



THE PLANNING ACT 2008

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES  
2010

Sea Link Energy Cable

**Appendix H6 to the Natural England Deadline 6 Submission**

**Natural England's Additional Comments on the Suffolk LVIA**

For:

The construction and operation of the Sea Link Energy Cable.

Planning Inspectorate Reference EN020026

13<sup>th</sup> April 2026

## **Appendix H6- Natural England's advice on documentation relating to Suffolk LVIA.**

In formulating these comments, the following documents have been considered in relation to Suffolk's Landscape and Visual impact of the Sea Link Energy Cable on Suffolk:

- [REP4-092] 9.94 (A) Planning Statement Addendum
- [REP5-069] 7.5.3 (C) Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked Changes)
- [REP5-116] 9.84 (C) Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (Tracked Changes)
- [REP5-131] 9.119 Applicant's Comments on Late Responses to ExA First Written Questions
- [REP5-132] 9.121 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 4
- [REP5-133] 9.121.1 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 4 - Appendix A
- [REP5-135] 9.123 Applicant's Responses to Second Written Questions
- [REP5-136] 9.123.1 Applicant's Responses to Second Written Questions - Appendices
- [REP5-137] 9.124 Landscape and Visual Nighttime Assessment

### **Summary**

We continue to advise that further information is needed to evidence the feasibility of successful restoration of acid grassland in the proposed 6ha mitigation/compensation area in the proposed location, adjacent to a pig farm, and at the timescales suggested by the applicant.

Detailed comments

Table 1: Natural England's Advice On: LVIA

| Document reviewed: [REP5-137] 9.124 Landscape and Visual Nighttime Assessment |         |  |   |
|---|---------|--|---|
| NE Ref  | Section | Key Concern and/or Update  | Natural England's Advice to Resolve Issue |
|   |         | Natural England notes that the viewpoints included do not include viewpoints within the Suffolk and Essex Heaths Protected Landscape and therefore does not fall within Natural England's remit. Should viewpoint regarding impact within the National Landscape or its setting be submitted we would be pleased to comment. |   |

Table 2: Natural England's Advice On: LVIA

| Document reviewed: [REP5-135] 9.123 Applicant's Responses to Second Written Questions |         |  |   |
|---|---------|--|---|
| NE Ref  | Section | Key Concern and/or Update  | Natural England's Advice to Resolve Issue |
|   |         | Natural England notes that the responses from the Applicant regarding Landscape Matters largely reiterate comments made in <b>REP5-132 9.121 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 4.</b> |   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Natural England have provided detailed comments for <b>REP5-132</b> included below and consider these are equally applicable to Landscape and Visual matters within <b>REP5-135</b>.</p> <p>Natural England provided a detailed response at Deadline 4, Appendix H4 [REP4-194]. We confirm that we have thoroughly reviewed the numerous references to prior documents in forming our conclusions, that the matter remains unresolved.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

**Table 3: Natural England’s Advice On: LVIA**

| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document reviewed: [REP5-131] 9.119 Applicant's Comments on Late Responses to ExA First Written Questions</li> </ul> |         |  |  |
|---|---------|--|--|
| NE Ref  | Section | Key Concern and/or Update  | Natural England’s Advice to Resolve Issue  |
| 1   | 1LVIA 7 | <p>National Landscape (NL) duty Provide your comments on Document 9.47 NL Duty Section 85 Duty Technical Note [REP1 120], including the approach to the s85 duty, the natural beauty indicators in table 3.2 and the special qualities indicators in table 3.3 and the cumulative effects on the NL in section 4 and tables 4.1 and 4.2. In your response include consideration of whether the extent and nature of the preferred area of acid grassland on plate 3.2 of [REP1-120] is sufficient and the appropriateness of the maintenance period of 10 years.</p> | <p>Natural England notes that the Applicant has not provided a specific response to LVIA matters in this submission and refers to <b>REP5-132 9.121 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 4</b> for this issue.</p> <p>Please see our detailed comments to <b>REP5-132</b> below.</p> |

