



# **East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm**

## **Appendix 23.1**

### **Onshore Ornithology Consultation Responses**

#### **Environmental Statement Volume 3**

Applicant: East Anglia ONE North Limited  
Document Reference: 6.3.23.1  
SPR Reference: EA1N-DWF-ENV-REP-IBR-000360\_001 Rev 01  
Pursuant to APFP Regulation: 5(2)(a)

Author: Royal HaskoningDHV  
Date: October 2019  
Revision: Version 1

#### Revision Summary

| Rev | Date       | Prepared by    | Checked by | Approved by  |
|-----|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| 01  | 08/10/2019 | Paolo Pizzolla | Ian Mackay | Helen Walker |

#### Description of Revisions

| Rev | Page | Section | Description          |
|-----|------|---------|----------------------|
| 01  | n/a  | n/a     | Final for Submission |

# Table of Contents

|             |   |          |
|-------------|---|----------|
| <b>23.1</b> | <b>Onshore Ornithology Consultation Responses</b> | <b>1</b> |
| 23.1        | Introduction                                      | 1        |

**Appendix 23.1** is supported by the tables listed below.

| Table Number | Title                                      |
|--------------|--|
| Table A23.1  | Onshore Ornithology Consultation Responses |

## Glossary of Acronyms

|      |  |
|------|--|
| BBPP | Breeding Bird Protection Plan                |
| CCS  | Construction Consolidation Sites             |
| CIA  | Cumulative Impact Assessment                 |
| DCO  | Development Consent Order                    |
| ES   | Environmental Statement                      |
| HDD  | Horizontal Directional Drilling              |
| IOF  | Important Ornithological Features            |
| MW   | Megawatt                                     |
| NGET | National Grid Electricity Transmission       |
| PEIR | Preliminary Environmental Information Report |
| SPA  | Special Protection Area                      |
| SSSI | Site of Special Scientific Interest          |

## Glossary of Terminology

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Applicant   | East Anglia ONE North Limited.   |
| Cable sealing end compound                        | A compound which allows the safe transition of cables between the overhead lines and underground cables which connect to the National Grid substation.   |
| Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound | A compound (which includes a circuit breaker) which allows the safe transition of cables between the overhead lines and underground cables which connect to the National Grid substation.  |
| Construction consolidation sites                  | Compounds associated with the onshore works which may include elements such as hard standings, lay down and storage areas for construction materials and equipment, areas for vehicular parking, welfare facilities, wheel washing facilities, workshop facilities and temporary fencing or other means of enclosure.  |
| Development area                                  | The area comprising the onshore development area and the offshore development area (described as the 'order limits' within the Development Consent Order).   |
| East Anglia ONE North project                     | The proposed project consisting of up to 67 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.                 |
| East Anglia ONE North windfarm site               | The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located.   |
| European site                                     | Sites designated for nature conservation under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive, as defined in regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and regulation 18 of the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. These include candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas. |
| Horizontal directional drilling (HDD)             | A method of cable installation where the cable is drilled beneath a feature without the need for trenching.  |
| HDD temporary working area                        | Temporary compounds which will contain laydown, storage and work areas for HDD drilling works.   |
| Jointing bay                                      | Underground structures constructed at regular intervals along the onshore cable route to join sections of cable and facilitate installation of the cables into the buried ducts.   |
| Landfall  | The area (from Mean Low Water Springs) where the offshore export cables would make contact with land, and connect to the onshore cables.   |
| Link boxes  | Underground chambers within the onshore cable route housing electrical earthing links.   |
| Mitigation areas                                  | Areas captured within the Development Area specifically for mitigating expected or anticipated impacts.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| National electricity grid                          | The high voltage electricity transmission network in England and Wales owned and maintained by National Grid Electricity Transmission   |
| National Grid infrastructure                       | A National Grid substation, cable sealing end compounds, cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound, underground cabling and National Grid overhead line realignment works to facilitate connection to the national electricity grid, all of which will be consented as part of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project Development Consent Order but will be National Grid owned assets. |
| National Grid overhead line realignment works      | Works required to upgrade the existing electricity pylons and overhead lines (including cable sealing end compounds and cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound) to transport electricity from the National Grid substation to the national electricity grid.   |
| National Grid overhead line realignment works area | The proposed area for National Grid overhead line realignment works.  |
| National Grid substation                           | The substation (including all of the electrical equipment within it) necessary to connect the electricity generated by the proposed East Anglia ONE North project to the national electricity grid which will be owned by National Grid but is being consented as part of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project Development Consent Order.   |
| National Grid substation location                  | The proposed location of the National Grid substation.  |
| Natura 2000 site                                   | A site forming part of the network of sites made up of Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas designated respectively under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive.   |
| Onshore cable corridor                             | The corridor within which the onshore cable route will be located.  |
| Onshore cable route                                | This is the construction swathe within the onshore cable corridor which would contain onshore cables as well as temporary ground required for construction which includes cable trenches, haul road and spoil storage areas.  |
| Onshore cables                                     | The cables which would bring electricity from landfall to the onshore substation. The onshore cable is comprised of up to six power cables (which may be laid directly within a trench, or laid in cable ducts or protective covers), up to two fibre optic cables and up to two distributed temperature sensing cables.  |
| Onshore development area                           | The area in which the landfall, onshore cable corridor, onshore substation, landscaping and ecological mitigation areas, temporary construction facilities (such as access roads and construction consolidation sites), and the National Grid Infrastructure will be located.   |
| Onshore infrastructure                             | The combined name for all of the onshore infrastructure associated with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project from landfall to the connection to the national electricity grid.  |
| Onshore preparation works                          | Activities to be undertaken prior to formal commencement of onshore construction such as pre-planting of landscaping works, archaeological  |

