

Date: 18 March 2026
Our ref: 536264
Your ref: EN0110001



keadbynextgeneration@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

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

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Sir/Madam

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

Thank you for your consultation on the above.

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 conclusions of Natural England's advice
PART II: Natural England's detailed advice (starting on page 6)

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 issues¹ 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.

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:
 - We are currently reviewing the recent information provided by the applicant on bird disturbance impacts and will be updating our comments as soon as we can.
- Air quality:
 - The main documents/assessments should be updated to include the updates provided in the "comments on relevant representations" document.
 - A standalone in-combination AQ schedule listing of all relevant emitters and modelling treatment should be provided in the AQ assessment.
 - The operational AQ assessment should take account of the in-combination assessment before concluding no adverse effects

Nationally designated sites

The Environmental Statement has not been updated but the "comments on relevant representations document" has provided additional information on impacts to nationally designated sites.

- The main documents/assessments should be updated to include the updates provided in the "Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations" document.
- 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.
- 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.

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.

NE key issue ref	Topic / Construction (C) or Operation (O)	NE commentary and advice on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	We are currently reviewing the recent information provided by the applicant on bird disturbance impacts and will be updating our comments as soon as we can.	N/A	Amber
NE2	Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar – Noise disturbance to birds (O)	We are currently reviewing the recent information provided by the applicant on bird disturbance impacts and will be updating our comments as soon as we can.	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 birds and lamprey within the River Trent as supporting habitat for the Humber Estuary Ramsar and SAC	N/A	Green
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. Comments in the applicant's 'comments on relevant representations' document are also noted, and NE agrees that the consideration of 'upper marsh' and graminoid dominated vegetation in this area in the appropriate assessment is appropriate. Humber Estuary has been assigned: · Ammonia critical level of 3µg/m3. Additional information has been provided (HRA 6.2.46 and in applicant's 'comments on relevant representations' document -NE10) that lichens and bryophytes are not integral to the	N/A	Green

		<p>qualifying habitats present on the vegetation communities adjacent to the site, therefore the higher critical level can be used. NE agrees with this conclusion.</p> <p>· Ndep critical load of 10kgN/ha/yr (6.3.38). We agree with the use of the lower critical load in screening.</p> <p>As outlined under NE10, the relevant habitat types for Hatfield Chase Ditches SSSI are still uncertain as these 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.</p>		
NE10	Air Quality – Critical levels and loads	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>HRA 7.4.7 - 7.4.17. Additional information has been provided in the Appropriate Assessment for why the</p>	Information informing the SSSI assessment should be added to the assessment documents to justify the use of the higher critical levels in the assessment	Green

