TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

24 November 2026
Our reference: TJ20645

Giles Frampton, Director
Evolution Power Limited
5th floor
16 Great Queen Street
Covent Garden
London
WC2B 5DG

By email to energy@evolutionpower.co.uk

Dear Giles

Longmarsh Green Energy

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Longmarsh Green Energy proposals.

I recognise the importance of investing in renewable energy generation and digital infrastructure. However, developments of this scale must demonstrate a clear national need, minimise harm to local communities and the environment, and command public confidence through openness and evidence-led decision-making. There must also be consideration of the cumulative impact of so many large-scale renewable energy projects impacting a community.

Having reviewed the consultation material and listened to residents, parish councils, farmers and local businesses across South West Norfolk, I am very concerned about the Longmarsh proposals and formally object to them.

Loss of productive agricultural land
My primary concern relates to the loss of significant quantities of productive agricultural land and the implications for our national food security. The land affected by this proposal forms part of some of the most productive farmland in the country. Norfolk plays a critical role in domestic food production and, whilst energy security is important, we cannot improve one form of national resilience by undermining another. Recent Government decisions on major solar developments have given significant weight to the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, particularly where developers have failed to adequately justify site selection or demonstrate that impacts have been minimised. The applicant must therefore provide robust evidence that no less damaging alternatives exist. This must also take account of the cumulative impact of all the major ground-mounted solar developments being proposed or developed in Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire. I note Italy has become the latest country to recognise this impact and effectively ban ground-mounted solar on grade 2 and above agricultural land – a position I strongly support.

Water Resources
Second, I remain very concerned about water resources. South West Norfolk is already recognised as an area of significant water stress. Whilst you have referred to “closed-loop cooling systems”, no clear figures have yet been published regarding cooling-water requirements, operational water

consumption, contingency arrangements during periods of drought, or the potential impact on local agriculture, biodiversity and businesses. Given the scale of the proposed development, local people are entitled to more than general assurances. From data more widely available it is clear that even close-loop systems require huge quantities of water to operate; water this is simply not available in West Norfolk.

Scale of the proposal

Third, I have serious concerns regarding the scale of the proposal itself. You are proposing a data centre campus with a capacity of approximately 1GW, representing around one-sixth of the Government's indicative requirement for UK AI and data-centre capacity by 2030. This would place one of the largest proposed data-centre developments in the country within a primarily rural area of West Norfolk. Such a proposal requires exceptional justification, particularly given the significant amount of data-centre capacity already proposed elsewhere in the United Kingdom.

Questions also remain regarding the project's energy requirements. Information provided to local residents suggests that the data centre could require around 6,000 GWh of electricity annually, while the associated solar generation may only meet a proportion of that demand. If correct, a substantial amount of electricity would still need to be imported from the national transmission network. You should therefore clearly explain the extent to which the co-located solar farm genuinely reduces dependence on grid electricity and provide transparent information about expected import requirements.

I am concerned by the lack of detail currently available regarding a number of key project characteristics, including building heights, battery-storage capacity, the number and operation of standby generators, traffic impacts, cooling infrastructure, flood-risk implications, cumulative impacts alongside other energy projects, and the identity of any future data-centre operators or occupiers. Residents should not be expected to comment on a proposal where many fundamental details remain unclear.

The cumulative effect of infrastructure development across West Norfolk must also be properly assessed. Communities are already experiencing growing pressure from solar farms, substations, battery-storage, transmission infrastructure and associated energy developments. These impacts cannot be considered in isolation. The combined effects on landscape character, visual amenity, transport networks, biodiversity, agricultural productivity and rural communities require careful and transparent assessment.

Climate Change and Sustainability

I believe further scrutiny is required regarding the overall implications of the proposal for climate change. While the development is being promoted on the basis of renewable energy generation and support for digital infrastructure, residents have questioned whether sufficient information has been provided regarding its full lifecycle carbon impact. This should include not only the carbon savings associated with electricity generation, but also the emissions arising from construction activity, the manufacture and transport of materials, extensive civil engineering works, data-centre construction, battery storage infrastructure, transmission infrastructure and ongoing operational energy demand. The applicant should provide a transparent assessment of both embodied and operational carbon emissions, together with clear evidence demonstrating how the scheme contributes to national climate objectives over its lifetime. It is important to understand whether the project's contribution to

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

decarbonisation outweighs the loss of productive agricultural land, changes to land use, impacts on peat and fenland soils, and any reduction in the natural carbon-storage functions provided by the existing landscape. It is essential that the development as a whole represents a genuinely sustainable climate solution once all environmental, landscape, ecological and carbon impacts have been taken into account.