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
|                             | investigations, environmental and engineering surveys, diversion and laying of services, and highway alterations.  |
| Onshore substation          | The East Anglia ONE North substation and all of the electrical equipment within the onshore substation and connecting to the National Grid infrastructure. |
| Onshore substation location | The proposed location of the onshore substation for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.  |
| Transition bay              | Underground structures at the landfall that house the joints between the offshore export cables and the onshore cables.                                    |

# 23.1 Onshore Ornithology Consultation Responses

## 23.1 Introduction

1. This appendix covers those statutory consultation responses, in relation to **Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology**, that have been received as a response to the Scoping Report (2017), the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) (2018) and Expert Topic Group (ETG) Meetings.
2. Responses from stakeholders and regard given by the Applicant have been captured in **Table A23.1**.
3. As Section 42 consultation for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project was conducted in parallel with the proposed East Anglia TWO project, where appropriate, stakeholder comments which were specific to East Anglia TWO, but may be of relevance East Anglia ONE North, have also been included in the consultation responses for East Anglia ONE North.

**Table A23.1 Consultation Responses Related to Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology**

| Consultee  | Date/ Document                 | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>The following comments were received prior to consultation on the PEIR and were in response to the Scoping Report or direct consultation with stakeholders. These comments were taken into account in the production of the PEIR.</p> |                                |   |  |
| Natural England  | 08/12/2017<br>Scoping Response | <p>As advised during the meeting with SPR on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017, the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) is within the onshore study area. Substation site selection is on-going, but any location west of the SPA would require the cable route to cross the Sandlings SPA either via Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) or trenching. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any mitigation must be dependent on the sensitivity of the designated habitat and/or species impacted – surveys must be undertaken to better inform mitigation;</li> <li>• Recommend at least 1 year of survey data – must ensure these are programmed in sufficiently (N.B woodlark can nest early);</li> <li>• Timing of construction works could be a likely mitigation option; and</li> <li>• HDD under the narrowest point of the Sandlings SPA would be Natural England’s preferred option to avoid direct impacts on habitat. Noting that even with a HDD option, there would be a need to consider seasonal restrictions or mitigation (e.g. screening) as nests within the SPA could still be disturbed by noise, light and vibration during construction.</li> </ul> | <p>Two years of breeding bird surveys have been undertaken, in 2018 and 2019. Baseline surveys were designed specifically to record the abundance and distribution of Sandlings SPA qualifying interests, as well as any other species of high conservation concern (see <b>section 23.5</b> of this chapter). Methodologies presented in the East Anglia ONE North and ONE North Onshore Ecology and Onshore Ornithology Method Statement were agreed with Natural England during consultation.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with minimising the likelihood of a significant effect of construction activities on the Sandlings SPA has been outlined in <b>section 23.6</b> of this chapter.</p> <p>The Applicant will not undertake onshore cable route construction works to cross the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) / Leiston – Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the</p> |

| Consultee | Date/ Document                 | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
|           |                                |   | SPA/SSSI boundary or within 200m of the SPA/SSSI boundary during the breeding bird season of mid-February to end of August, unless otherwise agreed with Natural England that (based on monitoring information provided by the Ecological Clerk of Works) bird breeding activities within 200m of the SPA/SSSI crossing works area have ceased.   |
| RSPB      | 20/12/2017<br>Scoping Response | The Scoping Report indicates that the new landfall location in the vicinity of Sizewell is likely to result in a need for the onshore cable route to cross the Sandlings SPA and the Leiston-Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Sandlings SPA comprises forest and heathland habitat and are designated for breeding woodlark and nightjar. The Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI is designated for its mix of habitats, including heathland, woodland and scrub and supports a range of breeding bird species. Of these, nightingale and turtle dove in particular are known to be present in the cable route search area, both within and potentially also outside the SSSI. Due to the likely presence of these species within the onshore cable route search area, we are concerned that the onshore breeding bird surveys are only proposed for March-April 2018. We recommend that at least two years of survey data are collected. We are also concerned that the survey period is not suitable for the likely species of interest. Nightjar (a feature of the Sandlings SPA) are typically surveyed from May to mid-July (this species does not arrive in the UK until late April – early May) whilst woodlark, an early breeder and also a feature of the Sandlings SPA, require surveys to start in the second half of February. The proposed | Baseline surveys were designed specifically to record the abundance and distribution of Sandlings SPA and Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI qualifying interests, as well as any other species of high conservation concern (see <b>section 23.5</b> of this chapter).<br><br>Breeding bird surveys, as agreed with Natural England, were undertaken each month from February to August 2018. Further breeding bird surveys have been undertaken in 2019 and are presented alongside 2018 results in <b>Appendix 23.3</b> . This is considered sufficient for determining current baseline |

| Consultee | Date/ Document                 | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--|--|
|           |                                | survey period of March-April therefore risks missing nightjar entirely and under-recording woodlark. Other species of interest, such as turtle dove and nightingale would typically be surveyed through four-visit territory mapping from March through to June. In order to ensure sufficient coverage of all these species (as well as general breeding bird interest), we therefore recommend that at least six visits should be carried out from mid- February to mid-July and that two years of survey data are collected.                        | conditions and likely distribution of qualifying interests.  |
| RSPB      | 20/12/2017<br>Scoping Response | We request that detailed consideration is given to potential mitigation measures, for example, avoidance of works in sensitive areas during the breeding season. We request a commitment that HDD techniques will also be used (where technically possible) if the cable route is required to cross a nationally or internationally designated wildlife site. It will also be important to understand whether there would be any need for jointing bays or other maintenance-related access within the SPA in order to evaluate all potential impacts. | <p>Mitigation associated with minimising the likelihood of a significant effect of construction activities on the Sandlings SPA have been outlined in <b>section 23.6</b> of this chapter.</p> <p>The Applicant will not undertake onshore cable route construction works to cross the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) / Leiston – Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the SPA/SSSI boundary or within 200m of the SPA/SSSI boundary during the breeding bird season of mid-February to end of August, unless otherwise agreed with Natural England that (based on monitoring information provided by the Ecological Clerk of Works) bird breeding activities within 200m of the SPA/SSSI crossing works area have ceased.</p> |

