



THE PLANNING ACT 2008

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES

2010

Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm

Appendix N2 to the Natural England Deadline 2 Submission

Natural England's Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions arising out of Issue Specific Hearing 1 on Environmental Matters

For:

The construction and operation of the Rampion 2 Offshore Windfarm located approximately 13km off the Sussex coast in the English Channel.

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010117

20 March 2024

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
Agenda Item 4 - Effects of the Proposed Substation at Cowfold / Oakendene			
Q4-1	<i>Ecology, wildlife surveys and observations at Oakendene</i>	Confirm whether there are no designated sites, priority habitats or documented local wildlife sites at the proposed substation site at Oakendene.	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.
Q4-2	Natural England	Comment on the wildlife surveys undertaken by the Applicant at the proposed substation site at Oakendene.	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.
Q4-3		Comment on the wildlife observations made by Interested Parties in regards to this site, particularly by Ms Creaye [RR-164] and [PEPD-077] and Ms Smethurst [RR-236] and [PEPD-083] in their respective Relevant Representations and Responses to Relevant Representations.	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.
Agenda Item 5 - Construction Effects			
Q5-1	<i>Biodiversity Net Gain</i> Natural England	Confirm whether the Applicant's approach towards Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) [APP-193] as its method and approach of mitigating the effects of the Proposed Development is supported, given that BNG is not currently a requirement of nationally significant projects to date.	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
Q5-2	HDD at Climping Beach SSSI Natural England	Confirm if further discussions have taken place with the Applicant regarding drilling beneath the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) since the Application was submitted for examination in August 2023.	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.
Q5-3		Respond on the adequacy of Commitment C-217 of the Commitments Register [APP-254], which states "The HDD works at the landfall location will be programmed to avoid the winter period between October and February inclusive, to avoid disturbance to wintering waterbirds during the coldest period", and whether this sufficiently mitigates concerns with the proposed HDD beneath Climping Beach SSSI.	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.
Agenda Item 6 - South Downs National Park			
Q6-1	<i>Seascape and Visual Effects</i> Natural England	In relation to the Special Qualities of the National Park and Special Character of the Sussex Heritage Coast, provide justification for why the suggested amendments to the eastern array in the form of exclusion of Wind Turbine Generators and a reduction in the combined lateral spread of Rampion 1 and Rampion 2 are necessary.	Natural England advise that it is necessary to exclude Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) from the Rampion Zone 6 eastern array area and reduce the lateral spread of turbines from R1 and R2 in adherence to the Design Principles as secured in the Rampion 1 DCO/DML, (section 1.3a RR-265) because these principles served to mitigate major adverse impacts of Rampion 1 on the statutory purposes of the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and Sussex Heritage Coast (SHC). The current design means that from the highly sensitive protected landscape between Beachy Head to Birling Gap the Rampion 2 WTGs will appear to be nearly twice the height of the Rampion 1 WTGs. The current design also means that the lateral spread of

