

09 July 2021

Dear Mr Wainman,

**SCREENING AND SCOPING OPINION UNDER THE MARINE WORKS
(ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2007 (as amended)**

COLWYN BAY WATERFRONT COASTAL DEFENCE

I am writing further to your request for a screening and scoping opinion, dated 19 May 2021, made in accordance with The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended) ("The Regulations").

The purpose of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening procedure is to determine whether the proposed works require an EIA and submission of an Environmental Statement (ES). The purpose of the scoping procedure is to determine what information should be provided in the ES.

In reaching our Screening Opinion we have considered the proposed works against Schedule A1 and A2 of the above regulations. In reaching our scoping opinion we have had regard to the information provided in the "Colwyn Bay Phase 2b EIA Scoping Report", dated March 2021, and considered the requirements of Schedule 3 of the Marine Works Regulations. We have also consulted with the bodies that we consider have an interest in the project by reason of their environmental responsibilities, or local or regional competences, as required by the above regulations, and had regard to their comments.

Screening Opinion

It is our opinion that the works fall within the categories of project listed within Schedule A2, paragraph 69 of the above regulations ("*Coastal work to combat erosion and maritime works capable of altering the coast through the construction of, for example, dykes, moles, jetties and other sea defence works, excluding the maintenance and reconstruction of such works*"), and therefore must be considered in terms of its size, nature and location having regard to the relevant criteria listed in Schedule 1 of the above regulations.

We have carefully considered the views of the consultation bodies alongside the criteria as set out in Schedule 1 of the regulations, and have determined, based on the information provided; that the project has the potential to have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a statutory EIA is required.

We have come to this conclusion on the basis of the likely significant impacts of the project, specifically with regard to the large scale of the development which includes beach recharge consisting of the importation of up to 1,000,000 tonnes of material. In addition, based on the information provided it is not currently possible to rule out effects on various receptors and further clarity is required regarding the likely 'Zone of Influence' (ZoI) associated with the project. Based on the location of the project there is potential to affect sensitive environmental areas including sites classified under national legislation e.g. Traeth Pensarn Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and sites designated under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Further details are described in the scoping opinion below.

Scoping Opinion

This letter sets out the additional information that we consider necessary to be included and/or assessed in the ES for this Project.

Please note our scoping opinion is based on the information available to us at this time. The information provided is not a definitive list of the ES / EIA requirements and further information may be required following an application for this project, to ensure a full assessment is carried out.

This Screening and Scoping Opinion will be provided to all those bodies that were consulted and will be publicised on our website and on our Public Register.

The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended)

Scoping Opinion (SC2105)

Summary of the proposal

The proposal by Conwy County Borough Council to carry out coast defence works to improve the level of flood defences to Rhôs-on-Sea and the wider Colwyn Bay area.

The coastal defence works are anticipated to include:

- From Rydal Boat store to the southern boundary of Rhôs-on-Sea Harbour:
 - Minor repairs (e.g. re-pointing) to the existing sea wall;
 - Removal of remaining areas of existing rock revetment located against the sea wall in recharge areas for re-use elsewhere; and
 - Modification of outfalls as appropriate to enable them to continue operating with the raised beach levels.
- From Horizon Shine to the southern boundary of Rhôs-on-Sea Harbour:
 - Beach recharge involving the importation and placement of approximately 1,000,000t (~625,000m³) of dredged sand material between the Rhôs-on-Sea terminal groyne to the west and the Horizon Shine Kiosk to the east to bring levels up to match the design profile of the Phase 1 works (approximately 5mAOD); and
 - Improvements to the curved rock groyne adjacent to Rhôs-on-Sea Harbour.
- To the east of the Horizon Shine Kiosk:
 - The Scheme would also appropriately include for any ‘topping up’ of beach levels and the management/recycling of the existing beach that may be required between the Horizon Shine Kiosk and the Porth Eirias groyne.

The promenade improvement works are currently anticipated to comprise upgrading the promenade to enhance the experience to the general public visiting the promenade. The design is on-going, however, it is currently anticipated to include:

- The inclusion of a 2.2m wide pedestrian-only zone;
- 4m wide shared surface with health markers at 50m intervals;
- Designated picnic / seating areas;
- Activity zones;
- “Rhôs” feature letters and artwork;
- Pedestrian links across the highway & promenade;
- Intermediate links across promenade & shared surface;
- New surface finishes;
- Landscaping (including if appropriate planting / soft landscaping);
- Streetlighting; and
- Street furniture / features.

