



Supplementary Environmental Information

*Draft Great Crested Newts Licence Application – Acknowledgment
of Receipt & Natural England Correspondence*

EX 11.20

June 2012
Revision: 0
Able UK Ltd

EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES LICENSING CONSULTATION

For European Protected Species Licensing Team

GREAT CRESTED NEWTS

NATURAL
ENGLAND

Applicant / Ecologist:	Applicant: ABLE UK Ltd Ecologist: Duncan Painter		
Site name:	Able Marine Energy Park, Rosper Road, Killingholme, Immingham, North Lincs.		
Case reference number:	EPSM 2012-4206A (JG) -DRAFT		
Date application received by assessor:	24 th February 2012	Assessor's response deadline:	22 nd March 2012
Date re-submission received by assessor:		Assessor's response deadline:	
Date modification received by assessor:		Assessor's response deadline:	

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

The appropriate authority shall not grant a licence under regulation 53(9)(b) unless they are satisfied that actions authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

It should be noted that the comments provided on this form do not provide an exhaustive list of concerns that need to be addressed. The onus is on the applicant/ecologist to provide all details required for a full assessment. The method statement should be carefully checked to ensure that it follows the recommendations provided in the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines (2001). Deviations from the recommendations should be fully explained within the method statement. Please ensure the method statement, with accompanying documents, is re-submitted in its entirety.

Please see the following documents for further advice:

http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wmlq04_tcm6-4112.pdf
http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wlmsfags_tcm6-3859.pdf
http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wmlq05_tcm6-4115.pdf
http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/WML-G11_tcm6-9930.pdf

1. Experience

Is the experience written in the application form and attached written references adequate for the proposed work?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- Experience will usually be taken as adequate if the ecologist has held or been named on a licence in the past three years for the same species and in relation to a project of a similar scale, methodology and mitigation.
- A licence to carry out survey work is not considered to be a similar licence.
- A new applicant must provide a description of their work experience with Great crested newts and include two written references, both of which must contain specific detail of the referees own experience with Great crested newts (including licence numbers) and their knowledge of relevant work carried out by the applicant. Please refer to document WMLG05 – link provided above.
- At least one of the written references must be from a person who held or been named on a licence in the past three years for the same species and in relation to a project of a similar scale, methodology and mitigation. Details of this licence must be provided.

If 'NO' please address the following:

n/a

2. Survey

Has an adequate and appropriate survey of the site been carried out in relation to the proposed objectives?

Yes ☐ No ☒

An adequate survey will include:

- *Details of the area and habitat that was surveyed;*
- *An appropriate scaled map(s) of:*
 - i) The area where the Great crested newts will be affected by the proposed work,*
 - ii) The proposed area where mitigation will occur (if applicable), and*
 - iii) Adjoining sites if part of a phased development or other Great crested newt mitigation licences are held in those areas;*
- *The survey methods used;*
- *The name/s of the surveyor/s who undertook the work;*
- *Dates and weather conditions when the surveys were carried out; and*
- *Clearly presented survey results (for each method used) cross-referenced to areas on the map(s).*

If 'NO' please address the following:

Further details are required before we are able to assess if the survey effort is adequate for the application.

2010 Survey:

The Survey dates for this survey were all very close together (4 visits within 7 days), and Natural England expects surveys to be spread across the breeding season where possible. Concentrating all surveys over a short period risks falsely concluding newts are absent, when they may be present (in low numbers) earlier or later than the survey period. In addition, many of the ponds identified within 500m of the site were not able to be surveyed due to a lack of access permission. The survey results from the 2006 Just Ecology survey have not been appended.

Given the above factors, Natural England needs assurance that the surveys are an accurate representation of the status of great crested newts (GCN) in this area, and no other ponds (other than Ponds 14 and 18) may support great crested newts. Please therefore provide the following:

- the 2006 Just Ecology survey report (as an appendix);
- written confirmation that landowner consent was sought for surveys of the ponds outside the site, and written confirmation that it was refused;
- if possible, HSI assessments or photos of ponds not able to be surveyed;
- Ponds 1, 5, 15, 17, 21, 24, 25, and 27 have been deemed unsuitable for great crested newts, despite no access being possible to survey these ponds (some were viewed from a distance). Ponds should not be dismissed purely because they appear superficially poor or sub-optimal for newts, and all these ponds are potentially relevant to the impact assessment – please provide further clarification regarding the status of these ponds. If access to survey is denied, but the ponds may support great crested newts, this needs to be taken into account in the impact assessment and mitigation proposals.
- Please provide all survey results from 2010 – not just those for ponds within the development site.
- Please clarify if the drainage ditches within the site offer potential habitat for GCN? Are these freshwater habitats? If they are potentially suitable, further surveys may be required in spring 2012.

