



The Planning Inspectorate  
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

# **REPORT on the IMPLICATIONS for EUROPEAN SITES**

## **Proposed Gatwick Airport Northern Runway**

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

Planning Inspectorate Reference: TR020005

25 July 2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	2
1.2	DOCUMENTS USED TO INFORM THIS RIES .....	3
1.3	CHANGE REQUESTS .....	3
1.4	RIES QUESTIONS.....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	EUROPEAN SITES CONSIDERED .....	5
2.2	POTENTIAL IMPACT PATHWAYS .....	6
2.3	IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES.....	8
3.2	THE APPLICANT’S ASSESSMENT .....	8
<b>4</b>	<b>CONCLUDING REMARKS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>ANNEX 1 EXA’S UNDERSTANDING OF POSITION AT POINT OF RIES PUBLICATION .....</b>	<b>11</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Gatwick Airport Limited (the Applicant) has applied to the Secretary of State (SoS) for a development consent order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) for the proposed Gatwick Airport Northern Runway (the application). The SoS for Housing, Communities and Local Government (formerly the SoS for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities) has appointed an Examining Authority (ExA) to conduct an Examination of the application, to report its findings and conclusions, and to make a recommendation to the SoS for Transport (SoST) 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 Regulations<sup>1</sup> for applications submitted under the PA2008 regime. The findings and conclusions on nature conservation issues reported by the ExA will assist the SoST 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 to European Sites<sup>2</sup> that was provided within the DCO application and submitted throughout the Examination by the Applicant and Interested Parties (IPs), up to Deadline 7 (DL7) of the Examination (15 July 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:  
[Gatwick Airport Northern Runway - Project information \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](https://www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/gatwick-airport-northern-runway-project-information)
- 1.1.4 This RIES is issued to ensure that IPs including the Appropriate Nature Conservation Body (ANCB) - Natural England (NE) - is consulted formally on Habitats Regulations matters. This process may be relied on by the SoST 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

sites and qualifying features as far as possible, in order to support a robust and thorough recommendation to the Secretary of State.

- 1.1.6 Following consultation, the responses will be considered by the ExA in making their recommendation to the Secretary of State and made available to the Secretary of State 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):

- Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 9.9.1 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Part 1 [[APP-134](#)], updated at D3 [[REP3-043](#)]; and
- ES Appendix 9.9.1 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Part 2 [[APP-135](#)], updated at D3 [[REP3-045](#)].

- 1.2.2 The HRA is supported by the following ES chapters:

- ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation [[APP-034](#)];
- ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [[APP-037](#)] updated 14 November 2023 [[AS-076](#)] and at D3 [[REP3-016](#)];
- ES Chapter 13: Air Quality [[APP-038](#)] updated at D3 [[REP3-018](#)]; and
- ES Appendix 9.3.1: Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses – Ecology and Nature Conservation [[APP-120](#)].

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

- 1.2.4 In addition to the HRA Report, 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 submitted the following change requests:

### **Change Request 1: 13 February 2023**

- Project Change 1 - Extension to the design parameters for the North Terminal International Departure Lounge (NT IDL) proposed southern extension (Accepted into the Examination on 8 March 2024).

- Project Change 2 - Reduction in height of the proposed replacement Central Area Recycling Enclosure (CARE) facility and change in its purpose (Accepted into the Examination on 8 March 2024).
- Project Change 3 – Revision to the proposed water treatment works (Accepted into the Examination on 8 March).

**Change Request 2: 26 June 2024**

- Project Change 4 - Provision of an On-airport Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) (Accepted into the Examination on 10 July 2024).

**Change Request 3: 15 July 2024**

- Project Change 5 - Extension to order limits for alternative temporary vehicular access at the Holiday Inn (ExA decision whether to accept into Examination is pending at the time of RIES publication).

1.3.2 No relevant HRA matters have arisen from these change requests.

## 1.4 RIES questions

1.4.1 This RIES contains one question for the Applicant and NE, which is drafted in *blue, underlined italic text.*

1.4.2 The responses to the question posed within the RIES and comments received on them will be of great value to the ExA in understanding IPs' positions on Habitats Regulations matters. It is stressed that responses to other matters discussed in the RIES are equally welcomed. In responding to the question, please refer to the ID number used in the question.

1.4.3 Comments on the RIES are timetabled for DL9 (21 August 2024).

## 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 sites.

2.1.2 HRA Report paragraph 1.3.5 explains that the scope was based on the pathways for potential effects informed by the following ES Chapter assessments:

- ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation [[APP-034](#)];
- ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [[APP-037](#)] updated 14 November 2023 [[AS-076](#)] and at D3 [[REP3-016](#)];
- ES Chapter 13: Air Quality [[APP-038](#)] updated at D3 [[REP3-018](#)]; and
- ES Appendix 9.3.1: Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses – Ecology and Nature Conservation [[APP-120](#)].