| Consultee  | Date/ Document  | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |   | Operational impacts are also considered in <b>section 23.6.4</b> of this chapter.  |
| Natural England  | 15/02/2018<br>Email response to Technical Note on Bird Survey Methodology | NE are now content with the changes and clarifications made regarding the bird survey methodology.  | Noted.   |
| <b>The following comments were made in response to the PEIR and were taken into account in the production of this ES</b> |   |   |  |
| RSPB   | 25/03/2018<br>Section 42 Consultation Response                            | PEI Table 23.8 outlines the survey periods used to establish the species present and potential impacts of the onshore works corridor. The RSPB is disappointed that only one year of breeding bird surveys have been conducted. The RSPB/ETG also recommended that surveys extending into 2019 should cover March. This does not appear to have happened. Given the presence of woodlark it is important that sufficient survey effort has been made to ensure there is a complete understanding of how the works area is used by early breeding species. | <p>Surveys during the 2018-19 non-breeding season extended into March, as detailed in <b>Appendix 23.4</b>.</p> <p>Further breeding bird surveys, similar in scope to 2018 have taken place within the onshore ornithology study from May to August 2019.</p> <p>As the target species present are found in distinct and predictable habitat types, the combination of two breeding seasons surveys, combined with historic data from 2009 to 2018 is considered to be sufficient to adequately determine typical distribution and abundance of these species. Further pre-construction surveys would take place to help avoid disturbance</p> |

| Consultee | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------|--|---|---|
|           |  |   | effects during the construction period, as part of the Breeding Bird Protection Plan (BBPP).  |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Inadequate measures have been proposed to address impacts on species of conservation concern. Additional measures to ensure such species will be maintained and enhanced (in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework) should be secured.   | Mitigation associated with minimising the likelihood of a significant effect of construction activities on the Sandlings SPA have been outlined in <b>section 23.6</b> of this chapter.<br><br>The Applicant will not undertake onshore cable route construction works to cross the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) / Leiston – Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the SPA/SSSI boundary or within 200m of the SPA/SSSI boundary during the breeding bird season of mid-February to end of August, unless otherwise agreed with Natural England that (based on monitoring information provided by the Ecological Clerk of Works) bird breeding activities within 200m of the SPA/SSSI crossing works area have ceased. |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | The RSPB notes that PEI Table 23.17 highlights the conservation status of turtle dove. However, the RSPB considers the conservation status of this species is not adequately reflected in paragraphs 77 and 78 of the PEIR and the information should be improved. Highlighting the conservation status of turtle dove more | The conservation status of turtle dove and other species is detailed in <b>Table 23.16</b> of this chapter. Each species' conservation status has been fully considered as part   |

| Consultee | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------|--|---|---|
|           |  | fully would be consistent with the approach taken with spotted flycatcher (paragraph 99) and yellow wagtail (paragraph 100), which are reported as red-list species of conservation concern. Whilst important to identify the importance of these species, only one pair of spotted flycatcher were recorded and only 2-3 pairs of yellow wagtail. The survey area is therefore of even greater importance for turtle doves and this needs to be reflected in the assessment of impacts and any mitigation requirements.  | of the impact assessment process in <b>section 23.6</b> of this chapter and the corresponding mitigation proposed for any associated unmitigated significant effects predicted. Those impacts relevant to turtle dove in terms of habitat loss and disturbance are detailed in <b>sections 23.6.3.1.1</b> and <b>23.6.3.2.3</b> of this chapter respectively.   |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Paragraph 110 attempts to dismiss impacts on the species within the works corridor by claiming that this will be offset by the project's contribution to reducing climate change impacts. In the long-term renewable energy projects have a part to play, but this does not negate the need for projects to be appropriately sited, or ensure that they contribute to maintenance and net gains for the species that could be impacted. Whilst habitat may remain suitable for turtle doves, once lost from an area they can be difficult, or impossible to get back under the current conditions. If the UK is to retain a breeding turtle dove population it is important that the remain pairs are protected and deterioration to nesting and foraging habitat avoided. The RSPB recommends that any proposed works in areas that support turtle dove are avoided entirely or works carried out in the least damaging way possible. Sufficient measures should also be secured to enhance the breeding and foraging habitat for turtle dove. | This is a misinterpretation of the text, which has been clarified and amended (see <b>section 23.5.5</b> of this chapter). The text describes the future scenario without the proposed East Anglia ONE North project present, and concludes that abundance and distribution of some species would decline as a result of climate change. There is no comment on the role that the proposed East Anglia ONE North project would play to specifically offset these impacts. |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Turtle dove<br>The RSPB agrees with the conclusion in PEI paragraph 146 (p.44) that the potential impact on the Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI population could be significant if not mitigated. Sowing turtle dove seed mix as advised by Operation Turtle Dove is supported, as is the provision of supplementary feeding areas. The RSPB recommends that SPR   | An area of 3ha within the onshore development area (see <b>Figure 23.5</b> ) has been identified for creation and management of   |

| Consultee | Date/ Document | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|
|           |                | <p>seeks to secure such measures for the life of the project to provide net gains as a legacy of the works.</p> | <p>suitable turtle dove feeding habitat during construction.</p> <p>No significant effects are predicted for turtle dove during the operational period, and so no mitigation is required.</p> <p>In December 2018, Defra consulted on plans to introduce the principle of Net gain to the Planning System in England. Defra's recent response to consultation<sup>1</sup> affirms their intention to bring forward legislation to mandate Net Gain within the Environment Bill but confirms their position that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and marine developments will remain out of scope of the mandatory requirement in the Environment Bill.</p> <p>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to</p> |

