>handling vessels (column six of the table). The number of tug / anchor handling vessels by project is correct (columns one and four), which is also consistent with the MDS provided in the Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) (APP-057) Section 1.6.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9.9.3: The document J21 Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (APP- 226) is used for management and safety of marine vessels and their operations for the Project. Whilst aerial traffic such as helicopters and drones may be used for the Project, they are not influential of marine traffic management and are not considered within this document.</li> <li>9.9.4: Like the response in 9.9.2 above, Table 1.2 of APP-226 mistakenly lists a total of four tug/anchor handling vessels instead of the correct total of three. The resulting MDS for maximum total number of vessels is therefore 30, not 31. The sub-totals are correct for each project (columns 2 and 4), i.e., 19 for the Morgan Offshore</li> </ul>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		Wind Project and 11 for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm. The Applicants will provide an updated Outline VTMP at Deadline 3.		
REP1-086 086.54	<b>9.10 APP-227 J22 Dredging and disposal - site characterisation plan</b> 9.10.1 The MMO may provide further comments on this document at Deadline 2 or 3.  The MMO notes that the disposal site has been created, IS156 Morgan and Morecambe, this should be referenced in the DMLs as set out within Section 10.4 below.	The Applicants note that the MMO may provide further comments on the Dredging and disposal - site characterisation plan (APP- 227) at Deadline 2 or Deadline 3.  The Applicants have responded to the point regarding updates to the draft DMLs in row REP1-086 086.61 above.	<a href="#">The MMO is still reviewing this document and will provide comments at Deadline 4.</a>	The Applicants note this response and welcome comments at Deadline 4.
REP1-086 086.55	<b>9.11 APP-228 J23 Cable Statement</b> 9.11.1 The MMO notes that the cable site selection will depend on factors such as the design parameters and site-specific environmental or engineering constraints. The MMO will maintain a watching brief and provide comments at Deadline 2 if necessary. 9.11.2 The MMO notes that the Applicants have committed to e extent	The Applicants have responded to each of the MMO points below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9.11.1: The Applicants note this comment.</li> <li>9.11.2: The overall cable protection parameters are outlined in Table 3.7 of Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the</li> </ul>	The MMO has provided further comments in Section 5 of this document.	Please refer to responses to comments in Section 5.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>of cable protection to 10% across the overall route, a reduced level of cable protection of up to 3% in the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone. However, within Chapter 3, the Applicants stated that 'The cable protection parameters have been reduced Morgan Offshore Wind Project from 20% to 10% across the overall route with 3% contingency for cable protection in the Fylde MCZ and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm from 15% to 10% across the route with 3% contingency for cable protection in the Fylde Please can the Applicants confirm the overall cable protection parameters.</p> <p>The MMO notes that the Applicants has stated that es will involve sandwave clearance and full consideration on applicants' mitigation of impacts towards benthic communities and ated sites should be considered. The MMO defers to NE in relation to this.</p> <p>9.11.4 The MMO notes that up to six offshore export cables will be required (up to four for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and up to two for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm). The Applicants refer to these as 'permanent' features of the offshore infrastructure. The MMO raises concerns about the use of the word 'permanent'. At this stage the current understanding is that all infrastructure would be removed at the decommissioning stage. Please clarify the</p>	<p>Environmental Statement (F1.3/F03) In summary, cable protection may be required for up to 10% of the whole route, with 3% contingency for cable protection in the Fylde MCZ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9.11.3: The Applicants note this comment.</li> </ul> <p>9.11.4: The Applicants use of the term 'permanent' in paragraph 1.3.2.1 of the Cable Statement (APP-228) "The permanent offshore infrastructure for the Transmission Assets includes the offshore export cables" simply reflects that the export cables comprise the only infrastructure offshore that would be in place permanently over the life of the project in comparison to offshore infrastructure that would be deployed through the construction phase, such as cable installation tools and vessels that interact with the seabed such as a jack- up vessel. At the end of the lifetime of the project, the offshore infrastructure would be decommissioned in accordance with the Decommissioning Programs approved under the Energy Act 2004 (as secured in</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	use of 'permanent'.	requirement 21 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (Document reference C1)).		
REP1-086 086.56	<p><b>10 Additional comments on DCO/DML</b></p> <p><b>10.1 General comments</b></p> <p>10.1.1 The MMO has reviewed the DCO/DML and has set out more specific comments below. If comments have been raised on Schedule 14, it should be assumed that similar comments relate to Schedules 15, 16 and 17 unless otherwise stated.</p> <p>The MMO may provide further minor comments at Deadline 3 and will continue to discuss these with the Applicants.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has provided comments in Section 4.1 of this document.	Please refer to responses to comments in Section 4.1.
REP1-086 086.57	<p><b>10.2 Schedule 2 Requirement 1 – Time limits/Lifespan</b></p> <p>10.2.1 The MMO has noted that on some offshore windfarms that the ES has not assessed several years during the Operation and Maintenance (O&amp;M) phase.</p> <p>10.2.2 This is not the case for the Project. However, the MMO wanted to highlight to the ExA and SoS that there may be a benefit to including an end date of the O&amp;M phase within the DCO and DML in relation to the lifespan of the project to ensure that any repowering etc. would be subject to a new consent or variation. The MMO notes that Marine Licences have end dates for all construction and maintenance activities and there is a clear</p>	<p>The Applicants approach to EIA which includes setting out an assumed operational lifespan of the Transmission Assets is a standard approach to assessment. The Applicants are not aware of other offshore windfarms that have taken a different approach to their ES.</p> <p>The Applicants do not consider there to be any justification to specify within the DCO or deemed marine licences an end date for the operation and maintenance activities. The Applicants confirmed at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (REP1-035)</p>	<p>The MMO would highlight that this is a recent comment raised by consultees.</p> <p><a href="#">The MMO is reviewing the Applicants comments and will provide a response in due course.</a></p>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>line when a new consent is required.</p> <p>The MMO is still discussing a position internally and may provide further comments ExA and SoS for consideration during the Examination.</p>	<p>that it is not standard practice to include a time limit within a DCO on the operational lifetime of a project and that, whilst the Transmission Assets will in practice be limited by the operational lifetime of the Morgan Offshore Wind: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets, the Transmission Assets have been considered to be permanent infrastructure, and are assessed within the ES as such, (although the wind farms will be decommissioned at the end of their lifetime).</p> <p>The DCO and DMLs already include sufficient controls over operation and maintenance activities and decommissioning through the various requirements, conditions and management plans. In particular, in relation to offshore activities, the Applicants note that an outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) (APP-224) has been submitted with the Application and Condition 11 of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1) requires operational and</p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
		<p>maintenance activities to be carried out in accordance with the approved OOMPs for each project. Any offshore activities falling outside of this would require further discussion with the MMO and where necessary, a further marine licence would be sought. This approach reflects that taken for other offshore wind farm DCOs, including most recently, the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Order 2025 (the Rampion 2 DCO).</p>		
