




MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

Alternative Ornithology Mitigation Note - Permanent



Deadline: [Secretary of State SoS](#)
Letter [2](#)
Application Reference: EN020028

Document reference:
S_SoSQ_6/[F02](#)

MRCNS-J3303-JVW-19130
MOR001-FLO-CON-ENV-RPT-0169

[22 June](#) 2026
[F02](#)

Document status					
Version	Purpose of document	Approved by	Date	Approved by	Date
F01	Secretary of State Letter 1	GL	April 2026	PM	April 2026
F02	Secretary of State consultation 2	GL	June 2026	AB	June 2026

Prepared by:

RPS

Prepared for:

**Morgan Offshore Wind Limited,
Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd**

Contents

4	ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION FOR ORNITHOLOGY TECHNICAL NOTE	4
1.1	Purpose of the Note	4
1.2	Alternative permanent mitigation	4
1.2.1	Background information	4
1.2.2	Approach to Assessment	6
1.2.3	Methodology for identifying alternative mitigation	10
1.2.4	Permanent mitigation options	24
1.2.5	Comparison of mitigation options	28
1.2.6	Conclusion	30
1.3	References	31
1	ALTERNATIVE PERMANENT MITIGATION FOR ORNITHOLOGY TECHNICAL NOTE	1
1.1	Purpose of the Note	1
1.2	Alternative permanent mitigation	2
1.2.1	Background information	2
1.2.2	Approach to Assessment	7
1.2.3	Methodology for identifying alternative mitigation	11
1.2.4	Permanent mitigation options	22
1.2.5	Comparison of mitigation options	28
1.2.6	Conclusion	36
1.3	References	37

Tables

Table 1.1:	Summary of the measures to be implemented at the south of Newton-with-Scales mitigation area	3
Table 1.2:	Comparison between the recorded peaks, means, and frequencies and the citation and current population sizes	7
Table 1.3:	The proportion of arable and pasture habitats within the 10 km foraging range of golden plover that are predicted to be permanently impacted	8
Table 1.4:	All non-breeding waders present at the onshore substations	9
Table 1.5:	Species foraging range, foraging and roosting habitats during the non-breeding season	18
Table 1.6:	Summary of the supplementary advice for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA golden plover feature (as taken from Natural England's SACO on the designated sites viewer)	20
Table 1.7:	The Ribble Sefton Site Improvement Plan (as taken from Natural England's Access to Evidence)	20
Table 1.8:	Comparison of the onshore substations and proposed mitigation areas	29
<u>Table 1.1:</u>	<u>Summary of the measures to be implemented at the south of Newton-with-Scales mitigation area</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Table 1.4:</u>	<u>All non-breeding waders present at the onshore substations</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Table 1.5:</u>	<u>Species foraging range, foraging and roosting habitats during the non-breeding season</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>Table 1.6:</u>	<u>Summary of the supplementary advice for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA golden plover feature (as taken from Natural England's SACO on the designated sites viewer)</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Table 1.7:</u>	<u>The Ribble Sefton Site Improvement Plan (as taken from Natural England's Access to Evidence)</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Table 1.8:</u>	<u>Comparison of the onshore substations and proposed permanent mitigation areas</u>	<u>34</u>

Figures

Figure 1-1: Environmental mitigation areas at south of Newton-with-Scales.....	4
Figure 1-2: Without prejudice alternative mitigation area at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh.....	5
Figure 1-3: Lapwing 5-year abundance by sector (2007/08 – 2011/12) as taken from Still <i>et al.</i> (2015).....	13
Figure 1-4: Golden plover 5-year abundance by sector (2007/08 – 2011/12) as taken from Still <i>et al.</i> (2015).....	15
Figure 1-5: Curlew 5-year abundance by sector (2007/08 – 2011/12) as taken from Still <i>et al.</i> (2015).....	17
Figure 1-6: Indexed 5-year averages in the Ribble Estuary for the impacted species as taken from Calbrade, <i>et al.</i> (2025) data.....	19
Figure 1-7: An indicative layout of the proposed measures at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh.....	25
Figure 1-1: Environmental mitigation areas at south of Newton-with-Scales.....	5
Figure 1-2: Indexed 5-year averages in the Ribble Estuary for the impacted species as taken from Calbrade, <i>et al.</i> (2025) data.....	20
Figure 1-3: Alternative permanent mitigation area at Lytham Moss.....	33

Glossary

Term	Meaning
400 kV grid connection cables	Cables that will connect the proposed onshore substations to the existing National Grid Penwortham substation.
400 kV grid connection cable corridor	The corridor within which the 400 kV grid connection cables will be located.
Applicants	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited (Morgan OWL) and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd (Morecambe OWL).
Biodiversity benefit	<p>An approach to development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before. Where a development has an impact on biodiversity, developers are encouraged to provide an increase in appropriate natural habitat and ecological features over and above that being affected.</p> <p>For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Onshore Order Limits. Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Order Limits.</p>
Code of Construction Practice	A document detailing the overarching principles of construction, contractor protocols, construction-related environmental management measures, pollution prevention measures, the selection of appropriate construction techniques and monitoring processes.
Commitment	This term is used interchangeably with mitigation and enhancement measures. The purpose of commitments is to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset significant adverse environmental effects. Primary and tertiary commitments are taken into account and embedded within the assessment set out in the ES.
Development Consent Order	An order made under the Planning Act 2008, as amended, granting development consent.
Environmental Impact Assessment	The process of identifying and assessing the significant effects likely to arise from a project. This requires consideration of the likely changes to the environment, where these arise as a consequence of a project, through comparison with the existing and projected future baseline conditions.
Environmental Statement	The document presenting the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment process.
Intertidal area	The area between Mean High Water Springs and Mean Low Water Springs.
Landfall	The area in which the offshore export cables make landfall (come on shore) and the transitional area between the offshore cabling and the onshore cabling. This term applies to the entire landfall area at Lytham St. Annes between Mean Low Water Springs and the transition joint bay inclusive of all construction works, including the offshore and onshore cable routes, intertidal working area and landfall compound(s).

Term	Meaning
Maximum design scenario	The realistic worst case scenario, selected on a topic-specific and impact specific basis, from a range of potential parameters for the Transmission Assets.
Mean High Water Springs	The height of mean high water during spring tides in a year.
Mean Low Water Springs	The height of mean low water during spring tides in a year.
Mitigation measures	This term is used interchangeably with Commitments. The purpose of such measures is to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset significant adverse environmental effects.
Morecambe OWL	Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited is owned by Copenhagen Infrastructure Partners' (CIP) fifth flagship fund, Copenhagen Infrastructure V (CI V).
Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets	The offshore export cables, landfall, and onshore infrastructure for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm. This includes the offshore export cables, landfall site, onshore export cables, onshore substations, 400 kV grid connection cables and associated grid connection infrastructure such as circuit breaker compounds. Also referred to in this report as the Transmission Assets, for ease of reading.
Morgan OWL	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited is a joint venture between JERA Nex bp (JNbp) and Energie Baden-Württemberg AG (EnBW).
National Grid Penwortham substation	The existing National Grid substation at Penwortham, Lancashire.
Onshore export cables	The cables which would bring electricity from the landfall to the onshore substations.
Onshore export cable corridor	The corridor within which the onshore export cables will be located.
Onshore substations	The onshore substations will include a substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets and a substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets. These will each comprise a compound containing the electrical components for transforming the power supplied from the generation assets to 400 kV and to adjust the power quality and power factor, as required to meet the UK Grid Code for supply to the National Grid.
Transmission Assets Order Limits	The area within which all components of the Transmission Assets will be located, including areas required on a temporary basis during construction and/or decommissioning

Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
AEol	Adverse Effects on Integrity
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CoT	Project Commitment
CMS	Construction Method Statement
DCO	Development Consent Order
ESDIO	Environmental Statement Defence Infrastructure Organisation
ExAEIA	Examining Authority Environmental Impact Assessment
FLL	Functionally Linked Land
HAT	Highest Astronomical Tide
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
ISAA	Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment
MDSOEMP	Maximum Design Scenario Outline Ecological Management Plan
MHWS o WHMP	Mean High Water Springs Outline Wildlife Management Plan
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
NNR	National Nature Reserve
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
RIES	Report on the Implications for European Sites
SACSACO	Special Areas of Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives
SIP	Site Improvement Plan
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSSI SNCBs	Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies Site of Special Scientific Interest
WeBS SSSI	Sit of Special Scientific Interest Wetland Bird Survey

Units

Unit	Description
%	Percentage
km	Kilometres
m	Metres
nm	Nautical mile

1 Alternative Permanent Mitigation for Ornithology Technical Note

1.1 Purpose of the Note

1.1.1.1 The original purpose of this note ~~is was~~ to address comments raised by Natural England in its Deadline 7 submission (REP7-049) regarding the use of the onshore substation sites and surrounding area by Special Protection Area (SPA) species, in particular golden plover. Natural England ~~considers~~considered that the mitigation area south of Newton-with-Scales ~~is was~~ needed to address the potential impacts on golden plover as a result of permanent habitat loss of ~~functionally linked land~~Functionally Linked Land (FLL). ~~In~~, in the unlikely event that the south of Newton-with-Scales mitigation area ~~cannot~~could not be delivered, (as a result of concerns from aviation stakeholders), Natural England *'would not be able to rule out Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) for golden plover'*. ~~Natural England also states that the mitigation area is required to address the permanent impacts on the overall waterbird assemblage associated with the SPA.~~

1.1.1.2 ~~The Applicants do not agree with Natural England that the land at the onshore substation constitutes FLL or that the potential impacts of permanent habitat loss represent AEoI for non-breeding golden plover and have presented this position in its Comments on the Report of the Implications of European Sites (RIES) (see section 3.4.13 of REP6-175). The Applicants consider that the~~As set out in the Applicants' Response to Secretary of State Letter and Request for Information 2 (S SoSQ 14), Natural England have advised the Applicants (in a meeting held on 19 June 2026) that, following review of the Applicants draft responses to Points 10 to 13, they consider there is no residual risk of AEoI on the basis that the substation sites are unlikely to represent FLL and therefore mitigation is not required to rule out AEoI. Natural England noted to the Applicants that this advice was subject to reviewing the final responses submitted to the Secretary of State, but the Applicants can confirm that the responses included in this submission have not materially changed from the drafts shared with Natural England. Therefore, the Applicant's expectation is that this verbal position will be reflected in Natural England's responses to these Secretary of State points.

~~1.1.1.2~~1.1.1.3 ~~The Applicants' position is that the mitigation~~ area south of Newton-with-Scales provides long term habitat mitigation to non-breeding waders (including golden plover) for the purpose of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). ~~Notwithstanding their position, the Applicants have, without prejudice, identified an alternative mitigation option (Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh) which would also avoid AEoI on non-breeding golden plover and EIA impacts on non-breeding waders. This note therefore provides an update on the approach to mitigating effects of permanent habitat loss on non-breeding waders (including golden plover), including alternative mitigation solutions to reduce the risk of bird strike and ensure the acceptability of the proposed mitigation to~~

[aviation stakeholders, whilst also being sufficient to mitigate significant residual EIA effects on non-breeding wading birds.](#)

~~1.1.1.3~~ [1.1.1.4](#) The Applicants have continued to engage with Natural England to address the comments raised in their Deadline 7 submission (REP7-049) ~~and to close out residual concerns and welcome Natural England's latest advice that, subject to seeing the Applicants' final submissions, AEoI can be ruled out. As part of this engagement, Natural England has been consulted on the principles of the alternative mitigation options included within this updated note. Natural England has recognised the possible benefits of the approach to address potential permanent habitat loss and has not objected in principle, whilst noting that more detailed information – as set out in this note and included in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (document reference J6/F08) – will be required to enable formal advice to be provided.~~

~~1.1.1.4~~ [1.1.1.5](#) This technical note should be read alongside the OEMP (Rev F07 document reference J6/F08), which ~~has been updated to include a without prejudice outline management plan (Appendix I) for delivery of alternative~~ [provides further detail on the proposed](#) mitigation measures ~~at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh to address potential permanent impacts, and takes into consideration feedback received from Natural England to date.~~ [set out in this note.](#)

1.2 Alternative permanent mitigation

1.2.1 Background information

1.2.1.1 This note considers alternative mitigation of potential permanent impacts caused by the [potential](#) displacement of birds due to habitat loss ~~at~~ [in the vicinity of](#) the onshore substation sites.

1.2.1.2 The permanent mitigation area south of Newton-with-Scales is the Applicants' preferred option. The Applicants have described (in the Outline Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (~~REP7-034~~) [oWHMP](#)); [S D3 8/F06](#)) that the mitigation measures will be implemented using an adaptive management approach supported by ongoing monitoring and an escalation process, to avoid an unacceptable increase in bird strike risk at Warton Aerodrome. Data was received from BAE Systems, which has allowed the Applicants to undertake the bird strike risk assessment for Warton Aerodrome and confirm that the approach in the ~~Outline Wildlife Hazard Management Plan~~ [oWHMP](#) is acceptable. BAE ~~is~~ [has](#) also ~~carrying~~ [carried](#) out ~~their~~ [its](#) own bird strike risk assessment. [\(C1-023\)](#).

1.2.1.3 The south of Newton-with-Scales mitigation area is proposed to accommodate birds [potentially](#) displaced ~~at~~ [from the vicinity of](#) the onshore substation sites. The Applicants and Natural England agree that the purpose of the proposed mitigation areas at south of Newton-with-Scales and Lytham Moss is *'to provide habitat for species already within the area and Ribble SPA/Ramsar which have been potentially impacted or displaced from FLL habitat as a result of the Project, not to attract birds from elsewhere outside the SPA* (see Natural England's

response to Q14 of the RIES (REP6-194)). However, BAE Systems and the DIO are concerned that the measures [on land south of Newton-with-Scales](#) could increase bird numbers and [has have](#) the potential to attract [unintended](#) bird species ~~not intended~~ (in particular, gulls and other large potentially hazardous species).

1.2.1.4 As shown in the ~~Applicants~~[Applicants'](#) bird strike risk assessment (Appendix C of the oWHMP (S_D3_8-~~F05~~)/[F06](#))), the measures south of Newton-with-Scales (and all other mitigation areas) will not lead to an unacceptable increase in bird strike. -In all circumstances, with the deployment of monitoring, agreed trigger levels and both passive and active management measures, the Applicants are confident that the risk of bird strike will not exceed existing levels. -However, due to ~~the~~ ongoing ~~objection by~~[concerns from](#) BAE Systems (as set out in their closing statement (REP7-055))), there remains some uncertainty surrounding the deliverability of mitigation in this area. [The Applicants' Response to Secretary of State Letter and Request for Information 2 \(S SoSQ 14\) also provides a further update on discussions with BAE Systems and DIO – see paragraph 1.3.2.11 onwards and the agreed joint response between BAE Systems and the Applicants to Point 21.](#)

~~1.2.1.5 Therefore, the Applicants have outlined an alternative mitigation option, which would satisfy Natural England's concerns regarding the suitability of mitigation (noting the Applicants maintain that the project impact from permanent habitat loss does not represent AEoI for the non-breeding golden plover of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site due to the substations not being on FLL~~[In response to the ongoing concerns of BAE and DIO, the Applicants have updated the measures proposed at land south of Newton-with-Scales to focus on maintaining existing habitats using grassland and rush management and reduced disturbance during the overwintering period \(see OEMP \(J6/F08\)\). The approach focuses on retaining the site's existing habitats through ongoing management activities to provide a safe haven for non-breeding waders, such as golden plover. The updated mitigation also reflects the minimal impact of the Projects on non-breeding waders and is proportionate to the risk of residual effects on birds.](#)

~~1.2.1.5~~[1.2.1.6](#)[The Applicants have additionally outlined an alternative permanent mitigation option at Lytham Moss, which it believes would be acceptable to Natural England in respect of providing suitable mitigation \(to address significant residual EIA impacts\)](#), and BAE Systems and DIO concerns regarding aviation safeguarding at Warton Aerodrome.

