



The Planning Inspectorate
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

REPORT on the IMPLICATIONS for EUROPEAN SITES

Proposed Heckington Fen Solar Park

An Examining Authority report prepared with the
support of the Environmental Services Team

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010123

23 January 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	BACKGROUND	2
1.2	DOCUMENTS USED TO INFORM THIS RIES	3
1.3	CHANGE REQUESTS	3
1.4	HRA MATTERS CONSIDERED DURING THE EXAMINATION.....	4
2	LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS	5
2.1	EUROPEAN SITES CONSIDERED	5
2.2	POTENTIAL IMPACT PATHWAYS	6
2.3	IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS	6
2.4	THE APPLICANT’S ASSESSMENT	7
2.5	EXAMINATION MATTERS	7
3	ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY	12
3.1	CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES.....	12
3.2	THE APPLICANT’S ASSESSMENT	12
3.3	EXAMINATION MATTERS	13
4	CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	13
	ANNEX 1 EXA’S UNDERSTANDING OF POSITION AT POINT OF RIES PUBLICATION	14

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Ecotricity (Heck Fen Solar) Limited (the Applicant) has applied for a development consent order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) for the proposed Heckington Fen Solar Park ('the Proposed Development'). On behalf of the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, an Examining Authority (ExA) has been appointed to conduct an Examination of the application. The ExA will report its findings and conclusions and make a recommendation to the relevant Secretary of State (SoS) as to the decision to be made on the application.
- 1.1.2 The relevant SoS is the competent authority for the purposes of the Habitats Regulations¹ for applications submitted under the PA2008 regime. The findings and conclusions on nature conservation issues reported by the ExA will assist the Secretary of State in performing their duties under the Habitats Regulations.
- 1.1.3 This Report on the Implications for European sites (RIES) documents and signposts the information in relation to potential effects on European sites² that was provided within the DCO application and submitted during the Examination by the Applicant and Interested Parties (IPs), up to Deadline 4 (D4) of the Examination (16 January 2024). It is not a standalone document and should be read in conjunction with the Examination documents referred to. Where document references are presented in square brackets [] in the text of this report, that reference can be found in the Examination library published on the National Infrastructure Planning website at the following link:
- [Examination Library](#)
- 1.1.4 This RIES is issued to ensure that IPs including the Appropriate Nature Conservation Body (ANCB) - Natural England (NE) - are consulted formally on Habitats Regulations matters. This process may be relied on by the SoS for the purposes of Regulation 63(3) of the Habitats Regulations.
- 1.1.5 It also aims to identify and close any gaps in the ExA's understanding of IPs' positions on Habitats Regulations matters, in relation to all European sites and qualifying features as far as possible, in order to support a robust and thorough recommendation to the SoS.

¹ The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations).

² For the purposes of this RIES, in line with the Habitats Regulations and relevant Government policy, the term "European sites" includes Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), candidate SACs, proposed SACs, Special Protection Areas (SPA), potential SPAs, Sites of Community Importance, listed and proposed Ramsar sites and sites identified or required as compensatory measures for adverse effects on any of these sites. For ease of reading, this RIES also collectively uses the term "European site" for 'European sites' defined in the Habitats Regulations 2017 and 'European Marine Sites' defined in the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, unless otherwise stated. "UK National Site Network" refers to SACs and SPAs belonging to the United Kingdom already designated under the Directives and any further sites designated under the Habitats Regulations.

1.1.6 Following consultation, the responses will be considered by the ExA in making their recommendation to the SoS and made available to the SoS along with this report. The RIES will not be revised following consultation.

1.2 Documents used to inform this RIES

1.2.1 The Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report (the HRA Report) comprised the following document(s):

- Shadow HRA to inform Appropriate Assessment [APP-049], which was updated at D2 [REP2-022] and at D4 [REP4-022], following an Additional Submission [PS-041] Shadow HRA to inform Appropriate Assessment which was accepted at the discretion of the ExA.

1.2.2 The HRA Report concluded that adverse effects on the integrity of all European sites could be excluded.

1.2.3 In addition to the HRA Report [REP4-022], the RIES refers to representations submitted to the Examination by IPs, Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) documents, Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and other Examination documents as relevant. All documents can be found in the Examination Library.

