



Dean Moor Solar Farm

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency

on behalf of **FVS Dean Moor Limited**

28 October 2025
Prepared by: Stantec UK Ltd
PINS Ref: EN010155
Document Ref: D4.7
Deadline 4
Revision: 3



Firma Energy

 **ib vogt**

DEAN MOOR SOLAR FARM
DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH ENVIRONMENT
AGENCY
PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE EN010155
PREPARED ON BEHALF OF FVS DEAN MOOR LIMITED

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009 5(2)(Q)

Project Ref:	EN010155/SoCG/EA
Status	Draft
Issue/ Rev:	3
Date:	28 October 2025
Submitted at:	Deadline 4
Document Reference:	D4.7

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Status of the Statement of Common Ground	1
1.2	Purpose of this document.....	1
1.3	Terminology	1
2	Current Position	2
2.1	Position of the Applicant and the Environment Agency	2
2.2	Matters agreed	3
2.3	Matters under discussion.....	14
2.4	Matters not agreed	14
3	Record of Engagement.....	15
3.1	Summary of consultation and engagement.....	15
4	Signatures	20

Tables

Table 2.1	Matters agreed	3
Table 3.1	Summary of consultation and engagement with the EA	15

1 Introduction

1.1 Status of the Statement of Common Ground

1.1.1 This draft Statement of Common Ground ('dSoCG') has been produced for FVS Dean Moor Limited ('the Applicant') to support the application for a prepared in respect of the Development Consent Order (the 'DCO application') to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero ('SoS') for Dean Moor Solar Farm ('the Proposed Development') located between the villages of Gilgarran and Branthwaite in West Cumbria (the 'Site'), which is situated within the administrative area of Cumberland Council ('the Council').

1.1.2 This dSoCG has been prepared by (1) the Applicant and (2) the Environment Agency (EA). It is agreed that this dSoCG is an accurate description of the matters raised by the EA and the current status of each matter. A high-level overview of the engagement undertaken since September 2023 is summarised in section 3.

1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 The dSoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. In the planning process, SoCGs are an established means of allowing all parties to identify and focus on specific matters that may need to be addressed during the Examination. The dSoCG is a 'live' document that will be updated by the parties as matters progress.

1.3 Terminology

1.3.1 In the matters tables in Section 2 of this SoCG, '*Matter agreed*' indicates where issues are resolved. '*Matter under discussion*' indicates where points will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties and '*Matter not agreed*' indicates agreement on the matter could not be reached following significant engagement.

2 Current Position

2.1 Position of the Applicant and the Environment Agency

- 2.1.1 The Applicant and the EA have had positive engagement on a number of matters, which are set out in Table 2.1 and 2.2 below. All matters are now agreed.
- 2.1.2 As requested by the EA, the Applicant has undertaken further hydraulic analysis, which was submitted to the EA on the 14.08.2025, which the EA has reviewed and confirmed agreement with (EA10, EA11, EA12).
- 2.1.3 The previous iteration of this dSoCG at D3 [REP3-021] reflected agreement in principle on the amendments recommended by the EA to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [APP-108] and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [REP2-022] which would provide a resolution to the remaining ‘matters under discussion’, subject to the EA’s review of these updated documents. The updated OCEMP [D4.13] and FRA & ODS [D4.15] have been updated, and the EA have been consulted on the amendments prior to D4. Agreement that the amendments made to these documents are appropriate to resolve the previous matters under discussion is reflected within Table 2.1 of this dSoCG.
- 2.1.4 The shared position set out below in Table 2.1 ‘*Matters agreed*’ is considered to be agreed. However, the wording may be refined following further engagement between the parties and these updates will be presented in the next version of this dSoCG.