<sup>1</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/819823/net-gain-consult-sum-resp.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/819823/net-gain-consult-sum-resp.pdf)

| Consultee | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------|--|--|--|
|           |  |  | achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments.  |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Nightingale<br>The RSPB supports the need to avoid disturbance to this species and for any habitat loss to be reinstated, as outlined in PEI paragraph 160. We also recommend net gains for habitat for nightingale be secured as part of the legacy of the project given the conservation status of this species and the need to ensure that conservation objectives for the SSSI are not simply maintained but improved.   | No significant effects are predicted for nightingale during the operational period, and so no mitigation is required.<br><br>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments. |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Nightjar<br>Additional measures to limit the impact of disturbance on nightjar have been set out within the HRA, which primarily relate to a Breeding Bird Protection Plan (BBPP) and the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works to ensure no activities take place that could cause disturbance to breeding birds. The principles of these may be appropriate, but will rely heavily on a suitable schedule of surveys to ensure accurate understanding of changes to breeding birds in the works area is known. The RSPB recommends that the BBPP update site managers on the works schedule to ensure any impacts on site management or surveys required to effectively manage the site to maintain conservation objectives are minimised. We support the final bullet point of the proposed mitigation, specifically, "...Where, in the opinion of the suitably qualified ecologist, disturbance cannot be avoided by mitigation, construction works within the area of disturbance will be suspended until chicks | Noted. A detailed schedule of works would be provided to RSPB prior to construction commencing.<br><br>RSPB's recommendations would be followed by the Ecological Clerk of Works during the construction period.   |

| Consultee | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------|--|---|---|
|           |  | have fledged.” The RSPB recommends that such decisions should be taken in conjunction with NE and with the relevant landowners and/or site managers to ensure a fully informed and agreed approach is taken.  |   |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Nightjar<br>Whilst impacts to habitat may be temporary, it may still take time for any replacement habitat to function. Replacement habitat should be 'like for like' and be in place and fully functional before impacts occur. We recommend that the BBPP also sets out opportunities to make enhancements to retained habitats that would benefit the impact species, such as supporting habitat improvement for the affected species. This would contribute towards overall biodiversity net gains from the onshore elements of the proposed projects. The revised National Planning Policy Framework states that 'planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by "...providing net gains for biodiversity." | <b>Section 23.6.3</b> of this chapter predicts that no habitats used by nightjar are likely to be affected by construction activities or during operation.<br><br>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments. |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Nightjar<br>To have confidence in any BBPP, we recommend that this be drafted for consideration at examination to ensure that appropriate principles, and the key measures needed to be in place, have been formally agreed.  | The BBPP would be drafted and agreed with the relevant stakeholders post-consent. Details regarding the content of the BBPP are provided within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) submitted with this DCO application, secured under the requirements of the draft DCO.  |