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>turbines from the R2 scheme will be double to triple the horizontal extent of Rampion 1 from most viewpoints within SDNP (section 3.5e(i) RR-265).</p> <p>Natural England considers a significant adverse effect on a defined special quality as a significant impact on the designations statutory purpose. Natural England's assessment of the evidence is that:</p> <p>the impacts to SDNP Special Quality 1 (- diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views) from the Rampion 2 project are significant/major.</p> <p>the impacts to SDNP Special Quality 3 (tranquil and unspoilt places) from the Rampion 2 project are also significant/major. This is because a large part of the seaward horizon in views out of the SDNP and SHC will be enclosed by WTGs, which will also be visible from the tops of the downs. The ES records the experience of tranquillity as greatest from the tops of the downs, where many of the viewpoints offer direct views to the open seascape, which could also be affected at night time due to the WTG lighting.</p> <p>For further detailed comments please refer to Appendix N2 - Annex 1.</p>
Q6-2		<p>In relation to Special Qualities of the National Park and Special Character of the Sussex Heritage Coast, provide justification for why and what further assessment is required, and explain why the existing assessments are not adequate to consider these impacts.</p>	<p>The existing assessments provided as part of the Environmental Statement (ES) show that the implementation of the Design Principles have achieved an element of mitigation for impacts to the Special Qualities of the SDNP and Special Character of the SHC. However, Natural England does not agree that the Design Principles that have informed the Rampion 2 design have acted to remove the significance of effects to the SDNP in relation to Special Quality 1 or for Special Quality 3. A key omission of the assessment is there is no direct assessment of the impact that the Rampion 2 Design Principles have on the SDNP special qualities. Natural England advise that a large number of Significant adverse effects</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>remain, and that there is potential for further refinement of the design to achieve better mitigation to reduce the significant adverse effects on the statutory purposes of the SDNP.</p> <p>For further detailed comments please refer to Appendix N2 - Annex 1.</p>
Q6-3		<p>In relation to National Landscapes (Chichester Harbour and the eastern portions of the Isle of Wight), provide justification for why and what further assessment of the west ward expansion is required, and explain why the existing assessments are not adequate to consider these impacts.</p>	<p>Natural England advise that the Examining Authority does not have information on (i) whether the Applicant's Design Principles have been applied to the consideration of effects on the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CHAONB) and Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (IoWAONB) and (ii) whether navigation and aviation lighting will result in significant effects on the IoWAONB, specifically Special Quality 5 which includes 'dark starlit skies'. Natural England advise that this further information is required to understand the impacts to the Chichester Harbour and Isle of Wight National Landscapes.</p> <p>For further detailed comments please refer to Appendix N2 - Annex 1.</p>
Q6-4	<p><i>Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Arun Valley Special Protection Area</i></p> <p>Natural England Horsham District Council</p>	<p>Natural England state in their Relevant Representation (RR) [RR-265 section 5.25 page 16] and Principal Areas of Disagreement Statement [AS-011 page 4], that there is the risk of a temporary loss of functionally linked land used by waterbirds related to the Arun Valley Special Protection Area during the construction phase of the Proposed Development lasting for several years longer than predicted, before it is returned to its previous condition. It is advised that this extended timeframe needs to be further</p>	<p>To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
		<p>assessed within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Explain whether this further assessment been undertaken or discussed since the Application was submitted for examination in August 2023.</p>	
Q6-5	<p><i>Water Neutrality</i> Natural England</p>	<p>It is advised [AS-011 page 4] and [RR-265 section 5.26 page 17] that development proposals within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone area that would lead to an increase in water demand will need to demonstrate and robustly evidence water neutrality and that an assessment of water neutrality is required to be undertaken by the Applicant in regards to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Confirm whether any progress has been made or discussions have taken place with the Applicant in regard to this request.</p>	To be provided as part of an additional submission prior to Deadline 3.
Agenda item 9 - Ornithology			
Q9-1	<p><i>Turbine Design</i> Natural England</p>	<p>Confirm whether the proposed air gap of 22m above Mean High Water Spring for the design of the wind turbine generators agreed at the pre-application stage is suitable for this location in regard to collision risk.</p>	<p>Natural England considers that there is evidence to suggest that the cumulative impact on great black-backed gull due to collision risk is 'moderate adverse' i.e. significant at the EIA scale, and the contribution of Rampion 2 to this impact is substantial.</p> <p>Natural England also consider that Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEOI) for kittiwake at Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) due to in-combination collision effects</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>cannot be ruled out.</p> <p>A larger 'air gap' achieved by raising the blades higher from the sea surface has the potential to decrease the number of predicted collisions, thereby mitigating this impact to some extent. However as set out in our Relevant Representations, raising the turbine blades higher would result in increased visual impacts on designated landscapes, notably the South Downs National Park, and therefore in this instance, Natural England considers this is not an appropriate mitigation measure for the Applicant to pursue.</p>