**Table 4: Natural England's Advice On: LVIA**

| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document reviewed: [REP5-132] 9.121 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 4</li> </ul> |           |   |  |
|--|-----------|---|--|
| NE Ref   | Section   | Key Concern and/or Update   | Natural England's Advice to Resolve Issue  |
| 1  | Table 5.1 | <p>Natural England advise that information to understand the fertility status of the 6ha area is needed, in addition to any further necessary mitigation.</p> <p>It is not clear how our comments have been addressed.</p> <p>The Applicant refers back to <b>REP2-014</b> (section 2.3), <b>REP3-064</b> (Table 15.1, points 9–15), with additional information provided in <b>REP4-241</b> (Table 3.1, point 6).</p> <p>These documents affirm the Applicants position that providing the additional information is not needed . . .<br/> <i>!Some movement of nutrients may occur but the refined area for habitat restoration</i><br/> <i>is existing degraded acid grassland, and most is approximately 200 m south of the</i><br/> <i>pig farm. Given the under-managed and bracken and gorse invaded nature of the</i></p> | <p>Natural England continues to advise that understanding the soil pH is needed to provide a robust evidence base to support the proposals for 6ha acid grassland enhancement.</p> <p>The project is relying on acid grassland enhancement to compensate for loss of 7.5ha of grassland through open trenching.</p> <p>Natural England notes the Applicant states there is no requirement for pH testing or fertility assessment on the area of land proposed for acid grassland restoration because there is already acid grassland present, albeit in a degraded condition.</p> <p>For clarity our advice relates to the feasibility of restoring acid grassland to the intended condition given the presence of the nearby pig farm and agricultural operations, and the requirement to provide suitable baseline evidence.</p> |

|   |                     |  |  |
|---|---------------------|--|--|
|   |                     | <p><i>degraded acid grassland there is considerable opportunity for enhancement in quality by introducing appropriate management. Given that reversion of former arable land is no longer proposed but instead existing degraded acid grassland, generally, further from the pig farm, will be restored by improved management</i></p> | <p>We advise that the influencing factors of the pig farm and land use (on the Ph of the soil for example) may restrict the project's ability to restore acid grassland as stated. This is therefore a risk to stated outcomes. The fact that the management is limited to 10 years is a further limiting factor. In addition, it is unclear if the rotation regime will include movement of the pigs in closer proximity to the 6ha area during the 10-year period.</p> <p>It remains unclear why the acid grassland enhancement cannot be secured for the lifetime of the project and what the intended use of this area of land will be post the ten-year period.</p> <p>A clear management plan including baseline status and objectives should be provided and secured in the oLEMP with contingency measures should acid grassland enhancement not proceed as expected.</p> <p>Furthermore, it appears that the 6ha contains deciduous woodland and additional habitat of biodiversity value, which should not be carefully considered by the proposals.</p> |
| 2 | Table 15.5<br>Ref 2 | The following is included as a key issue as the project is relying on the success of restored acid grassland for direct impacts to acid grassland habitats within the Protected Landscape.   | Please see comments above (ref table 15.1) for Natural England advice on this matter   |

|   |                                 |  |   |
|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
|   |                                 | <p>Natural England continue to advise that additional evidence is required regarding the baseline habitat type of this area (a portion of which appears to be deciduous woodland priority habitat). Information regarding soil pH and influencing factors such as the adjacent agricultural land use have not been evidenced.</p> <p>The applicant refers back to Evidence regarding the baseline habitat type, soil pH, the adjacent agricultural land use and reasoning for the 10-year commitment should be referred to within Table 15.1 contained in Application Document 9.36 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 2 [REP3-064]. Further information on the adjacent agricultural land use is also referred to within AP44 contained in Application Document 9.90 (A) Applicant's Response to Action Points from Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) [REP4 086].</p> | <p>In addition, AP44 is referenced which again does not provide further clarification on the influencing factors of the adjacent pig farm and agricultural practices.</p> |
| 3 | Table 15.5<br>Ref 2<br>(cont'd) | <p>It is not clear how the 10-year management plan would be sufficient to provide the stated gains, either on ecological grounds or Landscape and Visual. This is a clear risk to the efficacy of compensation. Furthermore, the pre-commencement management of this area does not appear to be substantiated in the LEMP or Plate 3.2 within Document 9.47 [REP1120].</p>   | <p>This matter has not been addressed in the document</p>   |