Please also only provide survey results from a single year within the Method Statement. Older survey results should be provided as an appendix.

Please ensure that the survey tables are only completed where a survey method was used – for example Pond 8 includes negative results for torch surveys, however the comments indicate this method was not used – please amend.

3. Impacts

Are the impacts of the development on the population fully described?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Impacts of the development on the Great crested newt population should be described as if taking place in the absence of mitigation:

- *Details of the areas and habitat types that will be lost to the development should be included;*
- *For phased developments impacts for all phases should be detailed (and a master plan provided as a separate document, please refer to WML-G11, link above); and*
- *The population must be considered in context of the local or regional population of Great crested newts.*

If 'NO' please address the following:

Map D – Please show Ponds 14 and 18, and include the 250m and 500m radii around them on this plan.

Please also provide a breakdown, either on Map D or within the text of D2, of the types and areas of habitat to be lost that are likely to be used by GCN (i.e. those up to 500m from the ponds).

D5.2 indicates 3 ponds will be lost, however the remainder of the impact assessment only refers to the loss of ponds 14 and 18 (confirmed to support GCN). Please clarify the third pond considered likely to be used by newts, and the impact of its loss. Pond 20 lies very close to Pond 18, although the HSI score indicates it is unlikely to be suitable for GCN, however Pond 13 appears to be more suitable, yet further from the known GCN ponds. Please note, table D5.1 (and D1/D2) should detail impacts on all ponds confirmed as being used by GCN *and* any likely to be used for foraging.

4. Methodology

Is the proposed methodology of the work programme suitable to meet the stated objectives in the application form?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Suitable methodology will include:

- *A clear description of the licensable operations e.g. capture and exclusion, translocation;*
- *Details of the proposed methods and techniques; and*
- *A detailed timetable of the proposed works pertaining to all licensable activities and mitigation, including disturbance /destruction of Great crested newt habitat. **This should be realistic and updated for any re-submission.***

The above must correspond with the details contained within the application form.

If 'NO' please address the following:

n/a

5. Mitigation

Is the mitigation proposed adequate with respect to the habitat which will be lost?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Adequate mitigation will include details of:

- *Habitat creation, modification and/or restoration (including areas and habitat types);*
- *Post-development habitat management;*
- *Post-development habitat maintenance;*
- *Post-development population monitoring; and*
- *Details of any mechanism in place for ensuring delivery (e.g. a Section 106 agreement).*

It will also include scaled drawings, plans and/or maps and photographs, as appropriate.

If 'NO' please address the following:

E3.1 – Please provide the dimensions for each of the new ponds – length, width and depth.

Map E3.1 – Please show the hedgerow planting/restoration proposed on this map.

E5.1 – Applications of this type require a Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan to be agreed and submitted as part of the licence application. No such document has been provided. Given that the success of the proposals relies heavily on the long term management and maintenance of both the newly created habitats and also the existing woodland habitats in the adjoining Fox Covert and Chase Hill Wood, a Management Plan is required that covers all these habitats. This must be agreed by all relevant parties (land owners and those carrying out the management) and submitted with the licence application.

A map is also required to show the areas referred to in the Plan and the management associated with them.

E5.3 – For developments with this level of impact, some form of legally binding agreement is required to ensure the long-term security of the receptor site and the adjoining woodland, and ensure that the habitats are managed and maintained in the future. Intentions to include the receptor site in a future LNR appear to be a laudable aim, however all agreements relating to the future security and management of the receptor site and the adjoining woodland must be in place prior to a licence being issued. In the absence of this security, it is not possible to reach a conclusion that the Favourable Conservation Status of the great crested newt population can be assured.

6. Conclusion in respect of regulation 53(9)(b)

Satisfied ☐
Not satisfied ☒

Assessed by: Cressida Mansfield

Date: 30/03/2012

7. Additional Comments

Natural England requires a named person to apply for the licence, and cannot issue a licence to a company. Therefore please provide the name of the licensee for the re-submission, and ensure that the declaration at the end of the application form is signed and dated. The cover sheet of the Method Statement also needs to show the name of the licensee (not the company).

Map F1 – Please clarify what the green shaded area in the south of the site comprises. Since the method statement indicates all habitats on site will be lost, it is assumed this area is proposed for some form of development, however if this is not the case, consideration should be given to utilising the area for habitat creation and/or a receptor site for the GCN population.

Please ensure all abbreviations are explained in full – notably, it is unclear who 'Humber INCA' are – please explain where relevant.

