

REPORT

Boston Alternative Energy Facility

The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Risk Log

Client: Alternative Use Boston Projects Ltd.

Planning Inspectorate EN010095

Reference:

Document Reference: 9.76

Pursuant to: APFP Regulation: N/A

Reference: PB6934-ZZ-XX-RP-Z-4104

Status: Final/0.0

Date: 01 March 2022



HASKONINGDHV UK LTD.

Westpoint
Lynch Wood Business Park
Peterborough
PE26FZ
Industry & Buildings
VAT registration number: 792428892

01733334455 **T**
consultation@bostonaef.co.uk **E**
royalhaskoningdhv.com **W**

Document title: Boston Alternative Energy Facility

Document short title: The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Risk Log

Reference: PB6934-ZZ-XX-RP-Z-4104

Status: 0.0/Final

Date: 01 March 2022

Project name: Boston Alternative Energy Facility

Project number: PB6934

Author(s): Project Team

Drafted by: Project Team

Checked by: Abbie Garry

Date: 01.03.22

Approved by: Paul Salmon

Date: 01.03.22

Classification

Project related

Unless otherwise agreed with the Client, no part of this document may be reproduced or made public or used for any purpose other than that for which the document was produced. HaskoningDHV UK Ltd. accepts no responsibility or liability whatsoever for this document other than towards the Client.

Please note: this document contains personal data of employees of HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.. Before publication or any other way of disclosing, this report needs to be anonymized.



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Response to Row 28 of Intertidal and Marine Ecology	1

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document “The Applicant’s response to Natural England’s Risk Log (REP6-039)” is submitted as indicated by the Applicant in the “Comments on Interested Parties Responses to the Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions (ExQ2)” (document reference 9.66, REP6-030), and as requested within the ExA’s written question Q3.3.1.22 which requests this submission at Deadline 7. The purpose of this document is to make it clear the Applicant’s view on each of Natural England’s risks, specifically noting where information responding to each item has been provided to the Examination. This is especially important where the Natural England version of the log does not recognise such information or submission.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant has provided additional commentary on Natural England’s Risk and Issue Log submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-021) including the updates within the Deadline 6 submission (REP6-039).

2 Response to Row 28 of Intertidal and Marine Ecology

- 2.1.1 Due to the length of the response to row 28 of the intertidal and marine ecology section this is provided below.
- 2.1.2 A further response on estuarine processes was provided at Deadline 3 Response to Environment Agency’s queries on Estuarine Processes (document reference 9.44, REP3-020). The Applicant has also provided a specific response below for Natural England to the question (in addition to previous responses submitted to the examination):
- 2.1.3 It is acknowledged that material would be lost from the system as maintenance dredgings would be used within the Facility as part of the lightweight aggregate production process. The volumes have been estimated at 8000m³ per year (approximately 12,000 tonnes). The Port of Boston currently dredges about 24,000m³ per year (approximately 36,000 tonnes) and this is currently disposed in The Wash. Our assessment only covers dredging of the Facility because the Port of Boston dredged sediment is considered as part of the baseline.
- 2.1.4 The estimated maintenance dredge volume of the facility (12,000 tonnes) is very small compared to the annual supply of sediment to The Wash from marine sources. The Wash is a sheltered, low-energy environment in which tides are the main factor controlling sedimentary processes. This environment favours

accretion making the area an important sedimentary sink. The present-day Wash has an area of about 600km² with about 40km² of fringing saltmarsh and a large area of intertidal mudflats. The annual input of suspended marine sediment into The Wash has been estimated at around six million tonnes, which is three orders of magnitude higher than the annual loss through maintenance dredging of sediment of the same type. Hence, the removal of sediment due to maintenance dredging operations will have little effect on the overall budget of The Wash system as a whole because it is a very small component of the overall contribution of sediment to the system. Even if the entire 12,000 tonnes of mobile sediment from the facility would be deposited in The Wash, it is only 0.2% of the sediment that is supplied to the Wash from the North Sea on an annual basis.

- 2.1.5 In an email dated 13th September, Natural England noted that maintenance dredging would be ongoing at the berths and channel and advised that this must be disposed of within The Wash. The Applicant offers the response above; the removal of 8,000m³ (approximately 12,000 tonnes) of mobile mud each year for maintenance is very small compared to the annual 6 million tonnes of marine supply of the same type of sediment and therefore not considered to be significant.
- 2.1.6 Response to ship wash comment:
- 2.1.7 The Applicant was able to locate Houser (2010) and Currin et al. (2017), but was unable to find Ellis et al. (2002) and Baldwin (2008). The two references found are: Currin, C.A. Davis, J. and Malhotra, A. 2017. Response of Salt Marshes to Wave Energy Provides Guidance for Successful Living Shoreline Implementation. In. Living Shorelines. The Science and Management of Nature-Based Coastal Protection, and Houser, C. 2010. Relative Importance of Vessel-Generated and Wind Waves to Salt Marsh Erosion in a Restricted Fetch Environment. Journal of Coastal Research, 26, 230-240.
- 2.1.8 Currin et al (2017) summarised the relationship between shoreline wave energy and marsh erosion rates, but did not differentiate vessel-generated and wind-generated waves. Indeed, ship wash was not investigated. However, Houser (2010) studied erosion of a salt marsh scarp between October 2007 and February 2008 in the North Channel of the Savannah River, the main shipping channel for the Port of Savannah, Georgia, and the relative importance of wind-generated and vessel-generated waves to its retreat. He concluded that the waves generated by large container ships (14 per day) accounted for about 5% of the cumulative wave energy, but because of their large height and long period, they accounted for almost 25% of the cumulative wave force. He showed that locally generated wind waves accounted for most of the wave force acting on the saltmarsh and are largely responsible for the observed erosion. He argued that an increase in vessel

traffic and/or the use of larger, post-Panamax ships would not significantly accelerate the retreat of the saltmarsh.

- 2.1.9 As set out in RR-013-08 the annual effect of erosion by wind-waves (and tidal currents) would continue to significantly exceed the erosion caused by ship wash, and the increase in erosion from such ship wash is considered to be negligible. Given the very small predicted increases the Applicant considers that a more in-depth assessment is not required to underpin the conclusions set out in the ES. Hence, the response is the same as in the response to Relevant Reqs.
- 2.1.10 The assessment of ship wash starts from the premise that erosion due to ship wash already occurs in The Haven and will continue to occur once the numbers of vessels increase (Paragraph 16.7.52 of Chapter 16 Estuarine Processes (document reference 6.2.16, APP-054)). The important element of the assessment is whether the increase in erosion induced by extra vessels is significant. The evidence for a negligible effect due to ship wash on erosion is presented in Chapter 16 Estuarine Processes (document reference 6.2.16, APP-054), Paragraphs 16.7.46 to 16.7.58. The key evidence supporting this conclusion is that the increase in time that ship wash would be active on the intertidal mudflats (from 0.15 % of a year pre the Facility to 0.37 % of a year post the Facility) will still be very small compared to the relatively large amount of time that natural wind-waves are active (greater than 99.6% of a year both pre- and post-Facility). So, even though the percentage of time that ship wash is active would be doubled, the relative amount of time it is active compared to natural wind-waves is still small. Hence, the annual effect of erosion by wind-waves (and tidal currents) would continue to significantly exceed the erosion caused by ship wash, and the increase in erosion from such ship wash is considered to be negligible.

Natural England's key to RAG status	Risk
<p>Purple</p> <p>Note for Examiners and/or competent authority. May relate to DCO/DML.</p>	
<p>Red</p> <p>Natural England considers that unless these issues are resolved it will have to advise that (in relation to any one of them, and as appropriate) it is not possible to ascertain that the project will not affect the integrity of an SAC/SPA and/or comply fully with the Environmental Impact Assessment requirements and/or avoid significant adverse effect on landscape/seascape, unless the following are satisfactorily provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> new baseline data; significant design changes; and/or significant mitigation; <p>Natural England feels that issues given Red status are so complex, or require the provision of so much outstanding information, that they are unlikely to be resolved during examination, and respectfully suggests that they be addressed beforehand.</p>	
<p>Amber</p> <p>Natural England considers that if these issues are not addressed or resolved by the end of examination then they would become a Red risk as set out above. Likely to relate to fundamental issues with assessment or methodology which could be rectified; preferably before examination.</p>	
<p>Yellow</p> <p>These are issues/comments where Natural England doesn't agree with the Applicant's position or approach. We would flag these at the PEI stage with the view that they would be addressed in the Application. But otherwise we are satisfied for <u>this particular project</u> that it will not make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, it should be noted that this may not be the case for other projects. Therefore it should be noted by interested parties that just because these issues/comments are not raised as part of our Relevant Representations in this instance it should not be understood or inferred that in other cases or circumstances Natural England will take this approach. Furthermore, these may become issues should further evidence be presented.</p>	
<p>Green</p> <p>Natural England supports the Applicant's approach.</p>	
<p>Grey</p> <p>These are issues/comments where the matter is closed.</p>	

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation -Appendix A - Generic Issues	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
Appendix A - Generic Issues											
1	We have continued concerns that not all the risks related to the proposal have been fully considered which means that, following the precautionary principle, we are unable to exclude, beyond all reasonable scientific doubt, no Adverse Effect on Integrity of the Wash SPA or The Wash & North Norfolk Coast SAC.		NE has advised the Applicant (in writing through our DAS service on 13th Sept) that unless the further information is provided to help determine the scale of the impacts, we will not be able to advise further on the appropriateness of any mitigation and/or compensatory measures and our advice will be more precautionary.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		Individual comments from NE are addressed in specific rows of this Risk and Issues log, including those which deal with further information.
2	Key plans identified to provide the necessary comfort to ExA and SoS that the projects will not have a detrimental impact have either not been provided or where they have they are too high level to demonstrate that necessary actions will be taken to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts to acceptable levels. As with other NSIPs we advise that the Applicant provides Outline plans as part of the consenting phase.		Natural England await being consulted on Outline plans throughout the examination.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		In row 2 of Table 1-13 in the Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035) notes NE's further comments on this point and the Applicant's response. In addition, an updated OLEMS was provided at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007).
Environmental Statement											

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation -Appendix A - Generic Issues	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
3	We do not currently agree with Worst Case Scenarios presented and conclusions. In particular (but not exclusively) this concern relates to cumulative/in-combination assessments and/or in direct consequences of the proposal e.g. relocation of fishing boats, increased dredging.		The Applicant provided clarification on this point (in writing on 13th August) "Worst case scenarios are defined in relation to many of the impacts, where relevant, in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 17, document reference APP-055). However, to remove any doubt or ambiguity we will confirm the basis of all assessments in a consistent format to stakeholders and the basis for their derivation during examination. Where such scenarios have an impact on features they are addressed within the impact assessment on that feature within the ES, HRA or both documents." However, whilst this clarity is welcomed the initial point hasn't currently been addressed and remains outstanding.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		Worst Case Scenarios were included where relevant within the Ornithology Addendum. With regards to NE's specific point on relocation of fishing boats, the relocation of fishing vessels has been confirmed as not being required as part of the project and does not form part of the project. With regards to dredging this has been clarified within our responses to Relevant and Written Representations. See REP5-004 (Q2.3.0.5) in particular plus REP2-008 (Q3.0.4 and 15.0.2), REP3-012 (Q15.0.2) and REP3-020. The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm what is outstanding with regards to worst case scenarios.
Environmental Statement - Chapter 5 - Project Description											
4	Ship numbers – RDF delivery; mentions 10 ships per week = 520 ships per year. Is this the maximum figure? This is single journeys so a return trip of 1040 vessel movements. In addition, need to consider pilot boats (1 or 2 vessels per high tide).		Natural England awaits an updated ES.		Ongoing		Ongoing		NE still require clarification over pilot boats.		A response to this question was provided in row 12 and row 102 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). Further information on pilot movements is provided in the Ornithology addendum to the ES and HRA (document reference 9.13, REP1-026) in paragraph 4.3.16.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation -Appendix A - Generic Issues	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
5	Ship numbers – following on from paragraph 5.6.10 – it notes 580 vessels per year or 12 ships per week: but 12 x 52 = 624? Is 580 the maximum number of vessels, can this be clarified?		Natural England awaits an updated ES.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		<p>A response to this question was provided in row 13 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). A response was also provided to the ExA on this question at Q3.0.6 of Comments on Examining Authority's First Written Questions (document reference 9.24, REP2-008).</p> <p>The Applicant requests Natural England confirm what is outstanding on this point.</p>
Environmental Statement - Chapter 17 - Marine and Coastal Ecology											
6	Disturbance to birds by vessel movement during construction – 89 vessels (178 return trips + pilot boats). Suggested numbers of 5 vessels per week (peak), typically 4 per month. This seems to be inconsistent with other sections of the ES.		Natural England awaits an updated ES.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		<p>A response to this question was provided in row 14 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035).</p> <p>The Applicant requests Natural England confirm what is outstanding on this point.</p>
7	Increased vessel traffic/ movement – from c. 420 (based on 2019 figures) to c. 1000 vessels – which equates to 2000 vessel movements along with pilot boat movements. Again, this is inconsistent with other sections of the ES.		Natural England awaits an updated ES.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		
8	Increase in pilot boats to accompany the vessels. The pilot travel faster and cause increased boat wash – is there a speed limit for the pilot boats?		Natural England awaits an updated ES.		Ongoing		Ongoing		Ongoing		<p>Further information on pilot movements is provided in the Ornithology addendum to the ES and HRA (document reference 9.13, REP1-026).</p>