~~1.2.1.6~~[1.2.1.7](#)The type of measures that will be implemented at the south of Newton-with-Scales environmental mitigation area are described in Appendix B of the OEMP, and a summary is provided in **Table 1.1** below. The location of the mitigation area south of Newton-with-Scales is shown on **Figure 1-1**. ~~The measures that will be implemented at the alternative mitigation area (if required) are described in Appendix I of the OEMP and the location can be seen in Figure 1-2. A summary of the measures can be found in Section 1.2.4.~~

Table 1.1: Summary of the measures to be implemented at the south of Newton-with-Scales mitigation area

Mitigation Area	Summary of measures
Land south of Newton-with-Scales	<p>Species: This mitigation area is specifically designed for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Golden plover Non-breeding waders, including golden plover, lapwing, snipe and curlew. <p>Size: this mitigation area would permanently occupy approximately 30 ha of land south of Newton-with-Scales.</p> <p>Measures:</p> <p>Water management – Adding sluices to existing ditches to control and raise the water table to suit waders and wildfowl</p> <p>Enhancement of scrapes to suit waders and wildfowl</p> <p>Maintenance and monitoring of existing habitat:</p> <p>Grassland management – Ensuring that there is a varied the sward height to suit is maintained for different waders and wildfowl using existing grazing practices</p> <p>Rush management – Ensuring that the rush cover is kept to no more than 30% existing extents (as defined by pre-construction monitoring)</p> <p>Reduction in disturbance – ensuring grazing and other activities are restricted within overwintering period (October to March inclusive)</p> <p>Monitoring: Based on the findings of the area ongoing monitoring, maintenance may be required to maintain the existing habitat relative to the pre-construction baseline.</p>




Figure 1-1: Environmental mitigation areas at south of Newton-with-Scales




Figure 1-2: Without prejudice alternative mitigation area at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh

1.2.2 Approach to Assessment

Magnitude of Potential Impact from the Transmission Assets Project

- 1.2.2.1 For clarity, the magnitude of potential impacts are separated into HRA and EIA level: (i) are measures required to reduce the risk of AEoI to the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, addressed through the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA-level mitigation); and (ii) are measures required to avoid or minimise significant adverse effects as assessed under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA-level mitigation).

Habitats Regulations Assessment

The threshold for FLL

- ~~1.2.2.2~~ This section reiterates the Applicants' closing statement in REP7-042. Effects on land beyond the SPA boundary will only constitute an AEoI if they are demonstrably linked to the SPA and essential to its functioning. There are a number of definitions from various [As set out in section 1.1 above](#), Natural England reports:

- ~~• **Functional linkage: How areas have advised verbally that are functionally linked to European sites have been considered when they may be affected by plans and projects – a review of authoritative decisions (NECR207)**~~

~~“In the context of this report, the term ‘functional linkage’ refers to the role or ‘function’ that land or sea beyond the boundary of a European site might fulfil in terms of supporting the populations for which the site was designated or classified. Such an area of land or sea [they consider there](#) is therefore ‘linked’ to the site in question because it provides a (potentially important) role in maintaining or restoring a protected population at favourable conservation status.”~~

- ~~• **Identification of Functionally Linked Land supporting Special Protection Areas (SPAs) waterbirds in the North West of England (NECR361)**~~

~~“For the purpose of this study, FLL is defined as: areas of land occurring within 20 km of an SPA, that are regularly used by significant numbers of qualifying bird species.”~~

- ~~• **Identification of Functionally Linked Land in the North West of England – Phase 2 (NECR483)**~~

~~“Functionally linked land’ (FLL) is a term often used to describe areas of land or sea occurring outside a designated site which is considered to be critical to, or necessary for, the ecological or behavioural functions in a relevant season of a qualifying feature for which a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) / Special Protection Area (SPA) / Ramsar site has been designated. These habitats are frequently used by SPA species~~

and supports the functionality and integrity of the designated sites for these features.”

1.2.2.3 — The common themes running through these definitions are that FLL is:

- Land beyond the boundary of a European site that supports a **significant number** of European site features.
- Land beyond the boundary of a European site that is **regularly used** by European site features.
- Land beyond the boundary of a European site that is **critical to maintain or restore** a protected population at favourable conservation status.

1.2.2.4 — Significance in population terms typically considers whether the potential impact affects >1% of the current population (or the citation population for unfavourable features) of the European site but frequency of use is rarely defined. However, for potential impacts on an area outside the SPA to significantly affect a population within a European site, the population must regularly rely upon the area for behaviours essential to maintain a population (i.e., feeding or roosting). Many areas within the foraging ranges of a European site might be occasionally used for range of behaviours, but the threshold for FLL infers that a population would not be able to maintain its current population in the site without access to the resource. The use of 1% of the relevant population is therefore considered to be precautionary.

Project impacts

1.2.2.5 — The potential impact from the Transmission Assets Project is very low and the Applicants’ position is that this is below the threshold for AEoI to the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site. Potential impacts were ruled out for all features based upon low numbers with the exception of non-breeding golden plover (see REP6-024).

1.2.2.6 — As originally reported in Appendix F of the OEMP (REP6-115), **Table 1.2** shows that golden plover were recorded in numbers exceeding 1% of the current SPA population on a one-off peak count. Golden plover were only recorded on one of 14 survey visits. When the average of the two annual peak counts and the overall mean number of birds are considered, the result is however below 1% of the current SPA population, with only seven birds on average affected.

Table 1.2: Comparison between the recorded peaks, means, and frequencies and the citation and current population sizes.

