Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Volume 4 – Technical Appendices

Technical Appendix A8.1 – Ecology and Biodiversity Consultation

Document reference – EN010162/APP/6.4.8.1

Revision number 1

June 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Table A8.1.1: Summary of Non-statutory Consultation

Consultee	Date	Stage	Details
Natural England (NE)	03/03/2022–23/11/2022	Pre-Scoping	Setting up Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) contract.
	15/08/2022	Pre-Scoping	Written request for advice about scope of bird surveys.
	24/01/2023	Pre-Scoping	Written request for advice about scope of great crested newt surveys. Response from NE received 28/03/2023. Further details in Technical Appendix (TA) A8.6 Great Crested Newt Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.7].
	31/03/2023	Pre-Scoping	Written request for advice about scope of surveys, assessment and Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).
	04/03/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to introduce project and discuss approach to engagement.
	09/05/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach.
	05/09/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach.
	14/11/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach, including protected species licensing.
	06/02/2025	PEIR	Meeting to discuss PEIR documents.
	13/03/2025	Post-PEIR	Meeting to discuss S42 comments and basis for SoCG. All S42 matters are addressed in Table A8.1.3.
	18/03/2025	Post-PEIR	Meeting to discuss approach to protected species licensing and LoNI.
Environment Agency (EA)	25/09/2024	Post-scoping	The effects of electromagnetic fields from underground cabling on fish need to be assessed.

Consultee	Date	Stage	Details
	14/04/2025	Post-PEIR	Meeting to discuss S42 comments and basis for SoCG. All S42 matters are addressed in Table A8.1.3. The EA also requested that the Humber Estuary is scoped into the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report [EN010162/APP/5.7] due to the potential presence of lamprey species in watercourse in or connected to the Order Limits.
Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC)	12/02/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to introduce project and discuss approach.
	23/04/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach.
	11/06/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to discuss approach to woodland, trees and arboricultural assessment.
	24/06/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach.
	13/03/2025	Post-PEIR	Meeting to discuss S42 comments and basis for SoCG. All S42 matters are addressed in Table A8.1.3.
Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC)	18/01/2024	Pre-Scoping	Meeting to introduce project and discuss approach.
	01/02/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to introduce project and discuss approach with respect to Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).
	11/07/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach, including Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	20/02/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to introduce project and discuss approach.
	15/05/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach.
	16/07/2024	Post-Scoping	Meeting to provide project update and discuss approach.
	15/05/2025	Post-PEIR	Meeting to discuss water vole Species Recovery Project.

Consultee	Date	Stage	Details
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	2024 (throughout and ongoing)	Post-Scoping and Post-PEIR	Meetings to provide project updates and discuss approach.
Buglife			
Trent Rivers Trust			
National Biodiversity Network			
Sherwood Forest Trust			
Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) Steering Group	07/11/2024	Post-Scoping	Introductory (online) meeting of the LEMP Steering Group to define scope and roles.
LEMP Steering Group	17/12/2024	Post-Scoping	In-person meeting of the LEMP Steering Group. Project update and discussion of the Masterplan and LEMP.

Table A8.1.2: Summary of Scoping Responses

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Planning Inspectorate		
3.2.1	Chapter 6 does not make any reference to an assessment of decommissioning. This is required, as outlined in ID 2.2.4.	Effects during the decommissioning phase are assessed for each receptor in section 8.8 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
3.2.2	Concerns over the absence of a full list of associated topics in paragraph 238 and a reference in either Chapter 6 or Chapter 13 to air quality impacts on ecological receptors. The ES [Environmental Statement] should include an assessment of whether the Proposed Development would result in LSE on ecology as a result of air emissions.	The potential for effects on ecological receptors from changes in air quality arising from the Development are addressed in section 16.2.6 of chapter 16 Miscellaneous Issues [EN010162/APP/6.2.16] and assessed for selected ecological features in section 8.8 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
3.2.3	The ES should provide an assessment of all designated sites which may be affected by the Proposed Development and ensure this is consistent between chapters. The Applicant should seek to agree to the approach to the assessment of nationally and internationally designated sites with NE.	The assessment of designated sites is provided in sections 8.8.4 through 8.8.7 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. Consultation with NE has been undertaken at all stages of the application process.
3.2.4	The ES should provide all survey information (timings, scope etc) and results undertaken throughout the project lifecycle. The surveys should also identify any assumptions or limitations associated and identify where any are proposed to be updated. Where surveys older than two years are to be relied upon, a justification of this should be provided.	The surveys undertaken to inform the assessment reported in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] are detailed in Technical Appendix) (TA) A8.2 through A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2-12], including dates and any potential limitations. Potential limitations are also addressed in section 8.5.1 of chapter 8.