REP1-086 086.58	<p><b>10.3 Schedule 1 Part 2 Article 6 Benefit of the Order</b></p> <p>10.3.1 The MMO would welcome an update to Article 6 (12) however this does not remove the position that the DML should be removed from Article 6.</p> <p>10.3.2 As a matter of public law, the MMO does not believe the Order can contain a provision transfer of Benefit of the DML as is being proposed. PA 2008 Section 120(3) should read against Section 120(4) and Part 1 of Schedule 5, which the MMO believes limits what the Order can contain to provisions which deem a marine licence to be granted under the order and to the conditions that should be deemed attached to that licence. The MMO does not consider this</p>	<p>The Applicants have set out their position clearly in their response to the MMO's relevant representation (PDA-013). The Applicants further note that its position that it is appropriate and necessary to include the ability to transfer or grant the whole of each DML within Article 6 is supported by the decision on the Rampion 2 DCO. During the Examination of the Rampion 2 DCO, the MMO put forward their position on the transfer of the benefit article and asked the Secretary of State to make a clear determination on the matter. Both the ExA Recommendation Report and the Secretary of State</p>	<p>The MMO has provided further comments that were not submitted within the Rampion 2 Examination within this examination and believes the DML should be excluded. The MMO understands this is likely to be an agree to disagree position and that it is for the ExA and SoS to provide further decision in relation to the additional comments.</p> <p><a href="#">The MMO is submitting comments on the Rampion 2 decision into the North Falls Examination on 15 July 2025 and will provide further comments at Deadline 4.</a></p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and refer the MMO to their response at section 4.2.1 above. The Applicants have reviewed the comments submitted into the North Falls Examination and do not believe that these raise any new considerations for the Applicants beyond those responded to in the documents referred to at section 4.2.1 above.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>to be sufficiently wide as to allow the inclusion of provisions which transfer the Benefit of the Order.</p> <p>10.3.3 If the Order cannot contain a DML transfer provision for the reasons set out, then it cannot exclude Section 72 of Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA) in the way proposed as Section 120(5) is limited to applying/modifying/excluding only those statutory provisions which relate to any matter for which a provision may be made in the order.</p> <p>10.3.4 The reason that the DCOs only deem the Marine Licence to be granted, rather than bringing the DML into the DCO as it does for other permissions under s33 of the PA 2008 is because the MMO was considered to be the expert in this area (see PINS note Annex 11 - MMO). The MMO questions why now is the SoS best placed to consider the implications of the marine licence being transferred and what might need to change?</p> <p>10.3.5 Therefore, the provision in paragraph (3) should not extend to the DML. The Order and the DML are not the same thing and so this provision does not extend to the DML, and references to the undertaker in the DML will stay as is.</p> <p>Whilst the mechanism is different, what falls out of the DCO process is a marine licence</p>	<p>Decision Letter for the Rampion 2 DCO support the Applicants' position. Specifically, the Applicants point to section 7.4 of the Recommendation Report and paragraph</p> <p>6.23 of the Decision Letter. Paragraph</p> <p>6.23 of the Decision Letter states:</p> <p><i>"The MMO stated at the ISH2 [REP4-072] that it wanted the Secretary of State to consider this a test case of its argument. The ExA sets out its assessment in detail [ER 7.4.4 et seq]. The Secretary of State has considered the MMOs position.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Secretary of State agrees with the ExA that Article 5 should be retained because it does not just deal with deemed marine licenses, but all other licences required to construct the Proposed Development, and the purpose of the PA2008 is to provide a simple one- stop shop process for obtaining consent for national infrastructure projects and to have one legal instrument, the Recommended Order, as its control."</i></p>		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	granted under MCAA which is distinct and separate to the DCO itself. The DML falls back to the MMO to further manage/regulate under the provisions of MCAA once the DCO is granted, to be regulated alongside and consistently with all the other marine licences we might issue.			
REP1-086 086.59	<p>The MMO notes the Applicant's concern in relation to the undertaker being required by statute to transfer the transmission assets to an OFTO and cannot retain those in the same ownership as the generation assets and that this is done at the earlier stages and any delay in this process. However, even for granted offshore windfarm orders that include a form of the Benefit of the Order Article, the MMO has done multiple variations alongside the transfer of benefit to ensure the DML variation is issued as close to the approval from the SoS to ensure the correct undertaker is on the face of the DML and so that updates to the Marine Case Management System can be completed.</p> <p>10.3.8 With the addition of Article 6 (9) current wording this s the MMO concern as this is just a notice of the transfer and ot include an official variation request to the MMO as required Section 72 of the Marine</p>	<p>The relevant extracts of the Rampion 2 Recommendation Report and Decision Letter are appended to this response at Appendix B.</p> <p>The Applicants note that the Secretary of State included some additional drafting in Article 5 of the Rampion 2 Order requiring the Secretary of State to consult with the MMO and have regard to responses before giving consent to the transfer or grant to another person of the benefit of the deemed marine licences.</p> <p>The Applicants have updated Article 6(5)(b) of the draft DCO at Deadline 2 to align with this drafting (Document reference C1).</p>	Please see the response to REP1-086 086.58 above.	Please refer to the response at REP1-086 086.58 above.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>and Coastal Access Act 2009. The does not believe SoS can amend the DML once consented. fore, the MMO would have to use their regulatory power to ct a variation and vary the licence to ensure the correct aker is on the schedule, this could cause a potential delay the t as if the transferring of unvaried licence impacted on our ability rce during this time, the MMO may have to suspend the licence he MMO conducted the variation.transferring of</p> <p>10.3.9 This process could be delayed without direct contact to the MMO to vary the DML. In addition to this the MMO has statute to charge for any variations, and this is not covered by the current Article. This is an issue for two reasons, the Applicants would be getting work at a different rate as the consultation would be a statutory request from the SoS and this is not aligning with other marine licences as per PINS MMO advice note 11 and two this puts the emphasis for the MMO to vary the licence once n</p> <p>tified so there would still be an additional step for the MMO to take which adds in further timescales.</p> <p>10.3.10 This means that the process is not achieving the required streamlined version the Applicants is requiring and increases the work and risk to the process.</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.60	<p>10.3.11 With regards to Transfer of Benefit being included in other DCOs and setting a precedent, the MMO considers that this does not mean the provisions that are in other orders should be repeated here, especially if there is good reason why they should not be included. The MMO had model provisions, however we have moved away from them now as our stance has changed.</p> <p>10.3.12 The MMO also notes that it is not clearly explained within the Sheringham and Dudgeon Extension Recommendation report or Decision document on the inclusion of the Transfer of Benefit. The MMO acknowledges the ExA and SoS made amendments in Hornsea Four OWF recommendation report/decision and notes the only reasoning provided was to keep them consistent with other consents and the SoS removed the ability to transfer part of the DML.</p> <p>10.3.13 The MMO has provided further reasoning since that Examination including counsel comments from Rampion 2 Examination, that were incorporated into our relevant and written representations alongside further comments on the Planning Act.</p> <p>10.3.14 The MMO notes the most recent Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Consent Decision where the ExA and SoS discussed this topic. Although the Article</p>		Please see the response to REP1- 086 086.58 above.	Please refer to the response at REP1-086 086.58 above.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>remained in this DCO the MMO has provided further arguments within this section which have not been commented on by the Applicants.</p> <p>10.3.15 The MMO does not agree that because there is a provision in other DCOs that this is reason enough to include it in this one, as the drafting process is iterative.</p> <p>10.3.16 Even if the SoS approves a transfer of benefit for the DML the SoS has no power under the Planning Act 2008 to change the DML once consented. As set out in Schedule 6 Paragraph 2 (13) and Paragraph 5 (6):</p> <p>"The power may not be exercised in relation to provision included in an order granting development consent by virtue of paragraph 30A or 30B of Schedule 5 (deemed marine licence under Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009)."</p> <p>10.3.17 Therefore, the transfer and variation completed by the MMO is the right and proper way to amend the DML.</p> <p>10.3.18 As per Section 72 (7) &amp; (8) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA 2009):</p> <p>Variation, suspension, revocation and transfer</p> <p>(7) On an application made by a licensee, the licensing authority which granted the licence—</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>(a) may transfer the licence from the licensee to another person, and</p> <p>(b) if it does so, must vary the licence accordingly.</p> <p>(8)A licence may not be transferred except in accordance with subsection (7).</p> <p>10.3.19 The reason MCAA says if the MMO transfer the licence must be varied is because it recognises that it is necessary to vary on transfer to maintain the enforceability of the licence. If DMLs are transferred under Article 5, but cannot be varied by the SoS, the MMO would have to review and then vary under its powers under Section 72(3)(d) (MCAA 2009) should a variation be required and it may well have to consider suspending the licence whilst that variation takes place, depending on what the nature of the required variation would be.</p> <p>10.3.20 There is no good reason to move away from the process already set out in MCAA, save for operator convenience, and the MMO's strongest preference remains for the DMLs not to be made subject to the Transfer of Benefit provisions in the main body of the order, in full or in part.</p> <p>10.3.21 The MMO is not trying to be unduly difficult over the issue, and has not yet been in a position to use this route as for all other consented offshore wind farms,</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>even those with the more recent proposed wording, the u</p> <p>dertakers have provided a request to the MMO for a variation alongside the Transfer of</p> <p>Benefit request to the SoS, therefore the MMO is not entirely sure what consequences will be.</p> <p>10.3.22 The MMO believes there is more risk including the DML with the inclusion of Article 6 than managing it under the current process.</p> <p>10.3.23 The MMO's stance on the Transfer of Benefit of the Order still stands. The MMO requests that all references to the MMO and DML should be removed from Article 6 for Transfer of Benefit of the Order of the DCO.</p>			