1.3 Change Requests

1.3.1 To date, the Applicant has made the following change request:

- [PS-001] Post Submission Changes Submission - Cover Letter
- [PS-002] Post Submission Changes Submission - Joint Position Statement with National Grid Electricity Transmission
- This was supported by the Applicant's Post Submission documents [PS-003] to [PS-153] which can be found in [Change Request Library](#). This included the Additional Submission – Document 5.2 Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment to Inform Appropriate Assessment - Rev 2, which was accepted at the discretion of the ExA [PS-041]
- The change request was for an increase in the Order Limits (approximately 0.9ha) for a new section of National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) infrastructure on land to the south of Bicker Fen Substation, and a new cable sealing end (CSE) compound on land to the west of Bicker Fen Substation, as shown on Figure 1 of the Change Notification Cover Letter [PS-001].

1.3.2 The change was accepted by the ExA following the ExA Response to Change Request Notification Letter [PD-008].

1.3.3 No relevant HRA matters arose from this change request.

1.4 HRA Matters Considered During the Examination

1.4.1 None of the IPs, including NE as the ANCB, disputed the contents or conclusions of the HRA Report up until D4. The Examination to date has focussed on the following matters that were considered by the ExA:

- Whether NE as ANCB agreed that all relevant European sites and their qualifying features had been correctly identified
- Whether NE as ANCB and any other IPs had any concerns over the baseline data, methodology or conclusions of LSE in the HRA Report
- Whether sufficient information has been provided by the Applicant to consider the in-combination assessment
- The adequacy of mitigation in relation to potential effects from impact pathways
- More details on the approach taken by the Applicant and how the conclusions were reached in the HRA Report.

2 LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

2.1 European sites considered

Introduction

- 2.1.1 The Proposed Development is not connected with or necessary to the management for nature conservation of any European site.
- 2.1.2 The scope of the assessment is described within Section 6 of the HRA Report [REP4-022]. European sites that were scoped into the assessment with the reasons for their selection are summarised in Appendix A of the HRA Report.

Sites within the UK National Site Network (NSN)

- 2.1.3 The Applicant's HRA Report identified three European sites within the UK National Site Network for inclusion within the assessment. These are listed in Section 4 and Appendix A of the HRA Report and are as detailed in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: European sites in the UK NSN identified in the Applicant's HRA Report

Name of European site	Distance from Proposed Development (km)
North Norfolk Coast and Wash SAC	14.5km
The Wash SPA	14.5km
The Wash Ramsar	14.5km

- 2.1.4 The locations of these sites relative to the Proposed Development are referenced in Appendix C of the HRA Report [REP4-022] and shown in a Figure 8.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) showing statutory and non-statutory designated sites [APP-153].
- 2.1.5 No additional UK European sites have been identified by IPs for inclusion within the assessment in the Examination to date.
- 2.1.6 NE raised no concern regarding the European sites selected for assessment and stated in its SoCG provided at D2 [REP2-069] that it agreed with the approach set out within the HRA Report.
- 2.1.7 NE agreed that all relevant European sites and European site features that could be affected by the Proposed Development had been identified by the Applicant and has raised no issues during the examination at Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 3 under the agenda item on the HRA or in [AS-035] and [REP2-069].

Non-UK European Sites

- 2.1.8 The Applicant has not identified any potential impacts on European sites in other European Economic Area (EEA) States.
- 2.1.9 Only UK European sites are addressed in this RIES.

Potential impact pathways

- 2.2.1 Sections 5 and 6 of the HRA Report [REP2-022], updated at D4 [REP4-022], detailed the potential impacts from the Proposed Development, along with the potential geographical extent of effects. Impact pathways and environmental changes generally associated with terrestrial developments are set out in Table 2 of the HRA Report. Appendix A of the HRA Report lists the sites and qualifying features. Appendix B lists the sites conservation objectives and threats and pressures to site integrity. Appendix D lists the potential impact pathways identified in the HRA Report during construction and decommissioning. The following potential impact pathways were scoped in for assessment by the Applicant and are set out in Section 6 of the HRA Report:
- Silt laden run-off from surface water
 - Contamination from surface water pollution events impacting on water quality downstream
 - Loss of functionally linked habitat
- 2.2.2 Annex 1 of this RIES details the potential impact pathways considered in the HRA Report by European site and qualifying features.
- 2.2.3 No additional impact pathways have been identified by IPs for inclusion within the assessment in the Examination to date.
- 2.2.4 The HRA Report assessed the potential impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning.