2.2 Matters agreed

2.2.1 Table 2.1 below details the matters agreed with the EA.

Table 2.1 Matters agreed

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
EA1	Approach to flood risk from sewers	There is no risk of flooding from sewers and no risk to sewage undertaker assets associated with the Proposed Development. Land searches provided in FRA Appendix C show that there is a United Utilities West (Uuw) clean water sewer which runs along the eastern boundary within the Site, but this is within the public highway and outside of where any new uses or intrusive works would be undertaken. As Uuw have confirmed they have no assets in any of the Site which could be affected by works and they have no records of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site, it is agreed that the potential for sewer flooding impacts and associated risks has been adequately addressed.	ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022] (section 5) Appx C - Stakeholder Correspondence of ES Appx 2.4 FRA and ODS [APP-101]
EA2	Use of buffer strips to protect Ordinary Watercourses within the Site.	<p>The Proposed Development includes minimum 8m exclusion areas from the top of the bank of watercourses/waterbodies in accordance with EA and LLFA recommendations, along with additional Site management mechanisms to protect watercourses. The parameters secured by the Works Plans, in conjunction with management plans such as the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP), and requirements associated with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) secondary consenting procedures will ensure effective protection of the water environment.</p> <p>The exception to the 8m buffer is limited to the locations of existing crossing points (e.g. culverts) which may be utilised as part of the final design. As set out in the OCEMP, works within 8m of the watercourse would only be undertaken in accordance with a method statement and design approved by the LLFA. It is agreed that restricting all development within 8m of a watercourse other than development which approved via the LLFA's procedure under the S23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 is an appropriate means by which to control development with the potential to effect ordinary watercourses across the Site. (See EA8 for independent discussion of this issue). The EA will be consulted on the final</p>	ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022] Works Plans [APP-007] ES Fig 3.5 Exclusion Areas [APP-050] Consents & License Position Statement [APP-025] ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-108] Draft DCO [REP2-004]

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		Drainage Strategy.	
EA3	Approach to flood risk management and monitoring	<p>Monitoring of flood risk conditions and ground conditions associated with weather events that may affect the timing or methods of working on Site are embedded in control documents governing each phase of the Proposed Development's operational life. These are principally contained within the OCEMP, Outline Operational Management Plan (OOMP), and Framework Decommissioning Management Plan (FDMP), although supporting measures will also be provided via the ODS, Outline Soil Management Plan (OSMP), and Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP). The Outline Operational Management Plan (OOMP) also includes a commitment to facilitate LLFA and EA's watercourse monitoring obligations.</p> <p>It is agreed that in-principle that the management plans are a suitable way to provide the means by which to monitor and manage flood risk conditions on the Site subject to the EA's review of the final versions provided to discharge the associated DCO Requirements.</p>	<p>ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-108]</p> <p>ES Appx 3.1 OOMP [APP-107]</p> <p>ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022]</p> <p>ES Appx 7.7 OLEMP [APP-145]</p> <p>ES Appx 5.4 FDMP [APP-111]</p>
EA4	Approach to minimising impacts from watercourse crossings.	<p>All watercourses on the Site are ordinary watercourses. An EA Main River is present outside of but adjacent to the eastern boundary of Area C. No works are proposed in the vicinity of this watercourse that would necessitate a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the EA. As per EA5, there will be a standard buffer of at least 8m for all watercourses. The exception to this are the limited locations where watercourse crossings are required. No new culvert locations are expected to be required for internal access, as the Site has numerous established existing crossings associated with the agricultural use. The Proposed Development will seek to retain and reuse existing crossings of ordinary watercourses. Where necessary, any new crossing works for internal access would involve upgrades or replacements of existing culverts and can be suitably designed so they do not impede the ordinary watercourses across the Site. i.e., no lesser cross-sectional area than the existing channel.</p> <p>Potential impacts on watercourses are minimised by the Works Plans which limit crossings to only the locations of existing crossings. Whilst works may occur at these locations to replace or reinforce existing crossings, this will occur in accordance with plans and method</p>	<p>Works Plans [APP-007]</p> <p>ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-108]</p> <p>Consents & License Position Statement [APP-025]</p>