The points raised above must be addressed in a revised Method Statement before the favourable conservation status test (Regulation 53(9) (b)) can be met. Please read the comments carefully and address all of the issues raised. The resubmission should be presented in its entirety to include all maps, appendices, reports etc. All changes from the previously submitted documents must be clearly highlighted.

The comments below are for information, however they must be borne in mind for future applications.

B2.2 – This section of the Method Statement indicates only 1 breeding pond will be lost, however the application form and section D5.2 of the method statement suggest 3 ponds will be lost (2 of which are confirmed as GCN ponds). Please ensure future applications are consistent on this point.

E2 – Ideally newts should be retained on site wherever possible, and the population maintained within

it's current natural range (i.e. within 500m of the known GCN ponds). Given the scale of this development, and the lack of opportunity for habitat creation within the site, the proposals to relocate the population approximately 1km from the current breeding ponds has been accepted in this instance, however this would not be the case for most mitigation applications. Please be aware that for translocations over 1km, the need for disease screening must be considered. For this application, the intention is to translocate newts to an area where newts are currently absent, and there is also a possibility that very small numbers of newts may disperse this distance from the current population. Connectivity from the receptor to the closest (non-GCN) pond is also restricted as a result of the proposed permanent amphibian fencing along Chase Hill Wood. Therefore disease screening has not been required for this case. This may not be the case for future applications however, and translocations beyond 500m from the existing GCN ponds should be avoided wherever possible.

E4 – It is unclear why only 75 pitfall traps/hectare will be used, rather than the recommended 80 traps/ha in the Great crested newt mitigation guidelines (GCNMG). Given this is a small discrepancy, and the trapping proposals shown on map E4a appear appropriate, amendment is not being required, however please bear in mind that deviation from the trapping recommendations in the GCNMG should be explained and justified for future applications.

E6a – Whilst appropriate, it is recommended that a longer period is allowed for capture of newts from the site. Given that some days between March and May are likely to be unsuitable for capture, it is recommended a longer period is included in the timetable, to avoid the need to apply for a modification in the event of prolonged periods of unsuitable weather. If relevant, please ensure that where activities may occur in the same month, a sequence of activities is specified in the comments.

Assessor's Licence Recommendations following a 'Satisfied' decision:

Number of Great crested newts to be licensed	
Licensable activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Capture <input type="checkbox"/> Kill <input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Disturb <input type="checkbox"/> Injure <input type="checkbox"/> Damage/destroy a resting place <input type="checkbox"/> Damage/destroy a breeding site
Licensable methods	<input type="checkbox"/> By hand <input type="checkbox"/> Hand search <input type="checkbox"/> Destructive search <input type="checkbox"/> Bottle trapping <input type="checkbox"/> Netting <input type="checkbox"/> Draining down pond/s <input type="checkbox"/> Night/torch searching <input type="checkbox"/> Pitfall trapping <input type="checkbox"/> Refugia <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by permanent amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by permanent one-way amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by temporary amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by temporary one-way amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Drift fencing
Period of Licence	From: To:
Compliance visit recommended?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Type of visit	<input type="checkbox"/> Telephone <input type="checkbox"/> Visit
When? E.g. time period or dates.	
Justification for visit and brief details of requirements	

Date: 04 April 2012
Our ref: EPSM2012 – 4206 A (JG)
(NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT
INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT – NSIP)



Jonathan Monk
Able Marine UK Ltd

Sent by e-mail only

Customer Services
Wildlife Licensing
Natural England
First Floor
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6EB

T [REDACTED]
F [REDACTED]
E eps.mitigation@naturalengland.org.uk

Dear Mr Monk

DRAFT NSIP EPS MITIGATION LICENCE APPLICATION – INITIAL RESPONSE

LEGISLATION: CONSERVATION OF HABITATS AND SPECIES REGULATIONS 2010

NSIP SITE: ABLE MARINE ENERGY PARK, ROSPER ROAD, KILLINGHOME, IMMINGHAM,
NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE

EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES: GREAT CRESTED NEWT (*Triturus cristatus*)

Thank you for your draft great crested newt mitigation licence application in association with the above NSIP site, which was received in this office on the 20th February 2012. For NSIPs which require protected species licences, Natural England would normally review draft licence applications before the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is submitted to the National Infrastructure Division (NID), previously the Infrastructure Planning Commission. Once content that the licence applications are of the required standard, we would issue a „letter of comfort“ to the developer which could be included with the application pack to the NID. Such letters of comfort are designed to provide the NID with confidence that the competent licensing authority is satisfied that a licence can be issued, subject to the DCO being granted by the NID (please see our guidance note http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/WML-G36_tcm6-28566.pdf which explains the process in more detail).