|   |                           |  |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|
| 4 | Table 15.5 Ref 2 (cont'd) | <p>The table appears to contain conflicting advice as follows:<br/> <i>resulting in no significant adverse effects on the SECHNL at any project stage for the Proposed Project alone or at operation cumulatively. A temporary significant adverse cumulative effect is reported, and all mitigation options have been explored.</i></p> | <p>Clarification as a temporary significant effect has been identified.</p> <p>The first stage of the mitigation Hierarchy is avoidance, and we continue to advise that the applicant has not provided a clear justification as to why sensitive habitats within the Protected landscape cannot be traversed via trenchless techniques.</p> <p>This would demonstrate compliance with the mitigation hierarchy and mitigate in itself remaining concerns regarding the temporary nature of the landscape and visual impact extending into the operational stage should reinstatement in the location of the trenches fail, or contingency measures needed should the 6ha of acid grassland fail.</p> <p>Furthermore, this would be in line with the LURA duty for which the mitigation hierarchy should be applied at each stage.</p> <p>In addition, trenchless techniques would mitigate impacts to FLL associated with the Sandlings SPA.</p> |
| 5 | Table 15.5                | <p>Clarification is required of the term “multifunctional enhancements” for this area. This should be evidenced by a clear audit trail of impact, mitigation and as a last resort</p>  | <p>An explanation for the term multifunctional benefits does not appear to have been addressed by the applicant.</p>   |

|  |                          |   |   |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|
|  | <p>Ref 2<br/>(cont'd</p> | <p>compensation with quantum provided for each impact. This is a requirement of the mitigation hierarchy. Enhancement is provided in addition to mitigation and compensation. Natural England consider open trenching to be a direct impact requiring compensation and we reiterate that this area would not be able to be considered for BNG as this must be secured for 30 years.</p> | <p><i>The acid grassland enhancement measures are considered to compensate for the short term and temporary cumulative effects and provide further enhancement for the SECHNLP within the operational phase of the Proposed Project (as set out in Plate 3.1 within Application Document 9.47 National Landscape Section 85 Duty Technical Note [REP1-120]).</i></p> <p>Natural England reiterates that if the 6ha of land appears to be included to compensate for direct impacts to c.7.5 ha of acid grassland within the Protected Landscape then it is not clear how this can also be considered as an enhancement in particular as the duration of works is limited to 10 years.</p> <p><i>In addition, we note that the Applicant reaffirms their position that the acid grassland enhancement proposals are appropriate and proportionate to demonstrate compliance with the Section 85 duty.</i></p> <p>Therefore, the acid grassland appears to be compensation for acid grassland loss (albeit less than that being impacted ,7.5 ha with associated biodiversity loss). In addition, the area does not provide additional acid grassland as the area is already acid grassland habitat. Natural England advise that the audit trail explanation detailing how the 6ha area is also enhancement and demonstrates compliance with the Section 85 LURA remains outstanding.</p> |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|

|   |            |  |   |
|---|------------|--|---|
|   |            |  | <p>We reiterate that in order to conserve the acid grassland trenchless techniques should be adopted.</p> <p><i>Regarding this the applicant Refers to Table 15.1 of Application Document 9.36 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 2 [REP3-064]. To use a trenchless technique along the small area of priority habitat acid grassland would involve extending the duration of works close to Sandlings SPA and Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI. This is considered less desirable than the much shorter timescale of open trenching through the acid grassland.</i></p> <p>This does not reflect the loss of 7.5 ha of acid grassland within the Protected Landscape, we have advised that we do not agree that the term small scale is appropriate and that the impact to the special qualities of the Protected Landscape as whole is appropriate.</p> <p>It is not clear how the time taken for the acid grassland to recover and risks involved compared with the extended works time to avoid impact is substantiated, in particular as HDD compound setup is to occur outside the breeding season.</p> |
| 6 | Table 15.5 | Natural England continues to advise that further evidence is required to support the assessment conclusions regarding significance of effect during construction. We have provided | The applicant refers to Application Document 9.94 (A) Planning Statement Addendum [REP4-092] provides the   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | <p>the following comments which should be clarified as part of the provision of further/updated evidence. • A clear Assessment of impact on each Special Quality remains outstanding. Table A.1 (Appendix A Document 9.73.1) does not address each defining feature of the National Landscape and instead provides an overall assessment of impact. Narrative is not substantiated with audit/evidence for each feature. For example, the presence of the barge, landing operations, lighting, do not appear to have been considered within the assessment.</p> | <p>Special Qualities Indicators baseline and further detail relating to the assessment of the sub-factors.</p> <p>The applicant also refers to Application Document 9.73.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions – Appendices [REP3 070] for detail on how the sub-factors of the Natural Beauty Indicators have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Project.</p> <p>We note that the applicant maintains that the additional narrative demonstrates that the non-significant effects reported at construction and operation within the Environmental Statement for the SECHNL remains justified.</p> <p>We advise that although the sub- factors have been acknowledged (which we welcome) each subfactor remains within an overall assessment which lacks clarity on how each subfactor may be impacted.</p> <p>For example, Relative wildness includes <i>a lack of human influence</i> sub factor:</p> <p>It remains unclear how machinery/lighting traffic/personnel associated with the construction works has been considered within this sub factor.</p> <p>The assessment continues to rely on the temporary nature of the impact to lessen significance (which may extend into operation) and the small scale of impact which is not appropriate as we have advised.</p> |
|---|---|--|