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		statements approved by the LLFA via their 'Ordinary Watercourse Consent' (OWC) procedures under S23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.	
EA5	Enhancements of watercourse and wetland habitats on Site	<p>Along with the Work Plans which reinforce the minimum 8m buffer the Applicant has proposed a green infrastructure strategy which will benefit watercourses, as illustrated by the Landscape Strategy Plan (LSP). Whilst in-stream enhancements are not proposed at this time, they may be considered as part of the final design. Measures that will directly and indirectly benefit watercourses as habitats and water quality include grassland ground cover and new and improved boundary vegetation which will reduce runoff and provide water quality treatment before surface water enters watercourses. Scrub and riparian planting along watercourses will provide habitat connection and enhancements to water quality and watercourses as habitats. An outline of the management regime for these enhancements is set out within the OLEMP.</p> <p>It is agreed that positive effects can be delivered for watercourses as habitats and on water quality, due to the 8m buffer being applied, new and improved green infrastructure, the reduction of intensive grazing, annual monitoring of planting and BNG achievement, and ongoing management.</p> <p>It is agreed that the LEMP (which will be in accordance with the OLEMP and its OGMP), which will operate across the lifetime of the Proposed Development and be subject to regular updates informed by monitoring, is an appropriate mechanism by which to secure the management planting and grazing on-Site. While this is subject to a review of the content of the final LEMP, and BNG outcomes to be delivered to be provided as a DCO Requirement, there is in-principle agreement that the approach proposed is sensitive to the potential impacts on water quality, to the need to prevent overgrazing, and the need to protect and enhance the buffer strips adjacent to watercourses.</p> <p>It is agreed that instream enhancements to watercourses would be impractical due to the size of the watercourses on Site.</p>	<p>ES Appx 2.3 WFD Assessment [APP-098]</p> <p>ES Appx 7.7 OLEMP [APP-145] (see Appendix A to the OLEMP - Outline Grazing Management Plan)</p> <p>ES Fig 7.6 LSP [REP2-046]</p> <p>ES Ch8 Biodiversity [REP2-053]</p> <p>ES Appx 8.8 BNG Report [APP-157]</p> <p>ES Appx 5.4 FDMP [APP-111]</p> <p>Pre-Application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [REP2-009]</p>
EA6	Approach to the Water Framework	The Applicant has submitted a Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment (WFDA) which details the potential impacts the Proposed Development could have on watercourses'	ES Appx 2.3 WFD Assessment [APP-098]

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
	Directive (WFD) Assessment	ability to meet the WFD requirements. It is agreed that the methodology of the WFDA has followed the EA's recommended methodology for WFD assessment in accordance with the EA's 2015 guidance, ' <i>Protecting and improving the water environment - Water Framework Directive compliance of physical works in rivers</i> '.	ES Ch2 EIA Methodology [APP-033] ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022]
EA7	Protection of peat resources within the Site	<p>The Applicant and the EA are aligned that peat is an important resource that must be protected. Areas of peat are identified in a Peat Survey Report (ES Appendix 10.3) and are excluded through the Works Plans and/or otherwise protected in management plans for each phase of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Peat will not be extracted or handled and no structures (e.g. buildings or solar arrays) or intrusive works such as cabling are proposed in areas of peat, including a minimum 10m buffer around identified areas of peat, to avoid potential impacts. Where Site activities have potential to effect peat resources they will only occur if they can be managed to avoid adverse impacts and this is secured through outline management plans for each phase of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Should any areas of peat be discovered or suspected in the course of construction, further preventative measures may be required. This approach is set out within section 5.5 and 11.3 of the OCEMP. The OSMP also outlines measures to ensure that peaty/organic soils are handled to maintain peatland ecosystem services and that construction machinery is not trafficked over soils where a peaty layer is present. If operational maintenance works are required in peat exclusion areas where controls were required by the CEMP, measures from the CEMP will be carried forward and applied to that part of the Site. Any measures required would also be taken forward into the decommissioning phase through the Decommissioning Management Plan, which would avoid impacts on identified peat.</p>	<p>ES Appx 10.3 Peat Survey Report [APP-173] Works Plans [APP-007] ES Fig 3.5 Exclusion Areas [APP-050] ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-108] ES Appx 5.3 OSMP [APP-110] ES Appx 5.4 FDMP [APP-111]</p>
EA8	Environmental permits	It is agreed that the approach to environmental permits and consents set out within the Consents and Agreements Position Statement accurately identifies potential consents that could be required and reflects in accordance with the Applicant's engagement with the EA on this matter.	<p>Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-025] ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-</p>