REP1-086 086.61	<p><b>10.4 Schedule 14 Part 1, Paragraph 2(f) and Part 2, Condition 16(5)– Disposal sites</b></p> <p>10.4.1 It is standard to have the disposal site reference number on the DML. The MMO is hoping the information provided by the Applicants satisfies the disposal site designation, and the correct reference can be included within the DML prior to the end of examination.</p> <p>Should the disposal site reference be provided Paragraph 2a and Condition 10(5) should be updated to the following:</p> <p>... (f) the disposal of up to 1,080,000 cubic</p>	<p>The Applicants note the MMO's proposed drafting and will continue to discuss this with the MMO during Examination.</p>	<p>The MMO will continue discussion with the Applicants on this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p><u>metres of inert material of natural origin within the Order limits produced during seabed preparation for cable works and boulder clearance works at disposal site reference IS156 within the Order limits seaward of MHWS unless otherwise agreed in writing by the MMO.</u></p> <p><u>16(5) The undertaker must ensure that only inert material of natural origin, produced during the seabed preparation and cable installation, is disposed of within disposal site reference IS156 within the Order limits seaward of MHWS unless otherwise agreed in writing by the MMO.</u></p> <p>The MMO acknowledges that the accurate site reference may not be ready during examination, and if this is the case, the MMO will work with the Applicants to develop a solution for drafting the above conditions.</p>			
REP1-086 086.62	<p><b>10.5 Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 11 Maintenance of the authorised scheme</b></p> <p>10.5.1 Alongside comments in Table 1, 11 (3) should be updated to:</p> <p><i>'No maintenance works authorised by this licence may be carried out until an offshore operations and maintenance plan in accordance with the outline offshore operations and maintenance plan has been submitted to the MMO for approval in writing at least six months prior to commencement of the operation of licensed</i></p>	<p>The Applicants do not consider that condition 11(3) requires updating or that Condition 11(4) should be removed or amended. The drafting in 11(3) and 11(4) together makes clear that all operations and maintenance activities must be carried out as approved. As per RR-1414 1414.19 of the Applicants' response to the Marine Management Organisations Relevant Representation (PDA-</p>	<p>The MMO believe that the wording set out is clearer and is within other offshore windfarms. On this occasion the MMO is content with condition 11(3).</p> <p>However, the MMO stresses that it does not delay determining whether to grant or refuse approvals unnecessarily. The MMO makes these determinations in a timely manner as it is able to do so. The MMOs</p>	<p>The Applicants note that the MMO is content with condition 11 (3). The Applicants are updating the draft DCO at Deadline 4 (C1/F06) to amend the timescales in the Schedules 14 &amp; 15 Part 2 Condition 11(4) from 4 months to 6 months.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p><i>activities.'</i></p> <p>10.5.2 11(4) should be removed as per the comments within Table 1.</p> <p>In 11(4) '<i>All operation and maintenance activities must be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.</i>' should be updated to a sub return.</p>	<p>013) it is considered necessary and reasonable to include determination timescales for the MMO and sufficient flexibility has been included in the drafting to allow for extensions of time where required.</p>	<p>view is that it is for the developer to ensure that it applies for any such approval in sufficient time as to allow the MMO to properly determine whether to grant or refuse the approval application.</p> <p>The MMO believes it is for the SoS to decide on the inclusion of Condition11(4).</p>	
REP1-086 086.63	<p>10.5.4 In addition to this the following should be added as a new sub condition</p> <p><i>'(6) An annual maintenance report must be submitted to the MMO within one month following the first anniversary of the date of first operation of the authorised development (notified in accordance with Condition 28 (Completion of construction)) and every year thereafter until the permanent cessation of operation.</i></p> <p><i>(7) The annual maintenance report in sub-paragraph (6) must provide a record of the licensed activities during the preceding year, the timing of activities and methodologies used.</i></p> <p><i>(7) Every third year, the undertaker must submit to the MMO, within one month of the anniversary of the date of first operation of authorised development (notified in accordance with Condition 28 (Completion of construction)), a consolidated</i></p>	<p>The Applicants have updated Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1) to include these additional sub- paragraphs at Condition 11.</p> <p>However, the Applicants note that the timing for submission of the consolidated maintenance report has been set as 'every fifth year' to align with the Morgan Generation Assets draft DCO and the Morecambe Generation Assets draft DCO.</p>	<p>The MMO is content with this update and considers the matter closed.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and resolution of this matter.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>maintenance report which will—</p> <p>(a) include a review of licensed activities undertaken during the preceding five years with reference to the reports submitted in accordance with sub-paragraph (6) of this licence; and</p> <p>reconfirm the applicability of the methodologies and frequencies of the licensed activities permitted by this licence for the duration of this licence.</p>			
REP1-086 086.64	<p><b>10.6 Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 14 Notifications and Inspections</b></p> <p>The MMO requests that Condition 14(1)(b) is updated to ensure the undertaker submits the confirmation rather than those persons.</p> <p>The MMO requests that Condition 14(6) the notification is updated to 14 days. This is to allow coastal officers to have enough time to prepare and arrange coastal compliance inspections. This has been requested to be updated on all Marine Licences and all DMLs going forward and the MMO would note that the Applicants program of works will allow enough time for these notifications to be issued within the updated timescales. To assist with planning and resources this earlier notification would be welcomed even if any changes should occur to the activity start date.</p> <p>10.6.3 The MMO has recently had a meeting with Kingfisher and requests that</p>	<p>10.6.1 : The Applicants note that the drafting in Condition 14(1)(b) is standard and reflective of that included in offshore wind DCOs including most recently the Rampion 2 DCO. Condition 14(1)(b) requires the undertaker to ensure those specified in 14(1)(a) confirm receipt direct to the MMO which is logical given the undertaker is not itself the person in receipt of the copies of the licence.</p> <p>10.6.2 : The Applicants have updated Condition 14(6) to provide that 14 days' notice of commencement of licensed activities is given to the MMO local office.</p> <p>10.6.3 : The Applicants have updated Condition 14(7) as</p>	<p>10.6.1 The MMO would question on how those specified in 14(1)(a) confirm receipt direct to the MMO? The Management of post consent is through the Marine Case Management System and it is only the Applicants who can access this system. The MMO believes it is for the Applicants to provide confirmation of receipt when the Applicants share the copies with the relevant copies of the licence.</p> <p>This issue was not raised on Rampion 2 therefore was not discussed within that drafting.</p> <p>10.6.2 The MMO welcomes this update.</p> <p>10.6.3 The MMO welcomes this update.</p> <p>10.6.2 The MMO notes this</p>	<p>The Applicants have provided updated wording at Condition 14(1)(b) in the draft DCO (C1/F06) at Deadline 4 further to discussions with the MMO on this point. As for the remaining comments, the Applicants note this response and resolution of these matters.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>Schedule 10, Part 2, Condition 14(7), has a minor update and is updated to</p> <p>‘(7) The Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish must be informed of details of the vessel routes, timings and locations relating to the construction of the authorised scheme or part thereof by include the information in a notice via their portal (<a href="https://kingfisherbulletin.org/submit-notice">https://kingfisherbulletin.org/submit-notice</a>) and sent to <a href="mailto:kingfisher@seafish.co.uk">kingfisher@seafish.co.uk</a>—</p> <p>at least 14 days prior to the commencement of offshore activities, for inclusion in the Kingfisher Fortnightly Bulletin and offshore hazard awareness data; and</p> <p>as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than 24 hours after completion of the authorised scheme</p> <p>and confirmation of notification must be provided to the MMO within five days.’</p> <p>10.6.4 Condition 14(9) should be updated to ‘...at least fourteen days before any planned operations and maintenance works...</p>	<p>requested.</p> <p>: Regarding the MMO comment against Condition 14(9), the Applicants consider that 5 days notification is reasonable and proportionate and aligns to drafting in other offshore wind DCOs including most recently the Rampion 2 DCO.</p>	<p>condition was updated and welcomes this update.</p>	