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology											
Environmental Statement - Chapter 17 - Marine and Coastal Ecology											
1	Please be advised that bird data required for March to June 2021 has not yet been submitted. Natural England advises for birds, a minimum of two years site specific data is collected to allow for variation in bird use between years.		The Applicant informed NE that they will include additional bird data and updated analysis in a HRA addendum (in writing on 13th August). We will respond to this through the examination process.		The Applicant submitted an Ornithology Addendum at Deadline 1 [REP1-026]. We welcome the additional survey data provided. While not representing two full years survey, as is best practise, the additional data does extend the surveyed period considerably and it now includes part of two winter seasons. However there still remains considerable evidence gaps relating to Annex I passage birds		No update.		The Applicant submitted Autumn passage bird survey data submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-019]. However, there is still not a complete data set.		Autumn survey data was submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 9.43, REP3-019) which covers the autumn wader passage including that of ruff which is an Annex I passage bird. Breeding bird surveys data in full for 2020 to 2021 (including the 2021 Breeding Birds Survey report) is being submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 7. These surveys (April to June) cover the spring wader passage season and geographically cover the Principal Application Site and the adjacent section of The Haven. Winter survey data covering the Principal Application Site, and the Haven from the Principal Application Site to the Mouth of The Haven, will be available when the latest winter survey data (covering the latter) is submitted by Deadline 8.
2	Natural England queries why citation text and list SPA species isn't fully utilised as well as SSSI features. For example, no mention of key species <i>i.e.</i> breeding Redshank and littoral sediment, SM4-28 saltmarsh etc.		The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th August) that this will be reviewed in the documents but the ES/HRA has discussed species/habitats that are likely to be affected. NE responded (in writing on 13th Sept) that we will be guided by the ExA on this as other NSIPs have been requested to submit the relevant site information in the past.		The Applicant submitted an Ornithology Addendum at Deadline 1 [REP1-026]. NE note that consideration has been given to impacts on a number of individual species which form features of the site, but there has been no assessment of the impacts to Annex I non-breeding waterfowl assemblage as a feature in its own right. This matter remains outstanding.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant provided an assessment of the breeding redshank feature of The Wash SSSI and non-breeding waterbird assemblage of The Wash SPA/Ramsar at Deadline 5 [document reference 9.59, REP5-006].

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
3	<p>Natural England notes that Redshank are shown as absent in table between April and July. However, we advise that they should be shown as present as they breed on The Wash. Also, Ringed Plover is missing a month, and this should be checked to be correct.</p>		<p>The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that Redshank are "not designated as a breeding species as the size of the breeding population, although 'undoubtedly of national importance', had yet to be assessed." NE responded to say that breeding redshank are a notified feature of The Wash SSSI and impacts on the feature need to be considered further (even if outside the HRA).</p>		<p>NE note that REP1-026 includes redshank as a breeding species as a feature of The Wash SSSI. We note the document states that breeding redshank were not recorded during any of the surveys undertaken and that is why they are absent April-July. However, Natural England queries the outcome of this data.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>The Applicant provided an assessment of the breeding redshank feature of The Wash SSSI at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006).</p>
4	<p>Natural England acknowledges that monitoring by an ornithologist was undertaken for the EA Boston Haven embankment works for activities carried out during the autumn/spring passage and overwinter. Monitoring considered noise and visual disturbance and recorded species, numbers, and bird behaviour. A stop trigger (based on 1% of the cited SPA numbers) was used when works were noted to show disturbance. At that time a 500m monitoring zone was required. For this project a 250m zone has been suggested based on the data collected. We advise that this appears to be appropriate for BAEF considering the distance from the SPA and the reduced numbers of birds using the upper stretches of The Haven; but note data has shown numbers of Ruff and Redshank</p>		<p>Natural England awaits a demonstration that the proposed 250m buffer zone is fit for purpose for ruff and redshank. The Applicant has informed NE that "buffer zones work to avoid and minimise disturbance, Cutts et al (2008) provides peer reviewed data on disturbance for waders. NE responded (on 13th Sept) to state that while Cutts et al. may be appropriate for identifying generic distances where no better data exists, disturbance and habituation are often subject to site specific variation. Some data had been collected as part of the bird surveys it would be appropriate to review behavioural response information to see how distances compare at this site and whether following Cutts et al is appropriate; precautionary; or not-precautionary enough.</p>		<p>This matter remains under discussion.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>NE welcomes the recognition of ruff as well as redshank as a species of concern at the development site and concurs with this assessment. Compensation will be required for ruff. But this could be the same, as the yet to be agreed, compensation for Redshank.</p>		<p>Potential for noise disturbance to redshank/ruff was summarised at Deadline 4 [document reference 9.50, REP4-015) and was indicated to be generally absent and during piling was suitably mitigated by seasonal restriction on this activity. Visual disturbance to redshank and ruff has been summarised as having no adverse impact on these species, within the HRA (document reference APP-111), HRA addendum (document reference REP1-026) and at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006). The Applicant agrees that in-principle compensation measures for redshank are likely to be suitable for ruff also, and plans for implementation and monitoring of compensation for waterbirds including these species will be provided at Deadline 8.</p>

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
5	Natural England notes that within the Haven there are likely to be seven SPA species likely to be disturbed by increased boat traffic i.e. dark-bellied brent goose, shelduck, lapwing, dunlin, black-tailed godwit, redshank, and turnstone.		The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that an addendum to the HRA and a without prejudice derogation case will be submitted into examination. We will advise further once received.		Natural England awaits further information, this issue is ongoing.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant submitted their Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation Case: Compensation Measures (document reference 9.30, REP2-013) at Deadline 2. Further assessment of disturbance and energetics of brent goose, redshank, black-tailed godwit, lapwing and golden plover were provided at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) section 7. Further information on compensation measures will be submitted at Deadline 8.
6	Natural England is concerned that disturbance to roosts at the mouth of the Haven may affect 24 species including 8 at greater than 1% of site population.		See issue 4 and 5.		Please see section 1 of Appendix B2 at Deadline 2.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant maintains that the HRA Ornithology Addendum Appendix A1 provides detailed assessment as to how the disturbance of the highlighted bird species stands to have no adverse effect on site integrity via conservation objectives for the species. Further assessment of disturbance and energetics was provided at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7). The most recent report on Changes in Waterbird Behaviour in response to vessel traffic (Jan to Nov 2021) was submitted at Deadline 6 (document reference 9.71, REP6-034).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
7	<p>Natural England notes that the area likely to be disturbed by the proposed works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • golden plover and black-tailed godwit at over 20% of The Wash SPA total and over 2000 individuals; and • lapwing 7.5% and 1100 individuals. <p>Therefore, we consider this to be an important area of supporting habitat of The Wash SPA. Natural England advises that an Adverse effect on integrity can't be excluded beyond all reasonable scientific doubt.</p>		<p>See response to 5 re disturbance. The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that additional disturbance could occur to golden plover and lapwing as they appear to remain at the site of initial disturbance and the work above on energy budgets. If a significant impact is concluded from the additional energy budgets required by these species then mitigation would be recommended. NE responded (on 13th Sept) to state that if there are considered to be significant energy budget implications that cannot be avoided or reduced to acceptable levels this is likely to require 'compensation' not 'mitigation'.</p>		<p>Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>The Applicant provided a technical note on implications of disturbance to these species at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006 section 7) which suggested insufficient impacts of disturbance (via energetics) as a result of the increase in vessel numbers above the baseline levels, to have adverse effects on the species or designated sites.</p>
8	<p>Natural England notes that it is recognised that birds are sensitive to boat disturbance.</p>		<p>See issue 5.</p>		<p>Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>No update.</p>		<p>In the ES Chapter 17 and Appendix 17.1 (HRA) - Ornithology Addendum (document reference 9.13, REP1-026), the Applicant has provided a worst-case scenario for vessel movement numbers and associated high tides used, and related this to the baseline vessel traffic and tide use. The Applicant notes Natural England's comments on potential importance of spring vs neap tides and will include coverage of this factor in final analysis of baseline ornithology data at Deadline 8. The Applicant confirms that references to fractions of a vessel (.6) simply refer to mean numbers of transits. Further response to Appendix B2 was provided at Deadline 5 (document reference 8.10, REP6-006) in the form of direct responses in Tables and coverage in main text.</p>