[1] Relevant numbered part or heading in the Scoping Opinion.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
3.2.5	Concerns regarding the absence of sufficient detail for the LWS (names, locations, justifications). The ES should also assess the potential for effects on other non-statutory designated sites within the study area (e.g. North Muskham Lake Nature Reserve).	LWS and other non-statutory sites are identified in TA A8.2 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]. Potential effects on LWS are assessed in section 8.8.7 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
3.2.6	The ES should identify any ancient woodland and veteran trees which may be affected by the Proposed Development. Any mitigation measures required to avoid/reduce impacts should be described in the ES and secured in the DCO. Restating the consultee comments: • In relation to buffer zones, a distance of one and a half times the tree height should be used. • Forestry Commission's consultation which refers to the requirement to assess potential impacts on replanted in relation to the use of public grant money from either the English Woodland Grant Scheme (EWGS) or Farm Woodland Premium Scheme (FWPS) which are still under obligation. The ES should also include an assessment of the implication of tree disturbance or removal where covered by a Tree Preservation Order.	Ancient woodland has been identified and is described in TA A8.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3] and potential effects are assessed in chapter 8 (section 8.8.8). An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12] of potentially high-impact parts Development was undertaken and included the identification of veteran, ancient and TPO-protected trees. A buffer distance of one and a half times tree height is a standard for power lines, in order to safeguard the power line. It is not required for the safety of the tree. The Development design included a buffer of 15 m from all trees and woodland within which potentially impactful works have been largely avoided. The AIA focused on works encroaching in these buffers and includes mitigation measures for retained trees. There will be no loss of or disturbance to plantation or TPO-protected trees.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
3.2.7	Concerns over the lack of information on proposed protected and notable species surveys. The ES should assess impacts on these species where significant effects are likely to occur and provide a justification as to why further surveys are required.	Protected and notable species surveys are described in TAs A8.2 to A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2-12] and summarised in Table 8.2 in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. The potential effects on protected species are assessed in sections 8.8.9 through 8.8.16 in chapter 8.
3.2.8	The ES should explain if any water features will be lost, and any required mitigation measures for waterbodies.	The potential for loss of water features/bodies is assessed in section 8.8.8 of chapter 8. Mitigation for water features is provided in the TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]
3.2.9	The ES should explain how the IEF, including its specified Zone of Influence (ZOI), has been determined, with reference to baseline data, relevant guidance and professional judgement. The ecological baseline should be evidenced by comprehensive surveys in line with relevant guidance, and this should be confirmed in the ES.	The determination of the IEFs is described in section 8.5.14 of chapter 8. The determination of ZOI is described in section 8.4.1.1 of chapter 8. The ecological baseline surveys referenced in chapter 8 are described in TAs A8.2 to A8.12.
3.2.10	The ES should justify why the study area for bats has been restricted to the Order Limits and habitat congruous to the Proposed Development. Agreement on the study area should be sought from NE and relevant consultation bodies and stakeholders.	The study area for bats is set out and justified in section 8.4.1.1, Table 8.1 of chapter 8 and TA A8.6 Bats Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.6]. No concerns have been raised in relation to the study area presented for bats in the Scoping Report.
3.2.11	Concerns regarding the lack of discussion on the potential impacts on aquatic invertebrates. The ES should assess impacts on both terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates where likely significant effects may occur.	Invertebrates are considered in section 8.5.12.2 of chapter 8. Embedded design and mitigation will safeguard terrestrial aquatic invertebrates, principally by avoiding their most important habitats.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
3.2.12	Due to the proximity of the Proposed Development to the River Trent and other local watercourses, the Inspectorate considers that fish surveys should be undertaken to inform the ES.	The EA requested additional information about and mitigation for fish (Table A8.1.3) – but not additional surveys – and these have been included sections 8.5.12 and 8.8.8 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. Based on the Development proposals, there is no potential for significant effects on fish or the River Trent (also addressed in chapter 9 Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9].
3.2.14	The Inspectorate is unclear as to how agricultural land classification (physical soil characteristics) could impact ecology, ornithology and biodiversity. Where the ES chapter refers to other aspect chapters, a clear explanation should be provided as to the relevance to the assessments.	The soil quality could affect the suitability of proposed mitigation/enhancement measures, for example, however, chapter 8 does not make reference to agricultural land classification. The Outline LEMP (TA A5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1] considers soil quality. Any references to other aspect chapters are supported by justifications of their relevance.
3.2.15	Concerns over the deer fence design. The ES should include information on mitigation measures to avoid significant effects from restricting the movement of species during construction and operation.	Development design measures to facilitate mammal movements are specified in chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5], section 5.4.3.5 (fencing) and 5.4.3.7 (culverts). These measures are reflected in section 8.6.6 of chapter 8.
3.2.16	The ES should assess potential impacts from INNS [Invasive Non-Nature Species] where significant effects are likely to occur. Where mitigation measures are required, the ES should describe these measures and signpost how they would be secured through the DCO.	Measures to prevent the spread of INNS are described in TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] as summarised in section 8.6.8.6 of chapter 8. Biosecurity is embedded in the Development and effects from INNS are scoped out of the assessment in chapter 8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
3.2.17	Specific survey and assessment data relating to the presence and locations of species that could be subject to disturbance, damage, persecution, or commercial exploitation resulting from publication of the information, should be provided in the ES as a confidential annex.	Two confidential TAs are provided: TA A8.10 Badger Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.10] TA A8.11 Schedule-1 Breeding Birds Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.11]
3.3.1	Concerns over the lack of consistency of SSSI identification and reasoning in relation to Besthorpe Warren and Besthorpe Meadows SSSIs. Also on the effects on Farndon Ponds and Devon Park Pastures Local Nature Reserves (LNR). The ES biodiversity aspect chapter should present a coherent assessment of the impacts on designated wildlife sites which explains which sites fall with the Proposed Development's ZOI.	Methods for the identification of designated sites are provided in TA A8.2 Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2] and section 8.4.1 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. Designated sites scoped into the assessment, and the rationale for this, is identified in Table 8.7. Consultation with NE and NSDC (Table A8.1.3) has further informed the designated sites to be scoped in. Potential effects are assessed in sections 8.8.2 through 8.8.7 and section 8.9.2 (cumulatives) of chapter 8.
Bathley Parish Council		
Para. 11	Concerns about the effects of the Development on the ability of animals to move freely in the landscape.	Development design measures to facilitate mammal movements are specified in ES Chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5], section 5.4.3.5 (fencing) and 5.4.3.7 (culverts). These measures are reflected in section 8.6.6 of chapter 8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Carlon-on-Trent Parish Council		
Para. 1	Altered water flow patterns and increased sedimentation can have long-term consequences for local ecosystems and water quality, impacting flora and fauna beyond the area of the development itself.	Addressed in section 8.8.8 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and are assessed in chapter 9 Water Resources EN010162/APP/6.2.9].
Para. 6	A thorough assessment of ecological effects by an independent specialist is required. Appropriate mitigation is required.	Chapter 8 has been prepared by an independent ecologist and presents an assessment of potential ecological effects, and proposes mitigation, in line with prevailing policy, guidance and good practice.
Para. 6	Monitoring of ecological effects and appropriate responses during the Development.	Details of monitoring and adaptive management and mitigation are provided in the following: TA A5.1 Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1] TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] TA A5.5 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5] TA A5.6 Outline Decommissioning Restoration Plan (DRP) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]
Para. 6	An extensive habitat restoration programme is required.	The Outline LEMP describes the proposed habitat management, which includes enhancement (restoration).
Para. 6	An assessment of the potential effects of reflected light on birds and insects is required.	The potential effects of reflected light are addressed in section 8.7.7 of chapter 8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
The Environment Agency		
Para. *Scoping in/ out*	The transfer of sediment to surface water resources should be scoped in for operation due to its impact on vegetation.	Assessed in section 9.6.1.12 of chapter 9 Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9]. Addressed in section 8.7.2 (likely effects) of chapter 8, as well the assessment of effects for various ecological features in section 8.8. TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] includes mitigation for these potential effects.
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Culverts should be avoided. Where there is no reasonably practical alternative to culverting, the hydrology and flood risk will need to be modelled. The installation of a temporary clear-span bridge crossing is preferred but the effects on hydrology and geomorphology should be considered	A Watercourse Crossing Inventory is included in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] and specifies the crossing method at each location. Culverts are only proposed at the lowest sensitivity locations. The potential effects of watercourse crossings on freshwater features are assessed in section 8.8 of Chapter 8 with reference to Chapter 9 Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9].
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Open span bridge design is preferred for access track crossings of watercourses or ditches.	A Watercourse Crossing Inventory is included in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] and specifies the crossing method at each location. Open-span bridges are specified as the preferred option.
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Flood defence failure will be covered in the Flood Risk Assessment and vibration should be considered in more detail and scoped in.	Vibration is identified in section 8.7.6 of chapter 8 as potential source of disturbance to animals and assessed in section 8.8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Where avoidance of ecological features from onsite cabling is not an option, trenchless method such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD) will be considered. HDD and other trenchless methods generally pose least risk to existing ecology and are our preferred method.	A Watercourse Crossing Inventory is included in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] and specifies the crossing method at each location. HDD has been specified for the cable crossings of all watercourses except the smallest, artificial types.
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan will include consideration of BNG and the positive biodiversity impact Local Nature Recovery Strategies can have.	TA A5.1 Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1], includes consideration of BNG and will be the document used to deliver it. The Outline LEMP and the BNG assessment (TA A8.13 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13] include consideration of Local Nature Recovery Strategies.
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Construction compounds (including temp compounds) will need to be secure to prevent wildlife entrapment. Trenches to be covered when not being worked.	These have been incorporated into the design and TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Recommend further investigation into which of the identified habitats are classified as Habitats of Principal Important under the NERC Act 2006.	Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI) are identified Table 8.7 of chapter 8 [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and TA A8.3 Habitats and Vegetation Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Concerns over species of importance. No eel and salmon identified, despite the River Trent and its tributaries being key migratory routes for these species. Protected fish, such as Bullheads may be present. The impact of the works on species of importance will need to be shown to be considered.	Fish have been identified as Important Ecological Features in chapter 8 and effects to them assessed in section 8.8.9.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Concerns over the ecological feature survey area of Great Crested Newts as it is unclear whether the 250m is from the nearest pond habitat or whether it will include potential terrestrial habitats also. Both ponds and their terrestrial habitat will need to be considered.	The Study Area for great crested newts extends up to 250 m from the Order Limits and was agreed in consultation with NE. Details are provided in TA A8.7 Great Crested Newt Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.7].
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Recommend aquatic invertebrates and fish are considered where development will impact a watercourse, this could be an access crossing point or cable crossing point amongst other activities.	Fish have been identified as Important Ecological Features in chapter 8 and effects to them assessed in section 8.8.9. Invertebrates are considered in section 8.5.12.2 of chapter 8.
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Supports the approach to undertake further targeted [water vole] surveys in areas where works are likely to be within 10m of the watercourse.	Further surveys have been undertaken (see TA A8.8 Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8] and the Outline CEMP includes a commitment, as recommended by the EA (in Table A8.1.3) to undertake further pre-commencement water vole surveys, which will target watercourse crossings.
Para. *Biodiversity Comments*	Expect to receive a Biosecurity Protocol within the Environmental Statement.	Biosecurity is addressed in section A5.3.11 (CEcMP) of TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
Forestry Commission		
Para. 3	Landowners must meet the terms and conditions of woodland grant schemes and agreement contracts.	All such obligations will be met by landowners, but this is not explicitly addressed in the ES.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. 4	Concerns over woodland connectivity. Grant scheme woodlands will need buffer zones and access tracks to enable future management. Proposals for managing the boundary of the woodland and any likely increased access will need to be planned carefully. Hedgerows and individual trees will need to be considered in terms of their overall connectivity.	Vehicular access will be maintained to all woodlands and will be confirmed in the final LEMP following consent. The locations of proposed new hedgerows and woodland planting (set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]) have been designed to increase connectivity.
Para. 5	Ancient woodlands of Coppice Wood and Lady Wood are under obligation to one of the Forestry Commission Legacy Grant Schemes. Please refer to further technical information set out in Natural England and Forestry Commission's Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland - plus supporting Assessment Guide and "Keepers of Time" – Ancient and Native Woodland and Trees Policy in England.	Ancient Woodland has been identified as an IEF in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and mitigation, including exclusion buffers, to avoid and reduce adverse effects has been embedded in the design. TA A8.12 AIA [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12] includes further assessment of and mitigation for ancient woodland and veteran trees.
Para. 8	Buffer zones to protect trees. For ancient woodlands, buffer zone of at least 15 meters.	This design principle has been incorporated into the design Table 5.1, chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5].
Para. 9	Root Protection Zone (as specified in British Standard 5837) must be taken into consideration for any woodland within development boundary.	A 15 m RPA has been applied to all trees and woodland in the design. Excluding ancient and veteran trees, this is the maximum theoretical RPA. Some works may be necessary in this buffer for which a targeted AIA has been undertaken (TA A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]).