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.65	<p><b>10.7 Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 16(1) Chemicals, drilling, debris</b></p> <p>The MMO requests Condition 16(1) is to be removed and Condition 18(1)(f) should be updated to the following:</p> <p>'...(f) an offshore environmental management plan covering the period of construction and operation to include details of—</p> <p>(i) a marine pollution contingency plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents during construction and operation of the authorised scheme in relation to all activities carried out;</p> <p>(ii) a chemical risk assessment, including information regarding how and when all chemicals are to be used, stored and transported in accordance with recognised best practice guidance and standards;</p> <p>(iii) a site specific chemical risk assessment for all chemicals that have a pathway to the marine environment used for the marine licensed activities, outside the course of normal navigation, to include;</p> <p>(i) <i>the function of the chemical;</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>the quantities being used and</i></p>	<p>10.7.1 : The Applicants have updated Condition 16 of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1) to remove sub-paragraph 1. The Applicants note that the Applicants have updated Condition 18(1)(f)(i) is already included in Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1).</p> <p>The Applicants have updated Condition 18(1)(f)(ii) of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (Document reference C1) and added Condition 18(1)(f)(iii) to reflect the changes requested by the MMO.</p>	<p>The MMO welcomes these amendments and has no further comments.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p><i>the frequency of use;</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>the physical, chemical, and ecotoxicological properties of the chemical, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the MMO. Chemicals present on the OSPAR List of Substances Used and Discharged Offshore which Are Considered to Pose Little or No Risk to the Environment (PLONOR) are exempt from this requirement;</i></p> <p><i>Submissions for approval must take place no later than ten weeks prior to use...'</i></p> <p>10.7.2 This would also include adding the following definitions to the 'interpretation' section of the DML:</p> <p><i>"pathway to the marine environment" open systems or closed systems that require top up.</i></p> <p><i>"chemicals" comprise both substances and preparations.</i></p> <p><i>"preparation" means a mixture or solution composed of two or more substances</i></p> <p><i>"substance" means a chemical element and its compounds in the natural state or obtained by any manufacturing process, including any additive necessary to preserve its stability and any impurity deriving from the process used,</i></p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p><i>but excluding any solvent which may be separated without affecting the stability of the substance or changing its composition.</i></p> <p>10.7.3 Based on the best available evidence to date, the MMO aims to create a revised, consistent and thorough approach to chemical consenting for OWF. This should proactively avoid last-minute delays and provide robust evidence regarding environmental impacts.</p> <p>10.7.4 The current approach for consented OWF projects requires chemical information to be submitted in an inconsistent manner across different projects. This results in many chargeable hours from both the MMO and Centre for Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas) for reviewing, assessing and requesting information from Applicants.</p> <p>10.7.5 Past DML's have referenced the Offshore Chemical Notification Scheme (OCNS) definitive ranked list of registered products (or otherwise incorrectly termed "approved list of chemicals") for offshore petroleum activities, stating that chemicals for use should be chosen from this list or consent sought where unable.</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	However, the use of this list for offshore petroleum activities does not remove the need for approval and reporting, as such, the use of this list for OWF should also not remove the need for approval and reporting. Noting that the list contains chemicals considered to be a threat to the marine environment (Chemicals of Priority Action) (as reported by OSPAR), the list should not be relied upon for assumption of safe use. The MMO has reviewed this past way of working, alongside new available evidence and is proposing an improved process. The approach being sought through this new condition is explained below.			
REP1-086 086.66	10.7.6 For all chemicals, written approval from the MMO must be obtained before their use, regardless of the risk of entering the marine environment. This is already standard practice and is conditioned by the requirement for a chemical risk assessment to be submitted to and approved by the MMO before the licensed activities or any phase of those activities may commence (usually held within the pre-construction plans and documentation of the DML conditions, e.g. the Project Environmental Management Plan). The condition generally reads as follows "chemical risk assessment including		The MMO welcomes these amendments and has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response and resolution of these matters.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>information regarding how and when all chemicals are to be used, stored and transported in accordance with recognised best practice guidance and standards". For completeness, the MMO outlines that this should include information on chemical use including function (meaning what the chemical will be used for, e.g., use within engines, paint, degreaser), methodology, quantity, and frequency of use.</p> <p>10.7.7 The MMO is proposing a change for chemicals with a pathway to the marine environment, where more information beyond the standard chemical risk assessment (above) is required.</p> <p>10.7.8 A more detailed chemical risk assessment (CRA) should be provided for any chemical with a "pathway to the marine environment", this includes chemicals used in both open systems, and closed systems where "top-up" is required (i.e., repeated use or maintenance). The CRA should include information on the physical, chemical, and ecotoxicological (bioaccumulation, biodegradability and aquatic toxicity) properties, and function of the chemical, alongside the quantities and frequency of use. This should be submitted to the MMO no later than 10 weeks prior to use. The review of this information and/or in consultation with Cefas, will</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>allow the MMO to make a determination on an approval for chemicals use by a project.</p> <p>10.7.9 The MMO is aware that concerns may be raised around the 10-week submission timescale proposed within the condition and provide the following justification. Based on the information intended to be assessed by Cefas obtained through this condition, the MMO has accounted for an 8-week-period for their review. The MMO further anticipates a 2-week period within which to review the submission, regard Cefas advice, and make a determination. This is deemed to be acceptable considering the current timeframe</p> <p>for which projects currently receive post- consent chemical discharges.</p> <p>10.7.10 The definitions to be included within the consents pertaining to the new condition wording, come from the definition for 'chemicals', 'preparation' and 'substance' given within OSPAR Decision 2002/2 on a Harmonised Mandatory Control System for the Use and Reduction of the Discharge of Offshore Chemicals.</p> <p>10.7.11 The MMO further includes clarity on where other regulations/ agreements exempt chemicals from this process.</p> <p>10.7.12 This approach should</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>exempt fluids used within gears and machinery (closed systems) from requiring a more detailed CRA, and disregards chemicals used on vessels and accommodation type chemicals (bleaches/toilet cleaners/grey water etc.), which are covered by alternative regulations.</p> <p>10.7.13 As the OSPAR Commission considers that the substances on the "OSPAR List of Substances Used and Discharged Offshore which Are Considered to Pose Little or No Risk to the Environment (PLONOR)" pose little or no risk to the environment and that they do not normally need to be strongly regulated they have been exempted from the need for approval.</p> <p>10.7.14 The MMO notes that the same CRA can be used for submission across both conditions, as long as they contain the necessary information and presented in a format allowing for clear distinction between the two requirements.</p> <p>10.7.15 The MMO is committed to supporting all the UK government's environmental goals, this includes both net zero targets and nature and biodiversity targets by promoting sustainable practices to protect and enhance the marine environment. This</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>new condition enables both, by ensuring proactive collection, assessment and management of evidence regarding chemical use post-consent.</p> <p>10.7.16 This is the MMO's position, and this has been set out in all current Examinations, however the MMO is open to condition placement and potential amended wording with discussion with the Applicants .</p>			
REP1-086 086.67	<p><b>10.8 Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 16 (10) – Dropped Objects</b></p> <p>10.8.1 The MMO requests this condition is updated to the following wording that has been agreed with the MCA:</p> <p><i>'16 (10) (a) Debris or dropped objects which are considered a danger or hazard to navigation must be reported as soon as reasonably practicable but no later than six hours from the undertaker becoming aware of an incident, to the relevant HM Coastguard Maritime Rescue Co-ordination Centre by telephone (add relevant number from this link HM Coastguard rescue coordination centre contact details - GOV.UK), and the UK Hydrographic Office email: <a href="mailto:navwarnings@btconnect.com">navwarnings@btconnect.com</a>.</i></p> <p><i>(b) All dropped objects including those in (a), must be reported to the MMO using the</i></p>	<p>The Applicants have updated Condition 16 of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (C01/F04) to incorporate these proposed amendments.</p>	<p>The MMO welcomes this amendment and has no further comments.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and resolution of these matters.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p><i>Dropped Object Procedure Form (including any updated form as provided by the MMO) as soon as reasonably practicable and in any event within 24 hours of the undertaker becoming aware of an incident, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the MMO.</i></p> <p><i>On receipt of notification or the Dropped Object Procedure Form the MMO may require relevant surveys to be carried out by the undertaker (such as side scan sonar) if reasonable t</i></p> <p><i>do so and the MMO may require obstructions to be removed from the marine environment at the undertaker's expense if reasonable to do so.'</i></p> <p>10.8.2 The MMO is currently reviewing the Dropped Object Procedure and there is a potential of a change of wording to align with Marine Directorate - <a href="https://www.gov.scot/publications/offshore-renewables-accidental-deposit-of-an-object-atsea-form-and-guidance/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/offshore-renewables-accidental-deposit-of-an-object-atsea-form-and-guidance/</a> (The MMO can PDF this webpage if requested by the ExA). This change should not alter the requirement by the Applicants or any changes to the DML as (b) identifies what should be submitted, it would just be a change in wording.</p> <p>10.8.3 The aim of this update is to ensure that reports must be made no later than 6 hours after the incident has been discovered for more major 'deposits' i.e.</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>those that may be hazardous to shipping and within 24 hours of the incident being discovered in all other cases. A defined list of major deposits cannot be provided due to the nature of the activity. If the Project is in doubt whether an object is a danger/hazard to navigation, then we would encourage them to assume it is and report it within 6 hours as per the condition.</p> <p>10.8.4 The MMO believes this change does not increase the reporting requirements as for major incidents/deposits the undertakers usually do contact the coastguard in less time than the 24 hours. All this updated condition is doing is ensuring it is clear for all parties on the expectations should an incident occur and does not believe this is burdensome.</p>			
REP1-086 086.68	<p><b>10.9 Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 20</b></p> <p>The MMO is reviewing this condition in light of the updates to UXO clearances.</p>	The Applicants note this comment.	The MMO has provided comments at Section 5 of this document.	Please refer to responses under Section 5 of this document.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
REP1-086 086.69	<p>Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 21 Marine Noise Registry (MNR)</p> <p>The MMO has liaised with the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and will provide an updated condition at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants will review the MMO and JNCC's drafting proposals following receipt at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The MMO is still in discussions with JNCC regarding MNR conditions, and we will provide a response at Deadline 4.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and welcome comments at Deadline 4.</p>
REP1-086 086.70	<p><b>10.11 Schedule 14 Part 2 Condition 23 Reporting of engaged agents, contractors and vessels</b></p> <p>The MMO believes this condition should be updated to include '<i>unless otherwise agreed in writing with the MMO</i>' in relation to 24 hours to allow post consent efficiencies when providing this information.</p>	<p>The Applicants have updated Condition 23 of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO (C01/F04) to incorporate this proposed amendment.</p>	<p>The MMO welcomes this amendment and has no further comments.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

