Date: 25 February 2026
Our ref: 536264
Your ref: EN0110001

keadbynextgeneration@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

BY EMAIL ONLY

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Sir/Madam

NSIP Reference Name / Code: Keadby Next Generation Power Station EN0110001

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 09 February 2026 which was received by Natural England on 09 February 2026.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

For any further advice on this consultation please contact the case officer at [redacted] and copy to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

NSIP Senior Officer –Yorkshire and Northern Lincolnshire

Natural England's Written Representations

Part I: Summary and conclusion of Natural England's advice

Purpose and structure of these representations

These Written Representations are submitted in pursuance of rule 10(1) of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 ('ExPR') in relation to an application under the Planning Act 2008 for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') for **Keadby Next Generation Power Station Project** ('the Project') submitted by Keadby Next Generation Limited ('the Applicant') to the Secretary of State.

Natural England has already provided a summary of its principal concerns in its Relevant Representations, submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 27 November 2025 and in its Written Representations submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 3 February 2026. This document comprises an updated statement of Natural England's views, as they have developed in view of the common ground discussions that have taken place with the Applicant to date.

Part I of these representations summarises what Natural England considers the main issues[1] to be in relation to the DCO application and indicate the principal submissions that it wishes to make at this point. Natural England will develop these points further as appropriate during the examination process. Natural England may have further or additional points to make, particularly if further information about the project becomes available.

These representations have been informed by discussions with the developer, and we welcome continued engagement on our advice.

As the Environmental Statement has not been updated, Natural England's comments regarding SSSI impacts remain as set out in our previous consultation response.

Our comments are set out against the following sub-headings which represent our key areas of remit:

- Internationally designated sites
- Nationally designated sites
- Protected species
- Biodiversity net gain
- Ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees

Our comments in Part II are colour coded according to risk;

Red are those where there are fundamental concerns which it may not be possible to overcome in their current form.

Amber are those where further information is required to determine the impacts of the project and allow the Examining Authority to properly undertake its task and/or where further information is required on mitigation/compensation proposals in order to provide a sufficient degree of confidence as to their efficacy.

Yellow are those where Natural England does not agree with the Applicant's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented. It should be noted by interested

parties that whilst these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances.

Green are those which have been successfully resolved (subject always to the appropriate requirements being adequately secured).

Grey are notes for Examiners and/or competent authority.

The natural features potentially affected by this application
International conservation designations

Natural England's position regarding impacts on internationally designated sites is summarised below. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given against each impact pathway in Part II.

Natural England is not yet satisfied for 'amber' issues identified in Table 1 below that it can be ascertained beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project would not have an adverse effect on the integrity (AEOI) of the following internationally designated sites. Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar.

Further information is required to justify the conclusion of no AEOI for impacts to Humber Estuary designated sites. Including;

- Noise disturbance to birds:
    - LAmax figures should be provided for the construction and operation activities with the most significant noise inputs
- Air quality:
    - Details of which sources have been included in the in-combination assessment, along with justification for those omitted.
    - To what extent an in-combination assessment has been undertaken within the modelling informing the assessment

Nationally designated sites

As the Environmental Statement has not been updated, Natural England's previous position regarding nationally designated sites remains the same as was presented in previous consultations. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given against each impact pathway in Part II.

- Our advice on Humber Estuary SSSI is in line with the advice given on the international designated sites.
- The air quality assessment for Crowle Barrow Pits SSSI should provide additional detail on the potential for this development to slow recovery of the designated site pollutant levels.
- The air quality critical load for Hatfield Chase Ditches SSSI should be given as the value for fen habitat, and an assessment should be undertaken.
- Further information required for air quality impacts to Risby Warren SSSI. This application has a >1% process contribution for the designated site. The latest habitat assessment for the SSSI identifies air pollution as a reason for unfavourable condition due to existing exceedances.

Protected Species

Natural England's position regarding European protected species is summarised below. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given in Part II (NE28 – NE31).

Natural England recommend the Applicant considers applying for a Letter of No Impediment for water voles to assist the decision-maker.

We also advise considering whether a licence will be required for the works in proximity to the badger sett.

Biodiversity net gain

Natural England's position regarding provision of biodiversity net gain is summarised below. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given in Part II (NE32).

We generally welcome the commitment to delivering BNG on this project. We recommend that the target increase in BNG of 10% across all biodiversity unit types is secured by a suitably worded requirement in the DCO.

By reviewing the project's biodiversity gain plan at this early stage, it gives us an opportunity to help maximise outcomes and reduce risks.

Improvements that could be considered include commitment to delivery of BNG habitats for a minimum of 30 years, rather than the proposed 25.

Ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees

In our Relevant Representation we referred to the policy in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) for irreplaceable habitats and noted that the ES should assess the impacts of the proposal on the ancient woodland and any ancient and veteran trees, and the scope to avoid and mitigate for adverse impacts. It should also consider opportunities for enhancement. Chapter 11 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (dated 22 September 2025) identified the presence of veteran or ancient trees within the application boundary. However, the Applicant has since provided an updated version of Chapter 11 to Natural England, which states in Table 11.2 that North Lincolnshire Council have visited the site and have confirmed T145 and T149 are not veteran trees and T152 and T154 are not ancient trees. Updates have also been provided to the outline LBMEP to reflect this clarification, we therefore consider this matter to be addressed.

Natural England's position regarding ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees is summarised below (NE34).

Part II: Natural England's detailed advice

Part II of these representations expands upon the detail of all the significant issues ('red' and 'amber' issues) which, in our view remain outstanding and includes our advice on pathways to their resolution where possible. Part II does not show 'green' issues where a resolution has been reached, subject always to the appropriate requirements being adequately secured. "Green" issues were included in Natural England's submission on the Relevant Representations, and we have no further comments to make on these at this stage.

Table 1: Natural England's detailed advice				
NE key issue ref	**Topic / Construction (C) or Operation (O)**	**NE commentary and advice on:** • **Further details about the project in order to enable assessment** • **Further evidence or assessment work require**	**Matters that must be secured in the DCO (with DCO/DML or omission ref as applicable)**	**Risk Rating**
NE1	**Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar - noise disturbance to birds (C)**	HRA 7.1. Natural England notes that the of noise contour maps in the previous HRA (August 2025) have now been removed, though reference is still made to them in the text (6.3.10 and 7.1.1). The previously provided contour maps demonstrated that a small area of the field to the north of the redline boundary will experience noise levels of 60db (figure 3) due to construction piling, with the noise level dissipating beyond this to 55db. The area which will experience 60db encompasses the site of Keadby wind turbines and is therefore less likely to be suitable to support SPA birds. However, the maps are based on noise levels calculated using the LAeq measure, and therefore this does not demonstrate potential impacts from loud bangs which can	**N/A**	Amber

		be more disturbing to birds than constant noise. We also note that the significance criteria outlined in 6.2.11 uses the LAmax figures. **We advise LAmax figures should be provided for the construction activities with the most significant noise inputs, along with contour maps where there is potential for attenuation beyond that demonstrated for the LAeq maps.**		
NE2	**Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar – Noise disturbance to birds (O)**	HRA 7.1. Natural England notes that the of noise contour maps in the previous HRA (August 2025) have now been removed, though reference is still made to them in the text (6.3.10 and 7.1.1). The previously provided noise contour information for the operational impacts demonstrated that the most significant noise impacts (>65db) will overlap with the site of the Keadby wind turbines, and the noise impacts will reduce beyond this. However, the maps are based on noise levels calculated using the LAeq measure, and therefore this does not demonstrate potential impacts from loud bangs which can be more disturbing to birds than constant noise. We also note that the significance criteria outlined in 6.2.11 uses the LAmax figures. **We advise LAmax figures should be provided for the operational activities with the most significant noise inputs, along with contour maps where there is potential for attenuation beyond that demonstrated for the LAeq maps.**	**N/A**	Amber
NE4	**Humber Estuary – water discharge (O)**	**HRA 6.2.76 and 6.3.60** The assessment has been updated to consider the impact that the discharged water and sediment transport may have on the forage resource for	**N/A**	Green

		birds and lamprey within the River Trent as supporting habitat for the Humber Estuary Ramsar and SAC		
NE5	**Humber Estuary SAC/ Ramsar Site - Mortality and Barriers to Lamprey Movement (C and O)**	**HRA 7.2.15 to 7.2.17.** Additional justification has been provided for why migrating lamprey will not be impacted by additional lighting from the proposed development in HRA paragraphs 7.2.15 to 7.2.17 (version dated February 2026). It is confirmed that wharf offloading is the only construction activity likely to require additional lighting which will impact the river Trent. Therefore, with the information that lighting controls will prevent excessive glare outside of the working area, and therefore light-spill will not encompass the full river channel width, **we agree with the conclusion of no AEOI for this impact pathway.**	The provision of final light control measures should be secured in the DCO. This could either be secured within Requirement 16 Construction Environmental Management Plan or Requirement 7 External Lighting of Schedule 2.	Green
NE9	**The Humber Estuary SAC/ Ramsar Site - Air Quality**	Nitrogen deposition: HRA Appendix E. Has been amended to include Ndep critical loads for pioneer saltmarsh, upper fen and rich fen, which we support. Humber Estuary has been assigned: · Ammonia critical level of 3µg/m3. Additional information has been provided (HRA 6.2.46) that lichens and bryophytes are not integral to the qualifying habitats present on the vegetation communities adjacent to the site, therefore the higher critical level can be used. NE agrees with this conclusion. · Ndep critical load of 10kgN/ha/yr (6.3.38). We agree with the use of the lower critical load in screening. As outlined under NE10, the relevant habitat types for Hatfield Chase Ditches SSSI are still uncertain as these	N/A	Green