Public safety and emergency planning
I am aware of concerns raised by residents regarding fire safety. The proposal incorporates extensive solar generation, large-scale battery energy storage systems and a major data-centre campus, each of which presents its own fire prevention and emergency response challenges. Whilst such facilities can be operated safely when designed and managed appropriately, local communities require confidence that fire risks have been fully assessed and mitigated. Questions remain regarding the potential consequences of battery fires, the management of thermal runaway incidents, the availability of water and firefighting resources, access for emergency vehicles, and the resilience of emergency response arrangements in a predominantly rural area. Given the scale of the proposed development and its proximity to agricultural land, rural businesses and local communities, you should publish detailed evidence regarding fire-risk assessments, prevention measures, emergency response procedures, liaison with the fire and rescue service, and the arrangements that would be in place to minimise risks to people, property, agricultural activity and the wider environment.

Suitability of the physical landscape and resilience of infrastructure
I am concerned about the physical suitability of the site and the resilience of the infrastructure upon which the project would depend. Local residents and those with long-standing knowledge of the area have highlighted concerns relating to the particular characteristics of the Fenland landscape, including unstable peat soils, land subsidence, surface geology and the continuing challenge of maintaining roads and infrastructure on low-lying, pump-drained land. Questions have been raised about the ability of existing roads, bridges and drainage systems to accommodate the construction and operation of a development of this scale, particularly where there are already concerns regarding road settlement, bridge load limits and the condition of local transport infrastructure. Residents have also questioned the resilience of electricity and drainage infrastructure within an area that relies heavily upon managed water systems and pumping operations. You should therefore provide clear evidence demonstrating that the proposals can be constructed, operated and maintained safely and sustainably in this environment, together with detailed assessments of ground conditions, land drainage impacts, highway constraints, construction logistics and the measures that would be taken to minimise disruption to local communities during what is likely to be an extensive construction programme.

Effects on tourism, residential amenity and tranquillity
A significant number of residents have expressed concerns regarding construction impacts, operational noise, light pollution, effects on local tourism businesses, potential impacts upon property values and saleability, and effects on their wellbeing. Many people chose to live in the area for its peace, tranquillity and rural aspect.

Norfolk's visitor economy is the county's biggest economic driver and makes a significant contribution to local employment and prosperity. Residents have questioned whether sufficient consideration has yet been given to the potential impact of a development of this scale on tourism, hospitality and rural businesses, particularly in relation to landscape character, tranquillity, visual amenity and the

perception of the area as a visitor destination. You should therefore publish a specific assessment of impacts on tourism-dependent businesses and the wider visitor economy.

Residents have raised concerns regarding operational noise from the data-centre campus and battery storage infrastructure. Given that data centres operate continuously, there must be transparent information regarding expected noise levels from cooling equipment, transformers, substations and standby generators, together with clear mitigation measures and enforceable limits to protect nearby communities.
Whilst I recognise that planning law does not normally provide compensation solely for loss of property value, it is reasonable to ask what protections are available for those households facing the most significant impacts from a nationally significant infrastructure project.

I therefore believe Longmarsh Green Energy should clearly state:
• Whether compulsory acquisition powers will be sought as part of the Development Consent Order application.
• Whether a voluntary property purchase scheme, property value protection scheme, need-to-sell scheme, or other mitigation measures have been considered for households most directly affected.
• What assessment has been undertaken regarding impacts on nearby homes, businesses, holiday accommodation providers and rural enterprises.
• What community benefit arrangements are proposed and how they would be secured for the long term.

Biodiversity and Nature Recovery
Residents have raised concerns regarding the potential impacts of the development upon internationally important bird populations associated with the Ouse Washes and The Wash. Many migratory and wintering wildfowl rely on surrounding agricultural land for feeding and movement between designated sites. Questions remain regarding the loss of feeding habitat, potential disturbance effects, collision risks associated with proposed overhead transmission infrastructure, and whether reflected light from extensive solar arrays could affect bird behaviour. These matters require detailed assessment supported by robust ornithological evidence.