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
9	Natural England agrees that displaced birds of some species fly 125-800m to alternate roosts. However, it is not clear if the alternative roost/s can accommodate all individuals of all species. But we note that there is also no information on the quality of alternative roosts and if these are secondary and only used as a second choice when their preferred area is not available for whatever reason.		Natural England await relevant documents on this issue.		Please see issue 7.		No update.		No update.		A response was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) Table 7-1, row 'RSPB paragraph 2.53'. "The Applicant agrees that the availability (to mouth of The Haven roosting birds) of alternative roost sites on The Haven, and along the foreshore of The Wash at Freiston and Frampton, clearly varies between neap and spring tide heights, as observed also by the Applicant's contractor during bird surveys. At neap tide the alternative roosts are within 800 m of the mouth of The Haven and, to at least some species (curlew, redshank, black-tailed godwit, golden plover), are of primary quality/preference and used immediately without prior disturbance (as the tide shifts foraging birds into initial roost sites)...."
10	Natural England notes that phasing of boats up the Haven is identified, but how traffic down the Haven will be managed is not discussed. Natural England is concerned that birds would be at risk of being repeatedly pushed around over each high tide cycle.		The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that if measures are available that could be implemented to reduce the occurrences of disturbance, they will be incorporated into the addendum to the HRA and secured through an appropriate mechanism in the DCO. NE advised that this mitigation needs to be captured within the DCO/dML. We await further information to be provided by the Applicant.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant's response to Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035) provides a response regarding the Navigational Management Plan which is a requirement of the DCO. NE's representations relating to vessel movements at Deadline 2 were additionally addressed at Deadline 6 in a note on Navigation Management (document reference 9.70, REP6-033).
11	Please be advised that most birds relocate on disturbance, but some species repeatedly return e.g. Lapwing and golden plover. Therefore, we believe that there is the potential for repeated disturbance impacts on same individuals.		The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that this is acknowledged in the ES and HRA but we advised a fuller assessment is required.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		A technical note on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
12	Natural England notes that it is recognised that some species abandon roosts after disturbance e.g. Oystercatcher; redshank; black-t godwit. But this is contradictory to the HRA wording.		NE were informed that the wording within the HRA is being reviewed. NE will respond to the addendum to the HRA through the examination process.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		A technical note on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7).
13	Natural England advises that, for species, which return to the roost it is likely to take more than 120 sec to pass by the roost from first disturbance to departure. Note this is equivalent to a flight of approx. 1.8km (based on 15m/s = 1800m per 120 secs (Hedenström, A. & Åkesson, S. (2017). <i>Flight speed adjustment by three wader species in relation to winds and flock size</i> . Animal Behaviour, 134, 209-215.)).		The Applicant informed NE "The flight times carry greater certainty than flight routes as they were directly measured by the field surveyor. A worst case flight time of 120 s, 30-100% higher than the typical flight times (60-90 s), has subsequently been used in calculations of energetic demand per disturbance flight, therefore the methodology has employed caution and should not impact on the relevance of resultant calculations." We advised that "calculations that reflect the distance flown by the birds (time in flight x flight speed) are likely to be more informative with reference to energy budgets than straight line distances between take-off and landing points." We await further correspondence from the Applicant.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		This comment was noted by the Applicant, the source was consulted, and the NE comment addressed at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) in paragraph 7.2.1.
14	Natural England notes that under calculation of energetic consequence of disturbance reference to Krist et al (2001) and Collop et al (2016 are seemingly missing.		The Applicant has informed NE this will be reflected in the addendum to the HRA and submitted into examination.		NE note this has been updated in REP1-026.						Point closed.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
15	Natural England is concerned in relation to energy lost per flush which is quantified for repeatedly disturbed golden plover and lapwing. Range 0.39-0.51%.		The Applicant has informed NE this will be reflected in the addendum to the HRA and submitted into examination.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		A technical note on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7).
16	Natural England is concerned that the daily loss of additional 2% energy input may be significant for species at the edge of their energy balance either as a default e.g. Black-tailed godwit (for which birds on the Wash have a negative daily energy budget in winter (Alves et al - Ecology, 94(1), 2013, pp. 11-17) or under certain conditions e.g. severe weather. Potential need for 2% increase in energy intake cannot be dismissed as insignificant or trivial.		The Applicant has informed NE this will be reflected in the addendum to the HRA and submitted into examination.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		A technical note on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7).
17	Natural England notes that the displacement of 6980 birds is argued as being beneficial as birds are not present to be repeatedly disturbed. However, this is contradictory to the conservation objectives for The Wash SPA and HRA expectation that distribution of features within the designated site should not be affected. Therefore, we advise that the conservation objectives for the site are being hindered and an adverse effect on integrity can be ruled out.		We await proposed compensation measures that will need to be considered as part of a derogations case.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		An initial in-principle compensation package was submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. This was updated and submitted for Deadline 6 (document reference 9.30, REP6-025). The Applicant stresses that nowhere in its assessments do they refer to displacement as 'beneficial'. More recently the Applicant submitted a technical note at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7) outlining local populations considered to be subject to 'one-off' displacement per tide and others subject to repeat disturbance due to each successive vessel; with details of the energetic outcomes of these respective situations. This note used project-specific survey data and published equations for modelling estimated energy expenditure.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
18	Whilst Natural England agrees that some level of habituation may currently be occurring, there is no evidence presented to support the argument that this will be the case from a significant more than doubling of vessel disturbance, especially if preferred supporting habitat is also lost.		We advise that impacts are avoided, reduced, and mitigated to acceptable levels and where that is not possible compensation measures must be provided.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		No update.		The Applicant submitted an initial compensation package at Deadline 2 (Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation Case: Compensation Measures, document reference 9.30, REP2-013). This was updated and submitted for Deadline 6 (document reference 9.30, REP6-025). Further information on compensation measures will be submitted at Deadline 8.
19	Natural England is unaware of any supportive evidence to say that night-time vessel movement would be less disturbing.		The Applicant has informed NE this will be reflected in the addendum to the HRA and submitted into examination.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		The assessment has considered the worst case scenario that there would be the same level of disturbance during the day and night. However the scale of the impacts		The Applicant's assessment has considered the worst case scenario that there would be the same level of disturbance during the day and night.
20	Natural England requests confirmation from the Applicant that with the traffic increase the current 20% of days (equivalent 46 days/yr) that are quiet would be lost. Natural England also advises that clarity is also sought on the potential for further increases in disturbance during all high tides from vessels movements i.e. will the proposed works take the Haven to the maximum carrying capacity? How would potential increases in boat traffic over the lifetime of the project be taken into account?		Natural England have been informed (through writing on 13th August) that this will be clarified in future submissions.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update. Natural England remains concerned about vessels movements as per D3 responses.		This is covered within the worst case scenario of the ornithology addendum (document reference 9.13, REP1-026). This includes the maximum capacity of vessels (paragraph 4.1.1). The Chapter 17 Marine and Coastal Ecology and Appendix 17.1 HRA Update submitted for Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) also discusses worst-case scenarios for vessel numbers and potential for disturbance to birds and effect on energetics. The numbers of vessels related to the Facility are not expected to increase over the lifetime of the project. The Applicant stresses that the peak number of birds recorded to be present at the mouth of The Haven at one time is approximately 6,500 individuals of all species, not the 20,000-30,000 outlined by NE at Deadline 3 (document reference REP2-045). These higher numbers quoted are the result of summing peak counts across dates and species, rather than a peak count from any one occasion.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
21	<p>Natural England notes proposals to enhance saltmarsh for redshank. And agrees that capital works are appropriate, but mechanism to maintain the works permanently are not identified.</p> <p>Please be advised that works will require (1) annual management to prevent succession to poor quality (for redshank) saltmarsh; and (2) a mechanism to prevent access and associated disturbance from users of the nearby footpath. Furthermore, the proposed roost is likely to be subject to vessel disturbance which may compromise its functionality as an alternate roost.</p>		Further consideration is required in relation to the suitability of any compensation measures.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		The updated OLEMS provided at Deadline 3 included ongoing maintenance (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). The disturbance from the footpath is not expected to change from the existing levels experienced. Monitoring is also proposed, with adaptive management, to survey the usage of the roost sites created and enhanced to ensure that they provide habitat for the same number of birds.
22a	<p>Natural England notes that the Applicant proposes to create additional mudflat with extra 10% over area lost. We require further evidence on the suitability of any chosen location/s proposed to compensate for supporting habitat lost.</p>		We will continue to engage with the Applicant on this issue.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). A response to NE Relevant Representations Appendix J2 was provided by the Applicant in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
22b	It can be reasonably expected to provide foraging habitat for redshank, the limitations for them utilising the area should also be noted. For example, the location is remote from the area of lost feeding and identified roost mitigation, so will require access to a roost area if it is to support function for redshank.		NE would like further clarity on the impacts of the proposed mitigation works for Redshank on the saltmarsh habitat e.g. there will be further loss (although limited) of saltmarsh habitat through the creation of scrapes.		NE note the need to manage the proposed alternative roost site with redshank-specific features and to undertake annual maintenance to secure the roost habitat has been acknowledged in REP1-026. However, our advice remains unchanged.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). A response to NE Relevant Representations Appendix J2 was provided by the Applicant in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
22c	We note that a site and detailed proposal are not available at the current time and therefore we would welcome this information as soon as possible.		NE have been informed that further measures within and close to the mouth of The Haven are subject to further discussion once the potential area to compensate is defined. We will respond once documents are submitted into examination.		We will continue to engage with the Applicant on this issue.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant submitted an initial compensation package at Deadline 2 (Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation Case: Compensation Measures, document reference 9.30, REP2-013). An updated compensation document was submitted at Deadline 6 (document reference 9.30, REP6-025). Further information on compensation measures will be submitted at Deadline 8.
22d	We advise that there is some evidence that recreated mudflats can be of good quality (Lucas, M., Lucas, M. & Mike, E. (2013). The value of wader foraging behaviour study to assess the success of restored intertidal areas. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 131, 1-5.) which provides reassurance.		RHDHV have been involved in studies to monitor created mudflat and have observed colonisation on such areas which have provided foraging areas for birds. NE queries how this has been taken into consideration for the project proposal?		We will continue to engage with the Applicant on this issue.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). A response to NE Relevant Representations Appendix J2 was provided by the Applicant in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy											
23	Natural England advises that there appears to be an omission of mudflat and saltmarsh from calculations, which need addressing given this is also supporting habitats/functionally linked land for SPA birds.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). A response to NE Relevant Representations Appendix J2 was provided by the Applicant in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
24	Is saltmarsh being classified as intertidal here in appendix 1 of the OLEMS?		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		This issue is now closed based on latest version of OLEMS.		Yes saltmarsh is classed as intertidal.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
25	Summary of proposals for roost compensation: We advise that proposals need amending to reflect the need for annual habitat management and the need to manage disturbance (both people and boats) if this is to work. Ownership of (any) shooting rights is important to know and not articulated.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5. Natural England advises that local wildfowling groups should be contacted in relation to shooting rights.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). The Applicant is not aware of any shooting rights near the proposed compensatory / net gain areas. The Applicant also submitted an initial compensation package at Deadline 2 (Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation Case: Compensation Measures, document reference 9.30, REP2-013). An updated compensation document was submitted at Deadline 6 (document reference 9.30, REP6-025).
26	Mudflat compensation 'not negotiated yet': we advise that there are no guarantees that the mudflat as a habitat will be suitable for foraging redshank; as not negotiated no certainty of delivery.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007). A response to NE Relevant Representations Appendix J2 was provided by the Applicant in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
Environmental Statement - Habitats Regulations Assessment											
27	Natural England acknowledges that the Applicant has confirmed that birds in the Haven are disturbed by vessels. But does not recognise that this will apply to the 'mitigation' roost area. And again, clarity is need in relation to vessel trip numbers etc.		Natural England awaits a further assessment of disturbance impacts from vessels.		NE note REP1-026 states alternative locations are being sought in order to provide additional locations for roosting birds, particularly redshank. We await an update on this issue.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix B3.		The Applicant considers that noise disturbance to waterbirds has been fully addressed and concluded to be respectively minimal (construction excepting piling, and operation) or mitigated (piling is seasonally restricted to avoid wintering season for waterbirds) within the technical note submitted at Deadline 4 (document reference 9.50, REP4-015 . Information on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.58, REP5-006, section 7).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
28	<p>Natural England notes that the loss of feeding grounds for 14-27 redshank has not been compensated for, and as a species that is site loyal in winter there is no evidence to support the assumption that they will relocate to adjacent areas. It is not clear if the Haven is at capacity or not for its redshank population. As a Functionally Linked Population this will have a bearing on the Wash population, although as a relatively small part of the wider population and relatively distant from the SPA. It may, or may not be, of low risk to integrity.</p> <p>Scheme should be aiming to compensate for this loss to mitigate impact on SPA.</p>		Natural England awaits consultation on a compensation package.		Natural England awaits consultation on a compensation package.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		This issue remains outstanding		The Applicant's view is that loss of redshank habitat at the proposed wharf construction footprint is covered by the provision of the Habitat Mitigation Area (noting no adverse effect on integrity is predicted). Please see further information on the Responses to Relevant Representations provided at Deadline 1 (document reference REP1-035). The updated Chapter 17 marine and coastal ecology and Appendix 17.1 HRA update (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) addressed the issue of connectivity of functionally linked habitat.
29	<p>Natural England disagrees with the loss of foraging being dismissed as low risk.</p>		Please see above point.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		No update.		The updated OLEMS provided at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.4(1), REP3-007) and the Without Prejudice HRA Derogation Case: Compensation Measures Update (document reference 9.30(1), REP6-025) both included ongoing maintenance. The disturbance from the footpath is not expected to change from the existing levels experienced. Monitoring is also proposed, with adaptive management, to survey the usage of the roosting and foraging sites created and enhanced to ensure that they provide habitat for the same number of birds.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
30	Natural England advises that the quality of saltmarsh as a biological community is not the issue for redshank – suitability as a roost is. This is more dependent on physical than botanical community aspects of the site. This will require active management and a monitoring regime that can feed into adaptive management. In the event that the disturbance caused by boats negates the value of the habitat enhancement.		The Applicant informed NE " the mitigation proposed is designed to provide additional roosting areas ... The redshank in this area seem to prefer roosting on the rocks in the transition between marsh and mudflat. As discussed above the Habitat Mitigation Area is located to be outwith the predicted zone for disturbance from the operational facility." This remains a concern for NE.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 including adaptive management and monitoring. Comments provided by Natural England in Appendix J2 on the OLEMS at Deadline 5 (document reference REP5-017) have been addressed in the updated OLEMS document to be submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.4(2)).
31	Natural England advises that the current description of proposed works to compensate for loss of habitat important to redshank is insufficient to have confidence that it will deliver the necessary compensation at the scale required.		NE await updated documents (addendum to HRA and OLEMS).		Natural England awaits consultation on a compensation package.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		No update.		The Applicant submitted an initial compensation package at Deadline 2 (Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation Case: Compensation Measures, document reference 9.30, REP2-013). An updated compensation document was submitted at Deadline 6 (document reference 9.30, REP6-025). An updated OLEMS document is also being submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.4(2)).
32	Natural England advises that species identified at risk as individual features, are not combined to risk to assemblage features from these 8, plus those at A17.6.46.		Natural England awaits further evidence and assessment to support HRA statements.		Natural England also notes that REP1-026 gives consideration to impacts on a number of individual species which form features of the site, no assessment is made of the non-breeding waterfowl assemblage as a feature in its own right.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant confirms that assessment for the assemblage is covered in the technical note submitted at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 5).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
33	Natural England notes that the period of disturbance limited to 1-3.5 hrs around high tide, which has been characterised by the Applicant as minimising risk. However, Natural England disagrees. This period is when alternate sites will be most limited so the most critical for roosting birds.		The Applicant has informed NE "The period of disturbance is restricted through the limitation of draft for the vessels entering and leaving The Haven. This does minimise the risk as large vessels will not be able to access The Haven at other times of the tidal cycle. This is when birds currently utilise the alternate roost sites as observed during the disturbance surveys undertaken at the mouth of The Haven". NE advice remains unchanged.		Our advice remains unchanged.		Our advice remains unchanged.		Our advice remains unchanged.		The Applicant confirms it has considered the relevance of spring versus neap tide and the availability of alternative roost sites, as seen in their response to RSPB within the technical note at Deadline 5 (document reference REP5-006, Table 7-1, row 'RSPB Paragraph 2.53'). Alternative sites may be more limited during high tide periods than at low tide, but they are available nevertheless, in the form of mudflats (at neap high tides) or off-Haven saltmarsh and lagoons (all tides), and alternative sites during neap tide include sites of primary preference (see same Table and row).
34	Natural England advises that the Applicants assumption that when redshank leave the roost, they are no longer disturbed is an unsupported assertion as there has been no monitoring of receiver roosts to understand disturbance risks		The Applicant informed NE that "birds that were recorded as relocating in the disturbance area for the surveys at the mouth of the Haven (A. Bentley 2020 Changes in Waterbird Behaviour due to river traffic at the mouth of The Haven, Boston, Lincolnshire) were still within the count area and should there have been further disturbance during the same survey period they would have been recounted." NE advised that a fuller assessment is required than what is currently included in the ES and HRA.		Please see further advice which is relevant to this point in Deadline 2 Appendix B2.		No update.		No update.		The Applicant directs NE to the Ornithology Addendum (document reference 9.13, REP1-026). Further response to Appendix B2 was provided at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) and Deadline 6 (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
35	Natural England advises that the Applicants assumption that when oystercatcher leave the roost, they are no longer disturbed is an unsupported assertion as there has been no monitoring of receiver roosts to understand disturbance risks .				No update.		No update.		No update.		
36	Natural England advises that the Applicants assumption that when black-tailed godwit leave the roost they are no longer disturbed is an unsupported assertion as there has been no monitoring of receiver roosts to understand disturbance risks .				No update.		No update.		No update.		