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. 9	Expect that there will be an assessment of any tree loss and woodlands and development of mitigation to minimise risk of net deforestation due to scheme.	Most woodland has been excluded from the Order Limit and minimum 15 m buffers applied to all woodland and trees. Ecological effects and mitigation are provided in Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and TA A8.12 AIA [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]. There will be a net gain in woodland and trees and this is specified in the TA A5.1 Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1] and evidenced by TA A8.13 BNG Assessment [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13].
Para. 10	Planting scheme should consider: the biodiversity of planting stock; climate, pest and disease resilience; maximising ecosystem services; and benefits of all new woodland where possible; maximising connectivity across the landscape.	These design principles have been considered in the Outline LEMP.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council		
Para: *Ecology, Ornithology and Biodiversity*	Proposed that night time surveys are included in scope to incorporate owl population.	Bird surveys have included a nocturnal component. Methods are provided in TA A8.4 Breeding Birds Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4].
Para: *Ecology, Ornithology and Biodiversity*	Concerns regarding effects on birds of prey.	The ecological effects on raptors and owls are assessed in section 8.8.15 in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
Para: *Ecology, Ornithology and Biodiversity*	Proposed that scope should include potential effects of fencing on wildlife.	Development design measures to facilitate mammal movements are specified in section 5.4.3.5 chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5]. These measures are reflected in section 8.6.6 of chapter 8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para: *Ecology, Ornithology and Biodiversity*	Concerns over wildlife emerging onto highway. Proposes that the scope should look at the creation of an unnatural pinch point and corridors.	Wildlife movements are addressed in section 8.6.6 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
Items Scoped Out of the EIA	Concerns that Laxton Sykes are not separated by "extensive agricultural landscape" and share hydrological connectivity. Council proposes that this is scoped.	Laxton Sykes has been identified as an IEF and scoped into the assessment in chapter 8, as assessed in section 8.8.6.
Natural England		
Para. *Biodiversity and Geodiversity*	Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) may be carried out as part of the EIA process or to support other forms of environmental assessments or appraisal. Guidelines have been developed by CIEEM.	The EcIA presented in chapter 8 follows CIEEM guidelines.
Para. *International and European Sites*	ES should assess the potential for the proposal to affect internationally designated sites of nature conservation importance/European Sites, as outlined in Article 6 of Habitat Directive.	The potential effects to internationally designated sites of nature conservation importance are assessed in sections 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of chapter 8. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report has also been submitted ([EN010162/APP/5.3])
Para. *International and European Sites*	Concerns regarding the proximity of development to Sherwood Forest area; identified as importance for breeding nightjar and woodlark and may become SPA in the future. Please refer to Natural England's Advice Note on this matter.	The potential effects to the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA) are assessed in section 8.8.3 of chapter 8. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report has also been submitted ([EN010162/APP/5.7]).