In-combination effects

- 2.3.1 Section 8 of the HRA Report [REP2-022] detailed the Applicant's approach to assessing in-combination effects. The projects included in the in-combination assessment were listed in Section 8 of the HRA Report and their locations depicted on Figure 8.2 [APP-153] of the Environmental Statement (ES) and on Figure 2.2a in Appendix 2 (Regional Context) (Revision 3)[REP2-050]. Table 3 of the HRA Report document was updated with reference to the cumulative projects that were reassessed as part of the ES for D2 in ES Technical Note- Updated Information on Cumulative Projects [REP2-050].
- 2.3.2 The Applicant omitted Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (Generating Station), Boston Tidal Barrier, and a 28MW solar farm at Ewerby Thorpe, as identified in the initial HRA Report [APP-049], from the revised Table 3 list of plans and projects with the potential to have in-combination effects in the updated HRA Report [REP2-022]. The Applicant was asked by the ExA [PD-012] (GEN 2.10) on 19 December 2023 to clarify why these projects

were omitted from the revised HRA Report list in Table 3 by D4. The explanation for this was explained at D4 by the Applicant [REP4-047] and the list amended in the revised HRA Report [REP4-022].

2.4 The Applicant's assessment

2.4.1 The Applicant explains in Section 5 of the the purpose of the screening assessment under Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations, is to assess any 'likely significant effects' (LSE) of the Proposed Development on European sites and that the screening assessment has been conducted without taking mitigation into account. The Applicant's conclusions in respect of the screening assessment are presented in Section 6 and Table 3 of the HRA Report [REP4-022].

2.4.2 The ExA asked questions on the HRA Report directed to the Applicant and IPs during Examination. See Section 2.5 of this RIES for further details.

Sites for which the Applicant concluded LSE on some or all qualifying features

2.4.3 The Applicant concluded that the Proposed Development could give rise to significant effects, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans, on one or more of the qualifying features of:

- North Norfolk Coast and Wash SAC
- The Wash SPA
- The Wash Ramsar

2.4.4 The qualifying features and LSE pathways screened in by the Applicant are detailed in Section 4 and Appendices A and D of the HRA Report [REP4-022].

2.4.5 No matters have been raised by NE or any of the other IPs in the Examination to date in relation to the Applicant's screening assessment.

2.5 Examination matters

2.5.1 Matters raised in the Examination to date, or for which the ExA seeks clarity, in relation to LSEs screened out by the Applicant are summarised in Table 2.2 below.

2.5.2 At the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 2 on 20th September 2023, the ExA asked the Applicant questions to clarify how the HRA Report had been prepared and its conclusions reached. Answers to these are available to listen to as a recording of ISH2 [EV-012] with a written transcript (Part 3) [EV-015].

2.5.3 The ExA asked for the HRA Report to be updated for D2 with the action points agreed at ISH 2 [EV-009a]. Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) stated that it would be pertinent for the Applicant to review the HRA Report's list of additional projects and sites that may potentially have in-combination effects to make sure that there were not any other sites that may need to be captured in the HRA Report [REP2-083]. Following ISH 2

North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) noted at D2 [REP2-084] that they were content with the assessment of wintering birds provided that NE agreed with the findings of the HRA Report.

- 2.5.4 The ExA issued their first written questions on 17 October 2023 [PD-012]. NE was asked in question BIO.1.7 to confirm if they agreed with the Applicants' conclusions regarding the effects of the Change Application on European sites from all phases of the development, including in-combination effects. NE agreed with the conclusions of the HRA Report and stated that it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Wash SAC, SPA and Ramsar alone or in-combination [AS-035].
- 2.5.5 ISH 4 [EV-019a] Agenda Item 7 focused on the HRA Report. In the written summary of the Applicant's oral case during ISH 4 [REP3-039] the Applicant explained the amendments to the most recent version of the HRA report brought its format into alignment with PINS Advice Note 10, and additional tables were provided as appendices to the HRA Report outlining which European Sites were scoped into the HRA; the conservation objectives of each European site and the threats and pressures to each of the sites integrity, and a summary of LSE were also provided.
- 2.5.6 Following discussion between the ExA and the Applicant at ISH2 the list of projects in Table 3 of the HRA Report was updated at D2 and D4 so that it was consistent with the ES, relevant to those sites considered in the in-combination assessment.
- 2.5.7 Second written questions were issued on 19 December 2023 [PD-012] and the ExA asked the Applicant to explain why Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (Generating Station), Boston Tidal Barrier, and the solar farm at Ewerby Thorpe were omitted from the revised Table 3 at D2 [REP2-022], given that these projects were included in the previous versions of the HRA Report [APP-049 and PS-041]. The Applicant responded [REP4-047] that Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (Generating Station) and Boston Tidal Barrier were removed in error when the HRA Report was updated to align with the revised cumulative list. The HRA Report was amended to include these sites and submitted at D4 [REP4-022].
- 2.5.8 The Applicant also explained [REP4-047] that the Land At Ewerby Thorpe project is to be included within the DCO application for Beacon Fen Energy Park and that the findings of the HRA Report were not altered as a result of its omission and the re-inclusion of the above sites in the HRA Report [REP4-022].
- 2.5.9 Further detail setting out instances when silt controls would be required during construction were added to the document and signposts to the Construction Environment Management Plan [REP2-071] were provided in response to the ExA's questions at ISH2 on when this mitigation would be required.
- 2.5.10 The Applicant [REP2-039] stated that the findings of the HRA Report remained the same as the previous submitted HRA Report [PS-041] and that NE concurred with this assessment and the reasoning provided, as documented in the SoCG with NE [REP2-069].