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
37	Natural England advises that the Applicants assumption that when shelduck leave the roost they are no longer disturbed is an unsupported assertion as there has been no monitoring of receiver roosts/adjacent to understand disturbance risks.				No update.		No update.		No update.		
38	Natural England advises that the Applicants assumption that when oystercatcher leave the roost, they are no longer disturbed is an unsupported assertion as there has been no monitoring of receiver roosts/adjacent to understand disturbance risks.		Natural England awaits further evidence and assessment to support HRA statements.		No update.		No update.		No update.		
39	Natural England advises that the anticipated increase in energy expenditure of 2% per day characterised as trivial for lapwing and golden plover is an unsupported conclusion without supporting evidence that birds are easily able to compensate for the additional energy need.				No update.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 (point 29).		No update.		A technical note on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7).
40	Natural England advises that the anticipated increase in risk for black-tailed godwit characterised as trivial for lapwing and golden plover is an unsupported conclusion without evidence that birds are easily able to compensate for the additional energy need. Note that (Alves et al - Ecology, 94(1), 2013, pp. 11–17) identifies that black-tailed godwits on the Wash operate on a neutral or negative energy budget under baseline circumstances.				No update.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 (point 29).		No update.		A technical note on bird disturbance and energetics was provided by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006, section 7).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status at D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
41	Natural England disagrees with the assertion made that displaced birds are subjected to no further disturbance at alternate, and presumably sub-optimal (as they have not been selected initially), roosts. Please be advised that no evidence from monitoring of receiver roosts has been provided so cannot assume that birds are able to occupy nearby alternates or that they are not subject to additional energy depletion as a consequence of relocation.	Yellow	Natural England awaits further evidence and assessment to support HRA statements.	Yellow	Natural England's advice remains unchanged.	Yellow	Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 (point 31) for advice on roosts.	Yellow	This point remains outstanding.	Yellow	The Applicant directs NE to the Ornithology Addendum (document reference 9.13, REP1-026). Further response to Appendix B2 was provided at Deadline 5 (document reference 9.59, REP5-006) and Deadline 6 (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
42	Natural England is concerned that the Applicant believes that there is no impact along Haven, when there has been no assessment and support evidence provided	Red		Red	NE note REP1-026 states "Given the updates above there is no change to the conclusion of no Adverse Effect on Integrity". NE disagree and our advice remains unchanged	Red	NE advice remains unchanged.	Red	No update.	Red	Further information will be provided at Deadline 8 (when survey information is available).
43	Natural England advises that increased disturbance by a <i>minimum</i> (depending on final agreed figures for vessel movements) of 20-25% because of move to daily boat traffic, including an increase of 34% of days in the key winter period is not insignificant and therefore should not be dismissed.	Yellow		Yellow	No update.	Yellow	No update.	Yellow	This remains an outstanding issue.	Yellow	Further information was provided in the worst case scenario of the Ornithology Addendum (document reference 9.13, REP1-026, paragraph 4.1.1).
44	NEW issue at Deadline 3: Natural England's initial view of the compensation measures identifies that the information provided is at a high level and does not provide enough detail or certainty to have confidence that an AEoI can be offset.	Grey		Grey		Grey	Once the Applicant has submitted an updated derogations case, we can review and provide further advice on ecological merits of the compensation measures and their adequacy in addressing our concerns.	Red	No update.	Red	The Applicant submitted an initial compensation package at Deadline 2 (Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation Case: Compensation Measures, document reference 9.30, REP2-013). As per above, this is being refined for Deadline 8.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
Appendix C - Intertidal & Marine Ecology											
1	Natural England notes that dredging of wharf completed in 2 phases will generate 75,000m3 of silt during 1st phase, and 150,000m3 of silt during 2nd phase (total 225,000 m3). However, it is not clear where this material will be taken? Will it be returned to the wider Wash? Answer may be explained in Chapter 17 (17.8.41) that material will be disposed of landward to minimise contamination of pollutants/ heavy metals, but material will be lost from The Wash and contradictory to the requirements for the Boston Barrage work. Note 17.8.97 – notes that dredging undertaken over 5 months; 2 months prior to wharf construction and 3 months following.		The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that the dredged material will be retained as backfill for the wharf. They also stated that "Most of the sediment that will be removed from the Haven to complete the capital dredge will be relict Holocene sediment that is not part of the active sediment budget. This older sediment is currently 'locked-up' beneath a veneer of mobile silt that is part of the budget. Assuming an active layer of about 20cm, the volume of sediment potentially active in the system that would be extracted for the capital dredge is less than 10,000m3 (or 15,000 tonnes)". NE query how this commitment to only use this amount of sediment and predominantly Holocene material will be documented to the ExA and secured?		No update		No update		Natural England acknowledges that the Applicant has addressed this matter but further work is required to fully resolve in relation to what is and isn't secured and how.		The Applicant responded to this in row 60 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Deemed Marine Licence (DML) (Schedule 9 to the draft DCO (document reference 2.1(3), REP6-002)) includes the volume to be dredged as part of the capital dredge in condition 4(1)(b). Under condition 12 of the DML the undertaker must submit as part of the construction environmental management plan a detailed dredging methodology that includes the volume of material to be dredged and under condition 23 of the DML bathymetric surveys will be undertaken before and after each dredging operation to determine the volume that was dredged. The Applicant request NE to explicitly set out what it considers needs to be secured and the specific drafting it would wish to be included in the DML.
2	Piling of the wharf will require 300 piles, piled to the depth of -35 to -40m OD. Natural England requests confirmation what the piling method will be? And whether or not this will be undertaken at high tide/low tide or BOTH? Please be advised that if using a hammer technique then mitigation measures will be required for marine mammals if works are undertaken outside of low tide.		The Applicant informed NE (in writing on 13th Aug) that mitigation measures will be secured in accordance with the DCO requirement (para 14 of schedule 9 dML) . NE notes that the condition in the DML referred to does include a range of mitigation for piling: Use of pile pads/shrouds at all times, soft start, MMO during high tide, timing to avoid periods of maximum abundance, details of the piling spread throughout the day and monitoring. Our only observation is the mention of avoiding periods of abundance is a bit open. We would therefore welcome amending the condition to specify the periods when piling would be avoided.		NE note the Applicant submitted a Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [REP1-025]. NE have concerns over some proposed mitigation measures such as soft start and MMOs please see Appendix C3 at Deadline 2.		No update		No update		A response was provided at Deadline 4 in the "Response to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and Natural England's queries regarding Marine Mammals and Fish" (document reference 9.49, REP4-014). The final MMMP will be approved by the MMO with consultation with NE.
3	Natural England requests details on slope protection extending over 10,000m ² ? Fig 5.2 sheet 3 shows concrete facing on the mattress protection under wharf and possibly big rocks (no key) for slope protection. Natural England is concerned about the potential scouring of the Habitat Mitigation Area and also to the north, and on opposite bank.		On 13th August the Applicant informed NE that the effects of indirect impacts would be negligible (increase in tidal prism at the wharf is less than 2% of the tidal prism on the entire Haven). Natural England doesn't believe 2% change in the tidal prism is insignificant and therefore awaits further assessment to demonstrate that the impacts would be negligible.		No update		No update		This point remains outstanding		A response to this question was provided in row 62 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm if they have further comments.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
4	Under the Habitat Mitigation Works within the Habitat Mitigation Area it mentions 4 shallow pools (max 15cm deep) created in the existing saltmarsh. Natural England is concerned that without maintenance these will quickly silt up. Therefore, we query what ongoing management will be needed to maintain these pools? Is the intention for these pools/ scrapes to remain unvegetated? Area of the 4 pools? Will the scrapes/ pools result in direct loss of further saltmarsh vegetation? Has this been calculated? this information is vital to assess the benefits of the proposed new area.		Please see issue 22b in the Offshore Ornithology section.		Please see issue 22b in the Offshore Ornithology section.		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Further information is provided within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3. The Applicant has responded to this point in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
5	Natural England notes that works in the Habitat Mitigation Area will be undertaken outside the overwintering bird period; and queries if can this also include outside the breeding bird period to minimise impacts (disturbance and physical) on ground nesting birds. Works should ideally be undertaken in August/ early September. Natural England requires further clarity and commitments on how impacts to breeding birds will be avoided, reduced, and mitigated.		The Applicant informed NE that "Maintenance will be discussed in the updated OLEMS document to ensure ongoing management of the Habitat Mitigation Area to ensure that it functions as required to mitigate the impact." NE queries how this mitigation will be secured?		No update		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		Please see comments at Deadline 5 Appendix relating to the DCO/dML		A response to this question was provided in row 64 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). A further response was provided in Table 2-7 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
6	Natural England queries how frequently will dredging be required over the lifetime of the project?		The Applicant informed NE that "Maintenance dredging is included within the dML (Para 5(l)(l) of Schedule 9 (DML) of the DCO authorises maintenance dredging)." NE notes that, as currently drafted, there are no limits on the dredging, volume or number of occurrences of dredging. Therefore, Natural England doesn't support this condition as written and requests that specific parameters are included.		No update		No update		Whilst the final maintenance dredging 'plan' will need to be approved by the MMO under condition 12 of the draft DML (Schedule 9, of the Draft DCO [APP-005]). We do not agree that it is appropriate based on current caselaw where there could be impacts to designated site features and/or supporting habitats for Annex I birds to not include a maximum volume of maintenance dredging or specify frequency. Without this, a full assessment of the worse case scenario impacts can't be made.		A response to this question was provided in row 65 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). It is anticipated that the annual volume of material from maintenance dredging of the berthing pocket would be approximately 8,000 m3 / year. This is based on a predicted 0.5 m accretion per year. Maintenance dredging of the berthing pocket will be carried out by crane from land as set out in paragraph 5.6.88 of Chapter 5 (Project Description) of the Environment Statement (document reference 6.2.5, APP043). There are not anticipated to be any potential pathways for impact on designated features as a result of maintenance dredging. The conditions provide appropriate controls on the maintenance dredging. Under condition 12 of the DML the undertaker must submit as part of the construction environmental management plan a detailed dredging methodology that includes the volume of material to be dredged (NE is a consultee on this condition) and under condition 23 of the DML bathymetric surveys will be undertaken before and after each dredging operation to determine the volume that was dredged. These conditions apply to both capital and maintenance dredging. Additionally, the Applicant is constrained by the assessment in the ES and actual volume dredged will need to be within the bounds of the impacts assessed.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
7	<p>Natural England notes that silt and clay will be used in the Lightweight Aggregate (LWA) process, with the silt being sourced from dredging along The Haven. Natural England queries what volume of silt will be taken? How will the sediment load remain balanced? Noting that this will be lost from The Wash, when it is normally returned to a deposit site in the wider Wash. NE requires further detail in relation to this operation. Please note that this is inconsistent with the Harbour Authorities dredging of the Haven where material is deposited in The Wash to ensure that it remains within the system.</p>		<p>The Applicant acknowledged that material would be lost from the system but stated that "estimated maintenance dredge volume is very small compared to the supply of sediment to the Wash from marine sources annually." Natural England advised that this must be disposed of within the Wash.</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>This matter is remains an outstanding as this commitment is not secured.</p>		<p>A response to this question was provided in row 66 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Applicant is not seeking to dispose of the material dredged during maintenance dredging in The Wash as it will be used as part of the LWA process, contributing to the circular economy by ensuring that otherwise waste ash results in a product that displaces further primary resources from extraction elsewhere. Additionally, the use of the sediment in the LWA process will reduce the number of vessels bringing clay in to the Facility by a small number, helping reduce potential effects on birds. The response to Question 28 (see below) sets out further details of proposed capital and maintenance dredging volumes and discusses the removal of sediment in context of the wider Wash system. The Applicant recognises that this situation is different from the Port of Boston dredging but maintain that impacts of removal of sediment are not significant due to the low relative and absolute volumes removed.</p>
8	<p>Natural England notes that under operation, change in vessel traffic on intertidal habitats (increased ship wash) it appears to include text on dredging, but limited information included.</p>		<p>Natural England awaits an updated HRA.</p>		<p>NE note the Applicant has reported to have addressed this issue is section 4.2 of REP1-028 however this issue remains outstanding.</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>A response to this question was provided in row 67 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Applicant requests that NE confirm if this point is closed or if additional information is required.</p>
9	<p>We note that saltmarsh loss due to construction of wharf and berth will be around 1ha (width is between 10-30m wide and about 400m long). Natural England understands that Biodiversity Net Gain off site at Freiston/ Frampton is being proposed, but this appears to be roosting/ feeding habitat with saline lagoon and shingle/ cockle banks rather than saltmarsh – is there any intention of using the saltmarsh turves elsewhere? The creation of pools and scrapes in Habitat Mitigation Area will result in saltmarsh loss – this needs to be accounted for.</p>		<p>Natural England requires further discussion and information.</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation (point 14).</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>An initial response to this question was provided in row 68 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). A further response was provided in Table 2-2 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).</p>