The Scheme also includes future management and maintenance actions comprising:

- Inspection, maintenance and repair of coastal defence structures;
- Inspection, maintenance and repair of Promenade and sea wall;
- Inspection, maintenance and repair of accesses, drainage, highways, lighting and other ancillary assets;
- Management of wind-blown sand;
- Maintenance of landscaping; and
- Beach management/reprofiling and small-scale re-nourishment as necessary.

Location

The Scheme 'Phase 2b' area currently comprises the existing seawall and adjacent sand and shingle of the Colwyn Bay to Rhôs-on-Sea beach along with the adjacent pedestrian promenade, the Promenade/West Promenade/Rhôs Promenade (highway) and in the central area the grassed embankment and Cayley Promenade to the west.

The approximate national grid references for the western and eastern Scheme boundaries are SH84248052 and SH85717903 respectively.

Consultation Responses Received

In considering the scoping report, the NRW PS consulted with various consultation bodies. The consultation bodies that responded are listed below:

- Natural Resources Wales Technical Experts (NRW TE)
- Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)
- Royal Yachting Association (RYA)
- Welsh Archaeological Trust (WAT)
- Cadw
- Ministry of Defence (MoD)
- National Air Traffic Service (NATS)

0. General comments

0.1. Marine and coastal guidance produced by NRW that may provide useful information to help with your project is available here:

<https://naturalresources.wales/guidance-and-advice/business-sectors/marine/?lang=en>

0.2. The ES submitted should demonstrate consideration of the points raised in this scoping opinion. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping opinion comments and how they are addressed in the ES.

0.3. The EIA must be undertaken by a competent person and the ES must include a competent expert statement.

0.4. Where possible, other environmental assessments should be coordinated with the EIA process. However, it is important to note that the Habitats Regulations

Assessment (HRA) and Water Framework Directive assessment (WFD), and any other assessment, are separate processes to the EIA.

0.5. Throughout the ES robust evidence should be presented so that the potential environmental impacts can be properly understood and evaluated; and appropriate measures identified to avoid, reduce or where necessary compensate for those impacts.

0.6. The ES must include:

- A Non-Technical Summary (NTS);
- A chart or map identifying where the activity will be carried out;
- A description of the likely significant effects of the project, whether direct, indirect, secondary, cumulative, transboundary, short-term, medium-term, long-term, permanent, temporary, positive and negative;
- A description of the methods used to make the assessment of the significant effects and difficulties encountered in compiling the information and uncertainties involved;
- A description of measures to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset identified significant adverse effects and proposed monitoring arrangements; &
- A description of the expected significant adverse effects of the project on the environment resulting from the vulnerability of the project to risks of major accidents or disasters.

0.7. The ES must consider any potential transboundary impacts where appropriate.

0.8. Early engagement with relevant stakeholders is encouraged. You are able to obtain further advice from NRW TE through the NRW Discretionary Advice Service, please see here: <https://naturalresources.wales/guidance-and-advice/business-sectors/planning-and-development/advice-for-developers/our-service-to-developers/>

0.9. The UK left the EU on 31 January 2020 – all legal obligations relating to compliance with environmental licences/permits and legislation will continue to apply. NRW on behalf of Welsh Ministers will continue to issue licenses in line with our current practice.

0.10. You must ensure that reference is made to and consideration of compliance with the UK Marine Policy Statement and the Welsh National Marine Plan and its associated policies within the submitted ES, alongside any further regional planning documentation. The published Welsh National Marine Plan can be found here: [Welsh National Marine Plan: document | GOV.WALES](#) Implementation guidance for the Welsh National Marine Plan can also be found [here](#).

0.11. When describing legislation under which habitats and species are protected, we recommend listing the UK legislation and not the Habitats Directive e.g. The

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and The Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

0.12. We are aware that a Scoping Opinion has also been issued by Conwy County Borough under the Town and Country Planning (EIA) (Wales) Regulations 2017 (as amended) for the proposal. As a single ES is proposed, you should ensure that the ES demonstrates how it has considered all Scoping Opinions received.