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   |  |  | <p>We continue to advise that trenchless crossings should be further assessed.</p> <p>With regards to duration, it is Natural England's understanding that short term impacts include impacts up to one-year, medium term up to 5 years, with long term beyond 5 years.</p> <p>This needs to be clearly considered within the receiving landscape, considering how long habitats will take to recover, wider impacts within the affected area of the PL and how these can be minimised and how effective compensation is on the special qualities of the Protected Landscape</p>   |
| 7 |  | <p>It is not clear how impacts to the Heritage Coast have been considered. • Impacts on the setting of the National Landscape via open trenching have not been included. • The assessment cites the impact as small scale which is not appropriate. The impact must be considered on the special qualities of the National Landscape. • The assessment conclusions rely on the temporary nature of impact. The impact of open trenching may extend into the longer term. The conclusion requires justification and in addition how avoidance of impact has been considered. • It is not clear where compensation for significant cumulative impacts has been provided.</p> | <p>Regarding Heritage Coast The applicant refers 1LVIA11 within Application Document 9.73 Applicant's Responses to First Written Question [REP3-069] for reference however this does not reference Heritage coasts</p> <p>Natural England have noted the reference AP46 and AP47 within Application Document 9.90 (A) Applicant's Response to Action Points from Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) [REP4-086].</p> <p>It would be helpful to provide a conclusion of effect on the Heritage Coast from impacts to the landfall area and associated works with specific regard to Heritage Coasts.</p> <p>We note that AP47 includes a conclusion and that this is based on short term impacts, but it would be helpful to cite</p> |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>the specific assessment material and evidence relating to this.</p> <p>Regarding setting the applicant refers to document Application Document 6.3.2.1.C ES Appendix 2.1.C Landscape Designation and Landscape Character Assessment [APP-097] and that setting, as an indirect effect, is addressed for each Natural Beauty Indicator where relevant.</p> <p>The justification for omitting impacts on the setting of the Natural Beauty indicators has not been included, and it would be helpful to include the full of special qualities and subsets in this assessment,</p> <p>alongside the location of the evidence supporting the conclusions. The setting does not appear to be considered in Special Quality terms and indeed the conclusion is that:</p> <p>The construction activity affecting the AONB and its setting would be localised and the main activity of the laying of the HVDC cable is not considered to be dissimilar to typical agricultural machinery on arable fields and the seasonal disturbance of soils which is characteristic of arable land. There would be highly localised temporary adverse effects on scenic quality, natural heritage, tranquillity and wildness, both directly and indirectly, due to construction activity including limited vegetation loss, that indirect effects</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

## **Annex I**

### **Natural England's additional narrative around the LVIA outstanding issues provided ahead of Deadline 6**

(provided via email to the Applicant on the 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2026)

Natural England hopes that the attached is helpful to provide additional narrative on our position regarding Protected Landscapes.

For clarity, we have reviewed all documents submitted in support of the application. Our advice focuses on the attached LVIA matters that remain outstanding.

As set out below, a key concern is the difficulty in locating, navigating, and understanding the evidence and audit trail underpinning the assessment conclusions. As a result, we have had to request further information to understand how these conclusions have been reached and what mitigation or compensation measures have been proposed to justify them.

We continue to advise that, given the nature and location of the project within a National Landscape, it remains unclear how alternatives to open trenching have been fully considered in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. As you are aware, the hierarchy must be applied at all stages of the Section 85 duty, with avoidance of impacts on Protected Landscapes as the first priority.