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
	NE disagree with classification of poor saltmarsh quality; "poor quality saltmarsh due to limited extent, low diversity and poor zonation", "only 18 plant species were recorded" (previously 19 in 2014 and 17 in 2011). This number of species is high for saltmarsh on The Wash. The NVC communities identified show that there is the expected zonation with pioneer/low-marsh and transitions to landward habitat. A botanical assessment (NVC-level with quadrats) of this area needs to be undertaken a suitable time of year (i.e. May-September). The information provided is not sufficient to make an assessment – especially as the data is used to calculate the Biodiversity Net Gain Units for saltmarsh currently based on a poor condition therefore scoring only 1 for condition. The Applicant needs to confirm whether they used this http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5850908674228224 pgs 26-27 for assessment. Also NE need to see the actual copy of the calculations used to check whether the number of units set out in OLEMS is correct. The assessment should also consider Transect B8 (as shown on Plate 17-3) as this lies in Habitat Mitigation Area.		NE undertook a saltmarsh survey on the 07/09,21 to assess the vegetation present in both the Wharf Area and Habitat Mitigation Area. 5 quadrats were taken in the Wharf Area and 10 in the Habitat Mitigation Area. We agree that the vegetation is broadly as described in the Marine and Coastal Ecology Chapter. These vegetation types are typical of The Wash, and are therefore no less important. Although the strip of SM16c (which is a more species-rich community type) in the wharf area is less common and only found at a limited number of locations in The Wash. Natural England also noted the presence of SM10, however access to the shoreline where the saltmarsh abuts the mudflats was limited. We would welcome the re-assessment of the condition of the saltmarsh to moderate value.		NE note that REP1-028 states that "The potential to change from poor condition to moderate will be considered in the updated OLEMS document to be submitted to the Examination at Deadline 2 which will include an update to the biodiversity net gain calculation." NE await the submission of this document.		NE awaits an updated OLEMS.		NE continues to disagree with 'poor' saltmarsh classification by Applicant. Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.		Data on the saltmarsh survey was sent by NE on 24 November 2021. This point was addressed in the updated OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 within paragraph A1.7.3. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
11	In the embedded mitigation section it mentions underwater noise – when piling is undertaken at high tide additional mitigation will be applied (explained more clearly in HRA A17.6.106) including soft-start and ramp-up procedures and pre-piling watch for marine mammals, as this will reduce impacts to marine mammals and fish. Natural England advises that this mitigation will need to be secured in the DCO/dML.		Please see issue 2.		Schedule 9 Part 4 Para 13 of REP1-033 - This condition requires provision of a piling method statement. Natural England is concerned that the Applicant has removed the requirement for marine mammal observers from this condition. This might be due to the inclusion of a Marine Mammal Mitigation protocol. Please can the Applicant provide justification as to why the requirement for marine mammal observers has been removed?		No update		Natural England concerns remain with the MMMP as per Deadline 2 REP2 - 043.		The Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) is conditioned within the Deemed Marine Licence. The Outline MMMP includes the requirement for marine mammal observers (condition 17 of the DML, Schedule 9 to the draft DCO (document reference 2.1(3), REP6-002). The Applicant has provided responses to NE's questions on piling mitigation within the Response to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and Natural England's queries regarding Marine Mammals and Fish (document reference 9.49, REP4-014). The updated Outline MMMP was submitted at Deadline 6 (document reference 9.12(1), REP6-20).
12	Natural England advises that recent monitoring of the Wash Harbour seals population has demonstrated that the numbers in the Wash has significantly declined along with the national population. Therefore, further impacts to this species should be avoided. Further information on this will become available over the examination of this project. Reference to Russel 2017 is now incorrect and we advise that a 5-10% further decline in the population would be an adverse effect on integrity.		NE advised the Applicant that we await clarity on the ES as there are contradictory statements. The proposed mitigation is unlikely to reduce the impacts to acceptable levels. We remain concerned about vessels waiting in anchorage areas for appropriate tidal windows to enter the Haven and the potential for seal pups in the near vicinity becoming entangled in propellers during this time. Consideration should be given for there to be a requirement for guarded propeller ducts for all vessels associated with the project.		NE note the Applicant has quoted Onoufriou et al. 2016 (section 4.5.20 of REP1-025) to demonstrate that seals are not attracted to vessels in open seas, Natural England staff have observed seals and seal pups approaching several vessels associated with the Lincs OWF cable installation within The Wash. Please see NE Appendix C3 for our concerns about marine mammals.		No update		No update		This point was responded to at Deadline 4 (document reference 9.49, REP4-014). The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm if they have further comments.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
13	Natural England notes that sediment rate across berthing area is calculated as length of berthing area x width x 0.5m/year. Ongoing dredging around the wharf will remove 400m x 40m x 0.5m = 8000m ³ per year of sediment removed from system and not returned to The Wash. This is in addition, to 24,000 tonnes of sediment dredged each year by Port of Boston. Presumably dredged material from Port of Boston will continue to be returned to The Wash and not used for LWA?		Please see issue 6.		No update		No update		Please see issue 6.		A response to this question was provided in row 65 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). A response has been provided to issue 6 above.
14	Natural England notes that this section describes area under wharf as being mudflat but Fig 5.2 sheet 3 appears to show it as having mattress protection (what is this made of? One of the drawings says concrete). Also mentions that saltmarsh species may re-establish here under raised deck of wharf. However, we advise that saltmarsh habitat requires high light levels, so we believe this is unlikely.		NE advised the Applicant that it remains unclear as to how the area under the Wharf has been taken into consideration in the assessments.		No update		No update		This point is now resolved in the updated addendums.		
15	Please note that width given here is 30m (previous section – 17.8.7 says 40m).		NE await addendum to ES.		No update		No update		This point is agreed.		

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
16	<p>Natural England notes that the Applicant has determined a Saltmarsh loss = 1ha. However, we advise that separation between each NVC type is provided As currently unable to agree with the following until provided Mudflat loss = 1.54ha Total loss of intertidal = 2.54ha or 24,500m2 States wider Haven has c. 18ha of saltmarsh and 36ha of mudflats. Please be advised that the EA have recently released Saltmarsh Extent and Zonation maps which include this section (available on gov.uk webpage). If above correct, loss in creating wharf/ berth = 5.5% of saltmarsh resource; 4.3% of mudflat resource. Note in A17.6.18 values of saltmarsh in Haven differ.</p>		<p>The Applicant advised NE that "it is expected that some saltmarsh will grow under the wharf area and that some mudflat will remain on the slopes under the wharf below any limit of saltmarsh growth." However this is contradictory to previous responses, we advise the WCS is reviewed and assessments updated accordingly.</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>Based on the ES/HRA Benthic Ecology, Fish and Habitats Addendum (document reference 9.15, REP1-028) submitted at Deadline 1. NE believes that it is now agreed that no saltmarsh will remain under the Wharf.</p>		
17	<p>To mitigate loss of saltmarsh/ mudflat in Area A will enhance saltmarsh in Area B, but we advise that this is for birds rather than Priority saltmarsh habitat. See comments on OLEMS and BNG.</p>		<p>NE have advised the Applicant that we remain concerned about loss of priority saltmarsh and how this will be offset as any Net Gain should enhance that habitat (not just offset the impacts of the project).</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3. Also, NE await an updated OLEMS.</p>		<p>Please see NE Appendix J2 at Deadline 5.</p>		<p>Habitat restoration through debris clearance along The Haven within saltmarsh habitats has been proposed in the updated OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3 in paragraph A1.7.9. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).</p>
18	<p>Natural England advises that full agreement should be confirmed from Crown Estate to secure mitigation below MHWS; and secure purchase for remaining area. Need to ensure long-term management (and its funding). Note 30-year management plan will be secured as set out in OLEMS.</p>		<p>Natural England await this to be confirmed and agreed and secured within the DCO/dML.</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>NE await an updated OLEMS.</p>		<p>This remains outstanding with further information to be submitted into examination by the Applicant.</p>		<p>AUBP is currently negotiating with the Crown Estate who have indicated that they are open to granting the necessary rights subject to agreeing commercial terms. AUBP is aiming to conclude negotiations by close of examination. For the part of the HMA that is outside of the Crown Estate's interest, the Applicant is seeking to compulsorily acquire that land under the DCO. See the OLEMS and requirements 6 (Landscape and ecological mitigation strategy) and 23 (Decommissioning) on long term management of the mitigation areas.</p>