Species	2022/23 peak	2023/24 peak	Overall peak	Mean peak	Mean	Frequency (%)
Number of birds						
Golden plover	0	104	104	52	7	7
% of citation						
Golden plover	0.00	2.89	2.89	1.45	0.19	7

Species	2022/23 peak	2023/24 peak	Overall peak	Mean peak	Mean	Frequency (%)
% of current SPA population						
Golden-plover	0.00	1.90	1.90	0.95	0.13	7

~~1.2.2.7 Although it is unknown how much of the available arable and pasture habitats within their 10 km foraging range the golden plover actually use, it is clear that the loss of grassland at the onshore substations is very small in comparison with other available pasture and arable habitats within 10 km (see **Table 1.3** and Appendix F of the OEMP (REP6-115)). This loss of 0.07% of habitat would affect an average of only 0.13% of the population and therefore represents a negligible impact and therefore no residual risk of AEol.~~

~~**Table 1.3: The proportion of arable and pasture habitats within on the 10 km foraging range of golden plover**basis that **are predicted to be permanently impacted**~~

Species	Permanent loss at the substations (m ²)	Available farmland within 10 km (m ²)	Proportion lost (%)
Golden-plover—10km	223,500	317,248,436	0.07

~~1.2.2.8 Although the surveys at onshore the substation sites recorded 104 golden plover on one occasion, this was not regular use (as demonstrated by the 14 surveys) meaning that the land is likely of low value for golden plover. Using definitions within Natural England reports, the availability of the onshore substation land is therefore not critical to maintain or restore the non-breeding golden plover population in the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site.~~

~~1.2.2.9 Therefore, the conclusions of no AEol reached in the ISAA are not dependent on the delivery of are unlikely to represent FLL and therefore mitigation.~~

~~1.2.2.10 All golden plover predicted to be permanently impacted were recorded loafing; the onshore substation sites therefore do not constitute important foraging or roosting resources, and the birds can loaf in numerous alternative fields within the SPA vicinity (see Table 1.3).~~

~~1.2.2.11 1.2.2.2 Notwithstanding the Applicants' position with regard to no AEol (as set out in REP7-042), if the is not required to rule out AEol (see the Applicants' Response to Secretary of State were to conclude that an AEol could not be ruled out, the Project would need to provide appropriate 'without prejudice' mitigation for an average of seven or more non-foraging golden plover between September and March inclusive, when golden plover are present in the area Letter and Request for Information 2 (S SoSQ 14). As such, this section has been removed.~~

EIA impacts

Environmental Impact Assessment

~~1.2.2.12~~ 1.2.2.3 The need for mitigation due to the permanent displacement from the onshore substation sites was identified during the EIA (F3.4 Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology (APP-090)) for non-breeding waders as the area was occasionally used by low numbers of oystercatcher, ~~lawing~~ lapwing, golden plover, ruff, curlew and snipe (**Table 1.2**). These were assessed in within the generic non-breeding wader species group for the EIA ~~and as (see the EIA was not directed at the European site level, they were not assessed against 1% of the SPA population (see HRA section above for SPA level impacts).~~

~~1.2.2.13~~ 1.2.2.4 Without further mitigation, the EIA concluded a moderate adverse effect on non-breeding waders. With the mitigation area at land south of Newton-with-Scales applied, the residual effect is reduced to minor and is not significant for EIA purposes. Only lapwing, golden plover, curlew and snipe had average counts above one bird, so the mitigation was developed for those species (see **Table 1.2**). The oystercatcher and ruff were recorded so infrequently and in such low numbers that the potential impacts to these species were deemed to be negligible, although the proposed mitigations may provide benefits to these species.

~~1.2.2.14~~ 1.2.2.5 Potential impacts for all other species groups and at other times of year were minor or lower without the need for additional mitigation. These impacts were therefore not significant in EIA terms and other receptors are not considered further for permanent impacts.

Table 1.2: All non-breeding waders present at the onshore substations

Species group	Species	2022/23 peak	2023/24 peak	Overall peak	Mean peak	Mean	Frequency (%)
Waders	Oystercatcher	2	0	2	1	0	7
	Lapwing	12	120	120	66	9	14
	Golden plover	0	104	104	52	7	7
	Ruff	2	0	2	1	0	7
	Curlew	0	4	4	2	1	14
	Snipe	28	1	28	15	2	14

The Applicants' position

~~1.2.2.15~~ ~~The Applicants' position is that, due to the low frequency of use of the onshore substation sites by SPA features (i.e., golden plover), the area of land to be permanently lost does not meet the threshold of FLL as per the guidance noted above. Although it contained greater than 1% of the SPA population of a qualifying population (golden plover) on one occasion, this was not regular use (only recorded 7% of the time) and is~~

~~therefore not critical to maintain or restore the non-breeding golden plover population in the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site. However, the Applicants are committed to providing EIA level mitigation for adverse effects to non-breeding waders, including golden plover.~~

~~1.2.2.16 — Notwithstanding the Applicants position, and in the event that the Secretary of State agrees with Natural England and cannot rule out AEoI on the Ribble and Alt Estuaries, the Applicants also present mitigation to rule out AEoI on a ‘without prejudice’ basis.~~

~~1.2.2.17 — The following sections provide further evidence to assure Natural England and the Secretary of State that the alternative mitigation would be suitable to avoid potential EIA level impacts on non-breeding waders, including golden plover, and avoid AEoI on the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site.~~

1.2.3 Methodology for identifying alternative mitigation

Purpose of the mitigation

1.2.3.1 As previously discussed, the purpose of the mitigation is to provide EIA level mitigation ~~(and ‘without prejudice’ mitigation in the event that the Secretary of State cannot rule out AEoI)~~ for low numbers of non-breeding waders, ~~including golden plover.~~

1.2.3.2 As highlighted in **Table 1.2**~~Table 1.4~~, the EIA ~~–~~ level mitigation needs to support, on average, at least nine lapwing, seven golden plover, one curlew and two snipe. ~~In the case that the Secretary of State cannot rule out AEoI, this ‘without prejudice’ mitigation needs to support, on average, at least seven golden plover.~~ This mitigation needs to be provided over the wintering period between September and March when these birds are present in the area.

1.2.3.3 The habitats being lost are improved and semi-improved grazed grassland.

1.2.3.4 The area being lost is 22.35 ha, (across both substation sites), although due to the low frequency with which birds used the area combined with the availability of other suitable habitat, it is not considered of critical value.

Screening

1.2.3.5 A screening process was undertaken to identify areas where appropriate mitigation could be delivered to ~~satisfy concerns from both Natural England (with regard to~~ mitigate for significant residual effects on ornithological receptors (in an EIA context) and satisfy concerns from BAE Systems and the DIO (with regard to concerns about potential increased risk of bird strike). The screening took account of:

- Habitats – The loss of grassland habitats that are occasionally used by small numbers of non-breeding waders including golden plover.

- Presence of birds at the site – In order to provide a direct benefit to the birds predicted to be impacted, the mitigation site must be demonstrably accessible to those birds.
- Distance from impact – The area must benefit the [wading](#) birds from the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site.
- Distance from SPA – The area must be within the foraging range of the impacted birds, e.g., the non-breeding golden plover foraging range is assumed to be 10 km based upon the Natural England [Site of Special Scientific Interest \(SSSI\)](#) impact zone buffer distance (see **Table 1.3**).
- Distance from Warton Aerodrome – In order to satisfy BAE Systems and the DIO aviation concerns regarding bird strike risk, the mitigation should be as far away from Warton Aerodrome as possible ~~and on the southern bank of the Ribble Estuary to avoid birds crossing the aerodromes flightpath.~~
- Therefore, to qualify as suitable mitigation, the area:
 - Must be within the foraging ranges for the non-breeding waders present (e.g., 10 km for golden plover).
 - Must contain, benefit or create habitats suitable to support the non-breeding wader assemblage that will be impacted.

1.2.3.6 The screening exercise identified potential measures to enhance habitat and reduce disturbance for non-breeding golden plover, lapwing, curlew and snipe on the southern bank of the estuary at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh. This option was investigated further to determine bird distribution and the suitability of the proposed measures. [However, this option has recently received internal funding from Natural England and is no longer available for delivery by the Applicants \(although the Applicants would note that the provision of this funding and the supported measures will generally provide benefits for non-breeding wading birds\).](#)

1.2.3.7 A further ten existing schemes were identified; however, these were largely beyond connectivity for ~~the~~[wading birds and](#) golden plover of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA, or contained habitats that were not suitable to support ~~golden plover.~~[these species.](#) These have therefore been screened out from further consideration [as mitigation](#) at this stage.

