

From: Walsh, James [REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk>
Sent: 01 February 2022 19:07
To: Able Marine Energy Park
Cc: Gooch, Hannah; Carson, Katharine; Wilson, Susan; Argent, Claire
Subject: RE: Updates for Able Marine Energy Park Material Change 2

Categories: Deadline response

Further to my earlier email, please note that we do not have any comments to make on the proposed change to construction sequence at the current time.

Kind regards

James Walsh
Lead Adviser, Sustainable Development Team
Yorkshire and Northern Lincolnshire Area Team
Natural England
3rd Floor, Lateral, 8 City Walk, Leeds LS11 9AT
[REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk

From: Walsh, James
Sent: 01 February 2022 17:47
To: Able Marine Energy Park <AbleMarineEnergyPark@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: Gooch, Hannah [REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk>; Carson, Katharine [REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk>; 'Wilson, Susan' [REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk>; 'Argent, Claire' [REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk>; Hewitson, Annette [REDACTED]@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Updates for Able Marine Energy Park Material Change 2

Please find attached Natural England's responses to the written questions ExQ2.

Kind regards

James Walsh
Lead Adviser, Sustainable Development Team
Yorkshire and Northern Lincolnshire Area Team
Natural England
3rd Floor, Lateral, 8 City Walk, Leeds LS11 9AT
[REDACTED]@naturalengland.org.uk

Natural England response to AMEP MC2 Examiner's written questions ExQ2 01-02-2022

Question ref	Question to	Question	NE Response
5. Biodiversity			
Q5.0.1	NE	In response to ExQ1: 5.0.6 the Applicant notes that the HRA Part 1 report has been updated in consultation with Natural England [REP1-023]. Does it resolve NE's concerns?	ExQ1 Question 5.0.6 was addressed to the applicant and not to NE. NE is satisfied with the updates that have been made to HRA part 1, however please see below under Q5.0.6 regarding outstanding information in HRA part 2.
Q5.0.2	NE	NE's response to ExQ1: 5.0.1 [REP1-036] notes that a LSE has been identified for ringed plover and sanderling but they do not appear to have been considered in the sHRA. However, para 9.4 of the LSE report explains that no LSE was concluded for sanderling as the species was not recorded in surveys. The ringed plover appears to have been assessed in the RIAA and an AEOI concluded at para 8.22. Do these parts of the HRA report satisfy NE's concerns?	This satisfies NE's concern with regard to sanderling. However, the reference in NE's response to ExQ1 Q5.0.1 was to little ringed plover, not ringed plover. The reason for excluding little ringed plover needs to be updated in HRA Part 1 para 9.4.
Q5.0.3	NE	At 4.7 of its SoCG with NE [REP1-002], the Applicant states, under matters not agreed, that there would be no change in the extent of noise disturbance as the quay piling would be no closer to receptors, as set out in section 16.4.0 of Chapter 16 of the UES [APP-087]. Does NE agree and is NE satisfied with the Applicant's response to ExQ1: 5.0.15 regarding noise effects under the Proposed Changes?	NE notes the information provided in the applicant's response to ExQ1 5.0.15 and in the updated HRA part 1 para 2.5 and 2.7 and part 2 paras 8.7 and 8.17. NE agrees and is satisfied with the applicant's response.
Q5.0.4	NE	NE's response to ExQ1: 5.0.3 at RR ref 3.3.3 [REP1-036] requests justification or evidence for the Applicant's conclusion that there would be no change in the extent of the operational noise disturbance and asks for clarification within the sHRA. Is NE content with the Applicant's response?	NE notes the information provided in the applicant's response to ExQ1 5.0.15 and in the updated HRA part 1 para 2.5 and 2.7 and part 2 paras 8.7 and 8.17. NE is satisfied with the applicant's response.

Q5.0.6	App, NE	NE's response to ExQ1: 5.0.3 at RR ref 3.3.2 [REP1-036] notes that it considers the effects of dredging volumes on aquatic ecology have not been adequately addressed in the sHRA. Also, that there does not appear to be any section within the sHRA providing a clear justification to support the conclusion that there would be no additional impacts on the Humber Estuary SAC/Ramsar designated features arising from the increase in dredging disposal volumes. Has the Applicant addressed the points made in this response in detail and, if so, where? Does NE agree with the Applicant's conclusion of no LSE from the dredging activities associated with the Proposed Changes?	We note the additional information provided in the updated HRA on dredging and disposal at part 1, para 2.7 and part 2, paras 8.8 – 8.12 and Table 12. However, on dredging it is not clear whether the mitigation measures set out in para 8.10 and 8.11 have been implemented, or whether it was considered not necessary to implement them and we advise that this should be clarified. We also advise that the applicant clarifies whether this updated information takes into account the recently proposed change in construction sequence.
13. Cumulative and in-combination effects			
Q13.0.3	NE	Is NE satisfied that the Applicant has considered all relevant plans or projects in the cumulative and in-combination assessments?	NE is satisfied that all relevant schemes have been assessed.