**Table 2.7: REP3-085 – MMO’s comments on Annex 3.2 to Applicants’ Response to WRs from Statutory Consultees: Marine Management Organisation**

**6.2 - Table 2: MMOs outstanding Responses to the Applicants’ response to MMOs Relevant Representations**

The MMO has deleted anything that has been resolved or did not need a response at this deadline.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants’ response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-02	The MMO welcomes the Applicants commitment to remove high order UXO clearance from the DCO and DMLs. The MMO notes that the Applicants recognises that separate marine licences will be required should they need high order UXO clearance, and low order UXO clearance will remain within the DMLs. The MMO will review the updates to the DML submitted at Deadline 1 and provide further comments in due course. The MMO believes that the Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (Document reference J18) will also be updated and will provide comments upon review.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants will review any further comments provided by the MMO at Deadline 3. The Applicants have submitted an updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (J18/F02) at Deadline 2.	The MMO notes that the Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol was submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-026), and the MMO has provided further comments in Section 5 of this document.	Please refer to responses in Section 5 of this document.
RR-1414-03	The MMO welcomes the response to the Rule 9 letter and is currently reviewing the detail with our scientific advisors. The MMO will provide further comments at Deadline 3.	The Applicants note this comment. The Applicants will review any further comments provided by the MMO at Deadline 3.	The MMO have reviewed the Response to the Rule 9 letter (AS-067) and we have no further comments at this stage. <a href="#">We may provide further updates at Deadline 4.</a>	The Applicants note this response and welcome further updates at Deadline 4.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-18	<p>The MMO strongly considers that the activities authorised under the DCO and DML should be limited to those that are assessed within the EIA.</p> <p>The MMO considers that the definition of maintain should be updated to include reference to any activities that do not give rise to any new or different environmental effects to those assessed in the environmental statement.</p>	<p>The Applicants note that the definition of 'Maintain' has already been updated in Article 2 and in the DMLs contained in Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 (Document reference C1) in line with the Applicants' response to Natural England - Appendix A (PDA-015).</p>	<p>The MMO welcomes the inclusion within the DMLs and has no further comments.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and consider this matter closed.</p>
RR-1414-19	<p>The MMO acknowledges the Applicant's comments. The MMO has two concerns with timelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approval timescale (Schedule 14, Part 2, Condition 19(2) and similar conditions in Schedule 15, 16, &amp; 17 and throughout the DML).</li> <li>2. 4-month submission timescale throughout Condition 19 and throughout the DML.</li> </ol> <p>4 months has been standard in a number of offshore windfarms, especially round 3 projects. However, the MMO along with our consultees have noticed a change in the submission information and required rounds of consultation to ensure the MMO is confident to discharge the documents submitted.</p> <p>The MMO would highlight that this has been requested by the MMO since the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm Examination. Since this examination, there</p>	<p>The Applicants updated condition 19(1) of Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO at Deadline 1 (Document reference C1) to provide that all pre-construction documents listed in condition 18 must be submitted for approval at least 6 months before the intended commencement of licensed activities. This drafting update was already made in response to Natural England's Relevant Representation (PDA- 015).</p> <p>As per RR-1414 1414.19 of the Applicants' response to the Marine Management Organisation's Relevant Representation (PDA-013) it is considered necessary and reasonable to include determination timescales for the MMO and sufficient flexibility</p>	<p>The MMO welcomes the amendments in relation to submissions date of six month and considers this matter agreed.</p> <p>The MMO welcomes the proposed flexibility but still has outstanding concerns with the inclusion of a determination date as per our previous comments.</p>	<p>The Applicants are updating the timescales of this condition in the Deemed Marine Licences (Schedules 14-17) of the draft DCO (C1/F07) at Deadline 4 following ongoing discussions with the MMO.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>is even more of a concern that more and more time is being spent working to determine documents submitted. There are a number of instances on projects where the submission at the four- or six- month date does not include everything that is required or within the outline plans and is more of a compliance requirement to ensure something is submitted in line with the consent. This leads to requests for additional information and multiple rounds of consultation and updates to ensure enough information is provided for the MMO to make a determination. It is becoming increasingly difficult to review the first submission of a document and therefore delays to the determination could cause significant impact to both the MMO and the Applicants.</p> <p>In relation to precedented timescales within other offshore wind DCOs. The MMO, of course, accept that there is a need for consistency in decision making. However, a decision maker is not bound by previous decisions and can depart from them where there is good reason to do so.</p> <p>The MMO welcomes Condition 11 that extensions can be agreed but believes this is an additional step which could also take time to agree between parties.</p> <p>The MMO would reiterate that it does not delay approvals unnecessarily and believes more realistic timescales should be included</p>	has been included in the drafting to allow for extensions of time where required.		

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>to allow for the Applicants to account for this within their programming.</p> <p>The MMO also highlights that it is also unclear what consequences would result if this deadline was not met, and how that would impact on the MMO's regulatory function.</p> <p>The MMO believes there is clear evidence with projects increasing in size as part of this discharge process that 4 months is not enough time to discharge a document and the MMO requests that all timescales are updated to 6 months submission timescales and that Condition 19(2) is removed.</p> <p>However, without prejudice to this position, the MMO believes that if time scales are included within the DML for plans then these should be six months as standard, not four months. The MMO is open to discussions on which documents must be six months, and which documents could be four months, to take into account the concerns that the Applicants may have. The MMO will continue to work with the Applicants to advise on any plans or documents that could have a four-month timescale.</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-20	<p>The MMO acknowledges the difference proposed between Section 86 of the 2009 Act and the inclusion of this condition and notes the updated part (2) of the condition.</p> <p>However, maintains its position regarding Force Majeure, as it is not necessary to be included within the DMLs. It is not something that the MMO would include in standalone marine licences. The MMO questions on if the inclusion of this condition is allowing an unknown licensable activity (deposit) that has not been assessed.</p> <p>The MMO believes the Applicants response still does not refute that the use of 'any other cause' is a very broad statement.</p> <p>Conditions must be precise, which currently using this term, it is not precise and could cover anything, therefore we believe this condition should be removed.</p>	<p>The Applicants have set out their position at RR-1414 1414.20 of the Applicants' response to the Marine Management Organisation's Relevant Representation (PDA-013). The Applicants maintain that the drafting of this Condition is sufficiently clear and precise and is well precedented, noting that this drafting has most recently been retained in the Rampion 2 DCO.</p>	<p>The MMO is of the opinion that this issue will not be agreed throughout examination and may provide further comments in future deadlines.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response at section 4.8.1 above.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-22	The MMO notes that the Applicants have confirmed that any requirement for clearance of high order unexploded ordnance (UXO) will be subject to a separate marine licence and will not be included in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). The Applicants intends to update the draft DCO to clarify that no high order UXO clearance will be undertaken and that the number of permitted low order detonations will be detailed within each deemed marine licence. The MMO agree s with this approach, provided the required associated details e.g., location/habitat and potential impacts to benthic receptors because of confirmed UXO detonation are included with the marine licence application.	The Applicants confirm that amendments have been made to the deemed marine licences in Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 (Document reference C1) to remove high order UXO clearance.	The MMO has no further comments.	The Applicants note this response and consider this matter closed.
	The Applicants have also provided a response to clarify a query regarding the proposed construction scenario for the sequential construction (with a gap of up to four years) of the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm. It is the MMOs understanding that the worst - case scenario considered within the Environmental Statement (ES) relating to the construction activities associated with the Transmission Assets includes a development gap of up to four years and as such is appropriate. The Morgan and	The Applicants confirm the MMO's understanding in relation to how the Transmission Assets and Generation Asset DCOs could be brought forward. The Applicants further confirm it is committed to working collaboratively where practical and reasonable to so and refers to Annex 5.2 to the Applicant's response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 (REP1-039) for further information on	<a href="#">The MMO is reviewing these comments and will provide comments at Deadline 4.</a>	The Applicants note this response and welcome comments at Deadline 4.