~~1.2.3.8~~ ~~Privately~~[Options on privately](#) owned land parcels were ~~not~~[also](#) considered ~~feasible~~ as part of this screening process. ~~The reasons behind this are:~~

- ~~There are limited options within the existing Transmission Assets Order Limits where the same scale of mitigation as Newton-with-Scales could be applied, and the projects have no compulsory purchase powers beyond this boundary;~~
- ~~BAE/DIO have indicated, noting that only land to the many parts of the search area (particularly south of the River Ribble Estuary would be potentially considered as an acceptable alternative in aviation impact terms;~~

-
- 1.2.3.8 ~~Much of the privately owned land bordering the southern bank of the Ribble Estuary is) are characterised by~~ Grade 1 ~~or~~ Grade 2 land in arable production. ~~Removal and use of this land~~ these areas for ornithological ornithology mitigation would lead to loss of ~~best and most versatile~~ productive agricultural land ~~;~~;

- ~~The arable land to the south of the Ribble currently supports the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA pink-footed goose and whooper swan, converting this to pasture would likely cause a significant impact upon these features;~~
- ~~Existing pasture already has the capacity to support golden plover so securing pasture will not increase their carrying capacity within the area. This point is alluded to in the supplementary conservation advice for golden plover in the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA (last updated by Natural England on 5 October 2023). This states that the evidence supports the feature being in good condition and/or currently un-impacted by anthropogenic activities in relation to the extent, distribution and availability of supporting habitat both within and outside of the SPA.~~

~~Evidence to support the selection of Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh~~

~~Presence of birds~~

- ~~1.2.3.9 To identify areas which are used by the non-breeding bird assemblage, work by Still *et al.* (2015) was reviewed and the location of roosts and abundance of birds in different regions (i.e. sectors) of the Ribble Estuary analysed.~~

- ~~Lapwing Figure 1-3 below shows the value of the area historically for lapwing with relevant sector 5-year averages of 864, 1,728, 5,435 and 284 respectively. This demonstrates that this was a key area for lapwing in the Ribble Estuary and whilst there is limited recent available data in the public domain, there is no evidence that the importance of this area has diminished over time. The Still *et al.* (2015) data indicates that up to seven high tide roosts are located within Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh for lapwing. Discussions with the Natural England NNR manager (30 January 2026) confirmed that high numbers of lapwing continue to use this area.~~



Figure 1-3: Lapwing 5-year abundance by sector (2007/08 – 2011/12) as taken from Still *et al.* (2015).

-
- ~~• Golden plover – Figure 1.4 below shows the value of the area historically for golden plover with relevant sector 5-year averages of 718, 1,186, 1,075 and 41 respectively. This demonstrates that this was a key area for golden plover in the Ribble Estuary and whilst there is limited recent available data in the public domain, there is no evidence that the importance of this area has diminished over time. The Still *et al.* (2015) data indicates that up to two high tide roosts are located within Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh for golden plover. Discussions with the Natural England NNR manager (30 January 2026) confirmed that high numbers of golden plover (regularly hundreds) continue to use this area.~~

-
- ~~Curlew – Figure 1-5 below shows the value of the area historically for curlew with relevant sector 5-year averages of 59, 91, 321 and 4 respectively. This demonstrates that this was a key area for curlew in the Ribble Estuary and whilst there is limited recent data in the public domain, there is no evidence that the importance of this area has diminished over time. The Still *et al.* (2015) data indicates that one high tide roost is located within Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh for curlew. Discussions with the Natural England NNR manager (30 January 2026) confirmed that curlew continue to use this area.~~



Figure 1-5: Curlew 5-year abundance by sector (2007/08 – 2011/12) as taken from Still *et al.* (2015)

- ~~• Snipe – Still *et al.* (2015) did not report on snipe, and snipe are often under recorded by waterbird counts such as the WeBS core and low tide counts. However, it is likely that snipe are distributed at low densities throughout wet areas with tussocky grass long enough to provide cover⁴; these conditions are found in the upper saltmarsh Discussions with the Natural England NNR manager (30 January 2026) confirmed that high numbers of snipe use this area.~~

Species ecology

Table 1.3: Species foraging range, foraging and roosting habitats during the non-breeding season.

Species	Foraging range	Diet	Foraging habitat	Roosting habitat
Lapwing	Unreported	Adult and larval insects (e.g. beetles), spiders, snails, earthworms ³	Damp grassland, stubble and ploughed fields ⁴	Scrapes and short grassland ⁴
Golden plover	10 km ¹	Earthworms, crane fly (and larva), spiders, beetles ³	Damp grassland, stubble and ploughed fields ⁴	Scrapes and short grassland ⁴
Curlew	15 km ²	Estuarine invertebrates and earthworms in terrestrial fields ³	Mudflats and coastal pasture / grassland. ⁵	Pools in saltmarsh and coastal wet pasture or grassland. ⁵
Snipe	Unreported	Larval insects, adult insects, earthworms, small crustaceans, small gastropods and spiders ³	Upper reaches of estuaries and coastal meadows with long grass and damp soils ³	Upper reaches of estuaries and coastal meadows with long grass and damp soils ³

¹ Natural England, ² Bowland Ecology (~~2023~~2021), ³ e.g., Birdlife International (2026), ⁴ Gillings & Fuller (1999), ⁵ Mander, *et al.* (2022)

Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives for Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA

~~1.2.3.10~~[1.2.3.9](#)In addition to the screening criteria, the screening process looked at the Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives (SACO) and Site Improvement Plan (SIP) for the species impacted where applicable. This was to identify the mitigation measures that could have the greatest benefits and to tailor mitigation to directly benefit the potentially impacted species within the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site. While there is no residual risk of AEoI and mitigation is not required for HRA purposes, consideration of the SACO of the Ribble and Alt

⁴ ~~Common Snipe Gallinago Gallinago Species Factsheet | BirdLife DataZone~~

[Estuaries SPA is useful to ensure the mitigation measures are appropriate for non-breeding waders generally.](#)

~~1.2.3.11~~[1.2.3.10](#)As lapwing, curlew and snipe are not designated features, no supplementary advice exists so assumptions about their status in the area can only be inferred from population changes. **Figure 1-2:** shows the five-year trends for the impacted species. Golden plover and lapwing have increased and are in favourable condition, curlew declined but have since increased ~~to~~[in](#) 2017/18 to remain stable over the period. Snipe appear [to](#) have declined but they are likely to be poorly recorded by the WeBS due to their cryptic nature.




Figure 1-2: Indexed 5-year averages in the Ribble Estuary for the impacted species as taken from Calbrade, *et al.* (2025) data

~~1.2.3.12~~[1.2.3.11](#)As there are no data on the threats and impacts to lapwing, curlew, or snipe within the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA, golden plover has been used as a proxy. Golden plover often associates with lapwing and have similar foraging and roosting requirements.

~~1.2.3.13~~[1.2.3.12](#)The supplementary advice for golden plover has a number of attributes, targets and supporting notes. Although golden plover, and its attributes, are in favourable condition for most attributes, there is some uncertainty surrounding the impact of disturbance within the site, and habitat quality at roosting sites.

Table 1.4: Summary of the supplementary advice for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA golden plover feature (as taken from Natural England’s SACO on the designated sites viewer²)

Attribute	Target
Disturbance caused by human activity	Restrict the frequency, duration and/or intensity of disturbance affecting roosting, foraging, feeding, moulting and/or loafing birds so that they are not significantly disturbed
Supporting habitat: vegetation characteristics for roosting	Maintain a vegetation structure of key roost sites dominated by bare ground or a short sparsely-vegetated sward.