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Nationally Designated Sites*	ES should include full assessment of direct and indirect effects of the development on the SSSI and identify appropriate mitigation measures.	The potential effects to SSSIs are assessed in sections 8.8.4 through 8.8.6 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. Mitigation is embedded in the design and described TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3], with particular reference to the SSSIs in section A5.3.11.2.
Para. *Regionally and Locally Important Sites*	ES should consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites, including local nature reserves.	The potential effects to Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are assessed in section 8.8.6. Mitigation is embedded in the design and described TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
Para. *Protected Species*	ES should consider the impacts of all phases of the proposal on protected species and consideration should be given to the wider context of the site.	The potential effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Development are assessed in section 8.8 of chapter 8. The wider context is addressed by the defined ZoIs (section 8.4.1.1) and the cumulative assessment (section 8.9).
Para. *Protected Species*	The area likely to be affected by the development should be thoroughly surveyed by competent ecologists at appropriate times of year, the survey results, impact assessments and appropriate accompanying mitigation strategies included as part of the ES.	Methods and results of baseline studies are presented in the TA A8.2 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2] through A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]. Impact assessment and mitigation are presented in chapter 8.
Para. *Protected Species*	Applicants should check to see if a mitigation licence is required using NE guidance on licencing NE wildlife licences. NE are unable to advise upon the decision for a license.	The need for and scope of mitigation licences has been discussed with Natural England (see Table A8.1.1). Licensing arrangements are described in the Outline CEMP.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *District Level Licensing for Great Crested Newts*	A DLL scheme is planned to be launched within Nottinghamshire in 2024. NE would encourage engagement from the applicant regarding DLL as soon as possible to ensure entry into the scheme is feasible.	Natural England has subsequently confirmed that DLL will not be available in Nottinghamshire 2024. Mitigation for great crested newt is described in TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
Para. *Priority Habitats and Species*	Consideration should be given to the potential environmental value of brownfield sites.	Undeveloped brownfield sites will not be developed as part of the Development.
Para. *Ancient Woodland, Ancient and Veteran Trees*	The ES should assess the impacts of the proposal on the ancient woodland and scope to avoid and mitigate for adverse impacts. It should also consider opportunities for enhancement.	Ancient woodland has been identified and is described in TA A8.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3] and potential effects are assessed in chapter 8 (section 8.8.8). An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12] of potentially high-impact parts Development was undertaken and included the identification of veteran, ancient and TPO-protected trees. There is no ancient woodland in the Order Limits, but the Outline LEMP (TA A5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]) includes woodland and ecotone creation to support the woodlands.
Para. *Biodiversity Net Gain*	On-site provision of BNG should be prioritised above off-site. Statutory Biodiversity Metric should be used, and the same version of the metric should be used pre and post development to ensure consistency.	As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure project (NSIP), the Development is currently exempt from mandatory BNG. However, the BNG assessment (TA A8.13 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]) uses the prevailing statutory metric and demonstrate that all gains will be achievable on site.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Ancient Woodland, Ancient and Veteran Trees*	Recommend that engagement with relevant local planning authorities, responsible authorities and statutory consultees (including Natural England) is undertaken to align habitat enhancement through the development with any emerging plans and policies in relation to LNRS.	A programme of consultation and engagement about habitat management has been underway with statutory and non-statutory consultees since 2023 (see also Table A8.1.1). A Steering Group has been formed by the Applicant (outlined in TA A5.1 Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]) to advise on the development and implementation of the Outline LEMP. The draft LNRS was published during the preparation of the DCO submission and the published version will be considered, post-consent, as necessary.
Para. *Biodiversity Net Gain*	Several BNG opportunities for habitat enhancement in the Sherwood area through the possible creation of connections between isolated habitat areas.	Habitat connectivity is a key principle of the Outline LEMP and the NSDC biodiversity opportunity mapping has informed designs. The Development itself will provide landscape-scale connectivity in an otherwise agricultural landscape.
Para. *Decommissioning and After use*	Natural England consider that the ES could include provision for new surveys and assessment to inform any additional mitigation/compensatory measures to be implemented prior to any reinstatement works occurring.	TA A5.6 Outline DRP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6] includes provision for new surveys to inform mitigation.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Climate Change*	The ES to identify how the development will embed Nature Based Solutions, maintain ecological networks and build resilience to climate change. The ES should also incorporate the policies as set out in NPS EN-1 relating to climate change. The NPPF requires that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment, which should be demonstrated through the ES.	The masterplan (Figure 5.2 [EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]) shows the proposed planting and vegetation changes. An assessment of climate change effects is provided in Chapter 15 Climate Change EN010162/APP/6.2.15], with commentary on how the proposals will help build local ecosystem resilience to climate change provided. Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] clearly demonstrates the adoption of the mitigation hierarchy advocated by NPS EN-1, including a range of enhancements which are further demonstrated by the BNG Assessment (TA A8.13 BNG Assessment [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]).
Newark & Sherwood District Council		
Para. *Project Description*	The ES should justify the reasons for the selection of any buffer distances provided.	Buffer distances are described in section 8.6.1 of chapter 8.
Para. *Project Description*	The ES must take into account the time and nature of any new landscaping being established and maturing during the lifetime of the development.	The time taken for habitats to reach target condition, and therefore deliver on BNG commitments, is reflected in the TA A8.13 BNG Assessment [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13] and TA A5.1 Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1].
Para. *Noise*	The ES should include an assessment of noise and vibration generated by tracking panels and its potential impact on residential and ecological receptors.	Tracking panels are not proposed; the fixed panels create no noise.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Preliminary Baseline Conditions*	In this instance the Order Limits only appear to encroach into the ppSPA area by approximately 400m and the farmland habitats this involves would be unsuitable to support these species. However, for completeness and avoidance of doubt, recommended that this is given consideration within the ES.	The Order Limits extend approximately 800 m into the 5 km buffer of the ppSPA Important Bird Area (IBA) but are 4.3 km from the IBA and 4.5 km from the Core Area. The potential effects to the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA) are assessed in section 8.8.3 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report has also been submitted ([EN010162/APP/5.7]).
Para. *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (including Habitats)*	Noted that further survey work was to be continued in 2024, but potentially only for areas subsequently brought into the Order Limits. Therefore, advise that habitat assessments have been undertaken at suitable survey timings.	TA A8.3 Habitats and Vegetation Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3] details the habitats surveys, including timing and potential limitations.
Para. *Reptiles*	There should be some assessment via targeted survey work for reptiles, particularly grass snake but the scope of this survey work should be reconsidered to enable a better understanding of the baseline conditions for reptiles, particularly grass snake, within the Order Limits.	Targeted reptile surveys were undertaken in 2024 and are reported in TA A8.9 Other Notable and Protected Species [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.9]. Grass snake has been identified as an IEF and scoped into the assessment in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
Mitigation and Enhancement (Section 6.5.5.4) –Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Para. 242	BNG assessment should utilise the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and follow the principles and processes for mandatory BNG for non-NSIP developments, if at the time of the assessment the proposed development is not bound by specific BNG legislation for NSIPs.	The BNG assessment, using the prevailing statutory metric, is provided in TA A8.13 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13].