The extensive network of fenland drains and ditches within the affected area forms a significant ecological resource in its own right (fenland-ditches-biodiversity-june-2015.pdf). These watercourses support a rich variety of aquatic plants and animals and act as important wildlife corridors across the Fenland landscape. Residents have questioned whether sufficient consideration has yet been given to the potential impact of the development on these habitats, both during construction and operation, including possible changes to drainage regimes, water quality and habitat connectivity.
A major development such as this should do more than just mitigate the effects on existing biodiversity and meet the minimum statutory requirements of Biodiversity Net Gain. It should contribute to meeting the challenge of the biodiversity crisis by contributing to nature recovery, taking into account the recently published Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy (Local Nature Recovery Strategy - Norfolk's Local Nature Recovery Strategy - Norfolk County Council).

Landscape Character
Beyond designated sites and individual environmental considerations, residents have expressed concern about the cumulative effect that a development of this scale may have on the wider character of the Fenland landscape. The Fens are recognised nationally for their distinctive open horizons,

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

expansive skies, productive agricultural landscapes, historic drainage systems and strong sense of place (The Fens - National Character Area Profiles). The Environmental Impact Assessment should therefore consider not only site-specific effects but also whether the proposal would contribute to the gradual industrialisation of a nationally distinctive landscape through the introduction of extensive solar infrastructure, overhead electricity transmission lines, battery storage facilities and one of the largest proposed data-centre campuses in the United Kingdom.

Conclusion

I have met local residents, campaigners and parish councillors and understand the strength of feeling that exists across the area. The overwhelming message I hear is not opposition to technological progress or renewable energy, but concern that this proposal is of an unprecedented scale, located in the wrong place, and currently supported by insufficient evidence.

I have attached an Annex listing specific technical questions, and look forward to you providing commitments, evidence and quantified assessments rather than general assurances to address these points. I would appreciate a prompt response to these questions within the time frame of the pre-application stakeholder engagement before the planned DCO application in April 2027. I would welcome a meeting and regular updates on progress with addressing the issues I have highlighted so I can ensure local communities are kept well informed.

I will continue to scrutinise the proposal closely, support residents in engaging with the consultation process, and press both Longmarsh Green Energy and Government to provide clear answers to the many legitimate questions that remain outstanding.

Yours sincerely



Terry Jermy MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk

Annex: Technical Questions for Longmarsh Green Energy

National Need and Site Selection

1. The proposed data centre campus has been described as having a capacity of approximately 1GW. What specific evidence has been used to demonstrate that this scale of capacity is required at this location, and what proportion of projected UK data-centre demand does the applicant expect the development to serve?

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

2. What assessment has been undertaken of alternative sites, including brownfield and previously developed land, and why were these locations considered less suitable than the proposed site?
3. Given that the project would represent a significant proportion of the Government's indicative future data-centre requirement, what assessment has been undertaken of other consented, under-construction and proposed UK data-centre developments?

Agricultural Land and Food Security

1. How many hectares of agricultural land would be affected by the proposals, and how much of that land is classified as Best and Most Versatile (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) agricultural land?
2. What measures have been taken to minimise the loss of productive farmland and how has the applicant assessed the cumulative impact upon food production?
3. Will the applicant commit to restoring affected agricultural land to its original agricultural classification at the end of the operational life of the project, and how will this be achieved?

Tourism, Rural Economy and Operational Noise

1. Tourism is the largest contributor to the Norfolk economy, supporting a substantial number of local businesses, jobs and visitor destinations across the county. What assessment has been undertaken of the potential impact of the Longmarsh Green Energy proposals on tourism-dependent businesses, including holiday accommodation providers, caravan and camping sites, visitor attractions, hospitality businesses, rural enterprises and recreational activities?
2. Has the applicant undertaken any assessment of whether the industrialisation of a predominantly rural landscape through the introduction of large-scale solar infrastructure, overhead transmission lines, substations, battery storage facilities and a major data-centre campus could affect visitor perceptions of the area and, in turn, local tourism revenue?
3. Will the Environmental Impact Assessment include a specific assessment of impacts on tourism and visitor-economy businesses?
4. What assessment has been undertaken of operational noise arising from the data-centre campus, including cooling equipment, ventilation systems, transformers, substations, backup generators and other plant operating continuously throughout the day and night?
5. What assessment has been undertaken of operational noise arising from battery energy storage facilities, including cooling systems, inverters, transformers and associated electrical infrastructure?
6. What are the predicted daytime and night-time noise levels at the nearest residential properties, schools, tourism businesses and other sensitive receptors, both under normal operating conditions and during emergency generator testing?