| Consultee | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Woodlark<br>Comments same as nightjar above  | Noted. No woodlark habitat would be affected by construction activities.  |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Turtle dove<br>Comments same as nightjar above   | Noted. Mitigation measures outlined in <b>section 23.6.3.1.4</b> of this chapter would be applied to minimise the effects of habitat loss on turtle dove.   |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Turtle dove<br>The RSPB notes that foraging habitat will be provided for habitat loss (see first comment on turtle dove above). However, breeding habitat should be avoided in the first instance. Additional habitat (for breeding and foraging) should be secured to enhance the area for turtle dove through this project to support national efforts to conserve this species. | Mitigation measures outlined in <b>section 23.6.3.1.4</b> of this chapter would be applied to minimise the effects of habitat loss on turtle dove during the construction phase.<br><br>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments. |
| RSPB      | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Nightingale<br>Comments same as nightjar above.  | Noted. Response as per nightjar   |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| RSPB            | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Until more detail is provided on the full suite of mitigation measures for Sizewell C and the East Anglia zone projects it is not certain that the cumulative impacts will have been addressed.   | Updated information on proposed Sizewell B and Sizewell C developments have been included in <b>section 23.7</b> of this chapter. Further information on the proposed East Anglia ONE North project is included in <b>Appendix 23.2</b> .  |
| RSPB            | 25/03/2018<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEI Table 23.23 summarises the assessments and conclusions for important ornithological features. Within the potential mitigation measures, pre-construction monitoring is listed. The RSPB disagrees that monitoring is a mitigation measure in its own right; it is an activity to inform mitigation requirements or the effectiveness of mitigation. Whilst they will be included within the BBPP, it is important at this stage to ensure clarity on what is appropriate as mitigation and what is not. The RSPB recommends that measures to enhance the sites affected should also be identified in the table to highlight the potential benefits that could be provided as a legacy of the project. | Surveys conducted prior to the commencement of construction activity form part of the BBPP which provides mitigation during construction.<br><br>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments. |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Any risk of a reduction in or loss of a terrestrial or marine European Site should be judged to be a 'likely significant effect', and the full significance of its impact on a site's integrity should be further tested by appropriate assessment.   | Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019   | Natural England recommends that in line with National Policy Statements there should be a clear ambition to provide net gain  | Woodland planting to screen the onshore substation and National  |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 | Section 42 Consultation Response                   | throughout the project development. There is currently no enhancement or net gain incorporated for habitats or species, we advise that the project should provide a legacy in line with the 25 Year Environment Plan.  | Grid infrastructure (see <b>Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact</b> ) would have the benefit of providing suitable nesting habitat for a variety of bird species.<br><br>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments. |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | There is currently a lack of information regarding the likely impact and proposed mitigation measures, with certain key considerations such as the impact of noise and vibration and a construction timetable lacking, and therefore we cannot confidently concur with the current conclusions of no Likely Significant Effect. Greater detail will need to be provided in the ES. | Detailed information on the nature, location and extent of construction activities are presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter. Further information on specific mitigation measures have also been included in this chapter.<br><br>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)                          |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019   | There is currently insufficient information provided as to the impact of the alternatives of open cut trenching through, or HDD under, the Sandlings SPA. We would expect further detail on the working  | Detailed information on the nature, location and extent of construction activities in relation to the SPA are   |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
|                 | Section 42 Consultation Response                   | corridor and direct habitat loss areas and disturbance areas within the ES.  | <p>presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b>, and summarised in this chapter.</p> <p>Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts between an open cut or HDD methodology for crossing the SPA are provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1 and 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts.</p> <p>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)</p> |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | There is currently insufficient information on alternative project design options for Natural England to provide substantive comments on adverse effect on integrity to Sandlings SPA. The methods for crossing the SPA should be confirmed and the timing of works in relation to features of interest outlined. Natural England would like to reiterate their preference for HDD under the Sandlings SPA, over open cut trenching, as outlined in response to the Scoping Report (2017). | <p>Detailed information on alternative project design options and methods of crossing the SPA are presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description, Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives</b> and summarised in this chapter.</p> <p>Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts between an open cut or HDD methodology for crossing the SPA are provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1 and 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into</p>   |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
|                 |  |  | <p>consideration for assessing construction impacts.</p> <p>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)</p>  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | There is currently insufficient information provided regarding areas of direct habitat loss, and indirect disturbance by noise, light and vibration to comment whether the mitigation proposed would be sufficient. We welcome the incorporation of mitigation for turtle dove and Barn owl. Where bird species are displaced by development, especially Section 41 birds and red and amber listed species, a suitable amount of replacement habitat should be considered as per Natural England Standing advice (2015). | <p>Detailed information on the nature, location and extent of construction activities are presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b>, and summarised in this chapter. Potential habitat loss (Impact 1) and noise, light and vibration disturbance (Impact 2) are described and assessed for each species, in <b>sections 23.6.3.1 and 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter respectively.</p> <p>Further information on specific mitigation measures in relation to Impact 1 and Impact 2, as described above, have also been included in <b>sections 23.6.3.1 and 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter.</p> <p>SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of</p> |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                 | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 |  |  | Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments.   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | We note within EA2 PEIR Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology Table 23.11 Temporal Magnitude definitions for long, medium, short negligible. Given the sensitivity of the features of interest we advise these are reassessed in line with the definitions of duration within the EA2 PEIR Chapter 22 Onshore ecology 22.4.3.4 Duration. The assessment of effects should be revised accordingly.   | <b>Table 23.9</b> of this chapter has been updated to be consistent with the <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology</b> definitions of duration.   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Natural England advises that any risk of a reduction in or loss of a terrestrial or marine European Site should be judged to be a 'likely significant effect', and the full significance of its impact on a site's integrity should be further tested by appropriate assessment, in accordance with case law.  | Likely Significant Effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) within the context of the Sandlings SPA in the Information to support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3) report.                                   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | Mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of a proposed project on a European site may no longer be taken into account by competent authorities at the Habitat Regulations Assessment ("HRA") "screening stage" when judging whether a proposed plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of a European designated site, and must be considered at the appropriate assessment stage. | Noted. Likely Significant Effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) within the context of the Sandlings SPA in the Information to support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3) report.                            |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | We recommend that there should be a clear ambition to provide net gain throughout the project development. There is currently no enhancement or net gain incorporated for habitats or species, we recommend that the project should provide a legacy in line with the 25 Year Environment Plan. National Policy Statement requires that developments show how SPR has taken advantage of opportunities                                       | SPR will continue to work constructively with Defra and key stakeholders such as Natural England to support the preparation of guidance on the application of Net Gain and in their work to establish potential approaches to |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
|                 |  | to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests  | achieving biodiversity net gains for NSIPs and marine developments.   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | There is currently insufficient information on the impact of lighting during the construction phase on bird species. Further information should be provided on lighting during the operational phase and potential habitat loss for bird species, in particular barn owl                  | Detailed information on lighting is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter, as part of the impact assessment in <b>sections 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter (during construction) and <b>23.6.4.2</b> of this chapter (during operation).<br><br>An Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan will be developed for the final design for the permanent infrastructure, secured under the requirements of the draft DCO, which will include measures to minimise light spill following the recommendations regarding birds set out in the Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Artificial Lighting and Wildlife guidance (2014). |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Figure 23.1<br>The Onshore ornithology study area does now not cover the Rochdale envelope for the proposed development. The survey data should include the most westerly extent of the redline boundary and a suitable buffer. Further surveys should ensure this area is included. | The scoping onshore ornithology study area considered in the PEIR (shown in <b>Figure 23.1</b> ) was created prior to finalisation of the onshore development area. The westernmost part of the onshore development area which lies outside of the scoping onshore ornithology study area, similar to   |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                 | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 |  |  | the habitats to the west of Aldringham, is likely to be of low importance to target species. Nevertheless, surveys in 2019, presented in Annex 1 of <b>Appendix 23.3</b> , have been based on the onshore development area and therefore cover the westerly extent. |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.4<br>Natural England would reiterate, as advised in our scoping response of the 8th December 2017, a preference for HDD under the narrowest point of the Sandlings SPA, in preference to open trenching.   | Noted.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.4<br>Natural England advise any risk of a reduction in or loss of a terrestrial or marine European Site should be judged to be a 'likely significant effect', and the full significance of its impact on a site's integrity should be further tested by appropriate assessment. This principle should be applied to terrestrial and marine SACs, SPAs, pSPAs, cSACs and Ramsar sites. An appropriate assessment should examine the predicted loss in more detail, clearly identifying whether or not it would affect the habitats or supporting habitats of the European Site's qualifying features within that site | Noted. Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.4.2.1<br>Breeding bird surveys were conducted from Feb-Aug 2018. Advise that further surveys are conducted to provide baseline data regarding bird activity for at least two full seasons to provide a robust dataset and present annual variability, as per Natural England standing advice and as agreed in the Onshore Evidence Plan Agreement Log May 2018.  | In addition to comprehensive surveys being undertaken in 2018, historic data from 2009 to 2017 have been made available from RSPB (see <b>section 23.4.2</b> of this chapter) which provides a sufficiently robust long-term dataset to be able to accurately       |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 |  |  | <p>determine potential effects on target species in this chapter.</p> <p>Nevertheless, a series of breeding bird surveys will be conducted in 2019 (May to August), and reported separately in Annex 1 of <b>Appendix 23.3</b>.</p>   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | <p>PEIR Section 23.4.2.1</p> <p>Wintering bird survey Feb-Mar 2018 and Nov – Feb 2019. Advise that surveys cover the entire winter season (Nov- March) to gather information about bird activity for at least two full seasons to provide a robust dataset and present annual variability, as per Natural England standing advice and as agreed in the Onshore Evidence Plan Agreement Log May 2018.</p> | <p>Wintering bird surveys were extended to cover the period of November 2018 to March 2019 (<b>Appendix 23.4</b>). Combined with surveys in February and March 2018 (<b>Appendix 23.3</b>), and local surveyor knowledge, the data available are considered to be sufficient to conduct a robust impact assessment in this chapter.</p>   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | <p>PEIR Section 23.4.2.1</p> <p>Target breeding species currently excludes Skylark and Bullfinch. Skylark are a Red list Bird of Conservation Concern and a UK BAP species, Bullfinch are an amber list Species of Conservation Concern. Advise all bird species which are a qualifying feature of a designated site, and/or a Bird of Conservation Concern are considered in the ES.</p>                | <p>Skylark and bullfinch have been included in this chapter as target species, as have the non-breeding SSSI species recorded during baseline surveys. Further scoping in <b>sections 23.6.1</b> and <b>23.6.2</b> of this chapter has determined whether these species should be taken forward for assessment, based on likelihood of any significant effects at a population level.</p> |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.10<br>Any loss in spatial Magnitude for designated species of a SPA or Ramsar should be considered LSE and considered as part of a Habitats Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. | Noted. Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.14<br>Minsmere to Walberswick Ramsar, need to include all features  | All features have now been included, as shown in <b>Table 23.9</b> of this chapter.<br><br>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3) |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.14<br>Minsmere to Walberswick Heath and Marshes SSSI, need to include all bird species on the citation.   | All features have now been included, as shown in <b>Table 23.9</b> of this chapter.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.14<br>Alde-Ore Estuary SSSI, need to include all bird species on the SSSI citation.   | All features have now been included, as shown in <b>Table 23.9</b> of this chapter.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.5.5<br>Anticipated Trends in Baseline Condition. We would expect these to be based on most recent data such as UKCP18.  | <b>Section 23.5.5</b> of this chapter provides a general summary of predicted conditions for ornithological features in the long-term, in the absence of the proposed East Anglia ONE North  |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 |  |  | project, based on a number of factors, including changes in land management as well as broad climate predictions.   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.1<br>Scoped-in Important Ornithological Features. Advise that this list is updated to include all important Ornithological Features, and those listed on citations, for example Bittern (Annex I).   | All target species, including those listed in SSSI citations have been included in <b>section 23.6.1</b> of this chapter and subject to a scoping in/out process dependent on the likelihood of any significant effects occurring at a population level.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.1.2, Para. 125<br>There are 7 Nightjar territories recorded within 750m of the onshore cable corridor. The onshore cable corridor may therefore be within the Nightjars territory and provide Functionally Linked Land, therefore habitat for nesting or foraging may be lost due to the construction of infrastructure associated with the project. | The onshore development area has been refined since the presentation of the scoping onshore development area in the PEIR, to take into account potential effects on Important Ornithological Features, including those on nightjar. Generally, the onshore development area has been located in habitats of low importance, at sufficient distance from the SPA to help avoid construction disturbance (see layout, <b>Figure 23.1</b> ). |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.1.5, Para. 128<br>The information provided is currently insufficient to inform assessment that habitat loss will not have a significant effect on nightjar. Further information is required on the final design,   | Detailed information on project design and construction timescales are presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter. Greater detail on the potential  |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 |  | construction timescales in relation to features of interest and mitigation.   | difference in impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology for crossing the SPA is provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1 and 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.2.2, Para. 135<br>There is currently insufficient information provided for Natural England to comment on likely significant effect to Woodlark. Any risk of a reduction in or loss of a terrestrial or marine European Site should be judged to be a 'likely significant effect', and the full significance of its impact on a site's integrity should be further tested by appropriate assessment. An appropriate assessment should examine the predicted loss in more detail, clearly identifying whether or not it would affect the habitats or supporting habitats of the European Site's qualifying features within that site. | Detailed information project design and construction timescales is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter.<br><br>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.2.5, Para. 138<br>There is currently insufficient information provided for Natural England to provide comment on the likely significant effect of habitat loss and disturbance to Woodlark. We would advise that mitigation is provided.  | Detailed information project design and construction timescales is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter. Greater detail on the potential difference in habitat loss impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology for crossing the SPA is provided in <b>section 23.6.3.1</b> of this chapter, and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts. |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                       | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 |  |  | The onshore development area has been refined since the presentation of the scoping onshore development area in the PEIR, to take into account potential effects on Important Ornithological Features, including those on woodlark. Generally, the onshore development area has been located in habitats of low importance, at sufficient distance from the SPA to help avoid construction disturbance (see layout, <b>Figure 23.1</b> ). |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42<br>Consultation<br>Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.3.5, Para. 147<br>We welcome the incorporation of Turtle dove mitigation   | Noted.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42<br>Consultation<br>Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.4.5, Para. 160<br>Natural England reiterate their preference for HDD under the SPA/SSSI.   | Noted.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br>Section 42<br>Consultation<br>Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.4.6, Para. 162<br>Natural England would expect to see potential effects of alternatives of HDD and open trenching across the SPA/SSI presented and used to inform assessment of potential effects and residual impacts | Detailed information on HDD and open-trench methods across the SPA is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter as part of the impact assessment. Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology for crossing  |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 |  |   | the SPA is provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1</b> and <b>23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts.   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.5.4<br>With regards Marsh Harrier, as there may be direct impacts from habitat loss and indirect disturbance effects, the impact should be considered for Marsh Harriers which form part of the assemblage of Minsmere to Walberswick SPA which may use the area as Functionally Linked Land.   | Effects on SSSI populations of marsh harrier have been considered in the impact assessment.<br><br>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3) |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.6<br>Would expect recent datasets such as Suffolk Community Barn Owl Project, to inform the final assessment within the ES.   | Historic datasets provided by the Suffolk Community Barn Owl project, the Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service, and RSPB have been considered as part of the impact assessment. These data sources are listed in <b>section 23.4.2</b> of this chapter.              |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.6.5, Para. 175<br>We welcome that 'Any potential losses of territories will aim to be compensated for by the erection of new nest boxes in suitable locations within the local area, in consultation with the Suffolk Community Barn Owl Project'. We would advise that any compensatory habitat is provided in appropriate timescales. | Noted. Barn owl nest boxes would be erected prior to construction commencing. Any habitat management required to mitigate construction impacts would also begin prior to construction.   |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.7.5, Para. 183<br>There is currently insufficient information to confidently assess significant effects to Cetti's warbler.  | Detailed information on the nature, location and extent of construction activities in relation to target species, including Cetti's warbler, are presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter. Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology is provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1</b> and <b>23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts. |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.1.9, Para. 193<br>As a Marsh Warbler was recorded within Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI, would expect to see consideration of indirect disturbance effects on this species.  | Disturbance effects on marsh warbler have been considered in <b>section 23.6.3.2.9</b> of this chapter.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.2<br>There is currently no assessment of the levels of Construction disturbance associated with the alternative HDD or open cut trenching options. Natural England advise the assessment of alternatives be provided in the EIA. | Detailed information on the alternative HDD and open-trenching options for crossing the SPA/SSSI and within the landfall area is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter for the purposes of the impact assessment. Greater detail on the potential difference in disturbance impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology is provided in <b>section 23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter   |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
|                 |  |  | and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts.   |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.2.1.5<br>Mitigation- We note a detailed Method Statement would be developed for working within and / or in proximity to the Sandlings SPA and advise this also applies to the Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI. As the method statement currently forms the main means of mitigation to bird species we advise that a draft copy would be submitted with the DCO.<br><br>There is currently insufficient information provided regarding areas of direct habitat loss, and indirect disturbance by noise, light and vibration to comment whether the mitigation proposed would be sufficient. | Noted.<br><br>Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology is provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1</b> and <b>23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts.  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | There is currently insufficient information provided regarding areas of direct habitat loss, and indirect disturbance by noise, light and vibration to comment whether the mitigation proposed would be sufficient.  | Detailed information on the proposed East Anglia ONE North project footprint and associated construction activities is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter for the purposes of the impact assessment. Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology is provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1</b> and <b>23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts. |