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Matters and aspects to be scoped out of the assessment.*	Understanding that Natural England are going to launch an updated version of the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zones (IRZ). The assessment process should ensure that it utilises up to date information.	The most up-to-date version of the SSSI IRZ data set has been used to inform chapter 8.
Para. *Scoping report environmental impact*	Insufficient detail is included in the plan to allow a full assessment of the potential impacts for example, it is accepted that veteran trees, ancient trees/ woodlands are not all mapped. As this is a reasonable reason to refuse development over a significant area it is suggested this be fully explored and documented prior to a layout being placed forward.	The Development design included a buffer of 15 m from all trees and woodland within which potentially impactful works have been largely avoided. The AIA focused on works encroaching in these buffers and includes mitigation measures for retained trees. Ancient woodland has been identified and is described in TA A8.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3] and potential effects are assessed in chapter 8 (section 8.8.8). An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]) of potentially high-impact parts Development was undertaken and included the identification of veteran, ancient and TPO-protected trees.
Para. *Scoping report environmental impact*	Cheveral Wood, Hockerton, North Clifton, Notts, an acknowledged ancient woodland protected by TPO. Noting that trees fail in high winds, particularly veteran trees, as such any offset should be 1 and a half times the mature tree height.	A buffer distance of one and a half times tree height is a standard for power lines, in order to safeguard the power line. It is not required for the safety of the tree. The Development design included a buffer of 15 m from all trees and woodland within which potentially impactful works have been largely avoided. The AIA focused on works encroaching in these buffers and includes mitigation measures for retained trees.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Scoping report environmental impact*	The placement of solar panels does not appear to take into account the RPA (root Protection area), ecology, climate change impacts.	A 15 m RPA has been applied to all trees and woodland in the design, including the solar PV work area (see Table 5.1, chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5]. Excluding ancient and veteran trees, this is the maximum theoretical RPA. Some works may be necessary in this buffer for which a targeted AIA (TA A.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]) has been undertaken.
North Muskham Parish Council		
Para. 7	A number of species are mentioned but we suggest the following should also be scoped in: Barn Owls, Deer, Hen Harriers – one of the UK's rarest birds of prey. Residents have seen these on numerous occasions in and around SE-26.	The species scoped into the assessment are described in Table 8.7 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and are based on extensive desk study and field surveys, which are fully described in TA A8.4 Breeding Birds Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4] and TA A8.5 Wintering Birds Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5].
Para. 7	The report and study should include the impacts that the substantial fencing will have on travel behaviours of stated study species and the well-being and sustainability of habitats be scoped in.	Development design measures to facilitate mammal movements are specified in section 5.4.3.5, chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5]. These measures are reflected in section 8.6.6 of chapter 8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. 8	Whilst the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve at North Muskham (off Manor House Drive) is just outside of the Order Limits in should still be scoped in and highlighted in dark blue as per similar sites.	North Muskham Lake has been identified TA A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2] but scoped out of the assessment (Table 8.7, chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]).
Para. 8	Immediately north of this asset is a further 25 acres of land currently being sought for purchase by North Muskham Parish Council to make formal submission for this to be a nature reserve. This should also be highlighted and scoped in as per above.	This area has been identified TA A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2] but scoped out of the assessment (Table 8.7, chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]).
Norwell Parish Council		
Para. 10	The management of 'waste' grass cuttings on-site during the operational phase should be scoped in.	Arisings will be managed in accordance with the Outline LEMP (TA A5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]).
Nottinghamshire County Council		
Para. *Ecology*	The Scoping Report hasn't detailed the Local Wildlife Sites occurring within 2km of the order limits, but it does note in section 6.3.1 that 31 such sites occur and that these will be presented in the PEIR and ES. Council wish to underline the importance of Local Wildlife Sites.	Local Wildlife Sites are identified in TA A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2] and assessed in section 8.8.7 of chapter 8.
Para. *Ecology*	It is important that surveys are up to date, and the applicant should have regard to CIEEM's Advice Note on the lifespan of ecological repots and surveys (CIEEM, April 2019). Any deviations from what is set out in this Advice Note will need to be justified.	The age of survey data is addressed in section 8.5.1.1 of chapter 8.