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
			108] (section 5) ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022]
EA9	Foundation Works Risk Assessment	As requested by the EA, if / where contamination is identified following ground investigation, a Foundations Works Risk Assessment will be prepared. The OCEMP, provides the mechanism by which the need to undertake FWRA is secured, stating ' <i>following ground investigation and subsequent assessment, if/where contamination is identified a Foundation Works Risk Assessment ('FWRA') will be prepared... to ensure that the proposed foundation method will not have an adverse impact by creating new pathways for the migration of contamination</i> '. DCO Requirement 4 provides the mechanism by which the OCEMP, and all the requirements within it, including the need to undertake FWRA, is secured.	ES Ch10 Ground Conditions [APP-041] ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-108]
EA10	Assessment of flood risk from watercourses within the Site, including the impact of climate change, and the application of the EA's updated National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA) mapping.	The Site is overall at low risk of flooding from all sources, as set out in the FRA (see Section 5.10). The Applicant has undertaken further hydraulic analysis which confirms the conclusions within the FRA and ODS, and the risks which are identified in the RoFSW mapping. It is agreed that the hydraulic analysis presented within ES Appendix 2.4 FRA & ODS Appendix D Hydraulic Modelling is reasonable and follows the approach that was discussed in the meeting between the Applicant and the EA on the 17 July 2025.	ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022] (section 5) ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS Strategy Appendix D – Hydraulic Modelling [REP2-024]
EA11	The need for modelling of flood risk from the ordinary watercourses which join Lostrigg Beck	The Applicant discussed the available baseline flood risk data with the LLFA, who are in agreement that the Site is generally at low risk of flooding and that the EA RoFSW maps, which include allowances for climate change, are sufficient to inform the assessment of flood risk for the Site given the nature of the Proposed Development as 'essential infrastructure' that is not associated with flood risk vulnerability or with potential to increase	ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022] ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS Appendix D – Hydraulic Modelling [REP2-024]

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
	main river	<p>flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>There are no main rivers within the Site, with the nearest being the Lostrigg Beck to the east of the Site opposite the public highway (Branthwaite Edge Road) that forms the Site's eastern boundary.</p> <p>The EA RoFSW mapping was updated in January/March 2025 with the EA's advice that these offer a 'significant improvement' to the previous mapping, using additional data and provide finer spatial resolution. In accordance with the feedback from the LLFA, the Applicant has maintained its position that additional modelling of flood risk informed by the updated RoFSW mapping was not necessary, as the Site is outside of the fluvial flood risk area from the Lostrigg Beck in present day and future climate change scenarios. As described in EA16, the Applicant's understanding of the position has not changed following the receipt of the updated mapping in March 2025.</p> <p>The EA requested further analysis (not modelling), based on the RoSFW mapping, and Applicant and the EA agreed the scope for further hydraulic analysis. This analysis has generated rating curves and detailed flood extents based on EA-advised precautionary flood flows and utilising the most precautionary 2080s epoch flows (on the basis that delays could push the operational and decommissioning phase into the start of this epoch).</p> <p>The results of this analysis are consistent with the EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) mapping which are also utilised to assess fluvial flood risk within the FRA and ODS. The hydraulic analysis has confirmed the RoFSW maps are a robust proxy for the fluvial flood risk where the ordinary watercourses converge over the central part of the Site. It is agreed that the hydraulic analysis presented by the Applicant is reasonable.</p>	ES Appx 2.3 WFD Assessment [APP-098]
EA12	Approach to the Pluvial (surface water) flood risk	<p>The Site is generally at low risk of surface water flooding other than along watercourses and in natural topographic depressions. The Proposed Development is of a nature that is not vulnerable to flood risk and will not increase flood risk elsewhere following the implementation of the targeted sustainable drainage strategy as set out in the FRA and ODS. The principles of the ODS are agreed with the LLFA and Natural England, and it is not considered that additional pluvial flood risk modelling will be necessary because this</p>	<p>ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022] (section 5 and section 8 (ODS))</p> <p>ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS Appendix D – Hydraulic Modelling [REP2-024]</p>