		have not been updated in the amended documents. Clarity should also be provided over the ammonia critical levels for the identified SSSI sites which in some cases are different in the construction and operational assessments. However, it is agreed that appropriate thresholds are used in the assessment of the European sites.		
NE10	**Air Quality – Critical levels and loads**	**HRA 6.2.51, Construction**. Further information has been provided which demonstrates that nitrogen deposition from construction would represent 0.7% of the critical load for rich fen vegetation. Any in-combination impact that could be relevant for operational impacts would be unlikely to affect construction impacts over the same timescale. We therefore we agree with the conclusion to screen out this impact. **HRA 6.3.40, Operation.** The screening assessment has been amended and the vegetation at OE1-5 is now assessed as upper saltmarsh (3.2% CL) and rich fen proxy (2.1% CL) We agree with the conclusion of LSE from this impact pathway. **HRA 7.4.7 - 7.4.17**. Additional information has been provided in the Appropriate Assessment for why the nitrogen deposition at OE1-5 will not affect the integrity of the Humber Estuary SAC/Ramsar site. **NE agrees with this conclusion.** ***Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments.*** *These documents have not been updated so we re-iterate our previous comments for SSSI protected sites:*	N/A	Amber

		Hatfield Chase Ditches SSSI (construction traffic assessment) - Table 8A.19-21 indicates no critical loads or levels are available. This should be reassessed, as the "lowland ditch systems" contain wetland species and reeds, so could be assessed as a fen ecosystem (15-25kgN/ha/yr). Ammonia and NOx critical levels are also provided in APIS (bryophytes and lichens are likely to be integral in wetland ecosystems). **Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI** (construction traffic assessment) Table 8A.19-21 • ammonia critical level of 1µg/m3 with which NE agrees; NE note that table 8B14 in the operational assessment for this site has CLevel as 3ug/m3 which is **not considered correct** for the wet wood/ fen habitat. A range of operational receptor sites (table 8B.10) indicated that no critical levels or loads apply, without justification of the relevant features. **Further information is required to provide justification for this indication.** The Operational assessment (Table 8B.14) assigns ammonia critical levels of 3µg/m^3 to several SSSIs, some of which are considered to have the potential to have bryophyte interest, **which should be considered**. Eg • Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI - alder carr, scrub, fen and open water (the correct 1µg/m^3 level is assigned in the construction traffic assessment) • Broughton Far Wood SSSI – ash and oak woodland with diverse understorey		

		• Broughton Alder Wood SSSI – alder woodland with diverse understorey, including a carpet of mosses, as outlined in the citation **Humber Estuary (at Blacktoft Sands) Ramsar, SPA, SAC and SSSI** would have a different range of features to the site immediately adjacent to Keadby, so **may require a separate assessment** as to whether bryophyte communities could be integral.		
NE11	**Air Quality – in-combination assessment**	It is unclear to what extent an in-combination assessment has been undertaken within the modelling informing the assessment. The HRA has been amended to emphasise that the air quality assessment was undertaken in combination with Keadby 2 Power Station (7.4.3.), which we support. However, we still require a standalone in-combination AQ schedule listing of all relevant emitters and modelling treatment. Agricultural ammonia sources (poultry, pig, dairy units) should be included along with whether each is accounted for via baseline or explicit project modelling. **Therefore, we re-iterate our previous comment:** *In combination construction traffic* It is accepted that traffic numbers informing the traffic modelling in the construction assessment are intrinsically in-combination. However, it is unclear whether other sources that could overlap temporally or spatially with the vehicle emissions are considered. For example, non-traffic emissions from agricultural or industrial developments close to the protected sites adjacent to the road. 8A.2.5 suggests that in-combination (cumulative) projects (as	N/A	Amber