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Para. *Ecology*	The applicant's attention should be drawn to recent research about the impact of solar PV sites on bats (Tinsley et al., 2023).	This research is considered in the assessment of effects to bats in section 8.8.12 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
South Muskham & Little Carlton Parish Council		
Para. 12	There are three areas that have not been considered by the applicant in this section; Smeatons Lakes, the South Muskham Fishery (A1 pits) and the lakes owned by Nottingham Piscatorial Society on Great North Road. These should be scoped in as they contribute significantly to ecology, ornithology and biodiversity in the locality.	These sites are not formally recognised for their nature conservation value and have been scoped out of the assessment. They may have value within the context of the Parish, but are extremely unlikely to be functionally linked to, or have clear ecological connectivity with, the Development. The majority of the nearby parts of the Development are proposed mitigation/enhancement.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council		
Para. 8–12	No comments on Ecology, Ornithology and Biodiversity.	These topics have been scoped into the EIA and are addressed in chapter 8.
Weston Parish Council		

Reference[1]	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	Concerns regarding the impact of the construction phase on local flora/fauna and birds and animals occupying land. New fences erected could prevent movement of animals.	The effects of the construction of the Development are assessed in section 8.8 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. Development design measures to facilitate mammal movements are specified in section 5.4.3.5 of chapter 5 Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5]. These measures are reflected in section 8.6.6 of chapter 8.

Table A8.1.3: Summary of Section 42 Responses to PEIR

This table only includes responses that substantively influenced the Development design or assessment of effects. A full set of consultation responses is provided in the Consultation Report [EN010162/APP/5.1].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
Environment Agency		
	Not all protected fish species present have been included in the baseline data for fish. Protected fish species may be negatively impacted by the scheme. Given that river lamprey and sea lamprey are in the River Trent, it is likely that lamprey species are present in the Moorhouse Beck, The Beck and Pingley Dyke, and thus should be included in the baseline data.	Lamprey are included in TA A8.9 Other Notable and Protected Species [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.9] and assessed in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
	Insufficient mitigation for fish during the diversion of watercourses and open cut trenching. Harm/mortality to fish (including protected fish species) and loss of habitat. If this falls during key fish migratory periods, this could significantly impact on spawning success and at worst significantly reduce recruitment in watercourses. This in turn could lead to a deterioration in WFD status.	Fish mitigation is outlined in section 5.3.11.11 of TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	Culverts have the potential to fragment habitats and reduce connectivity, making dispersal and commuting for species difficult. They also increase pressure on otters during periods of high water-levels, as they offer little room for conveyance and put otters at risk of being killed when crossing roads. Clear-span bridges should be considered if watercourse crossings are required, as these maintain habitat connectivity and allow species to commute freely.	A Watercourse Crossing Inventory is included in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] and specifies the crossing method at each location. Culverts are only proposed at the lowest sensitivity locations. The potential effects of watercourse crossings are assessed in 8.8.13 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] with reference to chapter 9 Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9].
	Otter status has been noted as 'absent' if no field signs were identified. Otter presence cannot definitively be ruled-out if signs are not found. Extend otter mitigation detailed in CEMP to all watercourses that hold water (such as maintaining a means for otters to move across work areas, outside of work hours).	Otter presence has been assumed on all suitable watercourses. This assumption is now outlined in TA A8.8 Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8] and reflected in the assessment of potential effects in section 8.8.13 chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
	We recommend that the applicant includes in-channel habitat enhancement measures…to improve the WFD classification of watercourses.	Watercourse habitat enhancements have been included in the Outline LEMP (TA A5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]) and are reflected in the Biodiversity Net Gain calculation for watercourse units (TA A8.13 Biodiversity Net Gain [BNG] Assessment [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	Potential widescale distribution impacts to macroinvertebrates. Invertebrates are a WFD biological quality element. Impacts to them can risk a deterioration in a WFD waterbody's status. Address this concern and explain why invertebrates won't be impacted in a significant way (such as with mitigation through panel design). Otherwise, we'd require specific monitoring or offsetting.	Since PEIR, solar PV has been removed from a large part of the south-east of the Order Limits, the part of the site closest to the River Trent corridor and potentially most important for macroinvertebrates. Similarly, solar PV is not proposed in large areas around key watercourses to create riparian corridors within which sympathetic habitat management will take place. Macroinvertebrates are addressed in sections 8.5.12.2 and 8.7.7 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].
	Expiration of water vole surveys (beyond 2 years).Underestimate the presence of water voles in the works corridors. We would expect two surveys to occur again during the optimal survey season.	The baseline surveys provide a reliable and representative baseline for the assessment of effects to water vole in chapter 8. Pre-commencement and pre-construction surveys are described in the TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
	Mitigation and compensation actions may not be proportionate to impacts to water vole. Water vole recovery in the county may be hindered if a joined-up approach to habitat enhancement is not taken. Discuss future water vole mitigation and enhancement opportunities with the Environment Agency and Wildlife Trust, to provide the best outcomes for water vole.	Water vole mitigation and enhancement opportunities have been discussed with the NWT in relation their species recovery programme. Further commitment is provided in section 8.8.13.2 of chapter 8 [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. The Outline LEMP will be finalised, post-consent, in consultation with the EA and NWT.
Newark and Sherwood District Council		

