

Impact Assessment Consultation Responses for Liverpool Bay/ Bae Lerpwl SPA:

The comments focused on the draft impact assessment for the Liverpool Bay / Bae Lerpwl SPA extension have been extracted from the full consultation responses and smart survey responses.

The formal consultation took place between 09 November, 2016 to 08 February, 2017.

Table 1 summarises the issue highlighted by each respondent and details Natural Resources Wales (NRW) response.

Please note the NRW comments have focussed on the Welsh impact assessment which was focussed on the extension in the Welsh part of the site.

Table 1: Summary of issues raised and NRW response.

Responder	Summary of comment	NRW response
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association (BMAPA)	Question about the extraction of aggregates and the need for a Review of Consents (RoC).	A joint letter from NE, JNCC and NRW was sent to BMAPA saying that the cost of this, if it does happen will be low. We do not believe there is a need to change the impact assessment.
The Crown Estate	The Crown Estate (TCE) have provided a list of all of their interests, including leases to others, in Liverpool bay including the extension. They can supply further socio-economic information if required. Would like further dialogue with lease holders on any new management measures related to the site.	The information supplied by TCE is very useful but we do not believe there is a need to change the impact assessment.
RSPB	RSPB acknowledge the wider conclusion that this extension is unlikely to require significant management changes for ongoing activities but query why information relating to red-breasted merganser was highlighted as needing to be	The specific mention of red-breasted merganser was due to the fact that there are no adjacent sites for this species, while there are adjacent sites with cormorant as a feature. The impact assessment states that new management measures were not foreseen for recreational activities so there was no

Responder	Summary of comment	NRW response
	<p>supplied for future Habitat Regulations Assessment but not stated for cormorant.</p> <p>They also wonder why given the foraging and rafting behaviours of red-breasted merganser and cormorant, it's unclear why any changes in "Recreational Activities" in the area wouldn't have to supply information on either of these species.</p>	<p>significant impact. If new management measures were proposed in the future, all features would be considered.</p> <p>We do not believe there is a need to change the impact assessment.</p>
Tidal Lagoon Power	<p>Tidal Lagoon Power (TLP) highlighted a number of concerns they have about the impact assessment and the designation in general including concerns about the impact the designation would have on the Coastal Tourism Protection Zone, as set out in the Local Development Plan for Denbighshire and the impact of the designation on coastal flooding plans.</p> <p>They also have a number of concerns about the amount of work that would be needed to be made by developers due to the extension.</p> <p>They also queried the fact that we did not think there would be no changes to the management of the site or no significant costs related to the production of a management plan.</p>	<p>A joint letter from NE, JNCC and NRW was sent to Tidal Lagoon Power dealing with their concerns.</p> <p>In our opinion given the scale of assessment that would need to be made for a tidal lagoon in the area and the number of sites that it would need to cover we do not think that the addition of one new "named component" of an already existing feature (Assemblage) is a significant impact.</p> <p>We have no plans to implement new management measures on the site and there are no plans to produce a management scheme for the site.</p> <p>We do not believe their concerns as stated mean a change needs to be made to the impact assessment.</p>

Responder	Summary of comment	NRW response
<p>Offshore Petroleum Regulator for Environment and Decommissioning (BEIS)</p>	<p>Specific text: "it is unclear from the consultation documentation how Natural England have determined that an Impact Assessment is not necessary yet NRW have undertaken an economic impact assessment, despite the majority of the SPA extension being in English/offshore waters."</p>	<p>This was a query for Natural England on the approach that they have taken, this has been responded to separately by Natural England.</p> <p>This query does not warrant any change to the impact assessment.</p>
<p>RYA</p>	<p>RYA state that they are not aware of any impact on recreational boating activities as a result of the existing SPA. That the ecological requirements of the new species proposed to be added are the same as for those species already protected by the existing designations; therefore they welcome that the consultation clearly states that for this reason, no new management measures are required for these new species within the boundaries of the existing SPAs.</p> <p>RYA would be very concerned if the extension resulted in any proposals for management of recreational boating within and around the pSPA, given that there is no need for management in the area at present, and they would welcome formal confirmation that measures will not be required for terns. They assume that this is the case; given the statement above that those species similar to those already protected within the existing SPAs do not require management measures.</p>	<p>It is stated very clearly in the impact assessment that no new management measures for recreational boating are being considered.</p> <p>We are not intending to make any changes to the impact assessment, this would be a formal confirmation that no management measures are planned.</p>