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
19	As permanent habitat loss will provide Biodiversity Net Gain, we advise at least 10% increase. However, no values given in Chapter – See comments on OLEMS and BNG.		Natural England await this to be confirmed and agreed and secured within the DCO/dML.		No update		NE await an updated OLEMS.		The issue in relation to enhancement/BNG remains outstanding please see Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		Although BNG is not currently a legal requirement the applicant is committed to BNG and there is an aim to incorporate BNG for this project. An updated OLEMS was submitted at Deadline 3 of the examination. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
20	Natural England is concerned that smothering of saltmarsh vegetation in adjacent unaffected areas including Habitat Mitigation Area (downstream) has not been fully considered from release of sediment.		Natural England have advised the Applicant that sediment plume distribution maps would demonstrate the areas likely to be impacted.		No update		No update		Natural England queries if the Applicant has addressed this issue in their examination submissions and if so where?		A response to this question was provided in row 79 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). Values were checked for the ES/HRA Benthic Ecology, Fish and Habitats Addendum (document reference 9.15, REP1-028) submitted at Deadline 1. NE to confirm if this point is closed or if additional information is required.
21	Natural England notes that generic noise data levels are quoted as being 110DB. However, is there anything more specific to the method to be used? For the Boston Haven embankment works agreed screw piles/ helical piles would be used rather than hammered piles to minimise noise (and vibration). Fig 5. Sheet 1 notes 300 piles piled to a depth of -35 to -40m OD. Confirm how long piling is likely to take?		Natural England have advised the Applicant that noise impacts should be minimised as much as possible.		No update		No update		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix B3.		A response was provided at Deadline 4 documents document reference 9.49, REP4-014 and document reference 9.50, REP4-015. A further response was provided in Table 2-3 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
22	Following on from 17.8.79. it is noted that wharf construction expected to take 18 months – with noisiest activities undertaken during periods less sensitive to birds using the mudflats and saltmarsh <i>i.e.</i> piling will take place between May and September (a period of 5 months). Natural England queries if 5 months is sufficient time to undertake all the piling (300 piles)? Also, whilst this appropriate for birds it doesn't take into account impacts to Harbour seals when they are at their most vulnerable during the pupping and moulting period June - August.		The Applicant informed NE that they will use soft-starts and ramp-up for any piling undertaken at high tide and that "A construction programme including avoidance of sensitive periods is currently being prepared and will be shared with key stakeholders." We welcomed this and advised that for smaller piles it has been found that soft start procedures are not successful as max. hammer energy is often immediately achieved with no options to 'ramp up'. Better mitigation has been found to be from an ECoW observing 500m area 30 mins prior to commencement to ensure that no seals have entered the area.		Please see Appendix C3 at Deadline 2.		No update		No update		A response was provided at Deadline 4 document reference 9.49, REP4-014. The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm if they have further comments.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
23	Natural England notes that the applicant proposes to have an observer on the vessel to mitigate for potential collisions. However, Natural England advises that due to the elevation of the vessel and need for not only 360 degree views but also directly adjacent to the vessel this is unlikely to provide the required mitigation for potential collisions.		The Applicant informed NE that vessels would travel at no more than 4 knots when going through The Wash and The Haven. However, it is NE's understanding (call on the 19th August) that the 4 knots speed may not be appropriate for the large vessels. In addition there is no evidence presented to demonstrate why 4 knots would be acceptable in reduce potential collision risk. Therefore, this remains an outstanding concern.		NE note REP1-025 states vessels will travel at 6 knots. There is clearly confusion over the speed vessels will travel and NE have concerns that there is no evidence to demonstrate this vessel speed is mitigation. Please see Appendix C3 at Deadline 2 for more information.		No update		No update		A response was provided at Deadline 4 document reference 9.49, REP4-014. The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm if they have further comments.
24	Natural England notes that there is mention of the anchor areas but no assessment of their use when waiting for available tidal window to enter the Haven. It is our understanding that depending on the vessel and timeframes the vessel will either maintain its position using multiple anchors or dynamic positioning. Both of these options potentially increase the potential for Harbour Seals to be injured and/or killed through entanglement with anchor chains or being dragged into unguarded propellers. This is especially the case for pups are more inquisitive and therefore have shown to interact with stationary vessels.		Please see issue 12.		NE note REP1-025 discusses DP, we agree that there is unlikely to be a significant effect if Dynamic Positioning is not used in favour of anchorage. Therefore, we advise that there is a condition that only permits the use of anchors within the Boston Anchorage Area whilst waiting for optimum tidal windows to enter The Haven. Any use of DP will require ducted propellers.		No update		No update - please note that any mitigation regarding DP will need to be secured.		A response was provided at Deadline 4 document reference 9.49, REP4-014.
25	Natural England queries where 10.46km ² for area of impact of BAEP came from to inform the Harbour seal assessment. When this figure is then used with outdated harbour seal numbers from 2017 there becomes increased uncertainty in the figures presented for collision risk.		NE await documents on mitigation measures.		No update		No update		No update		A response provided in Marine Mammals Addendum at Deadline 1 (document reference 9.14, REP1-027) The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm if they have further comments.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
26	Natural England notes that the vessel berth will be bedded with a layer of gravel/ chalk to prevent sediment release and further habitat damage. This area will therefore not recover to mudflats. It may be colonised by brown algae (fucoids), bryozoans and potentially ascidians, which we advise will be a change in habitat (possibility of invasive marine species establishing from boat hull). Natural England is also concerned about the potential habitat change and scouring of the riverbed in the surrounding areas as a result.		Natural England await consideration on how impacts from the placement of hard substrata in a soft sediment environment will potentially change the ecosystem and any potential lasting impacts.		No update		No update		No update		A response to this question was provided in row 85 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Applicant requests that Natural England confirm if they have further comments.
27	Natural England notes that the extent of vessel bed differs from earlier sizes of wharf, suggesting this will extend over 300m (3 ships long x 100m each). But we query how wide?		Natural England await further detail on the design parameters is secured on the face of the DCO/dML.		No update		No update		This matter is now resolved in the DCO.		
28	We advise that the increased vessel movements (17.8.155) are likely to increase erosion of mud and saltmarsh along the channel edge resulting in cliffed saltmarsh. This could occur from the mouth of the Haven i.e. at SSSI Unit 9, 10 all the way to the proposed site. Both the Port of Boston and the project will undertake dredging of the channel to maintain navigation (est to be 24,000m ³ + 8000m ³) which will also be lost from the system. Natural England queries if this has been accounted for? There is evidence that links boat wake energy to elevated turbidity and shoreline erosion, particularly in narrow waterways (Ellis et al., 2002; Baldwin, 2008; Houser, 2010; Currin et al., 2017). Due to the vastly different nature of boat waves and wind waves, there is at present no widely accepted method for making fair comparisons between boat- and wind waves with regard to shoreline erosion potential. To compare the two for the purpose of the environmental statement is not based on any robust science.		Natural England has expressed concern about potential changes to coastal processes from the proposed works and awaits a more in-depth assessment is provided.		No update		No update		If available further information should be submitted by the Applicant into examination.		Response provided in Section 2.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
29	We advise that the Applicant needs to consider the noise/ visual impact from the site to the proposed Habitat Mitigation Area particularly during construction (piling likely to be around 110dB) and during operation – what measures are in place to minimise/ avoid this? Paragraph mentions that Habitat Mitigation Area extends for 665m. [OLEMS paragraph 1.1.3 notes Habitat Mitigation Area lies 170m to south-east of site]. Remembering the Habitat Mitigation Area is existing habitat being used by bird species/ supporting saltmarsh/ mudflat – rather than a new habitat creation and also that this area will be impacted by the proposals too.		Natural England awaits further consideration of impacts to other areas proposed as compensation.		No update		No update		Please see Natural England Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		A response to this question was provided in row 92 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
30	Natural England advises that the projects to be considered cumulatively/in-combination is not a full list. Taking into account projects in the full foraging range of interest features. For example, we would expect to see for MM consideration of Norfolk Vanguard, Boreas, G. Yarmouth Port, Lowestoft port and O&M for operation windfarms.		Natural England awaits an updated cumulative/in-combination assessment.				No update		Please see Natural England's covering letter at Deadline 5.		The Applicant has responded to Natural England's comments in: Comments on Interested Parties Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) (document reference 9.66, REP6-030). The Applicant requests clarification from NE regarding which specific issues with the assessments remain outstanding following response. The Applicant confirms that all known projects which were potential sources of impact were considered in the in-combination effects assessment.
OLEMS											
31	Natural England welcomes biodiversity gains by retaining and enhancing existing scrub vegetation along Roman.		No further action								
32	Natural England welcomes the management plan covering a 30-year period. Further consideration will need to be given as to whether or not inclusion in the OLEM is sufficient to secure this.		Natural England awaits further consideration by interested parties.		No update		NE await an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2 and Appendix F3. This matter remains outstanding		An initial response to this question was provided in row 95 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035) which confirms that the final LEMS is secured in the DCO. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 and 2-7 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
33	<p>Natural England queries if low-level grazing within the Habitat Mitigation Area been considered? Grazing rates based on the approach used for saltmarsh at RSPB Frampton provides opportunities for increasing saltmarsh diversity and maintaining sward condition. This includes low-level grazing after 1st June until 31st October at a stocking rate of <0.5LU/ha. By introducing stock in June after Redshank have laid eggs and those eggs have hatched minimises the risk of eggs being trampled. Removal of stock by November helps prevent excessive damage to saltmarsh vegetation through trampling and poaching. Grazing could be agreed with a local grazier.</p>		<p>Natural England awaits further consideration of grazing to manage intertidal areas going forwards</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>NE await an updated OLEMS.</p>		<p>Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.</p>		<p>A response to this question was provided in row 96 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035) and details of management are included within the updated OLEMS. The narrow saltmarsh area is not likely to be able to support grazing due to the lack of freshwater source on the site and potential difficulties getting one there, along with safety/security concerns for stock in this area. Grazing opportunities are not therefore considered realistic.</p>
34	<p>NE notes that high level works included in Habitat Mitigation Area B include: • Shallow pools will be created, and existing pools scraped. This will result in saltmarsh vegetation loss – need to calculate areas of pools both new and existing. This loss needs to be considered in the BNG calculation. • re-profiling of some of the low banks will be undertaken to provide clear lines of sight for redshank. What is the vegetation along the low banks? Need habitat data? The flattening and removal of the bank may result in increased frequency of inundation of the saltmarsh behind – change in species composition, zonation, or even a loss of saltmarsh to mudflat. • The rocks at the edge of the saltmarsh help prevent erosion at the saltmarsh edge; the increase in rocks within the saltmarsh (moving those rocks from Area A the proposed wharf to Area B) will result in loss of saltmarsh habitat through their placement. This loss needs to be considered in the BNG calculation. • Where will surplus sediment from the lowering of the bank, and scrapes/ pools be used – the OLEMS document mentions the material will be used/retained on the marsh – for what purpose, what volume of material will be produced?</p>		<p>The details of mitigation area need to be finalised and agreed, before we can support this mitigation for saltmarsh habitat management. Please see previous comments in relation to compensation for impacts to birds.</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>No update</p>		<p>Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.</p>		<p>An updated OLEMS was provided at Deadline 3. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).</p>