	In our previous consultation response on 01/12/23, we expressed concerns that initial surveys were undertaken in suboptimal survey months (January and October 2022). The PEIR has confirmed that additional survey work, including habitat condition assessments for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), is being undertaken. However, we are concerned that surveys will target a sample of areas and focus on notable habitats. We acknowledge the scale of the site and support where appropriate that a proportionate approach. However, we take the view that all notable habitats should be subject to a full habitat assessment at the optimal time of year and will be required to inform the proposed BNG assessment.	Habitat surveys were initiated across much of the study area before UKHab methods became accepted good practice and before the prevailing Defra biodiversity metric (to calculate BNG), including its condition assessments and reliance on the UKHab method, was released. Some of the early habitat surveys were undertaken outside the optimal survey period, but later surveys of new areas were carried out during the optimum period and included resurveys of a sample of areas/habitats surveyed during sub-optimal periods. Due to the long duration of the Development's pre-submission phase, the habitat surveys have been undertaken against a backdrop of changing methods and guidance, and it should be noted that there is not yet any guidance for BNG in relation to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, which currently remain exempt from mandatory BNG. The approach taken to the habitat surveys (and BNG has attempted to address changing guidance and provides a robust baseline against which to assess potential effects. Additional information has been provided by the AIA (TA A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]) and river MoRPh survey (described in TA A8.13 BNG Assessment [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]). The BNG Assessment is based on work areas and the illustrative design which, following consent, will be developed into a final design. Consequently, the BNG calculation will be updated to reflect the final design. Additional habitat surveys and condition assessments will also

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
		be undertaken post-consent to provide reliable and up-to-date baseline data.
	Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are recognised by central government as an important tool in promoting sustainable development and protecting biodiversity. We recommended in our previous consultation response that the Nottinghamshire LWS Handbook should be used as part of the assessment process to determine ecological importance. Paragraph 25 of section 8.4.2.1 of the PEIR claims that the application of these guidelines is confounded by the scale of the Development and difficulties in defining boundaries. Guidance for selecting site boundaries for LWS are provided at section 7.4 of Part 1 of the handbook and we further encourage the use of these criteria, particularly with reference to LBAP habitats and species identified within the site.	Local Wildlife Site selection guidelines have been more fully considered in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and the relevant TAs.

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	Since our previous comments on 01/12/24, NSDC have adopted an interim BNG policy regarding 'strategic significance' for Biodiversity Net Gain assessments. NSDC note that this policy has not been included in section 6.4.1.3 (Local Planning Policy) of Chapter 6 of the PEIR or listed at section 8.3 of Chapter 8. NSDC consider it should have been included as this is a relevant adopted document. If the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not been published by the time that any BNG calculations relating to land falling within the Newark and Sherwood District undertaken, NSDC consider that this policy should be followed.	The BNG Assessment (TA A8.13 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]), which includes the BNG calculation, has adopted this approach and cites this policy.

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	It would be useful to have a list of statutory and non-statutory designated sites that have been scoped out of the project assessment. References are made within the PEIR to the benefits of creating corridors between LWSs and it is recommended that Kersall Grassland LWS & Hunt's Meadow LWS should be scoped into the assessment due to their proximity and hydrological connections to Eakring and Mapleback Meadows SSSI. Similarly, NSDC view that Norwell Meadows LWS should be scoped in due to connectivity to The Beck – Norwell LWS that passes through the site. It is recognised that the arboricultural assessment is ongoing, and that the site has largely excluded woodland blocks. However, given the location of the proposed development and potential for effects on ancient woodland the applicant should scope in potential effects on this habitat. The ES chapter should confirm whether any mature trees are considered to be veteran and address these specific receptors where significant effects are likely to occur.	The sites scoped into the assessment in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] are those in or bordering the Order Limits, as shown in Table A8.2.2 in TA A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]. Kersall Grassland LWS and Hunt's Meadow LWS have also been scoped into the assessment in chapter 8. Norwell Meadows LWS has been scoped out because the Development design no longer affects this area. Potential effects to woodland and ancient woodland, including ancient and veteran trees, are assessed in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity. The AIA (TA A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]) provides details about Ancient and Veteran trees and associated mitigation.
	Priority Habitats within the site were identified through a desk study. However, it is unclear from the PEIR and accompanying TA whether these areas have been verified through field surveys. As previously mentioned, NSDC believe the Nottinghamshire LWS handbook should be used in the assessment to reevaluate the LWS confirmed to be present within the site.	Priority habitats have been surveyed and their potential to qualify as priority habitats determined. Details are provided in TA A8.3 Habitats and Vegetation Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]. LWS within the Order Limits have not been reevaluated against the LWS guidelines. The condition of the LWS and their qualifying features is assumed to be the same as their citations.