2.5.11 The ExA's understanding of the Applicant's and NE's current positions in relation to LSEs is set out above and in Annex 1 Table A1 of this RIES.

Table 2.2: Issues raised in the Examination to date by the ExA and IPs in relation to the Applicant's screening of LSEs (alone and in-combination)

ID	Potential impact pathway	Details of issue	ExA observation / question
North Norfolk Coast and Wash SAC /The Wash SPA / The Wash Ramsar			
2.2.1	Silt laden run-off from surface water entering the ditch network. Source points may result during construction or decommissioning activities when heavy plant machinery is used to install or remove site infrastructure.	The Applicant ruled out any LSE via this impact pathway due to the distance of the hydrological link (over 10km), as any changes in hydrology or pollutants entering the watercourse would be sufficiently diluted. However, as the Proposed Development has a hydrological link to the SPA/SAC/Ramsar European sites and therefore the potential for LSE this could not be completely ruled out at Stage 1 of the HRA prior to mitigation so this was taken to Stage 2 of the HRA. The ExA asked the Applicant to provide more information on when or in what circumstances the installation of silt fencing would be required and how this would be secured through the DCO process at ISH2. The Applicant updated the HRA Report in response to this [REP2-022] and [REP4-022]. NE agreed with the conclusions of the HRA Report [REP2-069].	n/a – matter resolved.
2.2.2	Water quality effects. Contamination from surface water pollution events entering the ditch network and then impacting upon water quality downstream. Source points may result during construction or decommissioning activities when	As the Applicant could not rule out any LSE from this impact pathway at Stage 1 of the HRA prior to mitigation because the Proposed Development has a hydrological link to the SPA/SAC/Ramsar European sites this was taken to Stage 2 of the HRA. NE agreed with the conclusions of the HRA Report [REP2-069].	n/a – matter resolved.

Report on the Implications for European Sites for
Heckington Fen Solar Park

	heavy plant machinery is used to install or remove site infrastructure.		
2.2.3	All impact pathways – in-combination effects during construction and decommissioning	<p>The Applicant screened out in-combination effects on the basis that no LSE would occur alone and so there was no potential for in-combination effects.</p> <p>The ExA requested further information to justify this conclusion including an updated list of sites that were considered for in-combination effects and this was provided through an updated HRA Report [REP2-022].</p> <p>NE agreed with the conclusions of the HRA Report [REP2-069].</p>	n/a – matter resolved.
North Norfolk Coast and Wash SAC			
2.2.4	<p>Loss of functionally linked habitat.</p> <p>Solar arrays installed as part of Proposed Development may result in loss of habitat used by Otter within the Order Limits during construction and decommissioning.</p>	<p>The Applicant ruled out any LSE for the population of otters from the loss of functionally linked habitat. The HRA Report stated that the Proposed Development would have by design, setbacks of 8 metres from all drainage ditches and in order to comply with Internal Drainage Board (IDB) regulations, 9 metres from all IDB drainage ditches. The Proposed Development would not result in any loss of watercourses or associated functionally linked habitat such as wetlands or drainage ditches used by otters.</p> <p>NE agreed with the conclusions of the HRA Report [REP2-069].</p>	n/a – matter resolved.
The Wash SPA/ The Wash Ramsar			
2.2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pink footed goose - Golden plover - Lapwing <p>Loss of functionally linked habitat.</p> <p>Solar arrays installed as part of Proposed Development may result in loss of habitat used by pink</p>	<p>The HRA Report stated that the majority of the European site’s qualifying winter wetland bird species are restricted to the wetland habitat within the designation for foraging and roosting. However, Pink footed goose, Golden plover and Lapwing feed on farmland and the potential for LSE could not be completely ruled out. Loss of functionally linked land was therefore taken forward to Stage 2 of the HRA prior to mitigation</p> <p>NE agreed with the conclusions of the HRA Report [REP2-069].</p>	n/a – matter resolved.