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

7. What noise limits will apply to the development, how will compliance be monitored and enforced, and what remedy will be available to affected residents should noise levels exceed those limits?
8. Will the applicant publish detailed noise contour modelling and make available representative audio simulations so that residents can better understand the likely operational impacts of the development?
9. What measures are proposed to mitigate operational noise, including acoustic enclosures, building design, screening, equipment specification and restrictions on testing of backup generators during sensitive periods?
10. What assessment has been undertaken of the combined effect of the proposal on the landscape qualities identified within The Fens National Character Area and, consequently, upon the area's attractiveness for recreation, tourism, rural businesses and visitor-economy enterprises that depend upon the distinctive character of the Fenland landscape?

Water Resources

1. What are the anticipated annual and peak water requirements for the data-centre campus, including cooling systems, construction activities and ancillary infrastructure?
2. What assessment has been undertaken of the effect of the proposals on water resources within an area already recognised as water stressed?
3. What contingency arrangements are proposed during drought conditions or periods of water scarcity?
4. What discussions have you had with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency about your water supply requirements?

Energy Demand and Grid Infrastructure

1. What is the projected annual electricity consumption of the data-centre campus and what proportion of this demand is expected to be supplied directly by the co-located solar generation?
2. What will be the maximum import capacity required from the national transmission network and Walpole Substation during periods of low renewable generation?
3. Please provide a detailed explanation of how co-location with solar generation reduces demand on the national grid when compared with a standalone data-centre development.
4. What alternatives to the proposed overhead transmission infrastructure have been considered and why were these options rejected?

Fire Safety and Emergency Response

1. What fire-risk assessments have been undertaken in relation to the proposed solar farm, battery energy storage systems, substations and data-centre campus, and will these assessments be published in full?

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

2. What battery technologies are proposed and what measures will be implemented to prevent, detect, contain and respond to thermal runaway incidents?
3. What consultation has taken place with the relevant Fire and Rescue Service regarding the design of the scheme, emergency access arrangements, firefighting requirements and operational response plans?
4. What sources of water and firefighting infrastructure will be available in the event of a major fire affecting the data centre, battery storage facilities or associated electrical infrastructure?
5. What assessment has been undertaken of the risk of fire spreading to surrounding agricultural land, crops, field margins, drainage corridors, habitats and neighbouring properties during periods of dry weather?
6. What arrangements will be in place to ensure emergency vehicle access to all parts of the site throughout construction and operation, including during periods of flooding or severe weather?
7. What assessment has been undertaken of the environmental consequences of a significant battery-storage fire, including the potential effects on local watercourses, fenland drainage systems, agricultural land and protected habitats?
8. Will the applicant commit to publishing a site-wide Fire Prevention and Emergency Response Strategy before submission of the Development Consent Order application?

Drainage, Ground Conditions and Transport Infrastructure

1. What geotechnical investigations have been undertaken to assess the suitability of fenland soils for supporting large-scale data-centre buildings, battery storage infrastructure, substations, overhead transmission infrastructure and associated foundations? Please publish the findings.
2. What assessment has been undertaken of the risk of peat shrinkage, land subsidence and long-term ground stability across the project area and along the proposed cable and transmission routes?
3. Have the developers identified any risks arising from the area's surface geology, including historical settlement, ground movement or drainage-related instability, and how will these risks be mitigated throughout the operational life of the project?
4. What assessment has been undertaken of the impact of the proposals on existing land-drainage systems, Internal Drainage Board (IDB) assets, pumping stations, drains, ditches and flood-management infrastructure?
5. Given that much of the affected land is actively pump-drained, what contingency measures are proposed to ensure continued operation and resilience of the data centre, battery storage systems and associated electrical infrastructure during periods of flooding, pump failure or extreme weather?
6. What discussions have taken place with the relevant Internal Drainage Boards and what concerns or recommendations have they raised regarding the development?