Given the above process is relatively new, we agreed in this instance to work with you and your consultant with a view to issuing the required letter of comfort as soon as possible, to help ensure that the proposals meet protected species licensing requirements. Please note that Natural England seeks to reassure the NID that our decision to undertake this, rather than follow our guidance, does not in any way set a precedent for other cases.

We have now completed our initial assessment and provide advice as detailed below on the three licensing tests, which must be „met“ before any licence can be issued. As you are aware, no final licensing decision can be made, or a licence issued, until the development obtains all necessary consents in order to proceed and any relevant conditions are discharged. We have therefore assessed your draft proposals against the legislation and have concluded that the following issues, as detailed below, need to be addressed prior to a letter of comfort being issued. In relation to an application of this nature, our advice, if adhered to, will help you achieve the outcome required on all three licensing tests. We advise that you make the necessary changes to your application and re-submit the relevant documents following guidance in the attached annex. **Please can you mark your re-submission, ‘NSIP EPSM 2012-4206 – Able**

Marine Park for the attention of Kathryn Murray and John Gordon’. We will then review our decision/s based on the new information/evidence provided and issue a revised response within 30 working days of receipt.

Any letter of comfort issued following assessment of a re-submission (should all three tests be met) will confirm that, on the basis of the species information and proposals provided, Natural England is satisfied that the licensing tests can be met subject to the DCO being granted. Should the DCO be granted then the mitigation licence application must be formally submitted to Natural England. At this stage any modifications to the timings of the proposed works, e.g. due to ecological requirements of the species concerned, must be made and agreed before a licence is issued.

Licensing decisions:

Reasoned Statement

- **Imperative Reasons for Overriding Public Interest test (IROPI) (Purpose test) and**
- **No Satisfactory Alternative (NSA) test**

The evidence currently provided within your draft Reasoned Statement would not allow us to meet the „Purpose test“ or „No Satisfactory Alternative“ tests. The supporting evidence referenced within the „Reasoned Statement“ (Chapters 5, 6, 21 and Annex 4.4 of the Environmental Statement, submitted to the NID as part of the AMEP application package) has not been included with the licence application pack. This must be provided to verify the statements made before these tests can be considered met. Please note that, in terms of the purpose and NSA tests, it will not be possible for Natural England to consider that these tests have been **fully** met (in terms of obtaining a licence), in respect of any NSIP, unless the NID has granted the DCO.

Further details are provided in the enclosed determination report. Should you have any queries in relation to this matter then please do not hesitate to contact John Gordon or Oliver Lowe using the details provided below.

Method Statement

- **Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) Test**

The information and evidence currently provided within your draft method statement would not allow us to meet the „FCS“ test“. However, please see the enclosed FCS assessment report which indicates the areas of concern that need to be addressed in order to meet this licensing test. If there is any aspect of the FCS assessment report that is not clear to you and you wish to discuss it with the wildlife adviser who assessed the method statement, please contact Cressida Mansfield on 01245 237 682 or by email at: cressida.mansfield@naturalengland.org.uk

An email identifying issues in advance is helpful as it will enable Cressida to review your queries in the context of the case before discussing them with you. Like all Wildlife Advisers, Cressida does not spend all of her time in the office so there may be a short delay before she can respond to you.

Please note that Cressida does not deal with issues relating to the Purpose and Satisfactory Alternatives tests. As detailed above, should you wish to discuss any issues surrounding these two tests please contact Oliver Lowe (oliver.lowe@naturalengland.org.uk or 0300 060 1514) or John Gordon after 17th April 2012 (john.gordon@naturalengland.org.uk or 0300 060 1442). *(Please note that in order for us to be able to issue you with a ‘letter of comfort’ to support your application to the NID, this part of your application needs to be resubmitted as per the guidance in the Annex – Guidance for Providing Further Information).*

Although the tests cannot currently be assessed as “Satisfied”, this letter and its attachments can be used as evidence to the NID that we are actively working with you to resolve the

outstanding issues, and this may help your DCO application. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of the progress of the application to the NID.

I hope that the information detailed within this letter and its enclosures have been helpful. However, should you have any queries then please do not hesitate to contact me

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

Dr Kathryn Murray
EPS Senior Specialist - Licensing
Tel: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

Annex - Guidance for Providing Further Information.

Important note: When submitting your *re-submission* please mark correspondence 'NSIP EPSM 2012-4206 – Able Marine Park for the attention of Kathryn Murray and John Gordon'.

Submitting Documents.

Documents must be sent to Customer Service Wildlife Licensing (postal and email address at the top of this letter).