	<p>nitrogen deposition at OE1-5 will not affect the integrity of the Humber Estuary SAC/Ramsar site. NE agrees with this conclusion.</p> <p>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. It is noted that the applicant has updated the HRA to include this area as agreed.</p> <p><i>Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments. These documents have not been updated. However, additional information is provided in the applicant's 'comments on relevant representations' document</i></p> <p>Hatfield Chase Ditches SSSI (construction traffic assessment) - Table 8A.19-21 indicates no critical loads or levels are available. NE's previous comments indicated that these "lowland ditch systems" should be assessed as a fen ecosystem (15-25kgN/ha/yr). However, the applicant's 'comments on relevant representations' document identifies that in this case, the vegetation (including specific species on the citation) is more typical of that for aquatic habitats. Such habitats are only assigned a critical load (per Bobbink 2022) when there is low alkalinity and no significant agricultural or other direct human inputs – which it is accepted is not the case here. It is also accepted that in this case, bryophytes/ lichens would be integral to the ecosystem. NE therefore accepts the conclusion that there would be no harm to the site through addition of nitrogen</p>		
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>deposition (or ammonia) arising from traffic from the project.</p> <p>Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI</p> <p>NE's previous comments indicated that the ammonia critical level in the construction traffic assessment and operational assessment for this protected site were different. A critical level of 1ug/m³ was used in the construction traffic assessment, and a critical level of 3ug/m³ in the operational assessment.</p> <p>The applicant's 'comments on relevant representations' document indicated that bryophytes/ lichens are not integral for the lowland ditch habitat. However, only part of the Crowle Borrow Pit designation is for lowland ditch – with the site designated as “<i>a variety of habitats including alder carr, scrub, fen and open water in which several locally uncommon plant species occur. Much of the north-east sector of the site consists of wet alder Alnus glutinosa woodland.... Less dense areas have a fen ground flora...</i>” APIS does indicate that the woodland habitats would have integral bryophytes and lichens.</p> <p>Similarly, in the operational assessment, ammonia critical levels of 3µg/m³ were applied to several SSSIs, some of which are considered to have the potential to have bryophyte interest, Eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broughton Far Wood SSSI – ash and oak woodland with diverse understorey 		
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broughton Alder Wood SSSI – alder woodland with diverse understorey, including a carpet of mosses, as outlined in the citation <p>However, it is noted that previous detailed study of these areas (Crowle Borrow Pits, Broughton Far Wood and Broughton Alder Woods SSSIs) for Keadby 3 highlighted that although bryophytes were present they were not considered an integral part of the SSSI feature. It is therefore considered appropriate that the critical level of 3ug/m3 is used in the detailed assessment – although at screening the APIS figure should be used (i.e. APIS indicates that bryophytes and lichens are integral generally for the wet woodland habitat).</p> <p>Overall, however, it is considered that the further information provided applies correct critical levels and loads to the protected sites (European and SSSIs) so this issue is considered resolved.</p>		
NE11	Air Quality – in-combination assessment	<p>NE’s previous comments indicated that it was 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.</p> <p>The applicant also confirmed in their ‘comments on relevant representations’ document that agricultural ammonia sources (poultry, pig, dairy units) were included but none were identified. Assuming this is clarified in the documents, NE accepts that the projects included in the in-combination modelling are acceptable.</p>	<p>Assessment should be updated to include the confirmation in the applicant’s ‘comments on relevant representations’ of search criteria used in identifying the in-combination assessments, and that no agricultural developments were identified.</p> <p>A standalone in-combination AQ schedule listing of all relevant emitters and modelling treatment should also be provided in the AQ assessment. This should include</p>	Amber

		<p>A full list of projects considered within the AQ assessment should also be provided in the final version of the AQ assessment documents (i.e. not just chapter 21 or chapter 10 of the ES) for clarity. This should include whether operational emissions and/ or traffic impacts from the in-combination projects were considered. Overall, the AQ in-combination assessment is not presented in a clear format as it is unclear which projects are scoped in or out.</p> <p>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%. However, it is acknowledged that the assessment (of traffic impacts) does include the relevant in-combination traffic projects – though it is unclear whether it also includes the identified point sources in chapter 21.</p> <p><i>Operational assessment</i></p> <p>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”.</p> <p>The applicant’s ‘comments on relevant representations’ indicates that the assessment of cumulative impacts is only carried out in Chapter 21 of the ES (not in Appendix 8B) –</p>	<p>which projects were considered in the construction phase, and which at operational phase, and whether traffic emissions and/ or point source emissions were considered.</p> <p>The operational AQ assessment (App 8B) should also take account of the in combination assessment before concluding no adverse effects on the relevant protected sites. (both European sites and SSSIs)</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>but the AQ assessment of operational impacts does require an in-combination assessment</p> <p>It is noted that the North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park is included in the in-combination assessment – but it is not clear why the in-combination impact from this alongside the proposed development did not result in any residual effect to Risby Warren SSSI (the fact NLGEP itself would not result in a adverse effect, having regard to mitigation employed by that project, does not mean that the two projects in-combination would not have such an effect)</p>		
NE14	Air Quality - Construction dust assessment	<p>The assessment process outlined in 8.3.14 is appropriate, and in accordance with IAQM guidance. It is noted that unmitigated impacts are considered, which is the requirement for HRA.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>NE agrees with the assessment in the HRA (6.2.29) that LSE to the Humber Estuary cannot be screened out at stage 1.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We note that the DCO secures the Construction Environmental Management Plan within Requirement 17, Schedule 2 and welcome this.</p>	Green