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	Morecambe Array Projects may develop differently, and each entity is likely to pursue Project specific milestones regarding their connection to the national grid. However, the Applicants are committed to working collaboratively, where practical and reasonable to do so, for the transmission assets.	this.		
RR-1414-23	<p>The MMO notes that with regards to comment 4.3.5 in the document RR- 1414. The Applicants have provided an explanatory discussion of the shoreline impact assessment at the landfall site. The explanation provided is sufficient to understand the assessment and satisfied the previous request.</p> <p>The Applicants indicate a natural variability in beach level between 1- 3m, and hence define a target cable burial depth of 3m – as had been stated in the Environmental Statement (Volume 2 Chapter 1: Physical processes, paragraph 1.10.4.4) – and provides some explanation of the cause of this variability. The Applicants response highlights the spatial variability of the landfall site and the inconstant patterns of sediment transport and change – with a sediment transport divide located near the landfall site, migrating alongshore according to annually-varying wave distributions.</p>		The MMO notes that the Applicants has not provided a response for this comment. The MMO maintains our position.	<p>The Applicants provided their response at Deadline 3 as the following;</p> <p>In terms of shoreline retreat, the analysis undertaken by the Applicants, to inform the CBRA also confirms a trend of sediment accumulation and dune migration seaward, rather than significant shoreline recession, at the selected landfall site. This indicates a limited likelihood of future shoreline retreat posing a risk to the buried cables.</p> <p>The Applicants confirm that the potential for future shoreline changes, including the scenario of natural realignment and retreat, has been factored into the burial depth design. The design approach adopted incorporates a conservative burial DoL of 3.0m to</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>The MMO recognises that it is not reasonable to predict future beach changes in such conditions, and that the risk of cable exposure is a financial risk that the Applicants would be seeking to avoid. However, the discussion does indicate that “<i>The updated National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping (NCERM) (Environment Agency, 2024) indicates areas of recession at the landfall site, and ... the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)... is assigned managed realignment of natural features</i>”, and so the to complete the assessment the Applicants should indicate the maximum rate of shoreline retreat that could be anticipated and the resulting effect this might have on cable burial depth over the lifetime of the development i.e., to confirm their understanding of the risk of future cable exposure (necessitating reworking) under conditions of shoreline retreat; and whether the natural realignment is factored into the landfall location and burial depth design.</p>			<p>mitigate the risk of cable exposure due to future beach-level variations, including scenarios involving shoreline retreat.</p> <p>The Applicants consider that information provided on the detail around location and design of cable protection is appropriate support the conclusions of the environmental assessment and this will be captured in the updated Chapter 1: Physical Processes (APP-042) for submission at Deadline 5. In this case detailed numerical modelling would not be required. The Applicants also note that the conceptual approach was supported by a number of appropriate studies and modelling campaigns including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed project specific morphological seabed study (included assessment of historical datasets and modelling, ABPmer 2023)</li> <li>• Mona Offshore Wind Project</li> <li>• Morgan Generation (which included modelling of cable protection &amp; crossings)</li> <li>• Awel y Môr Offshore Windfarm</li> </ul>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
				<p>The Applicants are submitting the ABPmer report (Annex to Applicants response to MMO and NE submission at Deadline 3: Assessment of Seabed Level Vertical Variability for Morgan Offshore Wind Farm - Appendix C) at Deadline 4 (S_D4_19) to support the information provided in the Outline CBRA (APP-219) and the Outline CSIP (REP2-022) and the coastal processes assessment presented in Chapter 1: Physical Processes (APP-042). Moreover, a new commitment has been included to the Commitments Register at Deadline 4 stating that <i>"no cable/scour protection shall be permanently deployed in the intertidal area between MLWS and MHWS"</i> (see CoT133, F1.5.3/F05).</p> <p>The Applicants also highlight that a further new commitment has been made at Deadline 4 stating that <i>"As part of the detailed design process, micro-siting of the offshore export cables within the offshore export cable corridors will be considered where successful burial could pose a challenge or where a higher risk of remedial works such as external cable protection may be required."</i> (see CoT134, F1.5.3/F05)</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-24	<p><b>4.4.3</b></p> <p>The MMO would like to thank the Applicants for providing clarification regarding the origin of a fourth hearing category for fish, which was derived from Popper and Hawkins (2019). The MMO further notes that for the range of effect from vessel and construction noise, groups 3 and 4 fishes were modelled together using the appropriate thresholds from Popper et al. (2014) for the impacts of recoverable injury and temporary threshold shift (TTS) using 170 dB rms for 48 hours and 158 dB rms for 12 hours, respectively. The MMO considers this matter closed.</p> <p><b>4.4.4</b></p> <p>The MMO thanks the Applicants for confirming that Table 3.17 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology presents the modelled impact ranges for high and low order detonations for mortality and potential mortal injury in fish (all groups), rather than permanent threshold shift (PTS).</p> <p>The threshold of 229- 234 dB peak used in the modelling is appropriate.</p> <p>The MMO will confirm closure of this issue on review of the updated documents submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The MMO further notes that high order UXO detonation techniques have now</p>	<p>4.4.3 The Applicants welcome the agreement from the MMO that this matter is closed.</p> <p>4.4.4 The Applicants welcome the response to these points (as addressed in response to RR-1414 1414.24 in PDA-013) and awaits confirmation of closure.</p> <p>4.4.5 and 4.4.6: The Applicants welcome the MMO confirming that seasonal restrictions are not required for UXO clearance in the DCO.</p> <p>4.4.7 The Applicants welcome this response from the MMO.</p> <p>4.4.8 and 4.4.9: As per 4.4.5 and 4.4.6 above, the Applicants welcome the MMO confirmation that seasonal restrictions are not required.</p>	<p><b>4.4.4 The MMO believes this is largely resolved and will provide confirmation at Deadline 4.</b></p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and welcome confirmation of resolution at Deadline 4.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>been removed from the draft DCO, therefore only the mortality and potential mortal injury impact ranges for low order UXO detonation are now relevant to the assessment. The MMO agrees with the Applicants that the ranges for low order and low yield detonations are much reduced (&lt;147m). We are therefore content that in the absence of high order detonations, significant impacts to fish receptors are not likely to occur at a population level.</p> <p>The MMO will confirm closure of this issue on review of the updated documents submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p><b>4.4.5 &amp; 4.4.6</b></p> <p>The MMO thanks the Applicants for signposting to the table of qualitative impact ranges found in Table 1.7 of Volume 1, Annex</p> <p>5.2: Underwater sound technical report. Whilst the Applicants note that behavioural effects may occur and have potential to affect fish during spawning seasons, they highlight that the temporal overlap between UXO detonation and spawning periods is likely to be minimal because of the extremely short-term nature of the noise associated with UXO clearance activities (i.e. seconds). In light of high order UXO detonation being removed from the draft DCO, the MMO</p>			

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
	<p>is content that mitigation for low order and low yield detonation during the cod and herring spawning season is not required under the draft DCO and therefore no seasonal restriction is required.</p> <p>Should high order UXOs detonation be required, this would be licensed under a separate marine licence and further assessment will be undertaken at time of the licence application.</p> <p><b>4.4.7</b></p> <p>The MMO welcomes the Applicants considered response to our concerns raised on potential cumulative and inter-related impacts from the construction of Morgan.</p> <p><b>4.4.8 &amp; 4.4.9</b> have been addressed above.</p>			
RR-1414-25	<p>The MMO believes there are no outstanding issues related to shellfish ecology.</p> <p>The MMO will continue to maintain a watching brief in relation to any concerns on commercial shellfisheries and may provide comments in future responses.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome this response and note that the MMO may provide further comments at the future Deadlines in relation to their concerns on commercial shellfisheries.</p>	<p>The MMO notes that there are some minor comments for the Applicant to address in Section 1.4 of this document (SoCG).</p>	<p>Please refer to responses in Section 1.4 of this document.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-26	<p><b>4.6.1</b> The MMO welcomes the Applicant's response. The MMO is reviewing this internally and will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p> <p><b>4.6.2</b> The MMO welcomes this engagement and will maintain a watching brief on the discussions. The MMO has provided comments on the FLCP in Section 9.1 of this document.</p>	<p>4.6.1 : The Applicants acknowledge that the MMO may provide further response at Deadline 3.</p> <p>: The Applicants acknowledges the MMO's response and refers the MMO to its detailed response provided in REP1-086 086.44 above.</p>	<p>The MMO has provided further comments on fisheries monitoring in Sections 1.5, 3.4, and 3.8 of this document. <a href="#">The MMO will review the updated FLCP and provide comments at Deadline 4.</a></p>	<p>The Applicants note this response and welcome comments at Deadline 4.</p>
RR-1414-27	<p><b>4.7.2 &amp; 4.7.3</b> The MMO is still reviewing this information and will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The Applicants acknowledge that the MMO may provide further response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The MMO has provided a response in Sections 1.6, 2.8, and 5.5 of this document.</p>	<p>Please refer to responses in Sections 1.6, 2.8 and 5.5 of this document.</p>

Reference	Written Representation Comment	Applicants' response	IP submission	Applicants response at Deadline 4
RR-1414-33	The MMO welcomes the update to remove high order UXO clearances from the project. The MMO will review the updated document and provide comments Deadline 2 or 3.	The Applicants note that the MMO may provide further comments at Deadline 2 or 3 in relation to removal of high order UXO clearances from the project.	The MMO has provided a response in Sections 1.6, 3.5, and 5.5 of this document.	Please refer to responses in Sections 1.6, 3.5 and 5.5 of this document.
RR-1414-35	The MMO will maintain a watching brief on the assessments. The MMO would highlight that we are currently reviewing the impacted MCZ's in relation to our protection legislative requirements and may provide further comments at Deadline 3.	The Applicants note that the MMO may provide further comments at Deadline 3 in relation to their protection legislative requirements on the impacted MCZ.	The MMO has no further comments at this time.	The Applicants note this response.