Q9-2		Explain whether any concerns exist over the minimum turbine spacing stated in the draft DCO of 830m.	Natural England has no concerns over the minimum turbine spacing in the context of offshore ornithology.
Q9-3	<p><i>Cumulative Impact on the Great Black-backed Gull</i></p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>It is stated [RR-265 Appendix B page 5] that NE does not agree with the Applicant's conclusion in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [APP-053] that the cumulative impact on the great black-backed gull across the UK South-west & Channel Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scale is not significant. It further states that "a 1.99% increase on baseline mortality is significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms, and that the Population Viability Analysis results show that this would severely impact the regional population, resulting in a population 19% smaller than the counterfactual after 30 years".</p> <p>i. Explain whether there have been further discussions with</p>	<p>i. The Applicant has provided a document of updated collision risk modelling with different parameters at Deadline 1. We are currently reviewing this and will provide comments at Deadline 3.</p> <p>ii. The Applicant followed the recommended guidance for collision risk modelling in their original submission, but have deviated from it in their updated collision risk modelling document [REP1-038]. Natural England's advice is that the largest bio-season population for each species should be used as the reference population for annual EIA-scale impacts. The Applicant has presented their own method for calculating the breeding season population, alongside what they consider to be Natural England's position. Natural England's method is to sum the populations of all breeding colonies within the relevant Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scales (BDMPS) region for that species, as defined in Furness (2015). The Applicant has chosen also to include overseas birds in the</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
		<p>the Applicant regarding this point.</p> <p>ii. Confirm whether the Applicant has followed the recommended guidance and methodology in relation to this analysis.</p> <p>iii. Set out whether discussions are ongoing with the Applicant.</p>	<p>relevant breeding populations, which Natural England does not consider to be appropriate.</p> <p>Furthermore, we do not agree with the population the Applicant has calculated using our method either. This is due to a quirk in the appendix of Furness (2015), where tables are provided listing colony sizes for UK SPAs, plus an aggregated number for non-SPA colonies. In most cases these non-SPA colonies are presented for each relevant BDMPS region, but for GBBG a total figure for all western UK colonies is presented, covering both the "West of Scotland" and "Southwest UK and Channel" BDMPS regions. Since the majority of the western non-SPA colonies are found in the west of Scotland, using this figure to create a "Southwest UK and Channel" breeding season reference population leads to a vast overestimation.</p> <p>In this instance, Natural England recommends that the non-breeding season BDMPS population for GBBG for SW UK & Channel is used, which is 17,742. Using this reference population, rather than the far larger one proposed by the Applicant, would more accurately reflect the potential cumulative effects on the relevant population.</p> <p>iii. We will discuss these issues with the Applicant once we have reviewed the updated collision risk modelling report they have submitted.</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
Q9-4	<p data-bbox="324 284 651 480"><i>In-combination Assessment of Collision Risk to Kittiwake, on the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area</i></p> <p data-bbox="324 501 551 531">Natural England</p>	<p data-bbox="683 268 1189 603">It is stated [RR-265 Appendix B page 6] that NE does not agree that the contribution of the Proposed Development to the in-combination assessment of collision risk to kittiwake, on the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (SPA), is so small that it is of no consequence and that Adverse Effects on Integrity cannot be ruled out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="712 643 1115 1082">i. Explain whether there have been any further discussions with the Applicant since Dogger Bank South confirmed their willingness to allocate nesting platforms to Rampion 2 in the event that RED elect to provide compensation measures at any such structure, in a letter dated 01/12/2023 [PEPD-001] <li data-bbox="712 1086 1115 1249">ii. Confirm if there is any updated information available for the Examination in relation to this point. <li data-bbox="712 1254 1115 1417">iii. Confirm whether the Applicant has provided sufficient further detail in relation to the proposed compensatory measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1249 268 1995 331">i. There have not been any further discussions with the Applicant on this topic since 01/12/2023. <li data-bbox="1249 368 2069 467">ii. There is no relevant updated information that we are aware of on the in-combination assessment of collision risk to kittiwake at the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA. <li data-bbox="1249 520 2033 687">iii. The Applicant has provided a document containing proposed updates and further information about the Kittiwake Implementation and Monitoring Plan (KIMP) at Deadline 1 [REP1-026]. We have reviewed this and provided comments at Deadline 2. <li data-bbox="1249 740 2063 804">iv. The Marine Recovery Fund is still under development, and therefore its scope and delivery are subject to change. <li data-bbox="1249 857 2063 963">v. The Applicant submitted an updated KIMP at Deadline 1– the details have not yet been discussed with the Applicant. Please see our Deadline 2 response (Appendix B2).