2.1.3 The scope was further informed by scoping responses from consultation bodies provided in ES Appendix 9.3.1 Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses – Ecology and Nature Conservation [[APP-120](#)].

#### Sites within the UK National Site Network (NSN)

2.1.4 The Applicant’s HRA Report [[REP3-043](#)] identified seven European sites within the UK National Site Network for inclusion within the assessment. These are listed in HRA Report paragraph 1.3.5 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 [[REP3-043](#)]**

Name of European site	Distance from Proposed Development (km)
Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	9.22
Ashdown Forest SAC	11.96
Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA)	11.96
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	23.6
The Mens SAC	25.09
Ebernoe Commons SAC	29

Name of European site	Distance from Proposed Development (km)
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	33.8

- 2.1.5 The locations of these sites relative to the Proposed Development are depicted on HRA Report Part 2, Figure 1 [REP3-045].
- 2.1.6 The Applicant’s updated HRA Report [REP3-043] did not identify any additional European sites within the UK National Site Network for inclusion within the assessment.
- 2.1.7 No additional UK European sites have been identified by IPs for inclusion within the assessment in the Examination to date.
- 2.1.8 The ANCB, NE agreed [REP1-037] that all relevant European sites and/ or European site features that could be affected by the Proposed Development had been identified by the Applicant.

## 2.2 Potential impact pathways

- 2.2.1 HRA Report [REP3-043] Sections 4.2 to 4.9 detail the potential impacts from the Proposed Development, along with the potential geographical extent of effects. HRA Report, Annex 1 Screening Matrices list the sites and qualifying features and the impact pathways which could affect them.
- 2.2.2 The HRA Report assesses the potential impacts during construction, operation and maintenance; it did not assess impacts during the decommissioning phase. This is explained in ES Chapter 6, paragraph 6.2.14; the Proposed Development is anticipated to function as an integral part of Gatwick Airport on a permanent basis and decommissioning effects are subsequently scoped out of the ES and HRA.
- 2.2.3 Tables A1.1 to A1.7 in Annex 1 of this RIES detail the potential impact pathways considered in the updated HRA Report [REP3-043] by European site and qualifying features.
- 2.2.4 The HRA Report assessed the potential impacts during construction, operation and maintenance. The Applicant considered that all potential impacts during the decommissioning phase would be similar to, and potentially less than, those outlined in the construction phase [REP3-043].
- 2.2.5 No additional impact pathways have been identified by IPs for inclusion within the assessment in the Examination to date.

## 2.3 In-combination effects

- 2.3.1 HRA Report Section 2 [REP3-043] details the Applicant’s approach to assessing likely significant effects (LSE) both alone and in-combination. The process of identifying projects and the projects included in the in-combination assessment are detailed in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045] and their locations depicted on HRA

Figures 20.4.2 to 20.4.4 in the Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationship Figures [[APP-051](#)].

- 2.3.2 No additional plans or projects have been highlighted by IPs in the Examination to date.
- 2.3.3 The Applicant's conclusions in respect of screening and effects on integrity are presented in the HRA Report [[REP3-043](#)], Sections 4.9 and paragraphs 5.3.65 to 5.3.73 respectively. Table 4.9.1 sets out the LSE screened in for further assessment.

**Sites for which the Applicant concluded no LSE on all qualifying features**

- 2.3.4 The Applicant concluded that the Proposed Development would not be likely to give rise to significant effects, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans, on all qualifying features of the following European sites:
- The Mens SAC;
  - Ebernoe Common SAC; and
  - Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC.
- 2.3.5 The relevant ANCB, NE confirmed it agreed with the Applicant's conclusion of no LSEs in respect of the above European sites [[RR-3223](#)].

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

- 2.3.6 The Applicant concluded that the Proposed Development would be likely to give rise to significant effects, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans, on one or more of the qualifying features of:
- Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Ockham and Wisley Common SSSI as a component);
  - Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Chobham Common SSSI as a component);
  - Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC (Chobham Common SSSI component only);
  - Ashdown Forest SPA; and
  - Ashdown Forest SAC.
- 2.3.7 The qualifying features and LSE pathways screened in by the Applicant are detailed in Section 3 of the HRA Report [[REP3-043](#)] and are identified in Annex 1 Tables A1.1 to A1.7 of this RIES.
- 2.3.8 No matters have been raised in the Examination to date in relation to the Applicant's screening assessment.



## 3 ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY

### 3.1 Conservation Objectives

3.1.1 The conservation objectives for all of the European sites for which a LSE was identified by the Applicant at the point of the DCO application were included within the HRA Report [[APP-134](#)].