**Table 2.8: REP3-085 – Comments on stakeholder’s deadline 2 submissions**

Reference	IP submission	Applicants’ response
<b>7.1 - Environment Agency (REP2-056)</b>		
7.1.1	The MMO notes that the EA agrees with the Applicants SoCG.	The Applicants note this response.
7.1.2	Mitigation for Otters will be covered under the Ecological Management Plan (EMP). The MMO notes a revised EMP has been submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-018) which includes updates to Otter mitigation in Section B2.6. The MMO will maintain a watching brief over these matters.	The Applicants note this response. An update to the oEMP was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-022) and welcome any comments where appropriate from the MMO on this matter.
<b>7.2 - Flyde Borough Council (REP2-057)</b>		
7.2.1	The MMO notes that Flyde Borough Council (FBC) is of the opinion that the ES does not include the information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development on the environment. However, the MMO recognises that the Applicants has submitted updates to the ES at Deadline 2 (REP2- 008, 010, 012, 014, & 048), therefore we defer further comment to FBC at Deadline 3. In addition, MMO has provided their own comments on the updated ES documents in Section 5 of this document.	The Applicants note this comment. A detailed response with regard to reasonable information included in the ES and associated appropriate conclusions has been provided in REP2-057.057.2, 057.4 and 057.5 of ‘Applicants’ Response to WRs from Statutory Consultees: Fylde Council (REP3-053).
<b>7.3 - Natural England (REP2-062 &amp; REP2-063)</b>		
7.3.1	The MMO notes that NE advises that unless there are further updates to ES chapters, and/or named plans, any responses and commitments made by the Applicants within these documents will not be secured and therefore will not necessarily be ‘pulled through’ to the post-consent phases. The MMO recognises the Applicants has submitted updates to the ES at Deadline 2 (REP2-008, 010, 012, 014, & 048), therefore we defer further comment to NE at Deadline 3. In addition, MMO has provided their own comments on the updated ES documents in Section 5 of this document. The MMO will continue to review comments and highlight if these should be included in the DML at future deadlines.	<p>The Applicants will submit updated versions of the Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology (APP-045) and MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019) at Deadline 5 to include clarifications made at previous deadlines as well as updated commitments. Please see the Applicants’ response to 2.11.2 above for updates to commitments made at Deadline 4 with respect to the Fylde MCZ. In addition, the following additional commitments relevant to benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology have been made for Deadline 4 and included in the Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3 /F05):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment that no cable/scour protection shall be permanently deployed in the intertidal between MLWS and MHWS; and</li> </ul>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment that as part of the detailed design process, micro-siting of the offshore export cables within the corridor will be considered where successful burial could pose a challenge or where a higher risk of remedial works such as external cable protection may be required.</li> </ul>
7.3.2	<p>The MMO notes that the NE does not agree with the conclusion of no likelihood of hindering the conservation objectives of the Fylde MCZ, which has been designated for subtidal sand and subtidal mud. Unless it can be demonstrated otherwise, the nature, scale and duration of impacts from lasting habitats change/loss from the placement of cable protection is likely to hinder the 'maintain' habitat feature conservation objectives of the site. NE advised the Applicants that the MCZ assessment should proceed to a Stage 2 assessment and provide a without prejudice MEEB case.</p>	<p>The Applicants maintain that cable protection and cable crossings installed as a result of the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarms: Transmission Assets will not affect the ability of the Fylde MCZ to achieve its conservation objectives. In regards to the effects upon the Fylde MCZ and the request to provide Without Prejudice Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB), the Applicants maintain that a Stage 2 MCZ Assessment and MEEB are not required.</p> <p>The Applicants' have however provided a Stage 2 MCZ Assessment, including a without prejudice, in-principle MEEB Plan, at Deadline 1 (REP1-059) and a without prejudice, Benthic Compensation DCO schedule to secure benthic compensation, should the Secretary of State deem it necessary, at Deadline 3 (REP3-066). The Applicants would highlight that they and Natural England are in agreement that strategic compensation measures (via a payment to the Marine Recovery Fund (MRF)) are likely to be the preferred and best method for the delivery of MEEB for the Fylde MCZ. The Applicants have therefore included a new commitment in the updated Commitments Register at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05) stating that should benthic compensation be required, the Marine Recovery Fund is the preferred and prioritised option, and the project-led options (set out in the MEEB and without-prejudice Benthic Compensation DCO schedule (REP3-056)) would only be considered where the Marine Recovery Fund option is not made available to the Applicants.</p>
7.3.3	<p>The MMO notes that the Risk and Issues log between NE and the Applicants now includes an additional tab for Benthic Compensation. NE have provided detailed comments on the MEEB In-Principal Plan alongside their Deadline 2 submission in Appendix J located within REP2-062. The MMO welcomes this.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome this comment.</p>
7.3.4	<p>NE has highlighted that the progression of strategic compensation has come about due to the extreme difficulties in delivering project specific benthic compensation.</p>	<p>The Applicants note this comment and confirm that they and Natural England are in agreement that strategic compensation measures (via a payment to the MRF) are likely to be the preferred and best method for the delivery of MEEB for the Fylde MCZ.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
7.3.5	<p>The MMO notes that NE acknowledge and welcome further reduction to the MDS for lasting habitat change/loss of the subtidal sand feature, as presented in Section A1.6.3 [REP1-059] which is due to the removal of a cable crossing within the subtidal sand feature. However, notes that the approach taken to determine the Maximum Design Parameters (MDS) within this document still assumes that cable protection requirements could occur wholly within either the subtidal sand or subtidal mud feature. NE has highlighted that without refinement, there would be an expectation that compensation measures for subtidal sand and subtidal mud features to the maximum extent of 26,400m<sup>2</sup> and 30,400m<sup>2</sup> for each feature respectively would be provided by the Applicants. The MMO notes that NE continues to advise that an accurate MDS and realistic worse-case scenarios for each feature should be presented and assessed for lasting habitat change/loss.</p>	<p>The Applicants have responded previously to the points raised by Natural England within RR-1601.43 of their response to Natural England (PDA-014) and within RR-1601.1.4 of their response to Natural England – Appendix I (PDA-024). Both of which are summarised below.</p> <p>Details of cable protection material and volumes for the Transmission Assets are provided in sections 3.12.6 of Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (REP2-008) with further details provided in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (REP2-022). The MDS for cable protection within the Fylde MCZ is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 4 cable crossings (up to 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> of cable protection for cable crossings, which will only fall within the subtidal mud feature in the west of the Fylde MCZ) (see Table 3.8 of the Project Description (REP2-008), Table 3 in the Outline CSIP (REP2-022) and Table A.5 of the Stage 2 MCZ Assessment (REP1-059)); and</li> <li>• a 3% cable protection contingency for ground conditions (26,400 m<sup>2</sup> of cable protection for the MDS of up to 6 cables which may occur within the subtidal sand and/or subtidal mud feature (the total cable protection MDS will not be exceeded between the two features)) as detailed in Table 3.7 of the Project Description (REP2-008), Table 3 in the Outline CSIP (REP2-022) and Table A.5 of the Stage 2 MCZ Assessment (REP1-059)).</li> </ul> <p>The MDS for cable protection within the Fylde MCZ is therefore 30,400 m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>A precautionary approach has however been taken for apportioning the MDS between the features of the Fylde MCZ, assuming the full area of cable protection could fall in to each feature. Therefore the MDS for subtidal sand is 26,400 m<sup>2</sup> (cable protection only) and the MDS for subtidal mud is 30,400 m<sup>2</sup> (cable crossings and cable protection).</p> <p>The use of cable protection for ground conditions (MDS of 26,400 m<sup>2</sup>), where required, will be further evaluated and considered post-consent in the CSIPs, following pre-construction surveys, secured as part of the Outline CSIP (REP2-022).</p> <p>The Applicants consider that a precautionary but realistic approach has been adopted for the MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019). The approach assumes that all of the long term habitat loss associated with cable</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>protection for ground conditions may occur within either the subtidal mud or subtidal sand feature. As outlined in the Outline CSIP (APP-220) (and now included as a commitment in the updated Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05)) as part of the detailed design process, pre-construction survey data will be used to inform the final routing of the cable and any micro-siting requirements to avoid areas where there is a higher risk of remedial works such as the need for external cable protection. At this stage in the consenting process, however, the Applicants are unable to refine these assumptions further. Following detailed design post-consent, the exact compensation requirements may be refined, in consultation with stakeholders, which would then inform MEEB compensation figures if it is deemed to be required by the SoS.</p> <p>The Applicants have also committed to limit deployment of cable protection without a new marine licence to the first two years of the O&amp;M phase within the Fylde MCZ, which is secured in the updated Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) submitted at Deadline 4 (J19/F02). In regard to the impact of cable protection on sensitive habitats the Applicants have commitment at Deadline 4, to benthic community recovery specific monitoring in the Fylde MCZ through pre and post construction benthic community sampling to monitor for temporal and spatial recovery and the potential colonisation by INNS on and in the vicinity of any hard substrate within the Fylde MCZ, which is secured in to updated Offshore IPMP (J20/F03).</p> <p>The Applicants provided a Stage 2 MCZ Assessment, including a without prejudice, in-principle MEEB Plan, at Deadline 1 (REP1-059) which updates the MDS for long term habitat loss (total value still as shown above) of each of the features to account for the cable crossing occurring only within the subtidal mud feature. It is not possible to provide further detail regarding the location of cable protection to refine the MDS before pre-construction surveys are undertaken.</p>
7.3.6	The MMO notes that NE advise, as with other recently consented projects which propose to have similar 'lasting' impacts to that of Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets, that the conservation objectives of the site will be hindered by the project alone. NE reiterates its advice that presenting impacts considered as a percentage of the whole MCZ is misleading given the size of the site, the lasting habitat change/loss impacts from the Transmission Assets combined	The Applicants have responded previously to the points raised by Natural England within RR-1601.45 of their response to Natural England (PDA-014). This response outlined the Applicants' use of the mitigation hierarchy when designing the MDS for cable protection. Consideration for routing of the offshore export cables in and around designated sites is provided in Section 4.3.2 of Volume 1, Annex 4.2: Selection and refinement of Offshore Infrastructure (APP-032) with the selected route through the Fylde MCZ considered in paragraphs 4.3.2.3 – 4.3.2.6 and 4.4.2.7. The Applicants have acted to avoid, reduce and mitigate the impact from