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		<p>topic can be addressed through good design.</p> <p>It is agreed that the hydraulic analysis presented within Appendix D of the FRA & ODS is considered reasonable. Further pluvial flood risk modelling and hydraulic modelling is not considered necessary.</p>	
EA13	Management of contamination and pollution during construction, operation, and decommissioning	<p>It is agreed that the OCEMP and OSMP provide the basis of a comprehensive set of construction management measures that directly relate to water quality effects, including general housekeeping (how/where things are sited), pollution prevention (including dirt/dust and contamination incidents), waste management, the use of barriers such as silt fencing, and other measures which have knock-ons for water quality such as the restriction of works depending on soil wetness conditions.</p> <p>It is agreed that, during operation, the Proposed Development will only have a minimal risk of pollution, and proposed natural drainage and swales, vegetated buffer strips and marginal planting, and management of limited conservation grazing has the potential to improve water quality at the River Marron and benefit riparian plant species, birds, and aquatic species including European eel and brown trout. Habitats and planting on Site will be managed in accordance with a LEMP which will include surveys and monitoring and ensuring that non-native species do not become established. The GMP further has the objective of preventing overgrazing and agricultural runoff into watercourses.</p> <p>It is agreed that, during decommissioning, the FDMP provides a suitable framework to secure the appropriate pollution and contamination prevention measures, which will be set out within a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in line with the principles established by the OCEMP and best practice at the time of decommissioning.</p>	<p>ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [APP-108]</p> <p>ES Appx 7.7 OLEMP [APP-145]</p> <p>ES Appx 3.1 OOMP [APP-107]</p> <p>ES Appx 5.3 OSMP [APP-110]</p> <p>ES Appx 5.4 FDMP [APP-111]</p>
EA14	WFD Assessment of water quality impacts.	<p>The WFD Assessment concludes that the Proposed Development will not have any significant effects on the WFD water bodies and will not prevent future improvement to either the Lostrigg Beck and Lowca Beck WFD waterbodies. It further concludes that a positive impact on waterbodies is possible from reduced contamination from polluted surface runoff due to the reduced grazing, the use of SuDS, and the planting within Lostrigg Beck.</p>	<p>ES Appx 2.3 WFD Assessment [APP-098]</p> <p>Works Plans [APP-007]</p> <p>DPD [APP-028]</p> <p>ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [REP2-022]</p>

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		<p>The appropriate mitigation of water quality impacts (i.e. from materials management measures, pollution and contamination prevention, grazing management, and maintenance and monitoring of watercourses and habitat enhancements) are provided within the relevant outline control documents for the construction, operational, and decommissioning phases, as well as from the embedded measures such as watercourse buffers secured through the Works Plans, and infrastructure parameters, secured through the Design Parameters Document (DPD).</p> <p>The Applicant has noted the EA's recommendations for further measures to be included within the final CEMP in relation to the storage of fuel and oil, and wheel washing facilities. The Applicant welcomes the EA's recommendations on these matters and has noted them for the production in the final CEMP, for which the EA is named as a consultee within the dDCO.</p>	
EA15	The potential need for further engagement relating to temporary possession.	<p>The EA retains an interest in the following plots (described in the Book of Reference, which the EA has confirmed), which are subject to temporary possession. These highway plots are required for street works. It is understood that the EA may retain some interest in the land as a result of Lostrigg Beck running beneath the highway. No works are proposed to Lostrigg Beck.</p> <p>The Applicant will engage further with the EA if the EA has any concerns and will notify the EA if there are any changes to the plans that involve works to the Lostrigg Beck.</p> <p>Plots: 1-65,4-01.</p>	Book of Reference [APP-016]
EA16	Design / layout in relation to flood risk	<p>It is agreed that the position on flood risk and drainage is set out effectively in the FRA and ODS. This includes insight into aspects of mitigation which are embedded in solar farm technology and the Proposed Development's parameters, as secured in the DPD. It is agreed that the parameters for the solar panels provide sufficient freeboard above flood levels for the majority of the Site, and that the ODS provides appropriate controls for securing adequate freeboard allowances for the limited areas of Work No.1 where flood risk conditions are higher.</p> <p><u>Sequential siting of infrastructure</u></p>	<p>ES Appx 2.4 FRA & ODS [D4.15]</p> <p>DPD [APP-028]</p> <p>Works Plans [APP-007]</p> <p>ES Fig 7.6 LSP [REP2-046]</p> <p>ES Appx 7.7 OLEMP [APP-145]</p>