		outlined in Ch 21) are considered in the construction assessment “where relevant” but not which emissions were added to the construction (and/or operational) modelling. In addition, Ch21 (table 21.6) acknowledges that projects including Humber Carbon Capture Pipeline, Moors Solar Farm, Pilfrey Solar Farm and North Humber to High Marnham could result in in combination construction traffic, but the applicant screened this out due to mitigation and control measures (though these would not impact traffic numbers). It is unclear whether these projects were nevertheless included in the traffic modelling. The traffic modelling is stated (App 8A) to have been undertaken in accordance with the method set out in DMRB LA 105. NE does not consider this method is appropriately precautionary to assess ecological impacts. For example, in-combination impacts should be considered before confirming <1%. *Operational assessment* For the operational assessment, it is stated (e.g. in 8B.2.21) that “There are no short-listed schemes with significant sources of combustion gases that require dispersion modelling, and therefore no further consideration of these schemes is carried out in this Chapter”. NE would require confirmation that all relevant emission sources are included (including traffic and waste emissions during operation for example) and not just combustion gases. There also appears to be acknowledgement of potential in-combination impacts in Ch21. For example, ammonia and		

		N dep impacts are identified at Risby Warren SSSI arising from North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park alongside the proposed development, so it is unclear why these are not included in the in-combination assessment, despite mitigation being in place to reduce emissions to the SSSI. HRA App F indicates, regarding North Lincs Green Energy Park that the HRA Report for this development "considered Keadby CCS which is comparable with the Proposed Development. In reaching a decision the SoS concluded that, alone or in-combination, an Adverse Effect on Integrity of the relevant European Sites can be excluded beyond all reasonable scientific doubt. Given this conclusion and the currentness of the decision, there is no reason to re-visit this in relation to the Proposed Development". It is understood that should the proposed development go ahead, Keadby CCS would not – but this does not appear to be stated explicitly in the main body of the assessment, and if relevant, should be applied to the assessment of impacts at Risby Warren SSSI as well as the European sites. The AA indicates that "the AQ assessment was undertaken in-combination from the outset" (HRA 6.3.3) – however, as indicated above, it does not appear that relevant industrial in combination projects were scoped into the modelling, or that the search for possible projects included potentially relevant applications, such as agricultural developments in the area. This should be explored over the course of the examination.		
NE14	**Air Quality - Construction**	The assessment process outlined in 8.3.14 is appropriate, and in accordance with IAQM guidance. It is noted that	We note that the DCO secures the Construction Environmental	Green

	dust assessment	unmitigated impacts are considered, which is the requirement for HRA. NE agrees with the pre-mitigation high risk to the Humber Estuary and Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI (Section 8.6 in ES and App8A). The mitigation proposed is acceptable and the CEMP must include measures specifically to mitigate impacts at the two protected sites, and monitoring to ensure this is effective. NE agrees with the assessment in the HRA (6.2.29) that LSE to the Humber Estuary cannot be screened out at stage 1. We also agree with the conclusions of the appropriate assessment (7.3) and with mitigation proposed in the CEMP (assuming the required monitoring is put in place) there would be **no AEOI on the un-submerged reedbed/ marsh vegetation of the estuary.**	Management Plan within Requirement 17, Schedule 2 and welcome this.	
NE15	**Air quality - Construction traffic assessment (SSSIs)**	***Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments.*** *These documents have not been updated so we re-iterate our previous comments for SSSI protected sites:* **Ch 8, App8A and Ch 11** - (Comments on the in-combination assessment also apply to this assessment. It is unclear if the conclusions reached apply in-combination with all other relevant developments in the area). It is acknowledged that ammonia has been included as an emission from traffic, both in its own right and as a component of Ndep. Ch 8 indicates that the CREAM tool was used to calculate ammonia emissions. However, elsewhere (e.g. 8A.4.10 and Table 8.6) it is indicated that	N/A	Amber

		the National Highways tool is used – and Table 8.6 also indicates CREAM is a NH tool. **This should be clarified, as these are two separate tools.** NE agrees that SO2, CO, benzene, and 1,3-butadiene can be excluded from further assessment (Ch 8 – para 8.3.20) as critical levels would not be exceeded. The use of the IAQM AADT threshold for screening is acceptable, though consideration of any roads where traffic numbers could result in >1% of the relevant critical load (alone or in combination) would be more precautionary. Use of the more precautionary traffic numbers in the PEIR for AQ modelling are acknowledged, despite lower numbers being modelled for the ES traffic assessment. Use of the 2030 emission factor data for the 2036 construction/ opening year is also acknowledged as precautionary. NE accepts that most vehicle movements would be >200m from the protected sites so would not require assessment. The conclusions of the construction traffic assessment (App8A Table 8A.19-21 and ES Section 8.6) are that predicted NOx, nitrogen deposition, ammonia and acid deposition would be less than 1% of the lower critical load for all receptors assessed (Humber Estuary, Hatfield Chase Ditches SSSI and Crowle Borrow pits SSSI) – or that critical loads and levels are not appropriate. As indicated previously, NE does not agree that Hatfield Ditches SSSI, adjacent to the construction traffic route, does not have relevant critical levels/ loads (e.g. the APIS backgrounds should be included in Table 8A.18). Therefore, at present NE **cannot agree that LSE can be excluded**, where the project alone would lead to <1% of the critical level/ load for		