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	The site is predominantly comprised of arable land, with most arable margins recorded as their constituent grassland type. Arable field margins Priority Habitat is a declining habitat within the UK. Given the presence of rare and scarce arable plants identified within the site NSDC consider there should be an assessment to determine whether any arable margins meet the UK BAP definition.	Arable field margins of most types (as listed in the UKBAP definition) are common in the agricultural landscape covered by the Order Limits, although their type and location varies between years. The value of arable field margins is in the context of modern intensive agricultural landscape where they provide refuge for many species. Arable field margins are transient habitats and determined by prevailing agricultural land-use preferences and, unlike other semi-natural habitats, are generally not limited in the landscape. The Development will create a range of habitats with equal or greater value than existing arable margins, although it will also maintain some margins in cultivation, thus conserving and possibly improving conditions for many of the species associated with arable field margins. Arable field margins are scoped out of the assessment in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	The PEIR and TA 8.8 confirm that no evidence of white-clawed crayfish has been found to date, excluding the results of the 2024 surveys. However, paragraph A8.8.3.2 of TA 8.8 mentions an unconfirmed crayfish sighting in 2022 along a watercourse identified in the PEIR as Pingley Dyke. The eDNA test result was negative, leading to the assumption that the sighting was likely a signal crayfish. NSDC recommend conducting a targeted presence/absence survey of this watercourse to verify the record and provide a more robust assessment of the absence of white-clawed crayfish.	The cable route will use Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to pass under Pingley Dyke and avoid impacts to the freshwater and riparian habitats and species. Irrespective, the baseline studies undertaken provide an adequate baseline for assessment. Additional post-consent / pre-construction surveys may be undertaken if required (as specified in TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
	Assessment of likely significant effects on Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI. Section 8.8.4 of the PEIR describes the location of the SSSI in relation to the site and how it is uncertain how the boundary of the SSSI relates to the highway boundary. From a review of aerial mapping data, it appears that the site does overlap with the SSSI boundary but that the road verge associated with the unclassified road might not overlap the SSSI boundary due to its narrow diameter. This point should be confirmed within the ES Chapter and any indirect impacts to the SSSI fully evaluated.	The boundary of the Order Limits has been revised to be congruent with the boundary of Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI. Effects are fully assessed in section 8.8.4 of chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	The inclusion of embedded buffers to hedgerows, trees, woodlands, and watercourse is appreciated. It should be clarified if the 10m bank top buffer to watercourses is extended to ditches and NSDC suggest that a 5m buffer to this habitat would be appropriate.	A buffer distance of 5 m from ditches is specified in TA A5.3 Outline CEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3].
	Paragraph 204 of section 8.8.8 of the PEIR lists non-agricultural habitat Important Ecological Features (IEFs) that have the potential to be affected but omits mature trees. Where individual mature trees are located outside of constituent habitats such as hedgerows, these should be included within the assessment. Impacts should be assessed on any veteran trees identified through the further survey work. Additionally, it is recommended that ditches be assessed separately.	Potential effects to mature trees are included in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. The AIA (TA A8.12 EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]) includes additional information about Ancient and Veteran trees.
	NSDC consider that the impacts of decommissioning on habitats have not been thoroughly assessed. NSDC disagree with the notion that the loss of created habitats would represent a neutral effect through reversion back to a value equivalent to the anticipated future baseline value of the site.	The EIA methodology (chapter 2 Environmental Impact Assessment [EN010162/APP/6.2.2]) requires decommissioning effects to be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather than the baseline at the time of decommissioning. This is the approach presented in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	Section A8.7.2.2 of TA 8.7 indicates that water samples for eDNA surveys were only collected from ponds with a Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) rating of 'Average' or higher. While this approach may seem practical, additional justification is necessary. It is recommended that eDNA surveys be conducted in 2025 for ponds that have not yet been surveyed, including all ponds within the site.	The survey protocol (described in TA A8.7 Great Crested Newt Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.7]) was agreed with Natural England in 2024. It provides a pragmatic approach to establishing a baseline for assessment and informing likely mitigation and licensing requirements. Pre-commencement surveys will provide a fully up-to-date baseline to inform mitigation.
	In our comments on the scoping report, NSDC considered there should be some assessment via targeted survey work for reptiles. The PEIR has confirmed that additional survey work is being undertaken in 2024/25. NSDC would expect the ES (or supporting appendix) to provide a rationale and methodology for determining sample size and sample locations.	Reptile surveys are reported in TA A8.9 Other Notable and Protected Species [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.9]. With the implementation of the standard good practice mitigation in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3], the Development has very limited potential to cause adverse effects. Nonetheless, grass snake remains scoped into the assessment in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	It is noted that survey work for otter and water vole is ongoing and that a targeted approach has been taken of suitable waterbodies, contrary to good practice survey methodology with only one survey visit rather than the recommended two. Whilst NSDC agree that direct impacts to watercourses will be localised and that the above approach is proportional to the likely impacts and suggested mitigation, it is recommended that two surveys are undertaken in areas where works are proposed, and definitive evidence has been found in order to inform any potential mitigation licences required.	Further details about the survey approach are provided in TA A8.8 Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8]. Otter and water vole presence are now assumed in watercourses connected to those in which the species were confirmed. The current baseline is sufficient to inform the assessment of effects and potential licensing requirements. No further surveys have been undertaken, but comprehensive pre-commencement surveys, as requested by and to be agreed with the Environment Agency (see above) and included in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3] and will provide a fully up-to-date baseline to inform mitigation and licensing.
	Analysis of wintering bird data may skew results and should, ideally, be reanalysed and presented differently.	The data have been reanalysed, including new, more intuitive field groupings, and are presented in TA A8.5 Wintering Birds Baseline [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5].

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	NSDC support the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and clear span bridges to avoid temporary habitat loss and note that further detail regarding the operational phase of the development and further assessment of residual impacts from the construction period will be forthcoming within the ES. However, the PEIR states at section 8.5.12.5 that detailed fish surveys are not proposed. NSDC recommend that a specialist contractor is engaged to make a habitat assessment for fish potential at each crossing point, whether for access or cables, and provide further detail for any further mitigation requirements. Although eels are assumed to be present in some watercourses, there is no consideration within the assessment for the potential presence of lamprey which are known to be present within the River Trent, so this species should be included within the ES chapter.	River lamprey is now included in the baseline and scoped into the assessment in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]. Further details of watercourse crossings and more detailed fish mitigation are included in Section A5.3.11.11 of the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]).
Natural England		
	Potential pathways for effects on Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI from dust during construction, as well as hydrological effects, that need to be mitigated for. NE advise that the CEMP must include specific measures to mitigate for potential adverse effects from dust pollution and hydrological impact pathways on Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI during these construction activities.	Additional detail has been included in the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]), including explicit references to SSSIs in section A5.3.11 (CEcMP).

Reference	Issue	How it has been addressed in the ES
	NE advise that the construction of passing places near to Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI should be outside the bird breeding season in order to avoid any disturbance impacts.	Construction of the passing places adjacent to Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI will take place outside the bird breeding season. This commitment is included in chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010162/APP/6.2.8] and section A5.3.11 (CEcMP) of the Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]).
	NE advise that the CEMP should outline specific measures to ensure that any construction work undertaken does not encroach into Mather Wood SSSI.	Additional detail has been included section A5.3.11 (CEcMP) of the Outline CEMP. The AIA (TA A8.12 [EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]) includes method statements to safeguard trees and woodland.
	NE emphasises the importance of embedded mitigation in the CEMP which should note specific items where there are sensitivities nearby. As stated above, the avoidance of breeding seasons for groundworks adjacent to Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI is required by NE. Without avoidance, further consideration may be required for the possible disturbance to SSSI birds.	Additional detail about designated sites has been included in the Outline CEMP, including explicit references to SSSIs in section A5.3.11 (CEcMP).