~~1.2.3.14~~ In addition, the Ribble Sefton Site Improvement Plan (SIP) written in 2014 identifies disturbance as a threat to golden plover (

~~1.2.3.13~~ **Table 1.7).** ~~The SIP does not identify specific physical measures such as fencing to address this but instead education, investigation, research and monitoring.~~ Table 1.5).

~~1.2.3.15~~ ~~1.2.3.14~~ There are no specific recommendations for habitat enhancement measures for any of the habitats utilised by waterbirds such as roost sites.

² [Designated Sites View](#)

Table 1.5: The Ribble Sefton Site Improvement Plan (as taken from Natural England's Access to Evidence³)

Threats and pressures				
Priority and issue	Pressure or threat	Features affected	Measure	Delivery bodies
6. Public access/disturbance	Threat	A037(NB) Bewick's Swan, A038(NB) Whooper Swan, A040(NB) Pink-footed Goose, A048(NB) Common shelduck, A050(NB) Wigeon, A052(NB) Eurasian teal, A054(NB) Pintail, A130(NB) Eurasian oystercatcher, A137(NB) Ringed Plover, A140(NB) Golden Plover , A141(NB) Grey Plover, A143(NB) Red knot, A144(NB) Sanderling, A149(NB) Dunlin, A151(B) Ruff, A156(NB) Black-tailed Godwit, A157(NB) Bar-tailed Godwit, A162(NB) Common redshank, A183(B) Lesser Black-backed Gull, A193(B) Common Tern, H2110 Shifting dunes, H2120 Shifting dunes with marram, H2130 Dune grassland, H2150 Coastal dune heathland, H2170 Dunes with creeping willow, H2190 Humid dune slacks, S1166 Great crested newt, S1395 Petalwort, Seabird assemblage, Waterbird assemblage	Raise public awareness via Landscape Partnership Scheme and the new Sefton Coastal Strategy	Natural England, Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council, Sefton Coast Partnership

~~1.2.3.16~~[1.2.3.15](#) ~~In addition to meeting the screening criteria outlined above, this additional~~[This](#) evidence suggests that meaningful benefits for the impacted non-breeding wader assemblage can be achieved through mitigation that improves roosting habitat and reduces recreational disturbance.

1.2.4 Permanent mitigation options

1.2.4.1 As with the temporary impacts, mitigation for potential permanent impacts now comprise several options. Option 1 (land south of Newton-with-Scales) is the preferred option: it was assessed in the [DCO Development Consent Order \(DCO\)](#) application, carried through the examination, and has been agreed with Natural England. Option 2 constitutes an alternative mitigation area, addressed in detail below.

Option 1 – South of Newton-with-Scales

1.2.4.2 The mitigation at the land south of Newton-with-Scales has already been discussed at length ([see section 1.2.1](#)) and ~~agreed with Natural~~

³ Site Improvement Plan: Sefton Ribble - SIP212

~~England~~. Table 1.1). For further detail about the land south of Newton-with-Scales see Appendix B of the OEMP (~~REP6-115~~). ~~As it has~~ document reference J6/F08), noting the measures at land south of Newton-with-Scales have been adapted to ensure existing habitats would be maintained to provide wintering refuge, as the relevant wading bird species already ~~been agreed as a mechanism to reduce the EIA level impacts to acceptable levels (utilise the area and Natural England agree this would also rule out AEol)~~, this option is not discussed further in this document. existing habitats are suitable for these species (see Table 1.1).

Option 2 – Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh- Lytham Moss – permanent mitigation

Overview

1.2.4.3 The area of land that was originally proposed to deliver temporary mitigation at Lytham Moss is now also, in part, being proposed for the permanent mitigation, with measures being implemented in the southern part of the mitigation area following construction and taken forward for the lifetime of the project. The area in which permanent measures would be implemented is an area of arable land that is approximately 7.7 ha in size (as shown in Figure 1-3). Lytham Moss is widely accepted as an area of FLL for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA. A large number of wader and wildfowl species (including golden plover) were identified by both the Applicants' data and the Fylde Bird Club data, which showed golden plover using this area (APP-090 and APP-094). In addition, lapwing, curlew and snipe are known to frequent this area alongside other waders such as oystercatcher, redshank and black-tailed godwit.

1.2.4.4 The Applicants have engaged with the landowner's agent regarding the use of these field parcels for the purposes of permanent mitigation, and they have responded positively, indicating this would be possible in principle. Further, Blackpool Airport have confirmed that they would be content with this mitigation subject to detailed information on monitoring and management to be agreed post-consent and secured in the OEMP (document reference J6/F08). Due to the greater distance between Lytham Moss and Warton aerodrome than south of Newton-with-Scales, this is also less likely to be a concern for BAE (noting BAE have had less concern with the proposed mitigation measures at Lytham Moss for the construction phase and proposed permanent mitigation measures at Lytham Moss are similar, although considerably reduced to reflect the reduced impact during the operational phase of the project).

Objective of mitigation measures

1.2.4.5 The measures proposed at this alternative location would comprise broadly the same core measures set out for Newton-with-Scales in Table 1.1 above (see the OEMP (J06/F08) for full detail) as this would provide the necessary sanctuary areas for the relevant waterbird

[species, while also ensuring it is as similar as possible to the land being lost at the Morecambe substation site.](#)

- ~~1.2.4.3 — [Measures](#) Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh forms part of the Ribble and Alt Estuary SPA and Ramsar, Ribble Estuary NNR and SSSI and is composed of large areas of saltmarsh on the southern bank of the Ribble Estuary. It stretches over a total area of 1,2109.09 hectares and includes the full range of saltmarsh habitats from pioneer saltmarsh at the lower limits to coastal grazing pasture above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT).~~
- ~~1.2.4.4 — There is a freshwater influence where the River Crossens enters the saltmarsh (around cattle compartment 1a). Lapwing and golden plover are concentrated in these upper saltmarsh areas, curlew occur throughout at low densities, and snipe favour the longer grass areas that provide cover~~
- ~~1.2.4.5 — Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh is managed by Natural England in collaboration with the RSPB and Lytham District Wildfowlers Association (LDWA); local farmers are invited to graze their cattle on the land each year. Grazing is undertaken from 4 May to 4 October subject to the tides. The size of the herd is up to 800 cows and is managed by the NNR team during this period. There is currently no fencing on the saltmarsh so the grazing is uncontrolled. This has resulted in some areas of the saltmarsh being overgrazed and other areas where the sward height is much longer.~~
- ~~1.2.4.6 — The Applicants have held several meetings with the Reserve Manager at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh to discuss and develop the potential options for mitigation at the site and these discussions have informed the proposals contained within this section.~~
- ~~1.2.4.7 — Similarly to the land south of Newton with Scales the mitigation measures would reduce the potential EIA level impacts to acceptable levels and rule out AEoI.~~

Objectives of mitigation measures

- ~~1.2.4.8 — The primary objective of the mitigation measures area is to provide permanent alternative habitat for non-breeding waders due to the permanent habitat loss at the onshore substations for lapwing, golden plover, curlew, and snipe. Although the mitigation is targeted at these species it is likely to benefit a far greater suite of waders within the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site.~~
- ~~1.2.4.9 — Whilst there is little detail in the literature on species specific conservation measures during the non-breeding season, it is recognised that many of these species have similar non-breeding habitat requirements and are all found in similar wet grassland, saltmarsh and shallow scrape habitats during the non-breeding period. The short grassland and scrapes provide an open habitat which encourages many species of waterbirds to feel safe and provides roosting and loafing opportunities for birds. The aim in this area is to improve habitats for roosting, loafing and foraging birds and reduce disturbance on the lapwing, golden plover, curlew and snipe that~~

~~currently use this area and that may be impacted by the loss of land at the substations.~~

