GBEP Appendix B – Summary Biodiversity - Applicant Response to Roy Clegg Submission

Questions	Applicants Response to Biodiversity	Response from Roy Clegg
1. There has been an unprecedented rate of biodiversity decline in recent decades according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature. 2. Their 2018 list showed that 26,000 species are threatened with extinction, which reflected more than 27% of all species assessed. This was greatly increased from their 2004 report that found at least 15 species had already gone extinct between 1984 and 2004, and another 12 survived only in captivity. 3. Many years of research studying the effects from both natural and man-made EMF over a wide range of frequencies, intensities, wave forms, and signalling characteristics have been observed in all species of animals and plants. 4. The database is now voluminous with studies showing biological effects at both high and low-intensity man-made exposures, many with implications for wildlife health and viability. 5. Sensitive magnetoreception allows living organisms, including plants, to detect small variations in environmental EMF and react immediately as well as over the long term, but it can also make some organisms exquisitely vulnerable to man-made fields. 6. EMF may be contributing more than we currently realize to species' diminishment and extinction. Exposures continue to escalate without understanding EMF as a potential causative and/or co-factorial agent. It is time to recognize ambient EMF as a potential novel stressor to other species. 7. There are two prevalent misconceptions today about how low-level non-ionizing EMF couples with and affects nonhuman species: i). There is no need for environmental concern since exposures as currently regulated are too low to cause effects; and ii). Existing exposure standards for humans are sufficient to cover non-human species too. Neither supposition is accurate. 8. We have a long over-due obligation to consider potential consequences to other species – an obligation we have thus far not considered before more species go extinct. 9. Is the Developer, ExA and the Secretary of State satisfied that there is no risk to any species of flora and fauna and wildlife from the effect of EMF and its features because of the Project?	1-3. No response required. 4 - 7 The Applicant acknowledges the research quoted in the WR but this does not provide any evidence that significant effects can arise from the specific elements of the Gate Burton Scheme. The Applicant re-iterates that the design of the buried cables is effective mitigation against any perceived or potential impacts on important ecological features identified in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP017/3.1]. 8. No response required. 9. Based on the responses provided above the Applicant is satisfied that there is no potential for significant adverse effects on biodiversity identified in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-017/3.1]	1-3. No response required. 4-7. The Applicant has stated that the design of the buried cables is effective mitigation against any perceived or potential impacts on important ecological features is satisfied that there is no potential for significant adverse effects on the flora and fauna contained in the WR's. What the applicant has failed to do, is identify and specify the design of the cables and demonstrate how they will provide effective mitigation against the effects of EMF on Flora and Fauna at the site.