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

7. Residents have reported concerns regarding existing highway conditions, including road subsidence associated with peat shrinkage. What assessment has been undertaken of the ability of the local highway network to accommodate abnormal loads and heavy construction traffic without further deterioration?
8. Which roads are proposed as principal construction access routes, and what are the anticipated numbers of daily Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements during the peak construction period?
9. What assessment has been undertaken of bridge weight restrictions, bridge condition, load capacities and other highway constraints on routes likely to be used for construction traffic?
10. Where existing roads, bridges or drainage-related highway structures require strengthening, widening or improvement to accommodate construction traffic, who will bear the cost and when will such works be undertaken?
11. Given that many roads in the area are narrow rural routes used daily by residents, school transport, agricultural vehicles and local businesses, what specific measures are proposed to minimise disruption during construction?
12. Will construction traffic be prohibited from passing through village centres, and will time restrictions be imposed to avoid conflicts with school travel times, agricultural operations and commuter traffic?
13. What assessment has been undertaken of cumulative construction traffic impacts when considered alongside other planned or ongoing energy and infrastructure projects in the vicinity of Walpole Substation and across west Norfolk?
14. What modelling has been undertaken to assess the effect of construction traffic on emergency vehicle access, local bus services, farm operations and everyday journeys for residents?
15. Given reports of frequent local power interruptions and concerns regarding electricity network resilience raised by residents, what evidence is available that the existing network infrastructure can reliably support a 1GW data-centre campus without adverse effects on local electricity security or network resilience?

Data-Centre Operations

1. What will be the maximum building heights of the proposed data-centre buildings, energy infrastructure, substations and associated structures?
2. How many standby generators are proposed, what fuel will they use, how frequently will they be tested, and what are the anticipated emissions from testing and emergency operation?
3. What is the proposed battery-storage capacity, what fire-safety standards will apply, and what assessment has been undertaken of wildfire and battery-fire risks?
4. What are the predicted operational noise levels at the nearest residential properties arising from cooling systems, transformers, substations, battery storage and standby generators?

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

Communities, Property and Compensation

1. Will the Development Consent Order application seek compulsory acquisition powers and, if so, over which land interests, rights and properties?
2. Has the applicant considered a Property Value Guarantee Scheme, Voluntary Purchase Scheme or Need-to-Sell Scheme for households experiencing disproportionate impacts from the development and, if not, why not?
3. What community benefit package is proposed, what annual funding is envisaged, and will targeted support be available to households and businesses most significantly affected by the development?
4. Will the applicant publish a full schedule of residencies, businesses and tourism enterprises identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment as experiencing significant adverse effects, together with the mitigation proposed for each category of impact?
5. When will the applicant publish detailed information regarding building heights, site layouts, visualisations, cooling-water requirements, traffic assessments, construction routes and the identity of the intended operator or operators of the data-centre campus?

Climate Change and Carbon Impacts

1. What assessment has been undertaken of the proposal's whole-life carbon footprint, including emissions associated with construction, manufacture of materials, transport, installation, operation, maintenance and decommissioning?
2. What are the estimated embodied carbon emissions associated with the solar farm, battery energy storage facilities, data-centre campus, substations, transmission infrastructure and associated civil engineering works?
3. What are the estimated annual operational greenhouse gas emissions arising from the development, including emissions associated with backup generators, maintenance activities and imported grid electricity?
4. What assessment has been undertaken of the impact of the proposals on soil carbon, particularly where development affects peat soils, organic-rich soils or other carbon-storing habitats within the Fenland landscape?
5. Has the applicant quantified any carbon emissions associated with land-use change and the displacement of existing agricultural activities?
6. What assessment has been undertaken of the climate resilience of the proposed development, including risks arising from flooding, drought, overheating, extreme weather events, subsidence and future climate-change projections?
7. What proportion of the electricity consumed by the proposed 1GW data-centre campus is expected to be supplied directly by on-site renewable generation over an average year, and what proportion is expected to be imported from the national transmission network?