| Consultee       | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Section 23.6.3.2.1.5<br>Cumulative Impact Assessment with Sizewell C Power Station. The final assessment in the ES should be based on the most up-to-date project design and impact assessment available at the time. The ES should consider cumulative disturbance and displacement effects of proposed development at Sizewell C power station and any other relevant projects. | Updated information on proposed Sizewell B and Sizewell C developments have been included in <b>section 23.7</b> of this chapter. Further information on the proposed East Anglia ONE North project is included in <b>Appendix 23.2</b> .  |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.20<br>Operational impacts- Further information should be given as to the likely location of any jointing bays or access required within the SPA/SSSI during the operational phase.   | Detailed information on the project footprint and associated construction activities is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter for the purposes of the impact assessment.<br><br>Detailed design of the onshore cable corridor will occur post consent with details submitted to discharge requirements of the draft DCO prior to construction. No jointing bays will be located within the Sandlings SPA. |
| Natural England | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Figure 23.1<br>It is not clear whether Ornithology Figures currently include biological records searches and RSPB datasets. These should be used to inform the EIA.   | Historic datasets provided by the Suffolk Community Barn Owl project, the Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service, and RSPB have been considered as part of the impact assessment.<br><br>These data sources are listed in <b>section 23.4.2</b> of this chapter.   |