1. Introduction to the project

1.1. With regards to flood risk, it has been raised that in the introduction (section 1.1 and 1.2 of the scoping report) that little distinction is made between coastal defences (protection from coastal erosion) and flood defences (protection of low-lying land below the height of the defence). It is accepted that this is clear in the remainder of the scoping report. The distinction between coastal defences and flood defences should be made clear within the ES.

2. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

2.1. We agree that potential impact of the works on Archaeology and Cultural Heritage must be scoped into your assessment. A number of comments were raised by WAT regarding the scope of the assessment. WAT have stated that there are three key areas of potential impact identified which still need to be investigated further to address potential impacts by the current scheme and to help formulate a suitable mitigation response. These are:

- The sub-surface potential for preserved prehistoric land surfaces and the activity that may have taken place on these surfaces. This evidence will largely survive as peat layers, preserved tree stumps and artefacts, features or structures of prehistoric date. The potential for these deposits is unknown and has not been archaeologically assessed. Peat deposits have been located further north at Rhos on Sea and prehistoric artefacts have been found within the study area, these both suggest a high probability for sub-surface deposits of interest within the study area.
- The former medieval fish weir PRN 34278, which was surveyed in some detail by CPAT in 1997. This may have subsequently become either more revealed, or covered, by marine deposits in the intervening years. It is highly vulnerable to damage by engineering works and machinery access onto the beach. Robust measures to protect and conserve this monument in its entirety must be formulated and presented in the ES.
- There are 8 maritime heritage assets within the eastern fringe of the study area at the low tide mark and there are a further 2 in the offshore working area beyond the mean low tide. The precise location and nature of these remains is currently unknown. To be able to predict the impact of onshore and offshore works on these buried features an appropriate geophysical survey of the beach

at the low tide zone may be required to properly assess the exact location, level of preservation and depth of burial of these wrecks.

- 2.2. WAT note the provision of an earlier archaeological assessment report by Birmingham Archaeology for Mott Macdonald in 2010 and the current scoping report draws heavily on that document. The current scope recognises that the earlier report and baseline data is now 11 years old and needs updating. WAT would agree that the Historic Environment Record (HER) needs to be re-consulted and that all of the other sources listed in C2.3 need to be explored thoroughly including the National Monuments Record RCAHMW, the National Library of Wales (documents and cartographic) and the relevant County Archives. The assessment would also benefit from an updated and more systematic walkover survey by an archaeological contractor with mapping of features as they currently survive; this would address section 8.4 of the scoping report that states only a simple visual inspection was undertaken on 12 March 2021.
- 2.3. With regard to the prehistoric land surface potential of the study area, it is unclear at sections 8.7 and C2.3, what is meant by an archaeological assessment of the geo-technical logs. WAT note that they would expect a dedicated geo-archaeological contractor to specify and complete an appropriate transect survey of the intertidal beach area with boreholes, augering and/or test pitting and submit a profile of the prehistoric deposits with additional information on the palaeo-environmental potential of the deposits and dating. WAT advise that this cannot be done by a geo-technical contractor and must be completed by specialist geo-archaeological contractors. It therefore appears that the prehistoric deposit profiling suggested is inadequate for assessment purposes and this will need to be addressed. The geo-archaeological contractor must specify their methodology, reporting and archiving proposals in a WSI document (written scheme of investigation) in accordance with the relevant CIFA Standards and Guidance.
- 2.4. WAT also note that it is not clear how the Traeth Pensarn pipeline scheme fits into this phase of works. If the pipeline development is considered as part of the scheme, an appropriate assessment must take place of the pipeline development area to mitigate any potential impacts. WAT would expect as a minimum, a systematic walkover survey and detailed Desk Based Assessment for this scheme initially, with further assessment may be necessary depending on the results of the initial assessment.
- 2.5. The assessment scope therefore needs to address the issues raised above. We (NRW PS) consider that the impact of the proposed development on preserved prehistoric land surfaces, the former medieval fish weir and maritime heritage assets must be assessed and presented within the ES. We recommend that you engage with WAT in relation to the scope of the archaeological assessment and the development of a written scheme of investigation to ensure these issues are adequately considered.