Measures

- ~~1.2.4.10 — The mitigation measures comprise habitat improvements, interventions to reduce disturbance and improvements to a bird hide (not considered as a key mitigation measure but would form part of a package of measures to help aid the reserve with its monitoring). These measures are captured in an outline management plan (Appendix I of the updated OEMP (Rev F07). An indicative plan of the measures at the Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh site can be seen in **Figure 1-7**.~~

Habitat improvements

Description

- ~~1.2.4.11 — The proposal is to use fencing to divide cattle grazing on Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh into four discrete compartments so that grazing can be controlled and sward height heterogeneity increased. Currently the area is already grazed, however a lack of control over this has led to some areas being overgrazed and others under grazed creating sub-optimal habitat for non-breeding waders during the winter months.~~
- ~~1.2.4.12 — Any fencing to be installed will be designed to be sensitive to the SSSI features and will not impede or damage the dynamic coastal processes of the saltmarsh (including sediment dynamics) and its sensitive vegetation. The fencing will be designed in close collaboration with the Natural England site team at the NNR with the necessary SSSI assents and other permissions sought as part of the detailed design of the proposals. The fencing will also be designed to make it easy to move cattle between the compartments (i.e. avoiding narrow gateways).~~
- ~~1.2.4.13 — Many of the water troughs on the saltmarsh are not operational due to damage and/or are not connected to a reliable water supply. This results in heavy cattle movements to the few areas where water is available and damage to the saltmarsh habitat. The existing water supply and limited distribution of functioning water troughs would also inhibit the success of the proposed rotational grazing system. Therefore, the proposed habitat improvement measures also include the installation of a new water supply pipeline and replace/repair/reinstate existing water troughs. The design and installation of the water supply pipeline and water troughs will be in accordance with the necessary SSSI assents.~~

Benefits

- ~~● — Localised poaching
 - ~~— Repeated trampling of the ground by hooved animals can increase the amount of muddy and wet areas and increase feeding and roosting resources. It may be important to stock at high densities in small areas prior to the non-breeding season in order to create areas of bare ground and provide optimal roosting conditions.~~~~

- ~~Sward heterogeneity~~

- ~~— Having different grass heights can give birds options for slightly taller or shorter grass heights, depending on their preference. The proposal would be to graze some areas short, as loafing and roosting lapwing and golden plover prefer grass heights below 10 cm (Gillings & Fuller, 1999), whilst snipe prefer longer grass heights (BirdLife International, 2026) where they can remain undetected. The areas to be kept short will be the upper saltmarsh habitats, such as those found around cattle compartment 1a, however the final grazing regime will be evidence based and will use the latest bird monitoring data from the site to inform grazing rotation to benefit the target species.~~

- ~~Fertilisation~~

- ~~— Low levels of organic (i.e., cattle with no pesticides) fertilisation can increase soil invertebrate diversity and abundance and bring soil invertebrates closer to the surface in localised patches. Ford *et al.* (2013) also found a high level of terrestrial invertebrate abundance and diversity on Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh, with many Coleoptera, Araneae and Tipulidae present (all of which are prey items for lapwing, golden plover, and snipe, see **Table 1.5**), which may benefit from either fertilisation or habitat heterogeneity.~~




Figure 1-7: An indicative layout of the proposed measures at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh

Reducing disturbance

Description

~~1.2.4.14~~ — ~~People are currently accessing the saltmarsh from Marine Drive for informal recreational purposes such as walking, dog walking, bird watching, etc. This is largely due to the lack of fencing and signage to explain the area forms part of a nature reserve and is not a public right of way. This unmanaged access results in disturbance to birds and other wildlife using the saltmarsh and potentially damages the sensitive saltmarsh habitats. It is proposed to replace the existing degraded fence delineating the saltmarsh boundary along Marine Drive. The replacement fence will prevent people from accessing the area and encourage them to use alternative areas. The design of the fencing will be appropriate for its purpose and the landscape setting.~~

~~Whilst no supplementary advice exists for lapwing, curlew or snipe as they are not site features, the Sefton Ribble~~

1.2.4.6 The permanent mitigation measures proposed at Lytham Moss include:

- Management of agricultural activities – Lytham Moss is currently used for arable production with predominantly spring-sown crops. It is proposed that the mitigation area shown on Figure 1-3 is left as stubble over the winter. Wintering waders such as lapwing, golden plover, curlew and black-tailed godwit favour stubble/short grassland as it provides safe roosting, loafing and foraging opportunities.
- Reduction in disturbance – cultivation activities will be avoided during the overwintering period (October to March inclusive).

1.2.4.7 As set out in Appendix B of the OEMP (J6/F08), the temporary mitigation area at Lytham Moss will provide mitigation during the construction phase for a wide range of waterbird species, including golden plover. As such, should the construction phase for one project overlap with the operation and maintenance phase for another (e.g. a sequential construction scenario), then the relevant construction mitigation would be applied to the Lytham Moss mitigation area (effectively 'scaling up' mitigation to reflect the construction effects). This would provide a greater level of mitigation (e.g. creation of temporary scrapes) and therefore a much greater capacity for supporting waterbirds (including golden plover) than the alternative permanent mitigation measures set out above, rather than representing any potential conflict between the temporary (i.e. construction) and permanent (i.e. operation) mitigations. Further, the areas potentially impacted by permanent habitat loss (i.e. in the vicinity of the substation sites) overlap those impacted during the construction phase and therefore there would be no need for additional mitigation for permanent impacts during the construction phase.

~~1.2.4.1~~ — ~~Site Improvement Plan identifies recreational disturbance as the only current threat to golden plover.~~

Benefits

- ~~1.2.4.2 — As has already been identified by Natural England, disturbance is a threat to non-breeding golden plover in the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA. The proposal aims to manage public access to sensitive saltmarsh areas where no public footpaths exist and will not impede public rights-of-way.~~
- ~~1.2.4.3 — Reducing disturbance allows birds to focus on resting and/or feeding and reduces the energy lost from increased vigilance and evasion flights. Reductions in disturbance may lead to increases in their fitness and may reduce wintering mortality and increase breeding productivity if more healthy birds return to their breeding grounds (i.e. carry over effect). Reducing disturbance will provide non-breeding waders, including golden plover, with a safe, disturbance-free zone where they can carry out essential activities.~~
- ~~1.2.4.4 — Although no data exists on whether recreational disturbance threatens the Ribble Estuary lapwing, curlew or snipe, this measure is likely to benefit a wide range of non-breeding and breeding waterbirds and it is known that lapwing, golden plover, curlew and snipe are present in the area where disturbance will be reduced. All waders are sensitive to disturbance, especially at roost sites.~~

Deliverability of alternative permanent mitigation

- ~~1.2.4.5 — The measures have been included in the oOEMP (Appendix I) and secured via DCO Schedules 2A & 2B, Requirement 12 (Ecological Management Plan), but with an enforceable commitment to provide the necessary funding for the works. All measures, if deemed necessary, would be implemented prior to the start of works at the substation sites. The Applicants have been in positive discussions with Natural England NNR team who have been supportive of the proposals, as the landowner and manager of Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh, regarding the implementation of the alternative mitigation measures. Whilst these discussions are ongoing, the Applicants consider there to be a viable route for delivery.~~
- ~~1.2.4.6 — The detailed design will be undertaken by the Applicants in consultation with relevant stakeholders (including the Natural England NNR team, the RSPB, West Lancashire Council and Sefton Council). The design of the proposed measures will be in line with those set out in the Outline Management Plan for Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh (Appendix I of the OEMP (Rev F07)).~~
- ~~1.2.4.7 — The Applicants will have overall responsibility for the delivery and implementation of the measures with support on the ground from the NNR management team.~~
- ~~1.2.4.8 — These measures are considered additional to the standard management measures implemented within the SPA because:~~
- ~~• fencing of the saltmarsh and the replacement of water troughs to control grazing is not part of the current Site Improvement Plan (see paragraph 1.2.3.14) and there is no certainty that the measures will~~

be implemented. The lack of controlled grazing means that the habitats are not being managed to their full potential for attracting and sustaining bird species;

- the measures aim to improve the habitats of golden plover, lapwing, curlew and snipe which are not the current target species of the NNR; and
- the replacement of dilapidated fencing at Marine Drive will address the wider objective of managing informal recreation on the sensitive saltmarsh habitats.