		the most sensitive qualifying feature. This would also affect the conclusion reached at HRA 5.2.66 that there would be no impact on foraging resources of the Humber estuary SPA birds, through atmospheric pollution affecting habitat structure and function to the detriment of fish and invertebrate prey species. However, **assuming further evidence to demonstrate that the conclusion is based on a robust in-combination assessment** is provided NE could agree that no further assessment of the protected sites assessed would be required and there would not be LSE/ harm to the protected sites. NE also agrees that the impact of waterborne abnormal loads along the River Trent (Section 8.6.8) is likely to be negligible as assessed due to the low numbers involved. However, these should be outlined and emissions estimated (e.g. fuel used by barges could have an adverse effect if it is highly sulphurous, or using ammonia as a fuel, potentially). It is assumed that road-delivered abnormal loads are included in the assessment of construction traffic so would not require additional assessment.		
NE16	**Air Quality – Construction plant/ NRMM assessment**	**Ch 8, App8A and Ch 11 and HRA** - The assessment was limited to receptors within 200m of the plant (ES chapter 8 - 8.3.18). Although this is likely to be appropriate for many items of plant (vehicles such as diggers, dozers etc which would be anticipated to impact over a short distance given the location of exhausts etc), others such as generators could be anticipated to have an impact over a greater distance**. It should be confirmed whether such plant is proposed, and any evidence that 200m is an appropriate distance for such combustion equipment.**	Provide layout plan confirming minimum source–receptor distances.	Amber

		NEs standard screening distance for general combustion processes is 500m, or 2km, depending on the nature of the source. The assessment of construction plant in the ES Section 8.6/ App8A does not refer to ecological receptors, but it is unclear whether this is because there were none in the relevant 200m, despite the red line boundary being adjacent to the Humber Estuary. The HRA (5.2.40) does confirm that there would be no construction activities requiring plant and NRMM within the 200m screening distance so **there is no requirement to consider non-road machinery and plant.** The closest construction activity to the European Sites is for the Proposed Canal Water Abstraction and this is located 600m west of the River Trent. **A similar assessment should be made for SSSIs.**		
NE18	**Air quality- Operational emissions**	**Ch 8, App 8B, Ch 11 and HRA -** The modelling used appears acceptable, though NE does not comment on modelling approach/ setup. Use of 5 years met data, and incorporation of buildings and topography in the model are acknowledged. The worst-case parameters are considered acceptable within the Rochdale envelope approach, and the sensitivity testing for stack height acknowledged. Confirmation should be sought that "improved dispersion" provided by a taller stack would not lead to potentially significant impacts at protected sites that are further from the development, where a shorter stack with lesser dispersion would result in lower pollutant levels (though the	N/A	Amber

		nature of dispersion over a wider area means this is an unlikely scenario). Uncertainties in “final” emissions, and the need for further modelling of the final layout are acknowledged – but it is assumed that there will be requirement in the DCO that emissions will be no greater than assessed in the ES (regardless of the requirement also for an environmental permit). Key remaining questions around the assessment are: • **Whether amines will be emitted as part of the process**, and if so if they have been considered in deposition calculations – it is assumed they are not emitted as there is no intention to capture CO_2 from the process (due to H2 combustion being intended). • **Whether the in-combination assessment is robust** and includes all possible emission sources including e.g. local plan allocations and agricultural projects that could affect the same protected sites. • **Whether the results presented in App8B cover the project alone or in combination** – it is assumed they are alone (see note on in-combination assessment). The assessment of significance level (impact descriptors in table 8.7) is acceptable for the ES, but it must be noted that consideration of harm or AEOI for SSSI and Habitats Sites respectively should be addressed separately. (Text at 8.3.48 refers to Table 8.8 and 8.3.56 to table 8.6, whereas the relevant table is 8.7. In this table, it is unclear what a %		