3. Coastal Processes (Including Flood Risk, Water Quality and Navigation Aspects)

3.1. Coastal Processes

- 3.1.1 No information has been provided on how the Zone of Influence (Zol) distances detailed in table 9.1 have been derived. The Zol identified should be based on the area in which the scheme effects can be felt by the receptor/pathway under assessment rather than an arbitrary number. Further information regarding how the Zol has been identified must be provided within the ES.
- 3.1.2 We recommend a map is provided of the study area and a justification on the area determined.
- 3.1.2 Where the assessment relies on previous studies used to characterise the baseline or aid the assessments, NRW TE advise that these are brought into the ES as relevant, rather than having to refer to them through a number of other references.
- 3.1.4 NRW TE agree that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will need to be developed and agreed as part of the scheme, including, but not limited to, rock storage and sediment management.
- 3.1.5 The terminal rock groyne will need an assessment for changes to coastal processes once the design has been established. This will need to be included within the ES.
- 3.1.6 Confirmation on the sediment source and size fraction would be expected as part of the ES.
- 3.1.7 The criteria established in Table C.8: Scale for evaluating the sensitivity (value) of receptors, requires further rationale with regards to coastal processes. Understanding is sought on the SMP scale and scale on erosion/accretion effects.
- 3.1.8 The criteria to determine magnitude of effect in Table C.9: Scale for evaluating the magnitude with respect to effects on coastal processes and flood risk, also requires further rationale. The justification provided on the timings identified for 'changes to sediment dispersion patterns' is unclear. We would encourage you to engage with NRW TE as you carry out your coastal processes assessment.

3.2. Development Flood Risk

- 3.2.1 It is noted from section 11.3.1.2 (Wave climate) that a previous modelling study on waves has been carried out in 2010 by Royal Haskoning (included in appendix E). In 2019, new Extreme Sea Levels were adopted which are

based on the Coastal Design Sea Levels - Coastal Flood Boundary Extreme Sea Levels (2018). NRW TE advise that any new study on tidal flood risks should use the updated values (which include surge but not waves) and it is appreciated that joint probability analysis will consider varying extreme sea levels.

- 3.2.2 We welcome that additional information and assessments in the form of a Flood Management Plan (FMP) and Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) is scoped in and to be produced in support of the ES. Any buildings associated with future regeneration and shown to have a flood risk (as per Natural Resources Wales flood maps), will need to comply with the requirements of TAN15: Development and Flood risk.

3.3. Marine Water Quality

- 3.3.1 We agree with the consideration of potential water quality effects highlighted in Table 11.1 Coastal Water Quality of the scoping report; and these must be considered within the ES. We welcome the development of a CEMP as detailed in section 11.4 of the scoping report, NRW TE advise the use of NetRegs GPP5 (Works and maintenance in or near water) for guidance as you develop this document.
- 3.3.2 NRW TE note that the bathing water season takes place from 15th May – 30th September and recommend that where there is a level of risk of release of bacteria or sediment, that works activity avoid the bathing season.
- 3.3.3 As the works are taking place adjacent to the North Wales coastal Water Framework Directive (WFD) waterbody, we agree that a WFD compliance assessment needs to be carried out.

4. Biodiversity

4.1. Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

- 4.1.1 Traeth Pensarn SSSI is an important SSSI, as it is one of the longest stretches of this type of habitat (vegetated shingle ridge) in the country. We agree that impacts to the SSSI should be scoped in to the ES.
- 4.1.2 NRW TE have significant concerns should there be any proposal to construct the pipes for dredging within the Traeth Pensarn SSSI. As reference, NRW TE highlight that when the original Colwyn Bay beach feeding works were undertaken, a request to use part of the SSSI for this purpose was made which NRW TE voiced their concerns. The pipeline was subsequently constructed to the east of the SSSI on Pensarn beach.
- 4.1.3 Owing to the west to east dominant wave longshore movement and wind directions, it is conceivable that some of the characteristic vegetated shingle

ridge species may have colonised further to the east. NRW TE advise that if you wish to construct the pipeline in this locality, before doing so you need to assess the ecological sensitivity of the area by undertaking a vegetation survey in spring or summer months – any other time of the year would not provide appropriate information, as some plants will die back and not be seen. For information, a species known as Raii's knotweed (*Polygonum oxyspermum*) has been observed previously on the beach, east of the SSSI.