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
		<p>for kittiwake.</p> <p>iv. Confirm whether any changes are likely to the scope and delivery mechanism of the Marine Recovery Fund since the Application was submitted for examination in August 2023.</p> <p>v. Confirm whether the Applicant has discussed details of the proposed updates to the Kittiwake Implementation and Monitoring Plan.</p>	
Q9-5	<p><i>In-combination Assessment on Guillemot and Razorbill at the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area</i></p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>It is stated [RR-265 Appendix B page 7] that until a full in-combination assessment is carried out on the impacts on guillemot and razorbill at the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area, NE are currently unable to advise whether Adverse Effects on Integrity could be ruled out.</p> <p>Confirm if the Applicant has further discussed with NE the proposed in-combination assessment of impacts for guillemot and razorbill at the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA.</p>	<p>At Deadline 1 the Applicant submitted a document [REP1-027] containing an in-combination assessment of the impacts on guillemot and razorbill at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, and on guillemot at the Farne Islands SPA. We are currently reviewing these documents and will provide comments at Deadline 3 and will then discuss our advice with the Applicant as required.</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
Q9-6	<p><i>Impacts on Guillemot at the Farne Islands Special Protection Area</i></p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>It is stated [RR-265 Appendix B page 8] that NE does not agree with the Applicant that an adverse effect on integrity can be ruled out for the Farne Islands SPA due to impacts on guillemot in-combination with other projects. They state there is the potential for effects from the Proposed Development to combine with those from Berwick Bank and other North Sea projects, and this should be properly considered by the Applicant. Confirm if the Applicant has further discussed this point since the Application was submitted and if so, what progress is there to report.</p>	<p>See answer to Q9-5</p>
Agenda item 10 - Underwater Noise			
Q10-1	<p><i>Black Seabream</i></p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>Set out whether there is typically variability within seasons when it comes to the time period for black seabream nesting. For example, can the nesting seasons vary in length, whether longer or shorter periods, for each year.</p>	<p>There is some inter-annual variability in the exact timings of arrival and nesting, however the spawning season as defined in Natural England's conservation advice is March to July inclusive. Black seabream begin to arrive at the breeding sites in March, forming large, localised shoals. In Kingmere, nesting into July has been observed within data collected by the aggregate's companies in 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022. It should be noted that data was not collected in July prior to 2018, so data before this date cannot be used to demonstrate absence at this time. The 2023 data is not yet available.</p> <p>The factors determining this variability are not well understood and may include: water temperature, light penetration, day length, moon phase, plankton composition, the co-occurrence of neighbouring nests, and storm events, many of which can vary considerably in any given year and are not readily predictable in</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			advance.
Q10-2		If there were behavioral impacts of piling noise on nesting black seabream, explain whether this would potentially mean they would not return to the Sussex coast area in subsequent years.	<p>Natural England advises that individual black seabream are known to return to particular sites in consecutive years, but that there is insufficient evidence to determine whether disturbance from piling noise would prevent them returning.</p> <p>In any event, disturbance could affect breeding success and therefore the population size within Kingmere MCZ, for example by bream abandoning territories prior to egg laying, or by scaring male bream off nests leaving eggs open to predation/sedimentation. The MCZ has a target in the conservation advice to recover the population size, which the prolonged disturbance from piling noise could hinder the achievement of. We advise in the absence of evidence that this impact would not occur, it has to be assumed that this longer-term deterrence is possible.</p>