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		<p>It is agreed that the ODS includes a suitable commitment to a sequential approach being taken for the layout of equipment within the Site which avoids placing more sensitive elements of Work No. 1 (e.g. PCS units) and Work No. 2 in limited areas of med-high pluvial risk, and the use of targeted SuDS measures for any elements capable of representing new hardstanding. It is agreed that the OCEMP and ODS make it clear that the sequential siting of infrastructure within the final design will consider the baseline provided by the FRA and Appendix D – Hydraulic Analysis, and any additional available flood risk information.</p> <p><u>Landscape-led Drainage Strategy</u></p> <p>The ODS utilises SuDS and natural 'rural' drainage features where possible and aims to maintain greenfield runoff characteristics, minimise impacts on the existing blue infrastructure network, and utilise landscaping to provide the majority of SuDS services and betterment. This will largely be achieved by ensuring effective vegetated ground cover across the Site and the retention of existing and new boundary vegetation.</p> <p>This approach reflects established best practices on large scale solar farms which is backed by research which is referenced in the FRA and has been agreed with the LLFA and Natural England. It is agreed that the ODS will be a suitable foundation for the final DS which will be subject to LLFA pre-application consultation and approved as a DCO Requirement.</p> <p><u>Watercourse Crossings</u></p> <p>The Applicant does not intend for upgrade works to be undertaken to the existing culvert over the Lostrigg Beck which coincides with the highway (Branthwaite Edge Road) which is where the Lostrigg Beck becomes a main river under the purview of an EA. As set out in EA4, the Applicant intends to make use of the many existing culverted crossings across the Site, with works to be limited to any upgrades / reinforcements that may be necessary. It is agreed that the OCEMP section 12, which deals with the Applicant's approach to works actually/potentially affecting flows through a water channel via the OWC process, now confirms the expectation that the OWC application will be required to demonstrate the impact of any design on flow rates, either resulting in no change or no change that alters</p>	Draft DCO [REP2-004]

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		the outcomes of the Appendix D Hydraulic Analysis.	
EA17	Impacts on and mitigation of the River Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and River Derwent and Tributaries SSSI	<p>The impact-pathways between the Site and the Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake SAC have been appropriately considered within the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) in line with guidance/standards/feedback from Natural England and the EA. It is agreed that the application's SHRA methodology is appropriate and has considered the potential impacts arising from the Proposed Development on the SAC's populations of Atlantic salmon and other qualifying species.</p> <p>The sHRA has further considered the potential for in-combination effects with Lostrigg Solar (now withdrawn as a DCO but potentially coming forward under TCPA) and concluded that there will be no likely in-combination significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the potential impacts on fish populations downstream of the Site, which are not designated features of the SHRA. While the Applicant considers in-stream works to be unlikely, as existing farm tracks and established access points are intended to be used, provision has been made within the OCEMP for the potential for the construction of a crossing point. It is agreed that the OCEMP now provides suitable controls, including the provision of a Method Statement, to manage any potential damming or over-pumping to protect fish downstream of the Site, and the appropriate safeguards to protect the aquatic environment.</p> <p>Mitigation is embedded within the design through the work plans and control documents (OCEMP, OSMP, OOMP, OLEMP, ODS, FDMP) which reflect standard best practice and compliance with health and safety and environmental legislation for topics such as pollution prevention, waste management, and habitat protections. On this basis, the Proposed Development will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the River Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake SAC. As part of the Proposed Development, bankside habitats will be improved by riparian planting; buffers will be established between watercourses and infrastructure; and sheep will be excluded from the riparian corridor to prevent poaching and browsing as well to improve water quality. Such protections will also be carried through during operation, as set out in the OLEMP which includes protection of watercourses by riparian planting and a reduction in grazing pressure delivered by the measures described</p>	<p>ES Appx 8.7 - SHRA [APP-156]</p> <p>ES Appx 2.3 WFD Assessment [APP-098]</p> <p>ES Ch8 - Biodiversity [REP2-053]</p> <p>ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [D4.13]</p> <p>ES Appx 7.7 OLEMP [APP-145]</p>