		change of e.g. 1.5% would class as, as it is between the "very low" and "low" categories). It should be noted that NE does not consider 1% to be "insignificant" as stated in 8.3.55 – unless the total in-combination addition of pollution to a protected site is less than 1%. 1% is a trigger for further assessment to be undertaken because there is a noticeable amount of pollution, reflecting uncertainties in modelling/ rounding errors etc arising at much smaller percentage changes. A 1% addition could in fact be significant in some circumstances.		
NE19	**Air quality - Operational emissions – NOx and ammonia results**	***Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments.*** *These documents have not been updated so we re-iterate our previous comments for SSSI protected sites:* **Ch 8, App 8B, Ch 11 and HRA -** NOx assessment (Table 8B.13, HRA 6.3.29): Project alone would result in PC of 2.7% at Humber Estuary but <1% for all other statutory receptors (including Thorne & Hatfield Moors SAC/SPA). **In combination assessment therefore required for other receptors**. All receptors are < NOx critical level, so likely to be able to exclude AEOI even if there is LSE. Ammonia assessment (Table 8B.14, HRA 6.3.31): Project alone would result in PC >1% at Humber Estuary and Risby Warren SSSI. It is <1% at other SSSIs (including Thorne & Hatfield Moors SAC/SPA) but that is based on a critical level of 3µg/m^3 at Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI where bryophytes are likely to be integral (see separate section	N/A	Amber

		on critical levels) which could result in >1% alone. **In combination assessment and consideration of critical levels required before discounting harm at other sites**. The conclusion in Ch 8 that the addition of 1% of the ammonia critical level at Risby Warren SSSI is "not significant" is not justified in ecological terms – especially as Risby warren SSSI is exceeding its ammonia critical level. This is not considered in Chapter 11 either (only the Ndep assessment is considered for this protected site). Although the background on APIS for the Humber Estuary is below 70% of the 3µg/m^3 critical level (approx. 2µg/m^3 which is 66% of the higher critical level – so the PEC is 67% - per Table 8B.14), given the uncertainty around in combination impacts, it would be precautionary to give more consideration to this pollutant at Humber Estuary.		
NE20	**Air Quality - Operational emissions – Nitrogen deposition and acid deposition results**	**Ch 8, App 8B, Ch 11 and HRA** - *Detailed assessment of Humber Estuary Ndep*: Consideration of the qualifying features at Humber Estuary is addressed in our response to earlier questions. the vegetation at OE1-5 is now assessed as upper saltmarsh (3.2% CL) and rich fen proxy (2.1% CL) **which is considered appropriate. However, despite this we can agree there would be no AEOI from operational Ndep based on the assessment outlined in the revised HRA (eg para 7.4.8-7.4.17)** ***Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments.*** *These documents have not been updated so we re-iterate our previous comments for SSSI protected sites:*	N/A	Amber

		Detailed assessment of Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI Ndep – The assessment of the unfavourable condition of the site and existing high Ndep levels are not considered sufficient to be able to exclude impact. However, it is acknowledged that the site is floodplain wet woodland so input from sources other than atmospheric Ndep will likely dominate, and also there does appear to be a general trend in declining Ndep in the area. Although it is likely that there would not be harm arising from Ndep, some further assessment (for example, whether the proposed development would result in a <1year retardation of recovery) or mitigation to avoid impacts are recommended (especially having regard to in combination impacts). *Assessment of Risby Warren SSSI Ndep* – The assessment of the impact at Risby Warren SSSI is not considered to justify that there will not be harm arising. Adding additional Ndep onto an already exceeding site will not allow recovery of the designated features (lichen heath/ acid grassland). (11.7.113 indicates that elements of the qualifying feature (lichen heath) of particular sensitivity to nitrogen deposition have already been lost due to the existing baseline load – indicating that adding more will take the site further from recovery). If harm cannot be excluded (including in-combination with other plans or projects), consideration of additional mitigation could be taken into account – such as ensuring emissions of N pollutants are kept below a set amount through decreased ELVs or reduced consented hours (as suggested at 8B.5.35). *Acid deposition assessment – (table 8B.16):*		

		<1% at all receptors. At present NE does not agree that LSE from acid deposition at the Humber Estuary can be excluded due to uncertainty of the in-combination impact. (HRA 5.3.20). However, assuming in-combination impacts are considered, it is accepted that there is no requirement for further assessment of acid deposition.		
NE21	**Water Quality - Boat Movements (C)**	**HRA 5.2.54.** We advise that the measures taken to avoid or mitigate pollution of the water environment from boat traffic and unloading of cargo should be outlined and the effectiveness of those measures assessed in the HRA.	N/A	Yellow
NE22	**Water Quality – Cofferdam, Construction (C)**	**HRA 6.2.62 and 6.2.7.** Additional information on a range of measures to prevent pollution to the waterbody has been provided, including how water seepage into the cofferdam will be disposed of, which we support.	Methods for preventing pollution from the cofferdam can be secured in the Construction Environmental Management Plan within Requirement 17, Schedule 2 of the DCO	Green
NE23	**Water Quality – Pollution Prevention (C&O)**	**HRA 7.5.5.** Details of siting of bunded storage areas for hazardous materials above any potential flood water level has now been included in the HRA.	Details of bunded storage area locations can be detailed in the means of pollution control within the Construction Environmental Management Plan is secured in DCO Requirement 11, Schedule 2.	Green
NE24	**Water Quality – Drain infilling (C)**	**Chapter 12 Water Environment and Flood Risk 12.6.25**. It is stated in the Chapter 12 that it is anticipated that several drains will be fully or partially infilled and that "Measures are outlined in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Ref. 7.4) to mitigate potential impacts to the water bodies downstream of the drains (12.6.25)". The CEMP, however, does not currently contain details of these	We note that the DCO secures the Construction Environmental Management Plan within Requirement 17, Schedule 2 and welcome this. The CEMP must	Yellow