Q10-3		If piling works were not to take place in July, with a full seasonal piling restriction, explain whether this would sufficiently address concerns about noise impacts on black seabream as a result of piling noise.	Natural England advises that if a full piling exclusion from March to July inclusive were to be put in place, this would sufficiently address our concerns regarding underwater noise impacts on black seabream as a result of piling noise. Should a full piling exclusion for this period be secured our advice would be that the conservation objectives of Kingmere MCZ would not be hindered by this activity.
Q10-4		Explain whether it is possible that there could be any piling in July, within any of the proposed array area, which would be acceptable in terms of black seabream effects.	As stated in our answer to Q10-1, there is evidence of black seabream nesting in July across multiple years of data. The seasonality in Natural England's conservation advice in relation to breeding black seabream is March to July inclusive. During this entire period the conservation objective set out in the designation order applies, namely that <i>'the population (whether temporary or otherwise) of that species [i.e. black seabream] occurring in the zone be free of the disturbance of a kind likely to significantly affect the survival of its members or their ability to aggregate, nest, or lay, fertilise or guard eggs during breeding.'</i>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>In terms of the potential to hinder the conservation objectives of Kingmere MCZ, it is not acceptable for piling to occur in July at any location within Rampion 2. This is primarily because there is insufficient evidence that the mitigation proposed will be capable of achieving the levels predicted in the ground conditions at each specific location, that there is not sufficient confidence in the underwater noise models to have confidence in a zoning approach, and that even if these aspects could be overcome, there is no scientifically robust way of determining a suitable species-specific noise threshold that could be considered to avoid significant disturbance. We refer you to our relevant representations for more detailed advice on this matter.</p>
Q10-5	<p><i>Seahorses</i> Natural England</p>	<p>If there are smaller numbers or a dispersed population of short snouted seahorses which could be affected by piling noise, explain whether this would mean such adverse effects were less severe than if there were larger population numbers or densities.</p>	<p>In general terms, Natural England advises that smaller numbers could still be a significant proportion of the population in question if the overall population is small, as opposed to large. Furthermore, the cryptic nature of seahorses makes monitoring, studying and gathering evidence on seahorse populations challenging, and therefore we are not aware of sufficient data that could be used to reliably determine population levels. Therefore, we would urge considerable caution around an approach that tried to determine the severity of effects on seahorses based on numbers, densities, or population size.</p> <p>As Natural England were unclear on whether this question relates to seahorses within MCZs in which they are a designated feature or wider populations outside of MCZs (or both), we offer the following notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within MCZs designated for short-snouted seahorse (<i>Hippocampus hippocampus</i>), which includes Beachy Head West MCZ, Beachy Head East MCZ, Bembridge MCZ, and Selsey Bill & the Hounds MCZ, they are protected under Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 as a feature of the