Report on the Implications for European Sites for
Heckington Fen Solar Park

	footed goose, golden plover or lapwing within the Order Limits during construction and decommissioning.		
--	---	--	--

3 ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY

3.1 Conservation Objectives

3.1.1 Conservation objectives were not provided for the European sites for which an LSE was identified by the Applicant at the point of DCO application [APP-049]. Further to ISH 2 [EV-012] discussion and subsequent action points [EV-009a], the conservation objectives for all of the relevant European sites were submitted by the Applicant in Appendix B of the updated HRA Report [REP2-022] and [REP4-022].

3.2 The Applicant's assessment

3.2.1 The European sites and qualifying features for which LSE were identified were further assessed by the Applicant to determine if they could be subject to adverse effects on integrity (AEoI) from the Proposed Development, either alone or in combination. The outcomes of the Applicant's assessment of effects on integrity are summarised in Section 7 of the HRA Report [REP4-022]. The European sites which were assessed for AEoI by the Applicant were:

- North Norfolk Coast and Wash SAC
- The Wash SPA
- The Wash Ramsar.

3.2.2 The effects which were considered could have LSE on the above European sites were:

- Silt laden run-off
- Water quality effects including contamination from surface water pollution events
- Loss of functionally linked habitat.

Mitigation measures

3.2.3 The Applicant's HRA Report identified mitigation measures in Section 7 [REP2-022]. These were taken into account in the Applicant's assessment of AEoI.

3.2.4 The mitigation measures, as described in Section 7 of the HRA Report, are secured through the design of the Proposed Development, and with the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in accordance with the Outline CEMP [APP-238], [AS-027], [REP2-071] and in an updated version [REP3-019], to be secured through Regulation 13 of the DCO shown in [APP-015], [AS-008], [REP2-008], [REP3-004] and in the latest draft version of the DCO [REP4-014].

Sites for which the Applicant concluded no AEoI

- 3.2.5 The Applicant concluded that the Proposed Development would not adversely affect the integrity of any of the European sites and features assessed, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans as reflected in Table A1 in Annex 1.
- 3.2.6 NE confirmed it agreed with the Applicant's conclusion of no AEoI in respect of the above European sites [REP2-069].

3.3 Examination matters

- 3.3.1 No matters were raised in the Examination to date, or for which the ExA seeks clarity, in relation to AEoI.
- 3.3.2 NE confirmed in its SoCG [REP2-069] that it agreed with the Applicant's conclusions of no AEoI.
- 3.3.3 The ExA's understanding of the Applicant's and NE's current positions in relation to AEoI is set out in Table A1 of Annex 1 of this RIES.

4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

- 4.0.1 This RIES is based on information submitted throughout the Examination by the Applicants and IPs, up to D4 (16 January 2024), in relation to potential effects on European sites. It should be read in conjunction with the Examination documents referred to throughout.
- 4.0.2 Comments on the RIES will be of great value to the ExA in order to support a robust and thorough recommendation to the SoS. In particular, the ExA seeks confirmation whether the ExA's understanding of the screening and AEoI conclusions for the identified European sites (Table A1 in Annex 1) is correct at the point of this RIES publication.
- 4.0.3 Comments on the RIES must be submitted for D5 (13 February 2024).

ANNEX 1 EXA'S UNDERSTANDING OF POSITION AT POINT OF RIES PUBLICATION

4.0.4 Table A1 in this Annex summarises the ExA's understanding of the Applicant's screening exercise and assessment of effects on integrity, and agreement with the relevant ANCB at the point of publication of the RIES.