Ref	Topic	Shared position	Application Ref
		<p>within the OGMP.</p> <p>The EA is satisfied that the wording in 5.16.14 of the oCEMP is sufficient in covering off the outstanding issue.</p>	
EA18	Management of unexpected contamination	<p>It is agreed that the Applicant has secured the appropriate approach to managing unexpected contamination through the OCEMP, which has been updated to clarify the commitment to stopping work in the area of contaminated land and notifying the EA as appropriate.</p> <p>The EA has reviewed the revised wording in the OCEMP (sections 11.3.3 to 11.3.7) and are satisfied from a controlled waters protection perspective. The EA's suggested wording to cease works in the event of the identification of new contamination and also to consult us regarding further works, have been included.</p>	ES Appx 5.1 OCEMP [D4.13]
EA19	Relevant Requirements of the Draft Development Consent Order for the EA to be named as a consultee	<p>It is agreed that the EA are named as consultees within the appropriate DCO Requirements within the DCO (Requirement 4 (CEMP) and Requirement 8 (Surface Water Drainage Strategy).</p>	dDCO [REP2-004]

2.3 Matters under discussion

2.3.1 There are currently no matters under discussion between the Applicant and the EA.

2.4 Matters not agreed

2.4.1 The Applicant and the EA do not currently consider that there are any matters which have not been agreed, that are not capable of being resolved throughout Examination.

3 Record of Engagement

3.1 Summary of consultation and engagement

3.1.1 The table below summarises communication in relation to progressing this dSoCG.

Table 3.1 Summary of consultation and engagement with the EA

Ref	Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
EA.A	05.09.2023	Input to Scoping Opinion (ES Appendix 2.2 [APP-097])	The EA broadly agreed on the topics scoped in and out of the EIA
			Groundwater - The EA agree with the topics scoped out of the EIA in relation to groundwater
			Water resources and flood risk - the EA agreed on scoping out an ES chapter on water resources, hydrology, and flood risk from the ES and recommended that pollution prevention is taken into account during construction, operation, and decommissioning, and advised inquiring into private water suppliers in the vicinity of the Proposed Development.
			Ground conditions - the EA agreed with the proposed approach in relation to land contamination and to undertaking a ground investigation.
			Drainage - The EA raised that the drainage strategy should include measures to prevent pollution in line with guidance
			Information about environmental permits - the EA advised that if dewatering is required, an environmental permit may be necessary and pointed to the relevant guidance.
			Information about waste on site - the EA highlighted the appropriate guidance on excavated materials.
			Waste - the EA advised that contaminated materials should be adequately characterised and disposed of in line with British Standard Regulations.

Ref	Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
			Flood risk - the EA welcomed an 8m buffer around all watercourses and advised engagement with the LLFA on the potential impacts on the hydrology of Ordinary Watercourses.
			Water quality - the EA recommended consideration of measures to improve the ecology and chemistry of waterbodies on Site and advised on deep infiltration systems.
			Biodiversity - the EA recommended the creation of riparian buffer zones, advised on avoiding ecological impacts on European eel within the Lostrigg Beck which is a European eel and Brown Trout River, and advised on avoiding impacts on the CWS.
EA.B	21.11.2023	Meeting (ES Appendix 2.4 FRA Appendix C Stakeholder Correspondence [AS-013])	The Applicant met with the EA to discuss engagement going forwards and briefly the approach to flood risk modelling
EA.C	12.04.2024	Statutory consultation response (summarised in Table 1.1 of the FRA and ODS [AS-013])	The EA were satisfied with the scope of the PEIR
			Flood risk - The EA raised that the flood risk is not fully understood because fluvial flood risk is not mapped for catchments under 3km ² where the Lostrigg Beck converges with the ordinary watercourse.
			The EA raised comments in relation to vegetation planting within watercourses and minimising impacts on eel and brown trout
			The EA commented on the mitigation of water quality impacts within the OCEMP, ensuring compliance with the OCEMP, and pollution prevention / control.
			The EA raised comments in relation to ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity and the ecological enhancements in relation to the CWS and across the Site