| Consultee   | Date/ Document                                     | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|---|--|--|---|
|   |  |  | RSPB records are shown in <b>Confidential Figure 23.10</b> .  |
| Natural England   | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.23<br>Potential Impacts Identified for Onshore Ornithology - Any risk of a reduction in or loss of a terrestrial or marine European Site should be judged to be a 'likely significant effect', and the full significance of its impact on a site's integrity should be further tested by appropriate assessment. An appropriate assessment should examine the predicted loss in more detail, clearly identifying whether or not it would affect the habitats or supporting habitats of the European Site's qualifying features within that site. | Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)   |
| Natural England   | 26/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | PEIR Table 23.23<br>During the operational phase lighting impacts associated with the substations may increase the extent of effective habitat loss for protected species. Consideration should be given to this and mitigation in the form of lighting design and screening outlined  | Detailed information on the project footprint and associated lighting is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter for the purposes of the impact assessment.<br><br>The onshore substation and National grid substation will require motion-sensitive security lighting surrounding the perimeter, and are not anticipated to be permanently lit. Consideration of operational disturbance is given in <b>section 23.6.2</b> of this chapter. |
| Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council | 27/03/2019<br><br>Section 42 Consultation Response | One of the Councils key ecological concerns is the crossing of the Sandlings SPA (designated for breeding Woodlark and Nightjar) and how this will be mitigated. No assurances have been given by SPR as to how the potential disturbance will be avoided or mitigated but this could be done by rapid work "off-season". If it is   | Detailed information on the alternative HDD and open-trenching options for crossing the SPA/SSSI and within the landfall area is presented in <b>Chapter 6</b>  |