NE15	Air quality - Construction traffic assessment (SSSIs)	<p>Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments. <i>These documents have not been updated, but we note comments in the applicant's 'comments on relevant representations'</i></p> <p>Overall, we accept the comments on the in-combination assessment (NE11) but we still require an AQ-specific outline of which other projects have been included in the AQ assessment, including whether these are in the traffic assessment and/ or in the assessment on in-combination emissions.</p> <p>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 above, NE accepts that the ammonia critical levels for higher plants can be accepted. However, the potential in-combination impacts should also be assessed (a 0.3% increase as a result of the project alone could still lead to an in-combination impact >1% if several other projects have the potential to contribute as is the case here, as per Chapter 21) Consideration of the JNCC Decision making Threshold report may be made to assess where a PC can be considered "de minimis" and no bespoke in-combination assessment is required).</p> <p>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</p>	Update documents to clarify in-combination assessment approach, and clarify CREAM/NH tool as outlined in 'comments on relevant representations' document.	Amber
------	-------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

		<p>required and there would not be LSE/ harm to the protected sites.</p> <p>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. Information provided in the 'comments on relevant representations' document confirms that vessel use will be below LAQM levels, and although potential impacts could arise along the estuary rather than just at the port, overall impacts would be expected to be low, particularly given low sulphur fuel will be required.</p> <p>Confirmation that road-delivered abnormal loads are included in the assessment of construction traffic is noted.</p>		
NE16	Air Quality – Construction plant/ NRMM assessment	<p>The 'Applicant's comments on relevant representations' document confirms that there would be no construction/ NRMM closer than 600m to the nearest European site or SSSI. This, along with limits on construction plant hours and proposed limits on size and fuel of plant is considered appropriate to ensure there would not be harm to any site from such construction emissions.</p>	<p>Ensure limits of 600m proximity to any protected site, fuel use and plant size (<1MW) are incorporated into CEMP.</p>	Green
NE18	Air quality- Operational emissions	<p>The 'Applicant's comments on relevant representations' document confirms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should a taller stack be required to improve dispersion, modelling will be undertaken to assess any impacts on protected sites: • No amines will be emitted at any point in the process 	<p>Commitment in the DCO to further modelling should stack height be amended at detailed design stage to ensure no additional protected sites would be affected</p> <p>ES Chapter 11 and relevant sections of AQ chapter (Chapter 8) to be updated with revised critical loads/</p>	Green

		<p>Therefore these issues are considered addressed – subject to confirmation in the DCO.</p> <p>The in-combination assessment is addressed in relation to NE11, with the requirement that the operational AQ assessment considers in-combination impacts.</p> <p>At present, the biodiversity assessment (Ch 11) and relevant parts of the AQ chapter (Ch8) have not been updated, assessing the impact on SSSIs (including clarification of why the relevant critical levels and loads were selected as covered at NE10) and allowing for in-combination impacts at the SSSIs (1% threshold as trigger to undertake further assessment of harm must be in-combination) . Assuming this is done at a further deadline to identify harm to the Nationally designated sites (SSSIs) it is considered this point has been addressed.</p>	<p>levels/ assessment and justification for SSSIs – similar to HRA amendments at Deadline 1.</p>	
NE19	<p>Air quality - Operational emissions – NOx and ammonia results</p>	<p>Appendix 8A/B - Air Quality Assessments. <i>These documents have not been updated. However, note has been taken of the applicant’s ‘comments on relevant representations’ document.</i></p> <p>Assuming clarification is provided that the in-combination assessment considered all relevant projects (as covered at NE11) so the screening out at <1% is an in-combination 1%, this point is considered mostly addressed.</p> <p>However, it is not clear that our previous comments on Risby Warren SSSI are addressed. The point made in the ‘comments on relevant representations’ that the assessment is based on worst case assumptions and therefore likely to be lower in reality than presented in the assessment is noted, but it is the values presented in the</p>	<p>Update assessments of SSSIs in Ch 8 and Ch 11 of the ES to confirm and justify appropriate critical levels and loads (as per NE10) and confirm that percentages cited and assessments made are of the in-combination impact.</p> <p>Confirmation of impact on Risby Warren SSSI – including ecological justification of addition of 1% of ammonia CLe not resulting in harm to the SSSI.</p>	Amber