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

8. What evidence is available to demonstrate that the overall carbon benefits of the development outweigh the environmental costs associated with landscape change, habitat impacts, agricultural land loss and construction activity?
9. Will the applicant publish a Carbon Management Plan setting out how greenhouse gas emissions will be measured, reduced and monitored throughout the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the project?

Biodiversity and nature recovery

1. What assessment has been undertaken of the potential effects of the development on internationally important bird populations associated with the Ouse Washes, The Wash and other protected sites, including Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Ramsar sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)?
2. Many migratory and wintering wildfowl associated with these designated sites rely upon surrounding agricultural land for feeding and roosting. What assessment has been undertaken of the extent to which the development would result in the loss, fragmentation or displacement of these feeding areas?
3. What baseline surveys have been undertaken to identify the numbers, species, seasonal distribution and flight movements of wintering and migratory birds using farmland within and surrounding the proposed development area?
4. Has the applicant assessed whether the proposed solar arrays could create a "lake effect" or "polarised light effect", whereby reflected light from solar panels may be mistaken for water bodies by birds, potentially altering behaviour, increasing collision risk or disrupting established feeding and migration patterns?
5. What assessment has been undertaken of collision risks associated with the proposed overhead transmission infrastructure, particularly for swans, geese, ducks and other large-bodied wetland birds travelling between feeding areas and designated sites?
6. Has the applicant assessed whether new overhead lines could increase the risk of bird injury or mortality through collision, and if so, what mitigation measures are proposed, including line marking, visibility enhancement devices or route alterations?
7. What consideration has been given to cumulative impacts on bird populations arising from the combination of habitat loss, disturbance, overhead infrastructure, lighting, construction activity and increased human activity associated with the project?
8. What assessment has been undertaken of the effect of operational lighting from the data-centre campus, substations and associated infrastructure on migratory birds and nocturnal species?
9. How will the applicant demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, particularly in relation to the potential for adverse effects on the integrity of internationally designated sites connected ecologically to the development area?
10. If significant adverse effects on feeding habitat for wintering or migratory wildfowl are identified, what compensatory habitat is proposed, where would it be located, and how

TERRY JERMY MP
Member of Parliament for South West Norfolk
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

would the applicant ensure that it is available and functioning before any habitat is lost?

11. Will the applicant publish all ornithological surveys, collision-risk assessments, flight-path analysis and habitat modelling used to support the Environmental Impact Assessment to enable independent scrutiny by residents, conservation organisations and statutory consultees?
12. The ditch network within the Fens supports a nationally important assemblage of aquatic and marginal habitats and species, whilst also functioning as ecological corridors linking wider habitats across the landscape. What assessment has been undertaken of the potential effects of the development on fenland ditches and associated aquatic biodiversity, including impacts arising from construction activities, cable installation, changes to drainage patterns, altered water levels, water quality, sedimentation, shading, habitat fragmentation and long-term management practices? Furthermore, what measures are proposed to avoid, mitigate or compensate for any loss or deterioration of ditch habitats and the species that depend upon them?
13. How has the proposed development been assessed against the objectives, priorities and opportunity areas identified within the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy?
14. What specific contributions would the project make towards habitat creation, habitat restoration, species recovery and ecological connectivity within west Norfolk beyond the minimum statutory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain?
15. Has the applicant identified opportunities to support landscape-scale nature recovery through the enhancement of fenland habitats, wetland habitats, species-rich grasslands, hedgerows, field margins, drainage corridors and other priority habitats identified within the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy?
16. How will habitat creation and enhancement measures be designed to ensure they provide meaningful ecological benefits rather than fragmented or isolated areas of mitigation?
17. What measures are proposed to improve ecological connectivity between existing habitats and designated sites including the Ouse Washes, The Wash and associated wildlife corridors?
18. Will the applicant commit to publishing a long-term ecological management plan setting out how biodiversity enhancement measures will be monitored, maintained and adapted throughout the operational life of the project?
19. What mechanisms will be used to ensure that environmental enhancement measures are delivered and maintained in perpetuity, particularly where ecological benefits are relied upon to offset significant environmental impacts?
20. How will the applicant demonstrate that the project will leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than before development, taking account of both site-specific and landscape-scale ecological outcomes?

020 7219 8254 terry.jermy.mp@parliament.uk www.terryjermy.com @cllrterryjermy on Twitter, terryjermymp.bsky.social on BlueSky