| Consultee   | Date/ Document                                 | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|---|--|---|--|
|   |  | known where the lines will enter and leave the SPA, this should be feasible. NPS EN-1 (5.3.7) states that 'as a general principle...developments should aim to avoid significant harm to biodiversity'. The development will also require an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations.  | <p><b>Project Description</b>, and summarised in this chapter for the purposes of the impact assessment.</p> <p>Greater detail on the potential difference in impacts, e.g. between an open cut or HDD methodology is provided in <b>sections 23.6.3.1</b> and <b>23.6.3.2</b> of this chapter and taken into consideration for assessing construction impacts.</p> <p>Likely significant effects on European sites (SPA and Ramsar) are considered separately in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (document reference 5.3)</p> |
| Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council | 27/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | It is important to note that the bird breeding season for Woodlark starts in February until early August and Nightjar tend to arrive later in spring (April) and tend to leave in August. The Councils understanding is that SPR propose to cut across the narrowest part of the SPA which is about 150 metres. There is also a network of footpaths in this area. Footpaths well used by walkers with dogs will effectively 'sterilise' an area either side of the path. Mitigation for the works can be seasonal (i.e. over winter) and spatial (i.e. within the sterile zone). It is anticipated that Natural England, RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust will provide further comments on this in their submissions. Other possible mitigation might be placing the drilling units (for HDD) behind existing landscape features (such as buildings, hedgerows, tree-lines) and having sympathetic hours of operation. It will be for SPR to come up with a satisfactory mitigation strategy but there does not appear to be any reason why | Noted. Detailed information on the alternative HDD and open-trenching options for crossing the SPA/SSSI and within the landfall area is presented in <b>Chapter 6 Project Description</b> , and summarised in this chapter for the purposes of the impact assessment. Note that it would be necessary for HDD techniques to involve potential 24-hour working due to the nature of the drilling activity.  |

| Consultee   | Date/ Document                                 | Comment  | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|---|--|--|--|
|   |  | this particular stretch could not be dealt with out of sequence, should that be necessary.   | <p>Mitigation measures for habitat loss and disturbance associated with work within and in proximity to the SPA have been included in the impact assessment for turtle dove and nightingale. No habitat loss for woodlark is predicted, based on distribution of historic records.</p> <p>The Applicant will not undertake onshore cable route construction works to cross the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) / Leiston – Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the SPA/SSSI boundary or within 200m of the SPA/SSSI boundary during the breeding bird season of mid-February to end of August, unless otherwise agreed with Natural England that (based on monitoring information provided by the Ecological Clerk of Works) bird breeding activities within 200m of the SPA/SSSI crossing works area have ceased.</p> |
| Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council | 27/03/2019<br>Section 42 Consultation Response | During the construction phases the Councils welcome the appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works but it is hoped and expected that much better lines of communication will exist compared to previous SPR projects. | Noted. The ECoW would endeavour to maintain good communication with all relevant stakeholders.   |

| Consultee                         | Date/ Document                                      | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES  |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Onshore Ecology & Ornithology ETG | 27/04/2018<br>Onshore Ornithology & Ecology Meeting | ETG noted that some key features of designated sites appear to be missing from PEIR: Onshore Ecology and Onshore Ornithology Method Statement, e.g. bird species are missing from the Deben Estuary and Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPAs (SPAs are designated for bird species so these should be included).   | All ornithological interests of designated sites within 10 kilometres (km) have been taken into consideration for inclusion in the assessment – see <b>section 23.5.2</b> of this chapter for details. This buffer is to take into consideration the maximum extent of foraging range for any SSSI species present within the onshore development area.   |
|                                   |   | In line with their scoping response, the RSPB recommended that breeding bird surveys should be conducted over two years, rather than one due to the potential for variability between years. RSPB also noted that wintering bird surveys should cover the entire winter season (at least November to March) as coverage of February to March only is likely to miss some species. | Baseline surveys were designed specifically to record the abundance and distribution of Sandlings SPA and Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI qualifying interests, as well as any other species of high conservation concern (see <b>section 23.5</b> of this chapter).<br><br>Surveys, as agreed with Natural England, were undertaken each month from February to August 2018, with follow-up surveys in May to August 2019, which is considered sufficient for determining current baseline conditions and likely distribution of qualifying interests. Winter surveys were undertaken each month from |

| Consultee | Date/ Document | Comment   | Response / where addressed in the ES   |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|
|           |                |   | November 2018 to March 2019 inclusive.   |
|           |                | Onshore ornithology study area was agreed by ETG  | Noted.   |
|           |                | ETG recommended that that the potential greater impacts of open trenching should be acknowledged in case HDD is unsuccessful. | HDD techniques would be employed in the landfall area. Where the onshore cable corridor overlaps with designated sites HDD or open trench techniques may be employed. This has been considered in the <b>section 23.1.1</b> of this chapter. |