Changes to Documents – Reasoned Statement and/or Method Statement.

Changes must be identified using one or more of the following methods:

- underline new text/strikeout deleted text;
- use different font colour;
- block-coloured text, or all the above.

Reasoned Statement

Overriding Public Interest or Public Health and Safety and/or No Satisfactory Alternative.

When submitting a revised Reasoned Statement please send us one copy on CD, or by e-mail if less than 5MB in size, or alternatively one paper copy of the complete, revised document. Please do not send the amended sections in isolation.

Method Statement

Favourable Conservation Status.

When submitting a revised Method Statement please send us one copy on CD, or by e-mail if less than 5MB in size, or alternatively three paper copies. The method statement should be submitted in its entirety including all figures, appendices, supporting documents. This document forms part of the licence; please do not send the amended sections in isolation.

Customer Feedback – EPS Mitigation Licensing

To help us improve our service please complete the following questionnaire and return to:

Customer Services Wildlife Licensing, Natural England, First Floor, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6EB.

Fax: 0845 6013438 or email to wildlife@naturalengland.org.uk

<http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/regulation/wildlife/default.aspx>

NATURAL
ENGLAND

Natural England Reference Number (optional):	Please tick to indicate your role:	Consultant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Developer (Applicant/Licensee)	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. How easy was it to get in contact with the Wildlife Management & Licensing team of Natural England?

Difficult (1)

☐

OK (2)

☐

Easy (3)

☐

Very Easy (4)

☐

If 1 please specify who you initially contacted in relation to your issue/enquiry?

2. Please tell us how aware you were (BEFORE you contacted us) of wildlife legislation and what it does/does not permit in relation to your enquiry?

Unaware (1)

☐

Very Limited Awareness (2)

☐

Partially Aware (3)

☐

Fully Aware (4)

☐

3. How would you rate the service provided by Natural England?

	<i>Poor</i> 1	<i>Fair</i> 2	<i>Good</i> 3	<i>Excellent</i> 4	<i>Not applicable</i>
Ease of completion of application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advice provided by telephone (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our web site (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity and usefulness of published guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helpfulness and politeness of staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advice and clarity of explanations provided during Method Statement assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advice and clarity of explanations provided during Reasoned Statement assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speed of process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If 1 or 2 to any of the above please specify why:

4. Was your issue/enquiry resolved by the activity authorised under licence or advice provided by us?

Fully

☐

Partially

☐

Unresolved

☐

If not fully resolved please state what you think could have been done instead (note legislation affects which actions can be licensed):

5. Was there a public reaction to any action taken under the licence or as a result of our advice?

Positive support

☐

No reaction

☐

Negative reaction

☐

6. Would you use a fully online licensing service if it could be made available in the future?

Definitely

☐

Possibly

☐

Unlikely

☐

No

☐

7. Do you have any further comments to make or suggestions for improving our service, if yes please specify (continue comments on an additional sheet if necessary). If you are happy to be contacted at a later date to explore possible improvement options, please tick this box ☐ and ensure your Natural England reference number is at the top of this page.

Jenn Dawes

From: Mitigation, EPS (NE) <EPS.Mitigation@naturalengland.org.uk>
Sent: 13 June 2012 10:16
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: EPSM2012-4206B (JG), Able Marine Energy Park, Immingham, Lincs

Dear Mr Stephenson

CONSERVATION OF HABITATS AND SPECIES REGULATIONS 2010

LICENCE APPLICATION IN RESPECT OF EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES

SITE: Able Marine Energy Park, Immingham, Lincs

FILE REFERENCE: EPSM2012-4206B (JG)

I acknowledge receipt of your Resubmission in respect of a licence for the above site, received in this office on 12th June 2012.

The Resubmission has been forwarded to a Natural England Wildlife Adviser/EPS Adviser for their consideration. You should note that the Wildlife Adviser/EPS Adviser has 20 working days to consider the revised document and report back to this office. Once this advice has been received we will aim to determine the matter and issue a licensing decision within 10 working days.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Customer Services

Direct Line: [REDACTED]

Help Save trees, do you need to print this email ?

European Protected Species

Wildlife

Natural England

First Floor

Temple Quay House

2 The Square

Bristol

BS1 6EB

<http://www.naturalengland.org.uk>

We are here to secure a healthy natural environment for people to enjoy, where wildlife is protected and England's traditional landscapes are safeguarded for future generations.

In an effort to reduce Natural England's carbon footprint, I will, wherever possible, avoid travelling to meetings and attend via audio, video or web conferencing

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Nothing in the email amounts to a legal commitment on our part unless confirmed by a signed communication. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.