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>MCZ regardless of numbers, population size or density. It is worth noting these sites are the only 4 MCZ's in England with short-snouted seahorse as a designated feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both inside and outside of MCZs it is also an offence under Schedule 5 Section 9 (1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to intentionally kill or injure seahorses. The onus to prove that an offence will not be committed lies with the Applicant.
Agenda item 12 - Offshore Physical Processes and Benthic Ecology			
Q12-1	<p><i>Offshore Gravel Beds</i> Natural England</p>	<p>If some form of gravel beds were to be used as an alternative to floatation pits, explain whether there would be potential offshore environmental impacts from this method, and what could these be.</p>	<p>Natural England understand that floatation pits do not form part of the Application (see comment 19 of our relevant representations). We understand from the Applicant's response to our relevant representations (G11) that the material used will not be loose sand or gravel, and will be a solution that will be removed once this aspect of the construction works is complete. We advise that this commitment should be secured in the relevant named plans in order for our comments on this issue to be amended.</p> <p>As referenced in point 19 of our relevant representations Natural England's advice is that the commitment to use gravel bags is not sufficient in relation to mitigating damaging impacts on priority habitats, Annex I habitat and potential habitats suitable for bream nests. We note that the Applicant has provided an environmental impact assessment in relation to gravel bags in Appendix 13 – Further Information for Action Points 45 and 46 – Physical Process and Benthic. We have provided comments on this in our Appendix DF2.</p>
Q12-2	<p><i>Offshore Survey Work</i> Natural England</p>	<p>The ExA understands that the Applicant is not intending to undertake any further offshore survey works during the Examination process. Confirm whether</p>	<p><u>Geotechnical Data</u></p> <p>Natural England continues to disagree with the Applicant that there is sufficient information/detail included within the Application to</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
		<p>there is sufficient detail and commitments currently submitted to cover cable installation and mitigation.</p>	<p>demonstrate with confidence that hinderance of the conservation objects/damage to the interest features of designated sites will not occur. And that mitigation measures will be either viable and/or sufficient to minimize impacts to acceptable levels.</p> <p>We noted that in our relevant representations (point g) that a number of commitments had been proposed to minimise impacts upon sensitive features that had been identified. These include (but are not limited to) Cable burial (including the use of paleochannels), Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) (the full viability and extent of which is yet to be confirmed), reducing scour protection, targeting areas of the seabed that maximise burial, adoption of specialist cable techniques to minimise the footprint of direct and indirect disturbance. However, we continue to advise that, to understand the likely effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, geotechnical data should be provided at the consenting stage to inform an outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA), and outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) that both clearly take into account lessons learnt from Rampion 1.</p> <p>We advise that it is essential that these plans are submitted into the examination to understand how likely it is that cable burial will be achieved and that the mitigation proposed will successfully mitigate impacts. If external raised cable protection is required, this could have impacts on marine processes and the surrounding designated sites (Climping Beach SSSI, Kingmere MCZ and Offshore Overfalls MCZ), as well as Habitats of Principle Importance, Annex 1 Habitats and black seabream nests.</p> <p>If the feasibility of cable installation via HDD under Climping Beach SSSI is not fully considered, then there is a risk this will fail and impact on the SSSI.</p> <p>We understand that the Applicant's view is that geotechnical</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>information cannot be gathered in the marine environment within the timeframe of the examination. We advise that the Applicant still needs to produce the requested plans (Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA), and outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (which includes consideration of HDD feasibility). In the absence of the full suite of geotechnical and geophysical data we query what project specific information, and any other relevant geotechnical data/information from the surrounding area the Applicant can provided with in the timeframe to address the existing uncertainty? However, we highlight that further evidence gathering still may not be sufficient to address our concerns.</p> <p><u>Benthic Baseline Data</u></p> <p>As advised in our relevant representations due to limitations in the benthic characterisation data, collecting sufficient quality pre-construction data will be key to providing a robust baseline and informing the mitigation methods such as micro-siting around Priority Habitats, Annex I habitats and potential black bream nesting areas.</p>
Q12-3	<p><i>Migratory Insects</i> Natural England</p>	<p>There have been representations received [RR-163, RR-239, RR-029, RR-225, RR-189, RR- 389, RR-110] relating to the adverse effects of wind turbines on migrating insects. Comment, if required, on this matter.</p>	<p>Natural England's statutory advice remit primarily relates to the impacts of developments on protected sites, habitats and species. As we do not foresee impacts on the above receptors as a result of migratory insect fatalities, we have not raised this as a concern in our relevant representations.</p>
Q12-4	<p><i>Kelp Restoration</i> Natural England Marine Management Organisation</p>	<p>The ExA is aware of kelp restoration projects within the Sussex Bay area [RR-156, RR-176, RR-037, RR-377, RR-110]. Comment on the adequacy of the assessment and conclusions of likely significant effects reported within the ES Chapter 9 [APP-050].</p>	<p>Natural England's relevant and written representations focused on the assessments of impacts and conclusions relating to features of designated sites, and habitats and species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, Annex I habitats, and potential black seabream nesting habitats. We advise that this question appears to be outside of Natural England's remit.</p>

Q. No	Question Topic	Question	Natural England's Response
			<p>However, we note that the kelp restoration project relates to the Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCA's) Nearshore trawling Byelaw, which protects an area of the nearshore seabed off the Sussex coast from bottom-towed trawling gears. We advise that the IFCA and the Sussex Kelp Restoration Project are likely to be best placed to answer any questions the examining authority have with regards to impacts on their bylaw area and their resultant project. However, Natural England does recognise the value of the kelp restoration project in terms of increasing wider biodiversity and recommends that careful consideration is given through the adoption of appropriate mitigation measures to avoid hindering the future success of this project.</p>