		measures. We advise that the potential impacts of drain infilling on the designated sites downstream should be included in the CEMP. The HRA (6.2.70) does now make reference to measures to manage fine water sediment when infilling of minor ditches and protect waterbodies which we support.	include details of the impact of drain infilling.	
NE25	**Water Quality - Surface Water Drainage (O)**	**HRA 6.3.58.** We agree with the conclusion that the surface water pollution pathway has been screened in for appropriate assessment, due to lack of information currently available on the design. Section 6.3.54 **now includes details that SuDS will be used for low risk runoff.** 7.5.6. We note that details of the surface water monitoring program will be submitted at the permitting stage and that this information will inform the permit HRA.	We note that requirement for details of both temporary and permanent surface water drainage systems is secured in DCO Requirement 11, Schedule 2 and welcome this.	Green
NE26	**Water Quality - Surface Water Drainage (O)**	**HRA 6.4.** When designing the SuDS (7.5.5.) you must provide adequate treatment trains for the level of risk associated with the site use. As the surface water will be discharged to a drain which flows into the Humber Estuary SAC/SSSI, a precautionary approach must be used to ensure that pollutants will not reach the designated site. The details of these measures will be needed to inform the HRA for the surface water discharge permit application to demonstrate no adverse effect on integrity of the designated sites.	We note that requirement for details of both temporary and permanent surface water drainage systems is secured in DCO Requirement 11, Schedule 2. Details of SuDS design and pollution prevention can be provided here.	Yellow

NE27	**Water Quality - Effluent Discharge (O)**	**HRA 7.5.10 – 7.5.22.** The HRA now includes additional information, including further information on pollutant levels in effluent discharge (including biocides), thermal plume modelling and discharge water volume. **We can therefore agree with the conclusion that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the relevant European Sites as a result of water pollution impacts on qualifying habitats and species during operation of the Proposed Development.**	We note that requirement for details of the foul water drainage system is secured in DCO Requirement 12, Schedule 2.	Green
NE28	**Protected species - Licence for works impacting water vole**	As a licence to displace water voles is considered likely (as stated in section 4.3. Protected Species Licences) Natural England recommend that as per published guidance the **applicant considers applying for Letters of No Impediment to assist the decision-maker.** The use of the class licence CL31 should be considered where the conditions are applicable.		Green
NE29	**Protected species - Badger mitigation strategy**	**Environmental Statement Volume II – Appendix 11D Badger Survey Report.** As works to align an existing pipeline to be used for the Cooling Water Discharge will occur within the land parcel where Setts 9 and 10 are located, Natural England advise considering whether a licence will be required to complete these works. As detailed in Section 11D.5.8, Natural England recommend completing updated badger surveys before works begin to identify if any new badger setts have been created, or that if a badger licence is required, we will		Yellow

		expect a site survey to have been completed within six months prior to a licence application being submitted. If further documents are to be submitted to Natural England for comment, we recommend providing maps/figures that show the development layout in relation to the locations of the identified badger setts to evidence that badgers will still have access to foraging habitat during and post-development. It would be helpful to include 10m, 20m and 30m buffer zones around each sett on these maps/figures to support the justification that the setts will not be impacted by the development works.		
NE30	**Protected species - Impacts to badgers**	Plate 1 of the Outline Lighting Strategy shows that works will be completed in close proximity to Setts 9 and 10. If any lighting needs to be installed to undertake these works, the lighting design should be planned to avoid impacts to the setts and any mammal paths as much as possible.		Yellow
NE31	**Protected species – Impacts to bats**	It was noted that bat surveys were referenced from the year 2020 and that no surveys have been carried out in the last two years. Natural England's standing advice states that surveys "[...] be carried out in the most recent, appropriate season – except if licensing policy 4 is used" We note that a bat licence (2018-38476-EPS-NSIP1) was issued within 2km which was to destroy breeding and resting sites so something to be aware of as those bats may have moved since they surveyed in 2023. We suggest the Applicant check to see if a mitigation licence is required using NE guidance on licencing NE wildlife licences. Applicants can also make use of Natural		Grey