- 4.1.4 Conwy County Borough Council's warden has regularly put fencing on the SSSI to protect nesting Ringed Plover. There is a possibility that they also nest to the east. NRW TE recommend that the Council's Ecologist is consulted for advice regarding this issue and any potential survey requirements prior to the application being submitted.

4.2. Ornithology

- 4.2.1 We agree with the consideration of potential effects as highlighted in the scoping report. Table 9.2 of the scoping report (Page 52) includes the features of Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Little Ormes Head SSSI, wintering bird species, and breeding birds during both construction and operational phases of the scheme. We agree with the scoping in of these receptors into the EIA. NRW TE note there would be no overlap with the features of the Liverpool Bay SPA, if works were undertaken outside of the overwintering period (September to March inclusive).

4.3. Marine Benthic Ecology

- 4.3.1 As detailed in section 3.1.1 above, it is not clear how the Zol for potential impacts on marine features has been derived. The Zol is typically established based on the outputs of initial assessments i.e. modelled output results, to establish any impact pathways on sensitive features. Further information on how the Zol has been defined and must be provided within the ES.
- 4.3.2 Although section 9.1.3 of the scoping report refers to Y Fenai a Bae Conwy/Menai Strait and Conwy Bay SAC, including species listed under this site, there is no mention of the habitat features. These include: Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide, Reefs, Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time, Large shallow inlets and bays and Submerged or partially submerged sea caves. Although these habitats are >3km from the proposed development site, outputs of the physical process modelling should be used to identify and rule out any potential impact. Therefore, consideration of these features must be scoped into your assessment at this stage.
- 4.3.3 The potential effects of marine Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) must be included and scoped into this section for construction and operational activities. Construction-related vessels, vehicles and equipment movements

have the potential to introduce/spread marine INNS to and from the site. This potentially increases the likelihood of a stepping-stone effect on nearby sites of conservation importance and associated features. Operational effects related to the introduction of artificial substratum as part of the proposal may increase the likelihood of colonisation of INNS in the future, further adding to the potential introduction and spread. We acknowledge the potential effects of marine INNS can be mitigated through robust biosecurity management and welcome the intention to undertake a biosecurity risk assessment as part of the proposal.

- 4.3.5 Clarification is needed on descriptions of 'Moderate' and 'Minor' magnitude of impact levels provided in table C.6. NRW TE note there appears to be a typo where 'Permanent / irreversible damage or improvement to a biodiversity resource' should be Moderate magnitude of impact; and Minor should be Temporary. Currently these are the other way around.
- 4.3.6 *Sabellaria alveolata* reef is known to be present in the area of the project footprint (Colwyn Bay Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report July 2020) and therefore should have been included in section 9.3.2 habitats of the scoping report. Potential impact on *Sabellaria alveolata* reef must be considered within the ES.
- 4.3.7 Where permanent loss of biodiversity interest habitat results e.g. *Sabellaria alveolata* reef (Section 7 habitat – Environment (Wales) Act 2016), NRW TE would expect a biodiversity mitigation/offsetting for this loss of the feature. The appended report 'Colwyn Bay Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report July 2020 - Table 5.1: Potential Ecological Constraints and Initial Assessment of Effects', identifies that mitigation measures will be initiated to prevent loss of *Sabellaria alveolata* habitat, however, it is not clear from the documentation provided how this will be incorporated. We would advise that you engage with NRW TE to discuss mitigation measures, as well as potential opportunities for environmental enhancement measures that could be incorporated into the scheme.
- 4.3.8 Table 5.1 also discusses the direct loss of Blue mussel beds as a result of the scheme, and that the rocky habitat created will result in recolonization of this habitat. Evidence should be provided to justify that the surrogate rock material will support Blue Mussel habitat. NRW TE advise that provision for additional mitigation offsetting should be included if this does not occur. For example, NRW TE suggest seeding of new artificial rock habitat with Blue Mussel or some alternative offsetting measure.

4.4. Marine Mammals

- 4.4.1 It is not clear how the ZOI for potential impacts on marine mammals has been derived. As such, further information on how the ZOI boundary was created will be required within the ES. The ZOI values stated in the Preliminary

Ecological Appraisal Report (20 February 2020) (included in Appendix E), Section 3.1 Zone of influence, differ from those in chapter 9, and no reasoning is provided for either value or why they differ. Further clarity should be provided regarding this issue.