Key to tables:

C = Construction

O = Operation

D = Decommissioning

✓ = LSE or AEoI cannot be excluded

X = LSE or AEoI can be excluded

Y = Yes

N = No

? = Unclear

n/a = not applicable

Table A1. European sites and features for which the Applicant concluded no likely significant effects and degree of agreement with Interested Parties

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
North Norfolk Coast and Wash SAC					
Annex I Habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima</i>); • Coastal lagoons; • Large shallow inlets and bays; • Mediterranean and thermo-Atlantic halophilous scrubs (<i>Sarcocornetea fruticosi</i>) (Mediterranean saltmarsh scrub); • Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater 	Silt laden runoff (C and D)	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]
	Contamination from surface water pollution events (C and D)	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]

³ Applies to impacts from the Proposed Development alone and in combination, unless otherwise stated.

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<p>at low tide. (Intertidal mudflats and sandflats);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reefs; • Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand. (Glasswort and other annuals colonising mud and sand); and • Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time. (Subtidal sandbanks). <p>Annex II Species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common seal <i>Phoca vitulina</i>; and • Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i> 					
Otter	Loss of functionally linked habitat	X	Y [REP2-069]	n/a	n/a
The Wash SPA					

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bar-tailed godwit, <i>Limosa lapponica</i> - A157, nb • Bewick's swan, <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i> - A037, nb • Black-tailed godwit, <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i> - A616, nb • Common scoter, <i>Melanitta nigra</i> - A065, nb • Common tern, <i>Sterna hirundo</i> - A193, b • Curlew, <i>Numenius arquata</i> - A160, nb • Dark-bellied Brent goose, <i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i> - A675, nb • Dunlin, <i>Calidris alpina alpina</i> - A672, nb • Gadwall, <i>Mareca strepera</i> - A051, nb 	Silt laden runoff (C and D)	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]
	Contamination from surface water pollution events (C and D)	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goldeneye, <i>Bucephala clangula</i> - A067, nb • Grey plover, <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> - A141, nb • Knot, <i>Calidris canutus</i> - A143, nb • Little tern, <i>Sterna albifrons</i> - A195, b • Oystercatcher, <i>Haematopus ostralegus</i> - A130, nb • Pink-footed goose, <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> - A040, nb • Pintail, <i>Anas acuta</i> - A054, nb • Redshank, <i>Tringa totanus</i> - A162, nb • Sanderling, <i>Calidris alba</i> - A144, nb • Shelduck, <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> - A048, nb • Turnstone, <i>Arenaria interpres</i> - A169, nb 					

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbird assemblage • Wigeon, <i>Mareca penelope</i> - A050, nb 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pink footed goose - Golden plover - Lapwing 	Loss of functionally linked habitat	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]
The Wash Ramsar					
<p>Ramsar Criterion 1 The Wash is a large hallow bay comprising very extensive saltmarshes, major intertidal banks of sand and mud, shallow water and deep channels.</p> <p>Ramsar criterion 3 Qualifies because of the inter-relationship between its various components including saltmarshes, intertidal sand and mud flats and the</p>	Silt laden runoff (C and D)	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]
	Contamination from surface water pollution events (C and D)	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]
	Loss of functionally linked habitat	✓	Y [REP2-069]	X	Y [REP2-069]

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<p>estuarine waters. The saltmarshes and the plankton in the estuarine water provide a primary source of organic material which, together with other organic matter, forms the basis for the high productivity of the estuary.</p> <p>Ramsar criterion 5 Assemblages of international importance: Species with peak counts in winter: 292,541 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003).</p> <p>Ramsar criterion 6 Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance. Qualifying species/populations (as identified at designation): Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:</p>					

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common redshank, <i>Tringa 21etanus 21etanus</i>, 6,373 individuals, representing an average of 2.5% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3) - Eurasian curlew, <i>Numenius arquata arquata</i>, N. a. arquata Europe (breeding) 9,438 individuals, representing an average of 1.1% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3) - Eurasian oystercatcher, <i>Haematopus ostralegus ostralegus</i>, Europe & NW Africa -wintering 15,616 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3) - Grey plover, <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>, E Atlantic/W Africa -wintering 13,129 individuals, 					

Feature	Potential impact (C, O and D unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs? ³	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?
<p>representing an average of 5.2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3 – spring peak)</p> <p>- Red knot, <i>Calidris canutus islandica</i>, W & Southern Africa (wintering) 68,987 individuals, representing an average of 15.3% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)</p> <p>- Sanderling, <i>Calidris alba</i>, Eastern Atlantic 3,505 individuals, representing an average of 2.9% of the population (5-year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3).</p>					