

**RE: SZC Sch 5 No.6 - Info request 1 (clarifications required)**

**From:** NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd

**Sent:** Wed 01/12/2021 21:09

The HRA team have provided some clarification on SZC Sch 5 No.6 - Info request 1 as requested. Hopefully this answers your questions but please get in touch if you need anything else.

1. In relation to the first clarification that is being sought by EA, we would clarify that fulmar is a named component of the seabird assemblage feature of the Coquet Island SPA. This means it is not a qualifying feature in its own right but (as stated) only a named component of a qualifying feature. Also, fulmar is not a qualifying feature of the Farne Islands SPA, nor is it a named component of the seabird qualifying feature of the Farne Islands SPA.

Should you have any further queries re which seabird species may be qualifying features (or indeed named components of assemblage qualifying features) at particular SPAs, it is very quick to check this on Natural England's designated sites page ([Site Search \(naturalengland.org.uk\)](https://www.naturalengland.org.uk)).

Also, if EA are unclear as to how named components of assemblage qualifying features should be treated with regard to Appropriate Assessment Natural England should be able to advise.

2. In relation to the second clarification that is being sought by EA, the SPAs on the east coast of Scotland for which fulmar is a qualifying feature (or named component of the seabird assemblage qualifying feature) are as follows:

- Fowlsheugh
- Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast
- Troup Pennan and Lion's head
- East Caithness Cliffs
- North Caithness Cliffs
- Hoy
- Copinsay
- Auskerry
- Shiant isles
- Rousay
- Calf of Eday
- West Westray
- Fair Isle
- Sumburgh Head
- Foula
- Noss
- St Kilda
- Fetlar
- Hermaness, Saxavord and Valla Field

---

**From:** Senior Permitting Officer: Nuclear New Build  
National Permitting Service (Part of National Operations)

**Sent:** 30 November 2021 17:31

Following our initial review of the Schedule 5 No.6 submission for information request (IR)/task 1, we have identified two points for which clarification/additional information is required please:

- 1.) Section 1.2.16 of your Sch 5 No.6 IR1 response document states that: *At distances of 419km (Coquet Island) and 451km (Farne Islands) from the Project site, both of these SPAs are beyond the mean maximum breeding season foraging range plus 1 SD of all of their seabird qualifying features, other than fulmar (as a named component of the Coquet Island SPA seabird assemblage feature).* Following consideration of section 1.2.16, it is unclear whether fulmar are a feature of the Farne Island SPA, and/or the Coquet Island SPA. To fully address IR1 for purposes of our HRA, please clarify whether fulmar are features of both these SPAs.
- 2.) Section 1.2.16 of your Sch 5 No.6 IR1 response document states that: *'It is also the case that fulmar populations from some of the Scottish east coast SPAs are (theoretically) within foraging range of the Project site but (as outlined below) the issues concerning potential connectivity for distant seabird SPAs are adequately dealt with by limiting consideration to those in England'.* Please confirm and supply the locations of the Scottish East Coast SPAs that are within foraging range of the SZC project site. This detail is required for inclusion within our HRA (when considering likely significant effects).

If you have any queries regarding the above two requests, please let me know.