- 4.4.2 Marine mammals have been scoped in as a species group. We recommend using the Marine Mammal Management Unit (MMMU) approach to scope in relevant protected sites for marine mammals. The relevant management units and SACs we recommend are included in the assessment for each of the Annex II marine mammal species identified as using the region in the 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report section 4.1.3.2 Mammals' are as follows:

Harbour porpoise

Management Unit: Celtic & Irish Sea

Welsh SACs in with harbour porpoise as a feature within the Management Unit:

- Gogledd Môn Forol / North Anglesey Marine
- Gorllewin Cymru Forol / West Wales Marine
- Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren / Bristol Channel Approaches

Bottlenose dolphin

Management Unit: Irish Sea

Welsh SACs with bottlenose dolphin as a feature within the Management Unit:

- Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau / Lleyn Peninsula and the Sarnau
- Cardigan Bay / Bae Ceredigion

Grey Seal

Management Unit: OSPAR Unit III

Welsh SACs with grey seal as a feature within the Management Unit:

- Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau / Lleyn Peninsula and the Sarnau
- Cardigan Bay / Bae Ceredigion
- Pembrokeshire Marine / Sir Benfro Forol

- 4.4.3 Injury from noise must also be included in your assessment for marine mammals, alongside disturbance as an impact pathway.

- 4.4.4 We agree an underwater noise assessment is appropriate, noting that as per the prior comment in section 4.4.3, the potential for injury as well as disturbance should be assessed.

- 4.4.5 Chapter 15 of the scoping report states, "There are potential adverse effects on marine mammals due to construction noise, particularly from proposed beach replenishment works (running 24 hours a day)...". It is not clear if this means activities will be taking place 24 hours a day for the 8-week period described in chapter 2 of the scoping report, and as such clarity should be provided.

4.4.6 With regards to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (20 February 2020) (included in Appendix E), Section 4 Results and Interpretation, all the species identified as using the region (harbour porpoise, bottlenose dolphin and grey seal) are Habitats Regulations Annex II species, and so the MMMU approach previously described in section 4.4.2 should be used for screening in the relevant protected sites. Marine mammals are Annex IV European Protected Species, and the assessment should consider this alongside assessment against Annex II protected sites.

4.5. Fish

4.5.1 We agree with the conclusions of the scoping report with respect to fish species, that they should be scoped into the EIA and assessed against the impact pathways identified. NRW TE have advised that a review of the relevant fish species that may be affected by the works is conducted to inform the receptors to be assessed, and that the assessment considers the sensitivity of the receptors to the impact pathways identified, as well as the magnitude of the impact and the value of the receptor.

5. Noise and Vibration

5.1. No comments were received from consultees in relation to chapter 15 Noise and Vibration, other than those relating to marine mammals detailed in section 4.4. Other than those assessments mentioned in section 4.4, the ES should include an assessment of the impacts on noise and vibration, as set out in the scoping report.

6. Cumulative impacts and in-combination effects

6.1. The ES must include an assessment of cumulative and in-combination effects.

6.2. The following data sources may provide useful information on other projects for the assessment of cumulative effects:

- The Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects register:
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/register-of-applications/>
- The Developments of National Significance Register:
<http://gov.wales/docs/desh/publications/180312-dns-register-en.pdf>
- Planning Policy e.g. Local Development Plans, Transport Plans (National and Local) and National Policy Statements.
- An up to date list of marine licensable developments can be found at the following link:
<http://lle.gov.wales/catalogue/item/MarineLicences>

No comments were received from consultees in relation to the following chapters of the scoping report:

- Air Quality
- Climate

- Geology and Soils
- Landscape and Visuals
- Materials and Waste
- Population and Health
- Traffic, Transport and Access

The ES should include an assessment of the impacts on these topics as set out in the scoping report.

Please note our Scoping Opinion is based on the information available to us at this time. The information provided is not a definitive list of the ES / EIA requirements and further information may be required following an application for this project, to ensure a full assessment is carried out.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any clarification or would like to discuss any aspect of this scoping opinion.

Yours sincerely

Joe Thomas



Marine Licensing Team
Natural Resources Wales

Approved by:

Wendy Dodds



Marine Licensing Team Leader

Natural Resources Wales

Cc: All Consultation Bodies