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	are still 30,400m <sup>2</sup> . Additionally, the most recent condition assessment for Fylde MCZ concluded that subtidal sand and subtidal mud were in a favourable condition. Whilst the cable protection is in situ, the extent and distribution attribute of the site features can neither be maintained or restored, nor can the impacts be considered temporary even if removal is secured at decommissioning.	<p>cable protection (as detailed in Table 1.13 within the MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019)) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in Table 1.13 of the MCZ Screening and Stage 1 Assessment Report (APP-019) and Table A.4 of the Stage 2 MCZ Assessment, the avoid principle was first applied through the Offshore Export Cable Corridor routing exercise which sought to identify the shortest route from the Agreement for Lease areas to the selected landfall location at Lytham St Annes, whilst avoiding environmental sensitivities, such as MCZs, as well as third-party/existing seabed users. The Offshore Export Cable Corridor routing exercise was driven by consideration of the guiding principles described in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives of the ES (APP-030) and The Crown Estate (TCE) Cable Route Protocol (TCE, 2021). The Fylde MCZ could not, however, be avoided entirely due to its north-south extent between the Generation Assets and the point of interconnection at Penwortham. Routing around the Fylde MCZ to reach landfall location at Lytham St Anne's was not feasible due to the existing cables that run east/west through the MCZ which would need to be crossed in the shallow waters between the east edge of the MCZ and the coast.</li> <li>Cable protection for ground conditions within the Fylde MCZ was reduced from up to 20% at PEIR for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets to 3% for use as a contingency only, noting the Applicants commitment (CoT54 of Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (REP3-013)) for cable burial as the preferred option of cable protection and minimum target burial depth of 0.5 m or greater, where possible, being acceptable within the Fylde MCZ to minimise need for external cable protection as detailed in section 3.1.1.7 of the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (REP2-022); and</li> <li>Cable protection for ground conditions within the Fylde MCZ was reduced from up to 15% at PEIR for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets to 3% for use as a contingency only, noting the Applicants commitment (CoT54 of Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (REP3-013)) for cable burial as the preferred option of cable protection and minimum target burial depth of 0.5 m or greater, where possible, being acceptable within the Fylde MCZ to minimise need for external cable protection as detailed in section</li> </ul>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>3.1.1.7 of the Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan (REP2-022);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The offshore export cable route has been designed to minimise the number of crossings with existing cables, and therefore long term habitat loss resulting from cable protection requirements, within the Fylde MCZ. The Applicants have made all possible endeavours to move the cable crossings outside the Fylde MCZ however, they are restricted by existing infrastructure and engineering constraints (e.g. the need to cross the existing cable at a 90 degree angle). As such, whilst it was possible to move the Morecambe offshore export cable crossings westward beyond the boundary of the MCZ, the Morgan offshore export cables must cross the Lanis 1 cable within the Fylde MCZ. Therefore, the Applicants have sought to reduce the parameters of the crossing, such as length and height, to minimise its impact as far as possible;</li> <li>The total potential long term habitat loss from cable protection within the Fylde MCZ was reduced from 0.16 km<sup>2</sup> (0.06% of the Fylde MCZ) at PEIR to 0.03 km<sup>2</sup> (0.012% of the Fylde MCZ);</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the Applicants have updated the Commitments Register at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3 /F05), a new commitment, drawn from the Outline CSIP (REP2-022), that as part of the detailed design process, micro-siting of the offshore export cables within the corridor will be considered where successful burial could pose a challenge or where a higher risk of remedial works such as external cable protection may be required. The Applicants have also committed to limit deployment of cable protection without a new marine licence to the first two years of the O&amp;M phase within the Fylde MCZ, which is secured in the updated Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) (J19/F02). This is in accordance with the amounts of cable protection as set out in the Project Description (REP2-008).</p> <p>As the ability of the Fylde MCZ to meet its conservation objectives applies to the whole MCZ the Applicants maintain that presenting the percentage of long term habitat loss in the context of the full MCZ is the most appropriate approach. The Applicants acknowledge that the extend of the subtidal sand and subtidal mud features will be reduced as a result of the Transmission Assets cable protection and cable crossing however this is a small proportion of the overall area of both features and this loss would not affect the ability of this habitat to continue to provide its key ecological functions and services.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		The Applicants' provided a Stage 2 MCZ Assessment, including a without prejudice, in-principle MEEB Plan, at Deadline 1 (REP1-059) and a without prejudice, Benthic Compensation DCO schedule (REP3-066) to secure benthic compensation, should the Secretary of State deem it necessary, at Deadline 3 (REP3-066).
7.3.7	The MMO notes that with regards to Biogenic reef – native oysters, NE refers the ExA to the published 'Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 Dogger Bank Strategic Compensation Plan' (April 2024). Here it was considered by the Round 4 Plan Level Benthic Compensation Steering Group including SNCBs, DEFRA and DESNZ, that Reef creation/enhancement is not considered to provide comparable ecological function and is therefore not an appropriate measure for sandbank compensation. NE therefore considers the same to be true for subtidal sand and subtidal mud systems within Fylde MCZ and provides no further comment on this as a potential measure.	<p>The Applicants note this comment and Natural England and the Applicants are in agreement that strategic compensation measures are the preferred and best method for the delivery of MEEB for the Fylde MCZ, the details of which, as far as known are outlined in the Stage 2 MCZ Assessment (REP1-059). Without prejudice, a Benthic Compensation DCO schedule to secure benthic compensation, should the Secretary of State deem it necessary, has also been submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-066).</p> <p>In line with other projects currently going through examination (e.g. Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm and Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (Generating Station)), the Applicants have, however, also explored a longlist of potential project-led MEEB options. Project-led measures have been included in the Stage 2 MCZ Assessment (REP1-059) and Benthic Compensation DCO schedule (REP3-066) to demonstrate that they have been thoroughly considered as part of the MEEB Plan however, as noted by the MMO, these project led measures are unlikely to deliver the same function at the location of the long term habitat loss/within the Fylde MCZ. However, it is important that the project-led options are retained, or such other compensation measure as is agreed by the Secretary of State, in case the Marine Recovery Fund option is not made available to the Applicants.</p> <p>To reinforce the Applicants commitment to the Marine Recovery Fund option, the Applicants have updated Commitments Register at Deadline 4 (F1.5.3/F05), to include a clear commitment that, should benthic compensation be required, the Marine Recovery Fund will be the preferred and prioritised option and the project-led options would only be considered where the Marine Recovery Fund option is not made available to the Applicants.</p>
7.3.8	The MMO notes that with regards to Bivalve seeding inside MCZ, NE recognises some bivalves will form part of the infaunal benthic communities of the MCZ it remains unclear what additionally this measure would provide, and therefore question this as being compensation for lasting habitat loss/change to subtidal sand and subtidal mud. In addition, the	Please see the response provided above in relation to comment 7.3.7.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	seeding of bivalves is associated with biogenic reef communities on mixed sediment and not subtidal sand and subtidal mud. The MMO notes that it was considered by the Round 4 Plan Level Benthic Compensation Steering Group including SNCBs, DEFRA and DESNZ, that Reef creation/enhancement is not considered to provide comparable ecological function to Annex I sandbank and is therefore not an appropriate measure for sandbank compensation.	
<b>7.4 - South Ribble Borough Council (REP2-066)</b>		
7.4.1	South Ribble Borough Council (SRBC) remains concerned that the proposal documentation remains incomplete, and that environmental assessment is inadequate as noted by several respondents including Fylde Borough Council (REP1-079 & REP2- 057).	The Applicants note this comment. A detailed response with regard to reasonable information included in the ES and associated appropriate conclusions has been provided in REP2-057.057.2, 057.4 and 057.5 of 'Applicants' Response to WRs from Statutory Consultees: Fylde Council (REP3-053).
7.4.2	SRBC also note the hours of construction have not been re-considered. The MMO notes that in the revised submission Environmental Statement Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register (REP2-010), commitment CoT18 mentioned working hours for the construction of the intertidal and onshore works components will be as follows: Monday to Saturday: 07:00 - 19:00 hours; and up to one hour before and after core working hours for mobilisation ("mobilisation period") i.e. 06:00 to 20:00. Both SRBC and Preston City Council (REP1-095) have suggested, in their opinion, more reasonable working hours to be 8am to 6pm. The Applicants rebutted this suggestion at Procedural Deadline A (PDA-026), but they seem to disregard Preston City Council's comments. The MMO will maintain a watching brief over this matter.	The Applicants note this comment.

---

## 3 References

Brandt M.J., Höschle C., Diederichs A., Betke K., Matuscheck R., Witte S. & Nehls G. (2013) *Far- reaching effects of a seal scarer on harbour porpoises, Phocoena phocoena*. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 23, 222-232.

### 8.1.1

Scottish Government. (2014) [Online] *Evaluating and Assessing the Relative Effectiveness of Acoustic Deterrent Devices and other Non-Lethal Measures on Marine Mammals*. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/evaluating-assessing-relative-effectiveness-acoustic-deterrent-devices-non-lethal-measures> [Accessed 03 July 2025].