1.2.4.9 The Applicants consider that the measures proposed to improve upper saltmarsh habitat and reduce human disturbance will benefit a wide range of bird species, including golden plover and go beyond standard management measures currently implemented or planned to be implemented on site. Based on consultation to date, the Applicants understand that this is also the view of Natural England's NNR Site Management Team in respect of its operational conservation function.

1.2.4.10 The Applicants continue to engage with aviation stakeholders regarding bird strike risk. Based on discussions during the DCO examination process, the alternative permanent mitigation at Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh is likely to be an acceptable option with regards to bird strike risk given its location to the south of the Ribble Estuary. This option was briefly presented to both BAE and DIO. DIO were broadly supportive.

Additional measures

1.2.4.11 In addition to the mitigation measures described above the Applicants seek to provide the following measures:

- Erect educational signs along the stretch of Marine Drive where new fencing will be installed
- Repair the existing bird hide to aid the ongoing monitoring of Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh. The bird hide would allow for monitoring during inclement weather and be screened to reduce disturbance on birds.

1.2.4.12 These additional measures are not required to mitigate the potential impacts of permanent habitat loss from the onshore substation sites but relate to Natural England's wider objectives for the Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh. These measures could be secured via a separate agreement and funding mechanism.

1.2.5 Comparison of mitigation options

1.2.5.1 **Table 1.6** below highlights the similarities and differences between the area of potential impact and both mitigation options. ~~Although there is a slight difference in habitats, the grazed upper saltmarsh habitats of Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh are of much greater importance for non-breeding waders than the onshore substation sites, and~~

improvements to these areas are likely to bring benefits to many more birds than the small number predicted to be potentially impacted.



Figure 1-3: Alternative permanent mitigation area at Lytham Moss

Table 1.6: Comparison of the onshore substations and proposed permanent mitigation areas

Site	Sector	Habitats	Area (ha)	Bird presence
Onshore Substation sites	Total area	Improved and semi-improved grazed pasture	22.35 <u>(total across both substations)</u>	Non-breeding waders are present on average in single figures
Option 1. South of Newton-with-Scales mitigation site	Total area	Wet grassland, scrapes <u>seasonal ponds</u> and rush pasture	30	Non-breeding waders are present on average in double figures
Option 2. Crossens Outer and Banks Marsh <u>Lytham Moss</u>	Total area	Grazed saltmarsh, tidal <u>Pasture</u> and non-tidal <u>arable</u>	4240.09 <u>7.7</u> (sufficient in scale to mitigate for the number of wading birds predicted to be permanently impacted at the substation sites – see Table 1.2)	<u>Lytham Moss is widely recognised as FLL with large numbers of waders frequenting the area.</u> Non-breeding waders are <u>regularly present on average in thousand</u> triple <u>figures.</u>
	Compartment 1a	Grazed upper saltmarsh	60.70	
	Compartment 1	Grazed saltmarsh, tidal and non-tidal	288.40	

Site	Sector	Habitats	Area (ha)	Bird presence
	Compartment 2	Grazed saltmarsh, tidal and non-tidal	595.95	
	Compartment 3	Grazed saltmarsh, tidal and non-tidal	265.05	

1.2.6 Conclusion

- ~~The Applicants disagree with and~~ Natural England have agreed (subject to Natural England reviewing the Applicants' final Response to Secretary of State Letter and Request for Information 2 (S SoSQ 14)) that the permanent loss of land at the substation sites ~~represents~~ does not represent an AEoI on the golden plover feature of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site. ~~However, the~~ and therefore mitigation is not required to rule out AEoI.
- The Applicants remain committed to providing permanent mitigation for ~~small numbers of non-breeding waders for~~ the significant residual EIA effect of permanent habitat loss ~~of land at and in the vicinity of~~ the onshore substation sites. on a small number of non-breeding waders (including golden plover).
- The loss of land at and in the vicinity of the onshore substation sites affects very low numbers of non-breeding waders on sub-optimal improved and semi-improved grassland habitats. ~~The Secretary of State can therefore be confident in reaching a conclusion of no~~ AEoI.
- The Applicants have presented two mitigation options to demonstrate that, in the event that their preferred option (Option 1 – measures delivered on land south of Newton-with-Scales) is not deliverable, the Transmission Assets Project can still be delivered whilst meeting its commitments under the EIA regulations.
- ~~The Applicants have also proposed that this mitigation is considered on a 'without prejudice' basis in the event that the Secretary of State concludes that permanent AEoI cannot be excluded for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, either alone or in combination.~~

1.3 References

BirdLife International (2026) IUCN Red List for birds. Downloaded from <https://datazone.birdlife.org> 04/02/2026

[Bowland Ecology \(2021\) Identification of Functionally Linked Land supporting SPA waterbirds in the North West of England. NECR361. Natural England](#)

[Calbrade, N.A., Birtles, G.A., Woodward, I.D., Feather, A., Hiza, B.M., Caulfield, E.B., Balmer, D.E., Peck, K., Wotton, S.R., Shaw, J.M. & Frost, T.M. 2025. Waterbirds in the UK 2023/24: The Wetland Bird Survey and Goose & Swan Monitoring Programme. BTO/RSPB/JNCC/ NatureScot. Thetford.](#)

Gillings, S. and Fuller, R.J., (1999) Winter ecology of golden plovers and lapwings: a review and consideration of extensive survey methods. Thetford, UK: British Trust for Ornithology.

~~Goodship, N.M. and Furness, R.W. (MacArthur Green) (2022) Disturbance Distances Review: An updated literature review of disturbance distances of selected bird species. NatureScot Research Report 1283.~~

~~Liu, Y., Lu, Y., Chen, C., Zhang, G., Wang, Q., Xu, Z. and Wang, Z., (2018) Behavioural responses of the whooper swans *Cygnus cygnus* to human disturbance and their adaptability to the different habitats in the Rongcheng lagoon of China. *Ecohydrology*, 11(7), p.e2013.~~

Mander, L., Nicholson, I., Green, R.M., Dodd, S.G., Forster, R.M. and Burton, N.H., (2022) Individual, sexual and temporal variation in the winter home range sizes of GPS-tagged Eurasian Curlews *Numenius arquata*. *Bird Study*, 69(1-2), pp.39-52.

~~Still, D.A., Calbrade, N.A. & Holt, S.A. (2015) Review and analysis of changes in waterbird use of the Mersey Estuary SPA, Mersey Narrows & North Wirral Foreshore pSPA and Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR173~~

~~Stroud, D.A., Bainbridge, I.P., Maddock, A., Anthony, S., Baker, H., Buxton, N., Chambers, D., Enlander, I., Hearn, R.D., Jennings, K.R., Mavor, R., Whitehead, S. & Wilson, J.D. — on behalf of the UK SPA & Ramsar Scientific Working Group (eds). 2016. The status of UK SPAs in the 2000s: the Third Network Review. JNCC, Peterborough.~~