EN010170 Natural England's response to the Report on the Implications for European Sites for the proposed Green Hill Solar Farm.	
Question	**NE Response**
RQ6: Please confirm if you have further comments or concerns in relation to the applicant's survey data.	No further comments or concerns in relation to the applicant's survey data.
RQ7: Please comment on the applicant's clarifications on the suitability of the proposed fields, the methods of habitat creation and their timing, as well as management and monitoring measures, in light of your previous comments [RR-1242, REP1- 181, REP1-182]. Are you satisfied that the applicant's approach, set out in its updated OLEMP [REP3-062] and associated plans REP3- 042 to REP3-055] covers your concerns? If so, are you satisfied that these measures are sufficient (and sufficiently secured) to reach a conclusion of no AEoI on qualifying features of the UNVGP SPA and UNVRS? If not, please set out what further information is required to reach this conclusion.	NE are satisfied that the applicant's approach, as set out in its updated OLEMP and associated plans covers our previous concerns. NE are satisfied that these measured are sufficient to reach a conclusion of no AEoI on qualifying features of the UNVGP SPA and UNVRS.
RQ9: Do you consider that mitigation land for loss of FLL should be available and functional prior to the loss of FLL to the UNVGP SPA and UNVRS? If so, can NE comment on the applicant's assertion that sufficient existing land is available during any time lag between loss of FLL and mitigation land becoming available? Please comment on the timing of the applicant's measures included in the applicant's OLEMP [REP3-062], do you consider these sufficient and if not, what additional information or commitment(s) are required of the applicant?	Natural England suggest that as much of the mitigation land be available prior to the loss of FLL as possible. However, as the fields that are FLL are currently arable, and will become grassland, the proposal for the timing's is fine. While the grassland will be superior for the birds, the arable land will still suffice. We consider the applicant's assertion that sufficient existing land is available during any time lag. NE would suggest adding manure to the arable fields if possible, as this will help the birds in the meantime.
RQ14: Please comment on the applicant's proposed Method Statement 10 approach [REP1-140].	NE understand that these areas of land may have birds on. The mitigation and avoidance measures in place are sufficient and have been agreed.
RQ16: Please comment on the applicant's updated mitigation measures in place in relation to disturbance (OLEMP section 4.10, [REP3-062]). Are you satisfied that with measures in place there would be no AEoI from noise and visual disturbance to areas of FLL, both existing FLL and that proposed as mitigation for loss of FLL from the proposed development?	Ne are satisfied with the updated mitigation measures in place in relation to disturbance and are satisfied that with these in place, there would be no AEoI.
RQ17: Do you have any comments on the applicant's proposed mitigation measures for control of waterborne pollution through the OBSSMP, para 1.1.13 [REP1- 143] with regard to the waterborne pollution impact-pathway? Can NE confirm whether it is satisfied that there are no AEoI from this impact pathway on all qualifying features of UNVGP SPA and UNVRS?	NE have no comments to make on the proposed mitigation measures for control of waterborne pollution.