We also reiterate that it is not clear how the proposed 6 hectares of land will further the statutory purposes of the Protected Landscape. We would be grateful if you could direct us to the relevant information demonstrating this.

**Table 1: Summary of outstanding concerns and advice.**

| Advice  | Narrative  | Information required  |
|---|--|---|
| <p><u>6 ha area:</u></p> <p>We continue to advise that additional evidence is required regarding the baseline habitat type of this area (a portion of which appears to be deciduous woodland priority habitat). Information regarding soil pH and influencing factors such the adjacent agricultural land use, have not been evidenced.</p> | <p>Our advice relates to the feasibility of restoring acid grassland to the intended condition given the presence of the nearby pig farm and agricultural operations, and the requirement to provide suitable baseline evidence.</p> <p>The influencing factors of the pig farm and land use (on the pH of the soil for example, chemical drift, nutrient runoff) may restrict the project's ability to restore acid grassland as stated. This is therefore a risk to stated outcomes. The fact that the management is limited to 10 years is a further limiting factor.</p> <p>In addition, it is unclear if the rotation regime will include movement of the pigs in closer proximity to the 6ha area during the 10-year period.</p> <p>We advise that the influencing factors of the pig farm and land use (on the Ph of the soil for example) may restrict the project's ability to restore acid grassland as stated. This is therefore a risk to stated outcomes. The fact that the</p> | <p>The risks regarding the location of the proposed enhancement should be acknowledged and incorporated. They remain an unmitigated risk.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of existing biodiversity value of the area and how this will be maintained.</p> <p>Understanding the pH of the soil would help understand likely success of acid grassland restoration</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>management is limited to 10 years is a further limiting factor as below.</p>   |  |
| <p><u>10 year management plan:</u></p> <p>It is not clear how the 10 year management plan would be sufficient to provide the stated gains either on ecological grounds or Landscape and Visual. This is a clear risk to the efficacy of compensation. Furthermore, the pre-commencement management of this area does not appear to be substantiated in the LEMP or Plate 3.2 within Document 9.47</p> | <p>In addition it is unclear if the rotation regime will include movement of the pigs in closer proximity to the 6ha area during the 10 year period.</p> <p>When considering the time taken for directly affected habitats to establish and the limitations of the proposed area it is not clear how this area can be considered as enhancement.</p> <p>We again advise that employing trenchless techniques to avoid habitats should be adopted</p> <p>We note that the timescales involved in HDD and small area of acid grassland have been cited as a reason not to employ this technique.</p> <p>This does not reflect the loss of 7.5 ha of acid grassland within the Protected Landscape. We have advised that we do not agree that the term small scale is appropriate and that the impact to the special qualities of the Protected Landscape as whole is appropriate.</p> | <p>We again advise that employing trenchless techniques to avoid impacts to sensitive habitats should be adopted.</p> <p>This advice is in line with the mitigation hierarchy.</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>It is not clear how the time taken for the acid grassland to recover with risks involved, compared with the extended works time to avoid impact is substantiated.</p>   |  |
| <p><u>Multifunctional enhancements:</u></p> <p>Clarification is required of the term <i>multifunctional enhancements</i> for this area. This should be evidenced by a clear audit trail of impact, mitigation and as a last resort compensation with quantum provided for each impact. This is a requirement of the mitigation hierarchy. Enhancement is provided in addition to mitigation and compensation. We consider open trenching is a direct impact requiring compensation and reiterate that this area would not be able to be considered for BNG as this must be secured for 30 years.</p> | <p>The 6 ha acid grassland enhancement appears to be <i>compensation</i> for acid grassland loss (albeit less than that being impacted, 7.5 ha with associated biodiversity loss). In addition, the area does not provide additional acid grassland as the area is already acid grassland habitat.</p> <p>The same 6ha area is also described as enhancement and also to further the purpose of the Protected Landscape.</p> | <p>Further information required:</p> <p>Detail regarding the targeted function of the 6ha area</p> <p>This should consider the existing biodiversity value of the site and how this will be conserved, alongside risks of establishment of acid grassland and how this is mitigated.</p> <p>This area is described as compensation (required for impacts to 7.5 ha of acid grassland).</p> <p>An audit trail is required to demonstrate how the 6ha area will also provide enhancement and, in addition an explanation of how it is considered that the area of land which is provided to compensate for an impact to the habitats within the National Landscape can also further the purpose of the National Landscape.