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
35	Natural England advises that the vegetation survey of Habitat Mitigation Area (Area B) needs to be completed before mitigation activities listed in A1.2.2 are finalised. In addition, the habitat losses caused by the mitigation proposed need to be calculated to inform the BNG strategy. The vegetation survey also needs to cover the saltmarsh in Area A. In both areas the vegetation survey needs to include an NVC-level survey with quadrat sampling, collect data to determine the condition i.e. following the criteria set out in the Defra Biodiversity Metric 2.0: Technical Guidance for Intertidal Habitats. The survey should check for local species i.e. <i>Artemisia maritima</i> (Sea Wormwood) and also the known Schedule 8 plant <i>Equisetum ramosissimum</i> (Boston Horsetail). Until this survey data is made available further discussions on the Habitat Mitigation Area and BNG strategy will be difficult.		Natural England has advised that further assessment is required.		No update		NE await an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		NE submitted survey data in November 2021 has been reviewed and incorporated into the OLEMS update at Deadline 3. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
36	See comments given previous (17.6.10-17.6.12) on saltmarsh condition.		Further discussion and information needed.		No update		NE await an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		See comments on other rows. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
37	NE would like to see breakdown of how the biodiversity units have been calculated. Also understood applicant wished to see a 10% net gain target for the site (paragraph 17.8.34). However, we advise that this needs to consider in calculations saltmarsh loss due to Habitat Mitigation Area and other factors such as erosion and increased nitrates. We disagree with 'poor' condition used for saltmarsh which gives a score of 1. Having looked over the criteria we believe an assessment of Moderate with a score of 2 is more appropriate. This would increase the Biodiversity Unit values of the Saltmarsh. With limited information on habitats the following assessment has been made. Area A appears to meet criteria set out in our RR [RR-021 pg 17].		These calculations and details need to be shown and agreed, before Natural England can support.		No update		NE await an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		The updated OLEMS at Deadline 3 includes the baseline calculation for biodiversity units (see paragraph A1.7.6 onwards). A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix C - Intertidal and Marine Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
38	Natural England agrees that using either RSPB Freiston Shore/ Frampton Marshes for Biodiversity Net Gain is appropriate. But suggested habitats are not creating saltmarsh or mudflat.		Areas of saltmarsh and mudflat need to be created, for this to be supported by NE.		No update		NE await an updated OLEMS.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		Further information is provided in the updated OLEMS submitted at Deadline 3. A further response was provided in Table 2-6 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix D - Air Quality	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
Appendix D - Air Quality											
Environmental Statement - Chapter 14 - Air Quality											
1	Whilst dust impacts during construction are considered at Havenside LNR; what about on the area of saltmarsh being used for the Habitat Mitigation Area? This needs to be considered.		NE await all areas relevant to the proposals to be thoroughly considered.		Natural England notes mitigation measures will be secured in the Code of Construction Practice. We will review this document once it has been submitted into examination.		No update		NE request the Applicant to confirm dust impact mitigation measures and monitoring will also be in place at this receptor site. Please see NE Appendix D3.		The Applicant has specified the mitigation and monitoring actions that would be implemented during the construction phase of the project in the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Section 14.8, paragraphs 14.8.1 to 14.8.6 (document reference 6.2.14, REP1-006). This will include daily visual inspections of the site itself plus inspections of nearby receptors, including the Habitat Mitigation Area. Such general dust mitigation and control measures are specified in the Institute for Air Quality Management Guidance on assessing dust emissions during construction. These measures are implemented on the construction site itself, so as to prevent and minimise generation of dust at source.
2	As above, for Critical Loads/ Levels the ecological receptors considered statutory and non-statutory sites – but not Priority Habitats <i>i.e.</i> the saltmarsh adjacent to the site and part of the Habitat Mitigation Area.				Natural England is content that Table 4-6 of REP1-028 addresses this concern.						
3	Natural England is aware that only one other project has been included in the in-combination assessment. We would welcome a further check that this remains the case with other interested parties. We advise that the search consider any present or confirmed future projects which would not be included in the background data and other sources and sectors. The assessment should explain the criteria applied to the search.		We would welcome confirmation from other interested parties that all sources have been included.		REP1-028 4.3.21 – Natural England notes that no further projects have been identified by stakeholders for consideration within the assessment and that Natural England's SSSI Impact Risk Zone criteria, which were applied to all designated sites considered in the assessment. Therefore, we consider this matter resolved.						
4	We note that the consultant has used the higher daily NOx threshold of 200 ug/m3 rather than 75 ug/m3. Whilst this higher threshold is considered in casework, a robust and evidenced argument must be made to show that the criteria are met <i>i.e.</i> SO2 and O3 below their respective CLe. This assessment bases the justification on national and modelled data.		Natural England have requested that local, finer resolution or monitoring data is used to underpin the justification. And reassurance provided that O3 and SO2 will at no point exceed the CLe locally.		Please see Appendix C3 Deadline 2. This matter is resolved.						

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix D - Air Quality	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
5	We note that the construction phase of the assessment does not consider emissions from ammonia. This suggests that ammonia from vehicle and vessel emissions were not considered. We query if the justification for this can be provided and the rationale as to why ammonia would not be a significant contributor? Especially given that nitrogen deposition exceeds the 1% threshold.		Natural England have asked for more clarity and justification regarding the consideration of ammonia from vessels and vehicles and their contribution to nitrogen deposition. Especially in relation to why ammonia is not considered to be a significant contributor?		Please see further advice in Appendix C3 Deadline 2		No update		No update		The Applicant responded at Deadline 5 to NE Appendix D3 within the Report on Outstanding Deadline 2, 3, and 4 Submissions (document reference 9.63, REP5-008).
6	We support the consideration of an assessment on priority saltmarsh habitat. However, are there other sensitive habitats?		Natural England have asked the Applicant to provide recent survey data or evidence to support this decision to only consider saltmarsh. A footprint map confirming that only saltmarsh is present within the area of impact would be beneficial.		Natural England advises that the use of saltmarsh is an appropriate proxy for the other habitat types present and this matter is resolved. Please see Appendix C3 Deadline 2						
7	The assessment states that the minor adverse impact identified will be dealt with by monitoring. However, Natural England advises that this is not mitigating the adverse impact and does not negate the impact to sensitive features. What will monitoring be looking to identify? If a significant change occurs, what actions will be taken?		Natural England have asked that the purpose and outcome of the monitoring be expanded to explain how this will mitigate an adverse impact to the designated features? A minor adverse impact is acknowledged, but no mitigation proposed.		Whilst a minor adverse impact is acknowledged, there is no mitigation proposed. The matter remain outstanding		No update		Issue remains outstanding, There is no mitigation for impacts proposed in REP3-015 or REP4-016.		The Applicant responded at Deadline 5 to NE Appendix D3 within the Report on Outstanding Deadline 2, 3, and 4 Submissions (document reference 9.63, REP5-008).
8	Natural England queries how precautionary are the emissions which have been calculated? Was this based on a worst-case scenario e.g. worst-case MET data for Daily NOx and maximum run-times? This would be useful if made clearer.		It would be useful if these assumptions could be made clearer as it can influence the approach taken to the minor adverse impact i.e. if it's a highly conservative estimate.		Please see Appendix C3 deadline 2		No update		No update		The Applicant responded at Deadline 5 to NE Appendix D3 within the Report on Outstanding Deadline 2, 3, and 4 Submissions (document reference 9.63, REP5-008).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix D - Air Quality	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
9	Natural England notes that Table 14-30 presents values during operational phase for The Wash with in-combination contributions of all pollutants above 1% of the relevant annual mean Critical Loads/ Levels. Therefore, we query how impacts will be mitigated for?		NE await further clarity on how impacts to designated sites will be mitigated and any measures secured.		Natural England notes that further information on the proposed mitigation measures is required before we can provide further nature conservation advice. We await further information.		No update		Issue remains outstanding, There is no mitigation for impacts proposed in REP3-015 or REP4-016.		The Applicant responded at Deadline 5 to NE Appendix D3 within the Report on Outstanding Deadline 2, 3, and 4 Submissions (document reference 9.63, REP5-008). Furthermore, an assessment was undertaken to consider the potential impact on designated sites and saltmarsh based on more realistic emission parameters, rather than worst-case emission limits, as presented in the technical note 'Comparison of Predicted Critical Load and Level Results Using Maximum Permissible Emissions Limits and Realistic Emission Scenarios' (document reference 9.72, REP6-035). This showed that the impact within The Wash would be reduced below 1% of the nitrogen Critical Load, and therefore impacts would not be significant.
10	Natural England notes that all levels of pollutants exceeded for LNR and LWS. Therefore, we query what the effects of N deposition on the Habitat Mitigation Area will be? If based on similar values to Havenside LNR then PEC predicted to be marginally over the most stringent critical load range (20-30 kg N ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹).		All areas relevant to the proposals need to be thoroughly considered.		Natural England welcomes the inclusion of data for proposed Habitat Mitigation Area. Therefore, this matter is resolved.						
11	"The Facility was not predicted to lead to any significant effects during its operation which would require mitigation measures. As the Facility would be required to operate under the conditions of its Environmental Permit, this is considered to be an adequate mechanism to ensure that significant impacts are not experienced." Natural England queries what mitigation is suggested for designated sites? Only mention monitoring of stacks.		Further clarity is needed on how impacts to designated sites will be mitigated and any measures secured.		Natural England notes that REP1-007 states mitigation measures will be secured in the Code of Construction Practice. NE will review this document once it has been submitted into examination However, we advise that the CoCP will need to consider in-combination phase impacts during the construction phase as we do not believe these to be insignificant.		No update		Issue remains outstanding, There is no mitigation for impacts proposed in REP3-015 or REP4-016.		The Applicant responded at Deadline 5 to NE Appendix D3 within the Report on Outstanding Deadline 2, 3, and 4 Submissions (document reference 9.63, REP5-008).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix E - Terrestrial Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D6	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
Appendix E - Terrestrial Ecology													
Environmental Statement - Chapter 5 – Project Description													
1	Design of new footbridge along the Roman Bank (sea bank) ECP – the new footpath alignment will alter the route of the ECP further inland. Natural England advises that full consultation would be required if the route were to be changed including an Appropriate Assessment.		Natural England have recommended that the Applicant continues to consult the English Coastal Path team on this issue and fully considers the implications of alterations to the route.		Please see Appendix E2 Deadline 2		NE note that in ISH2 the Applicant explained why they could not consider our ECP proposal. We will respond to any documents through examination.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix E3.		N/A		The alignment of the (proposed) ECP both at, and to the north of, the Facility will change, but there is no proposed change to the proposed ECP route to the south of the Facility. The proposed footpath configuration, and consideration of an alternative proposed by Natural England, is provided in The Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 on Environmental Matters (REP3-023 [Agenda Item 5D]). The Applicant confirms that the proposed ECP configuration has not changed from that provided in the DCO application. The Applicant has considered the proposed ECP change within Section 2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening and Integrity Matrices submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-018).
2	Fig. 5.3 shows English Coast Path – which is being diverted inland away from the channel.										N/A		
Environmental Statement - Chapter 12 – Terrestrial Ecology													
3	Natural England confirms that we believe that the surveys appear adequate. We agree that the surveys show low numbers of common species – Soprano Pipestrelle & Common Pipestrelle. Whilst we agree that the area concerned is low quality scrub/grass areas within existing industrial units, there is no indication of the route of transects so it is unknown if any bats are crossing the river when foraging.		Natural England have suggested that further right Bank transect may be required to assess this further.		No update		No update		We are waiting for NE specialist feedback on this matter.		Information regarding the route of 4 transects has been included at paragraph 5.1.3. of the updated OLEMS [REP3-008] and illustrated at Appendix 2 (drawing PB6934-RHD-01-ZZ-DR-4023). However, there are no details of any right bank transects. Is the Applicant intending to carry out this additional suggested transect? We note at 1.7 that the specific location and type of bird and/or bat box will be determined by a suitably qualified ecologist prior to the implementation of the final landscape mitigation planting scheme.		A response is provided within Table 2-1 of the Third Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.78).
4	Natural England queries if materials are to arrive by river would this be only during daylight hours to minimise light pollution affecting bat behaviour? If not, then the light pollution sections need updating to include potential light pollution from vessels.		Natural England have asked for further clarification to confirm if vessels will be transiting at night and if yes provide an updated assessment.		No update		No update		We are waiting for NE specialist feedback on this matter.		No further update received		A response was provided within Row 118 of Table 1-13 of the Responses to Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). At the Applicant's request for clarity on this matter, NE sent an email to the Applicant on 18/02/22 confirming "We would still need clarification as regards vessels transiting at night and the potential impact on bats." Therefore the Applicant has responded in Table 2-1 of the Third Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.78).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix E - Terrestrial Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D6	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
5	Mitigation includes low pressure sodium lighting, locating lights away from areas used by bats. Ambient night-time levels to be maintained. Planting of new linear features around site boundary away from lighting. Bat enhancement features: bat boxes on retained trees. Additional planting incorporated into design that encourage bat foraging. All appropriate.		Natural England need to see more detailed plans which show new additional planting, locations & numbers of bat boxes. In addition, consideration should be given to motion operated lighting rather than 24/7.		No update		No update		Natural England notes that an additional figure is provided in the OLEMS [REP3-008] updated at Deadline 3 (Appendix 2). This figure also includes additional planting and bat box locations. As a principle of the Outline Lighting Strategy, which will be secured through Requirement 17 of the DCO, Operational Lighting Scheme motion sensors will be used to ensure lighting is only used when needed. We are waiting for NE specialist feedback on this matter.		No further update received		An additional figure was provided in the OLEMS updated at Deadline 3 - see Appendix 2. This figure includes additional planting and bat box locations. As a principle of the Outline Lighting Strategy which will be secured through Requirement 17 of the DCO for an Operational Lighting Scheme motion sensors will be used to ensure lighting is only used when needed. The Applicant requests that NE update their position on this point.
6.4.11. Appendix 12.1 Extended Phase 1 Habitat Report													
6	Natural England notes that it is stated that the Facility will result in areas of habitat being lost. The north-eastern extent of the Facility adjoins Coastal Saltmarsh and Mudflat Priority Habitat. The Facility will involve a localised loss of these habitats (0.99 ha and 1.54 ha respectively) to accommodate the proposed wharf facilities on The Haven for feedstock delivery. This loss of Priority Habitat would account for a very small proportion of the overall saltmarsh and mudflat habitat locally. However, Natural England advises that any loss would need to be addressed in the form of Biodiversity net gain and replacement areas.		Natural England disagrees with the Applicant about the scale of the impact and, as set out in Appendix B, further detail is required.		No update		Please see Appendix J1 at Deadline 3 for NE's advice on compensation.		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix J2.		N/A		Further details on intertidal habitats are addressed within the Intertidal and Marine Ecology category of the Risk and Issues log including biodiversity net gain.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix E - Terrestrial Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D6	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
7	The hedgerows and woodland habitats within the survey area provide suitable foraging and commuting habitat for bats. As the proposed facility will require the removal of these habitats, we advise that further surveys to understand their current usage by foraging/commuting bats will be required. In addition, mitigation measures will need to be considered during the construction and operational phases of the Facility to minimise impacts to local bat populations. We advise that these measures are provided in principle now to give the Examining Authority comfort that impacts to protected species can be mitigated for.		The Applicant must provide further detail on in-principle mitigation measures which could be adopted to remove significant impact to protected species.		No update		No update		We are waiting for NE specialist feedback on this matter.		No further update received		A response to this question was provided in row 121 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Applicant requests that NE update their position on this point.
8	We note that there are suitable habitats within the survey area for which reptiles could use. No further reptile survey will be required; however, mitigation measures will need to be considered during the construction and operational phases of the proposed facility to minimise impacts to local reptile populations. We advise that these measures are provided in principle now to give the Examining Authority comfort that impacts to protected species can be mitigated for.		The Applicant must provide further detail on in-principle mitigation measures which could be adopted to remove significant impact to protected species.		No update		Natural England have reviewed the Outline Reptile Precautionary Method of Working (PMoW) [REP2-015]. Please see point 3 of cover letter.						Point closed.
9	The proposed facility will result in direct and indirect impacts to birds because of disturbance and habitat loss. Therefore, mitigation measures will need to be considered during the construction and operational phases of development to minimise impacts to local bird populations.		The Applicant must provide further detail on in-principle mitigation measures which could be adopted to remove significant impact to protected species.		No update		No update		No update		N/A		A response to this question was provided in row 123 of Table 1-13 of the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference 9.2, REP1-035). The Applicant requests that NE update their position on this point.