		England's (NE) charged service Pre Submission Screening Service for a review of a draft wildlife licence application. NE then reviews a full draft licence application to issue a Letter of No Impediment (LONI) which explains that based on the information reviewed to date, that it sees **no impediment to a licence being granted in the future should the DCO be issued.** This is done to give the Planning Inspectorate confidence to make a recommendation to the relevant Secretary of State in granting a DCO. See Advice Note Eleven, Annex C – Natural England and the Planning Inspectorate | National Infrastructure Planning for details of the LONI process. The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species and consideration should be given to the wider context of the site, for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area. The area likely to be affected by the development should be thoroughly surveyed by competent ecologists at appropriate times of year for relevant species and the survey results, impact assessments and appropriate accompanying mitigation strategies included as part of the ES. **Surveys should always be carried out in optimal survey time periods and to current guidance** by suitably qualified and, where necessary, licensed, consultants. Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species, which includes guidance on survey and mitigation measures. A separate protected species licence from Natural England or Defra may also be required.		

NE32	**Biodiversity net gain**	We welcome the commitment to delivering BNG on this project. We recommend that the target increase in BNG of 10% across all biodiversity unit types is secured by a suitably worded requirement in the DCO. By reviewing the project's biodiversity gain plan at this early stage, it gives us an opportunity to help maximise outcomes and reduce risks. In particular the commitment to delivery of 30.16% in hedgerow units is welcome. We also note and welcome the connectivity of newly delivered habitats with the LWS. An improvement that could be considered is the current proposal to maintain the habitats for a minimum period of 25 years. We recommend 30 years is committed to, in line with best practice.	We note that the commitment to incorporation of BNG is secured within Requirement 6, Schedule 2 of the DCO and welcome this. Recommendations for the wording are included in Part III of this letter.	Grey
NE34	**Ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees**	Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat of great importance for its wildlife, its history, and the contribution it makes to our diverse landscapes. Paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the highest level of protection for irreplaceable habitats and development should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists. Please refer to Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.4.53, which states "The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of any irreplaceable		Green

		habitats, including ancient woodland, and **ancient and veteran trees** unless there are **wholly exceptional reasons** and a suitable compensation strategy exists" In our Relevant Representation we noted that the ES should assess the impacts of the proposal on the ancient woodland and any ancient and veteran trees, and the scope to avoid and mitigate for adverse impacts. It should also consider opportunities for enhancement. Chapter 11 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (dated 22 September 2025) identified the presence of veteran or ancient trees within the application boundary, and we previously referred to the policy in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) for irreplaceable habitats. However the Applicant has since provided an updated version of Chapter 11, which states in Table 11.2 that North Lincolnshire Council have visited the site and have confirmed T145 and T149 are not veteran trees and T152 and T154 are not ancient trees. **Updates have also been provided to the outline LBMEP to reflect this clarification. Therefore, we consider this matter to be addressed.**		
NE35	**In-Combination Impact Assessment**	While there is some level of justification on the scoping out of projects for cumulative impacts, further information is required from the Applicant for a number of thematic areas, especially relating to air quality. We note that there is reference to the Outline CEMP (Doc. Ref. 7.4.) but as it currently stands this does not provide a level of detail to demonstrate cumulative impacts will be negligible. Without this information NE do not yet fully understand the impacts of Keadby Next Generation Power Station on the		Amber

		designated site. We advise that the in-combination assessment is updated to fully consider thematic impacts and the lack of information provided by the Outline CEMP.		
NE36	**Climate change**	Natural England is committed to helping deliver more renewable and low carbon energy in a sustainable manner which avoids adverse impacts on the natural environment. As the government's adviser on the natural environment, climate change is central to NE's work. Climate change is a profound threat to nature and people. The natural environment is experiencing the impacts of climate change and needs to recover, adapt to change and build resilience. Sustainable development can and should contribute to net zero through supporting nature recovery and climate change mitigation and adaptation, helping both nature and people adapt, through Nature-based Solutions. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 sets out strong support for the use of Nature-based Solutions and nature inclusive design, including nature-based solutions being used alongside conventional techniques (4.10.5) and that Applicants should look for opportunities within the proposed development to embed nature-based or technological solutions to mitigate or offset the emissions of construction and decommissioning (5.3.6). NE advises that schemes should deliver 'high nature, low carbon', recognising that the climate and nature crises are inextricably linked, and both emergencies must be tackled together. Renewable and low carbon energy development		Grey

		should not be delivered at the expense of the natural environment.		