</p> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><u>Assessment of impact on each Special Quality remains outstanding:</u></p> <p>Table A.1 does not address each defining feature of the Protected Landscape and instead provides an overall assessment of impact. Narrative is not substantiated with audit/evidence for each feature.</p> | <p>Although the sub- factors have been acknowledged in Table A.1 (REP3- 070.) (which we welcome) each subfactor remains within an overall assessment which lacks clarity for the reader on how each subfactor has been considered</p> <p>For example, Relative wildness includes a <i>lack of human influence</i> sub factor:</p> <p>It remains unclear how machinery/lighting traffic/personnel associated with the construction works has been considered within This sub factor.</p> <p>The project therefore appears to impact this special quality but it is not clear how this will be mitigated or how consideration of this impact has led to the assessment conclusions. This is because the specific impacts are not clearly substantiated/assessed against sub factors with accompanying evidence used to reach conclusions.</p> | <p>Further information:</p> <p>Clear audit trail regarding how sub factors have been considered and any mitigation employed ton address impacts.</p> <p>The term “overall” does not provide clear narrative of how each factor has been considered and mitigated.</p> |
| <p><u>Small Scale Impact:</u></p> <p>The assessment cites the impact as small scale which is not appropriate. The impact must be</p>  | <p>The small scale of impact is frequently cited alongside the quantum of the area affected compared to the Protected landscape as whole.</p>   |   |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>considered on the Special Qualities of the National Landscape</p>  | <p>We have advised that the impact should be considered on the Special Qualities of the receiving landscape i.e. considered as an impact to the Protected Landscape and how this first can be avoided.</p>   |  |
| <p><u>Temporary Nature:</u></p> <p>Conclusions rely on the temporary nature of impact which is not clearly justified.</p> | <p>The assessment in Table A.1 (REP3-070.) continues to rely on the temporary nature of the impact to lessen significance (which may extend into beyond the stated short-term) , and the small scale of impact which is not appropriate as we have advised.</p> <p>For example, <i>Visual Impacts in patterns of land cover</i> he cable trench and associated vegetation removal will introduce a severing/scaring activity into the National Landscape and its setting.</p> <p>Reinstatement of the various habitats will take time as the habitats mature and therefore the impact will be experienced for both landscape character and visual impacts within the Protected Landscape and its setting until the habitats reinstate.</p> | <p>Clarity on timescales of construction and operation considering how long habitats will take to recover.</p>   |
| <p><u>Heritage Coast:</u></p> <p>It is not clear how impacts to the Heritage Coast have been considered.</p>              | <p>The applicant refers 1LVIA11 within Application Document 9.73 Applicant's Responses to First Written Question [REP3-069] for reference however this does not reference Heritage coasts.</p>   | <p>It would be helpful to provide a conclusion of effect on the Heritage Coast from impacts to the landfall area and associated works with specific regard to Heritage Coasts.</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>Natural England have noted the reference AP46 and AP47 within Application Document 9.90 (A) Applicant's Response to Action Points from Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) [REP4-086].</p> <p>Natural England have noted the reference AP46 and AP47 within Application Document 9.90 (A) Applicant's Response to Action Points from Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1).</p> | <p>We note that AP47 includes a conclusion and that this is based on short term impacts but it would be helpful to cite the specific assessment material and evidence relating to this.</p>  |
| <p><u>National Landscape:</u></p> <p>Impacts on the setting of the National Landscape have not been included.</p> | <p>Table 2.1 APP097 is referenced for this assessment and that <i>setting, as an indirect effect, is addressed for each Natural Beauty Indicator where relevant.</i></p> <p>However Natural England are unclear on how the assessment on impacts to setting has been approached, where this has been presented, and where the conclusions are presented.</p>   | <p>Evidence base and audit trail including the justification for omitting impacts on the setting of the Natural Beauty indicators has not been included, and it would be helpful to include the full list of special qualities and subsets in this assessment,</p> <p>alongside the location of the evidence supporting the conclusions.</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |
| <u>Compensation:</u><br>It is not clear where compensation for significant cumulative impacts has been provided. |  | As above clear audit trail to show avoidance/mitigation and compensation measures. |