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix E - Terrestrial Ecology	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D6	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
10	The grassland, scrub, trees, and woodland on site may support common species of terrestrial invertebrates. The tidal River Witham and mudflats may also provide suitable habitat for common species of aquatic invertebrates. No further surveys are required for invertebrate species, but mitigation measures are recommended during the construction and operational phases of the Facility to minimise impacts to invertebrate populations which is a key prey resource to Annex I birds.		Natural England have asked to see how this will be provided and secured before we can be certain that impacts have been avoided, reduced, and mitigated to acceptable levels.		No update		No update		We are waiting for NE specialist feedback on this matter.		Information on mitigation measures for terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates during construction and operation phases within the Principal Application Site has now been included at paragraphs 7.2.12 to 7.2.14 of the updated OLEMS [REP3-008].		A full response on this point is provided in the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on Environmental Matters (Part 1) (document reference 9.47, REP3-023). NE to confirm if this point is closed or if additional information is required.
11	Natural England notes that no evidence for the presence of badgers, otters or water voles was detected during the surveys in 2017 and 2018 - General Ecological Awareness is detailed in section A12.13 which will be followed.		Natural England have advised that Preconstruction surveys would need to be carried out to verify presence or absence of these species. This will need to be captured in the in-principle plans		No update		No update		Natural England advises that there should be a secured commitment to under take preconstruction surveys for all protected species which will need to be discharged by the Local Planning Authority in consultations with the relevant SNCB.		N/A		A response is provided within Table 2-1 of the Third Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.78).
Chapter 19 Traffic and Transport													
12	The England Coast Path team at Natural England has been consulted on the diversion routes. During the construction, the following footpath sections would be permanently closed: BOST/14/4, BOST/14/10 and BOST/14/5. The closure would also affect the England Coast Path route which follows these footpaths, as does Macmillan Way (which is a series of inter-connected footpaths). The diversion for these route closures would follow the route of an existing footpath, which follows the route of Roman Bank (also known as 'Sea Bank') along footpath sections BOST/14/11 and BOST/14/9.		Natural England requires clarification regarding the diversion of the England Coast Path. Any proposed changes would require a full consultation and Appropriate Assessment in its own right.		No update		Please see point 1.		Please see point 1.		N/A		See response to Items 1 and 2 above. Note that an email from Ros Deeming to Paul Salmon on in October 2020 states that the there is a requirement to consider the new proposed ECP alignment within the project's HRA (i.e. not in its own right).

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix F - DCO/dML	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
Appendix F - DCO/dML											
1	The MMO and LPA have overlapping responsibility for the intertidal habitat. The current drafted DCO appears to put the responsibility for the intertidal areas on the Local Planning Authority to discharge. While there are no issues with the MMO deferring to another regulator we will make the MMO aware of this to ensure that they are content with the approach given NE provided advice to both regulators.		Natural England have advised further consultation with the MMO and awaits an updated DCO.		No update		No update		No update		The MMO has requested via an email to the Applicant that it has approval of the parts of the Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy that are below MHWS. The Applicant has agreed to add a new condition to the DML to address this. This will be included in the next iteration of the DCO to be submitted to the Examination.
Project ES description											
2	The project ES description considers the Local plans, but no reference is made to the Eastern Inshore Marine Plans. Given the project impacts below mean high water springs then there should be some reference to this relevant plan.		Natural England have advised that the project should be considering all relevant plans and policies within those plans.		No update		No update		No update		As discussed in the Applicant's comments on Relevant Representations, an East Marine Plan Policy Checklist (document reference 9.19, REP1-032) was submitted at Deadline 1 of the examination. The MMO have confirmed they had no comments to make on this checklist in their Deadline 2 submission. The Applicant requests confirmation from NE on why this point is still open and whether NE have any further comments.
Draft Development Consent Order											
3	Definition of commence includes conduction of environmental surveys. This may lead to conflict as conditions/requirements timing may be linked to commence.		Natural England await further consideration.		NE note that Article 2 [REP1-002] has been updated and this issue is now resolved.						
4	There is no definition of relevant statutory nature conservation body. As a matter of consistency with other DCOs and to future proof the DCO against changes to Natural England's function, all references to Natural England within the DCO should be amended to the relevant statutory conservation body and a new definition of statutory nature conservation body should be added. Example wording from an OWF DCO: "statutory nature conservation body" means the appropriate nature conservation body as defined in regulation 5 of the 2017 Regulations;"		We await an updated DCO.		The Applicant has added the definition of statutory nature conservation body in response to our comments [REP1-002]. We are content with the wording use.						

No.	Natural England's Relevant Representation - Appendix F - DCO/dML	RAG status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG status D5	Applicant's Position Deadline 7
5	NE has not seen an article securing limits of deviation before. In OWF DCOs it is not included as an article but as an interpretation. The article allows extension of the project outside the limits of deviation as defined within the works plans, with approval of the LPA and secretary of state. The DCO explanatory memorandum makes it clear that the Applicant needs this for flexibility. There is reference to two made DCOs with similar provisions; National Grid (Kings Lynn B Power Station) Order 2013 and National Grid (North London Reinforcement Project) Order 2014. Those are both old order. King's Lynn Order does not include provision for extension beyond the limits of deviation. It is very close to the model provisions. North London DCO is close to the model provisions but does include allowance to deviate to any extent downwards as may be necessary or convenient. Upwards a stick 3m limit is given. The model provisions do include a limits of deviation article. However, this article does not allow for extension beyond the limits of deviation shown on the plans. It is important to note that the Applicant links the approval required to schedule 2 Part 2 for discharge. Which means an 8-week period and if no answer is given within the 8 weeks then an approval is assumed. We therefore question if that is appropriate for a potential extension beyond the worst-case scenario assessed.		Given that an extension beyond this line could create additional impacts and that a refusal appears to be based on having materially different impacts. As a minimum, we advise that this article be amended to include consultation with the Relevant statutory nature conservation body. Natural England is seeking further legal and MMO advice on this article. The Applicant may also wish to discuss with the MMO as this would apply to all works in the marine area as well and therefore could have implications on their DML.		Natural England notes that changes that have been proposed. We welcome the inclusion that the relevant statutory nature conservation body will be consulted by the Applicant on any deviation beyond the maximum limitation. However, with the exception of works detailed under Article 7 (1) (c), the article provides no maximum extent for the limit of deviation. Could clarification be provided on what these maximum extents are? Are they located on the works plans referenced within the condition?		No update		Please see NE Deadline 5 Appendix F3.		The Applicant has responded to this point in Table 2-7 of the Second Report on Outstanding Submissions (document reference 9.68, REP6-032).
6	The definition of arbitration within this DCO would allow for arbitration against both the MMO and the Secretary of State who both act as decision makers under this DCO. On several projects Natural England and the MMO have raised concerns over the inclusion of such arbitration articles. Those arguments were considered within the Hornsea 3, Thanet and Vanguard applications and the Secretary of State determined that it was not appropriate for the Secretary of State or MMO to be subject to arbitration. Therefore, this article should be amended.		Natural England advises that this requirement is amended. Also, please see the concerns raised on the Tilbury 2, Hornsea 3 and Vanguard projects and the determination that the BEIS SoS came to as precedent that these articles should be amended.		The Applicant has updated Article 50 to reflect the wording used in OWF DCOs excluding the SoS and MMO from arbitration [REP1-002]. This is the change NE requested.						
7	This requirement is for the Code of Construction practice. There are a large swathe of environmental mitigation documents under this overarching plan. The condition as currently drafted does not secure consultation with Natural England on any documents. Does the outline plan itself secure consultation?		Natural England requests to be a named as consultee on this requirement to ensure we get the chance to provide feedback to the LPA on the draft plans and their sufficiency.		NE Notes that this requirement has been amended to secure that the SNCB will be consulted.						