

██████████
The Planning Inspectorate
Tween Bridge Solar Farm Case Team
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Interested Party ref: ██████████

Your ref: EN010148

Date: 29 September 2026

Order Granting Development Consent for Tween Bridge Solar Farm at land either side of the M180, High Level Banks (the A18) and the Stainforth and Keadby Canal (EN010148)

Deadline 7: Representations on further information submitted at Deadline 6

Dear Sir

Pursuant to Deadline 7, the Environment Agency notes that the Examining Authority invites comments on any other submissions received at Deadline 6. Accordingly, we provide comments on those submissions, relevant to the Environment Agency's remit.

1.0 Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [[REP6-002](#)]

1.1 We note that the dDCO has been updated. We wish to highlight that the Provisions for the Protection of the Environment Agency, contained in Schedule 14, Part 5, include incorrect paragraph references. We request that the paragraph references are revised to ensure that cross-references within the body of the provisions are accurate. For example, the reference to paragraph 57 (Disputes) in Paragraph 49(2) should be updated to 58 (Disputes) etc.

2.0 Applicant Written Responses to ExQ3 [[REP6-050](#)]

2.1 In the Applicant's response to Q3.14.1, reference is made to the environmental permitting regime (EPR), in respect of piling. The Applicant suggests that the Environment Agency will be afforded '*an additional layer of control beyond the CEMP*' under EPR. We wish to highlight to the Examining Authority that this is not correct. Piling is not a permitted activity and therefore the control over this activity, to ensure that there is no unacceptable environmental impacts, relies on the DCO and adequate consultation on any relevant risk assessments/method statements.

- 2.2 We note that in answering this question the Applicant outlines that the DCO does not seek to disapply the Environmental Permitting Regulations. For clarity, the Environment Agency has agreed to the disapplication of EPR in respect of flood risk activities only. This is noted throughout documentation submitted for the DCO.
- 2.3 In addition, we acknowledge that the revised outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [\[REP6-032\]](#) includes updates in respect of piling on Page 56. For the avoidance of doubt, we do not consider that these amendments address the concerns previously raised by the Environment Agency. We therefore maintain our request for an additional requirement in respect of piling, as outlined in our response to Q3.14.1 of ExQ3 [\[REP6-092\]](#).
- 3.0 Applicant Responses to the ExA Commentary on the dDCO [\[REP6-047\]](#)**
- 3.1 In respect of the Applicant's response to question DCO.4.1, we do not agree that our request to remove Article 20(10) would introduce an additional consent that runs contrary to the intention of the Planning Act 2008 in creating a one-stop shop. Whilst we support the streamlining of consents where appropriate, we do not agree with the dismissal of land-owner consent. Land-owner consent is not a duplication of regulatory approval - as set out in our answer to DCO.4.1 [\[REP6-084\]](#), the Environment Agency's regulatory and landowner functions are separate and distinct and cannot be collapsed into a single approval process. Furthermore, the absence of an equivalent provision in other made solar DCOs undermines the Applicant's assertion that the removal of Article 20(10) would frustrate the intention of the Planning Act 2008.

Should you require any additional information, or wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact me on the number below.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Sustainable Places Planning Advisor

National Contact Centre: 03708 506 506
LNplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk
Ceres House, Searby Road, Lincoln, LN2 4DW