		assessment that must be assumed in determining whether there is likely to be harm to the protected sites.		
NE20	Air Quality - Operational emissions – Nitrogen deposition and acid deposition results	<p>Note has been taken of the applicant's 'comments on relevant representations'.</p> <p>Overall, NE accepts the assessment that there would be no AEOI from operational Ndep on the Humber Estuary based on the assessment outlined in the revised HRA (eg para 7.4.8-7.4.17). Assuming in-combination impacts are considered (as addressed in NE11), it is also accepted that there is no requirement for further assessment of acid deposition.</p> <p>However, an update of the assessments of the SSSIs (in particular Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI and Risby Warren SSSI) in Ch 8 and Ch 11 of the ES.</p> <p>Justification of the impact at Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI has not been made (having regard to the relevant thresholds outlined in NE10) requires to be made. 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).</p>	<p>Update Ch 8 and Ch 11 with impacts on SSSIs</p> <p>Confirm in-combination assessment has been taken into account in consideration of acid deposition at Humber Estuary SAC (in AQ assessment and HRA)</p>	Amber

		<p><i>Assessment of Risby Warren SSSI Ndep</i> – 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).</p>		
NE21	Water Quality - Boat Movements (C)	<p>HRA 6.2.54. We advise that the measures taken to avoid or mitigate pollution of the water environment from boat traffic and unloading of cargo will need to be considered when applying for a license from the navigation authority.</p>	N/A	Grey
NE22	Water Quality – Cofferdam, Construction (C)	<p>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.</p>	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)	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Green
NE24	Water Quality – Drain infilling (C)	<p>Chapter 12 Water Environment and Flood Risk 12.6.25. We acknowledge the clarification provided in the applicant’s response that there is no impact pathway to the Humber Estuary from infilling the drains onsite.</p> <p>The HRA (6.2.70) Refers to measures to manage fine water sediment when infilling of minor ditches and protect waterbodies which we support.</p>	<p>We note that the DCO secures the Construction Environmental Management Plan within Requirement 17, Schedule 2 and welcome this.</p>	Green
NE25	Water Quality - Surface Water Drainage (O)	<p>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.</p> <p>Section 6.3.54 now includes details that SuDS will be used for low-risk runoff.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Green
NE26	Water Quality - Surface Water Drainage (O)	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	Yellow

		<p>SAC/SSSI, a precautionary approach must be used to ensure that pollutants will not reach the designated site.</p> <p>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.</p>	and pollution prevention can be provided here.	
NE27	Water Quality - Effluent Discharge (O)	<p>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.</p>	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	<p>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.</p> <p>The use of the class licence CL31 should be considered where the conditions are applicable.</p>		Green
NE29	Protected species - Badger mitigation strategy	<p>Environmental Statement Volume II – Appendix 11D Badger Survey Report.</p> <p>It is confirmed in the applicant response that works to align an existing pipeline to be used for the Cooling Water Discharge will not occur in proximity to known badger setts,</p>		Green

		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, if a badger licence is required, we will expect a site survey to have been completed within six months prior to a licence application being submitted.		
NE30	Protected species - Impacts to badgers	It is confirmed in the applicant response that no works are proposed in proximity to setts 9 and 10.		Green
NE31	Protected species – Impacts to bats	<p>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”</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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</p>		Grey

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
NE32	Biodiversity net gain	<p>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.</p>	<p>We note that the commitment to incorporation of BNG is secured within Requirement 6, Schedule 2 of the DCO and welcome this.</p>	Grey

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
NE34	Ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees	<p>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.</p> <p>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 habitats, including ancient woodland, and ancient and veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists”</p> <p>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</p>		Green

		<p>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.</p>		
NE36	Climate change	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		Grey

		<p>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).</p> <p>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 should not be delivered at the expense of the natural environment.</p>		
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