3.1.2 The updated HRA [[REP3-043](#)] sets out the following in relation to the conservation status for those sites screened in for LSE:

- Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) SPA: there are 14 SSSIs that underpin the SPA, but paragraph 1.3.5 states that Ockham and Wisley Common SSSI and Chobham Common SSSI are the only SSSIs relevant to the assessment. Paragraph 3.7.1 states that the '*majority of units within the 14 SSSIs are in favourable condition with areas that are in unfavourable recovering condition*' but does not identify the status of units for Ockham and Wisley Common and Chobham Common SSSIs.
- Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham (TAPC) SAC: paragraph 1.3.5 indicates that Chobham Common SSSI is the only SSSI component relevant to the assessment. No conservation status is provided (beyond the general commentary in paragraph 3.7.1) but it is stated that the Site Improvement Plan covers TBH SPA and TAPC SAC;
- Ashdown Forest SAC – '*The majority of Ashdown Forest has been identified as unfavourable recovering, with some areas of unfavourable declining and favourable condition*' (paragraph 3.3.3); and
- Ashdown Forest SPA – no conservation status is provided but it is stated that the Site Improvement Plan is the same as for Ashdown Forest SAC (paragraph 3.4.5).

3.1.3 The ExA [[PD-021](#)], EN2.8 sought confirmation from NE as to whether it was content with the information provided by the Applicant about the conservation status of TAPC SAC. NE [[REP7-116](#)] confirmed that it was content and it considered that the information was sufficiently specific.

[Q3.1.1 \[To the Applicant and NE\] The ExA notes the information presented in the HRA Report and the response from NE to EXQ2 EN2.8. However, the ExA remains of the view that the information provided is not sufficiently clear to confirm the conservation status of areas of European sites where effects from the Proposed Development could occur. NE is asked to confirm the conservation status of Ockham and Wisley Common and Chobham Common SSSIs and Ashdown Forest SPA. The Applicant is asked to clarify how it approached conservation status in its assessment of effects on integrity of each of the European sites listed.](#)

### 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 Table 5.3.1 of the updated HRA Report [[REP3-043](#)].

**Sites for which the Applicant concluded no AEOI**

- 3.2.2 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. No mitigation measures were relied on to reach the conclusions of no AEOI.
- 3.2.3 The relevant ANCB, NE confirmed it agreed with the Applicant's conclusion of no AEOI in respect of the above European sites [[RR-3223](#)].

## **4 CONCLUDING REMARKS**

- 4.0.1 This RIES is based on information submitted throughout the Examination by the Applicants and IPs, up to DL7 (15 July 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 The RIES has identified gaps in the ExA's understanding of IPs' positions on Habitats Regulations and comments on the RIES will be of great value to the ExA in order to support a robust and thorough recommendation to the SoST. In particular, the ExA seeks:
- Responses to the question identified in Section 3 of this RIES.
  - Confirmation whether the ExA's understanding of screening and adverse effects conclusions at point of RIES publication (Tables A1.1 to A1.7 in Annex 1) is correct.
- 4.0.3 Comments on the RIES must be submitted for DL9 (21 August 2024).

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

The tables in this Annex summarise the ExA's understanding of the Applicant's screening exercise and assessment of effects on integrity, and agreement with the relevant ANCB at time of publication of this 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 A1.1: Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Stable xerothermophilous formations with <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> on rock slopes (Berberidion p.p.)	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates *important orchid sites	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
<i>Taxus baccata</i> woods of the British Isles *priority feature	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
European dry heaths	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
<i>Asperulofagetum</i>	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
beech forests	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Great crested newt	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Bechstein's bat	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
	Aqueous Emissions/Discharges	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a



**Table A1.2: Ashdown Forest SAC**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
European dry heaths	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB/IPs?	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
Great crested newt	Land Take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat Fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial Emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous Emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and Vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a

**Table A1.3: Ashdown Forest SPA**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Dartford Warbler	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Nightjar	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a

**Table A1.4: The Mens SAC**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with <i>Ilex</i> and sometimes also <i>Taxus</i> in the shrub layer	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Barbastelle bat	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a

**Table A1.5: Ebernoe Common SAC**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with <i>Ilex</i> and sometimes also <i>Taxus</i> in the shrub layer (or <i>Ilici-Fagenion</i> )	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Barbastelle bat	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Bechstein's bat	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB?	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a

**Table A1.6: Thames Basin Heath SPA**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Dartford Warbler	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Nightjar	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Woodlark	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a



**Table A1.7: Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC**

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB
		✓ / X	Y/N/?	✓ / X/n/a	Y/N/?
Depressions on peat substrates of the <i>Rhynchosporion</i>	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a
Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i>	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a

Feature	Potential impact (C and O unless otherwise stated)	LSE?		AEoI?	
		Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB	Applicant's conclusion (alone or in combination)	Agreement with ANCB
European dry heaths	Land take	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Habitat fragmentation	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Aerial emissions	x (C) ✓ (O)	Y	x	Y
	Aqueous emissions	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Noise and vibration	x	Y	n/a	n/a
	Lighting	x	Y	n/a	n/a