Ref	Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
			The EA commented on repeat surveys and, the control of invasive species, and the potential for creation of wetland habitats.
			The EA highlighted the potential need for a Foundation Works Risk Assessment
			The EA provided information on permits and consents
EA.D	17.01.2025	Email	Applicant shared minute of meeting with the LLFA to discuss flood risk
EA.E	30.01.2025	Email	The EA agreed that the flood risk from Lostrigg Beck is low and not a concern
EA.F	30.01.2025	Email	EA highlighted potential flood risk from ordinary watercourse and requested an assessment of fluvial flood risk with consideration of the 1 in 100-year plus climate change flood event particularly for the ordinary watercourse.
EA.G	05.02.2025	Email	The Applicant responded to summarise the agreement on the baseline flood risk data with the LLFA, and that the EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water maps were suitable. The Applicant considers that the parameter plan has been developed with consideration of flow routes, and that given the steep topography, it is not likely that climate change would significantly affect flood risk.
EA.H	17.02.2025	Email	The EA provided a response, summarising the need to undertake flood risk modelling of the ordinary watercourse
EA.I	18.03.2025	Email	The Applicant shared the Potential Main Issues for Examination which included the EA's comments about flood risk modelling.
EA.J	14.04.2025	Email	Applicant and the EA met to discuss the EA's comments regarding Lostrigg Solar DCO and possible cumulative impacts.

Ref	Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
EA.K	22.04.2025, 25.04.2025	Email	Applicant clarified that only minor amendments were necessary after further updates to the EA's flood risk mapping service. The EA Confirmed the minute 25.04.25.
EA.L	15.07.2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the SoCG and Relevant Rep.
EA.M	21.07.2025	Email	The Applicant wrote to the EA to propose the scope of the hydraulic analysis to inform the flood risk assessment.
EA.N	21.07.2025- 22.07.2025	Email	21.07 The Applicant shared the methodology for the hydraulic analysis. 22.07 The EA provided comments from the scope and confirmed the methodology.
EA.O	14.08.2025	Email	The Applicant shared the results of the hydraulic analysis for EA review.
EA.P	11.09.2025	Email	The EA shared comments on the hydraulic analysis and the outstanding matters within the dSoCG, confirming that the matters which can be considered as 'agreed' as a result of the additional analysis.
EA.Q	16.09.2025	Email	The EA shared additional comments on the dSoCG in relation to water quality, confirming that this matter is agreed, and made further recommendations for content within the CEMP.
EA.R	23.09.2025	Meeting	The EA and the Applicant met to discuss the outstanding matters within the dSoCG and agreed on actions to resolve these matters through updates to the OCEMP and ODS to be submitted at D4. The updated position on these matters is reflected within Table 2.2 of this dSoCG.
EA.S	25.09.2025	Meeting	Follow up meeting to confirm how the outcomes of the discussions will be captured within the dSoCG.
EA.T	01.10.2025	Email	The EA confirmed they concur with the Applicant naming the EA as consultees within the dDCO for the OCEMP and Surface Water Drainage Strategy, and that the EA do not need to be named as a consultee for the OOMP.
EA.U	20.10.2025	Email	The EA confirmed within their comments on the dSoCG that the previous matters that were outstanding are now agreed based on the Applicant's updates to the OCEMP and FRA & ODS. The only matter outstanding was the design in relation to flood risk (EA16).

Ref	Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
EA.V	21.10.2025- 28.10.2025	Emails, Meetings	The EA and the Applicant further discussed the EA's comments in relation to the minimum freeboard to the solar panels, and agreed on text to be added to the ODS to be able to resolve this matter.

4 Signatures

4.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of the Environment Agency

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant:

Name:

Signature:

Date:

