

Planning Inspectorate

**Our ref:** XA/2025/100427/01  
**Alt Ref:** ENVPAC/1/NIT/00019  
**Your Ref:** EN010159

[via Planning Inspectorate website &  
[oneearth solar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:oneearth solar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)  
]

**Date:** 21 August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

## **ONE EARTH SOLAR FARM**

### **RESPONSE TO DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT DEADLINE 2**

Thank you for consulting us on the additional documents submitted by the applicant on the 29 July 2025, we have reviewed the submissions and have the following comments to make appendix 1 (response to submitted documentation). Within the below water quality section, reference is also made to documentation submitted at earlier deadlines including the stage 1 WFD screening assessment.

Please also see a list of key issues as highlighted below in our Work Package Tracker, Appendix 2, we are in regular consultation with the applicant to work through these issues.

We trust this advice is useful.

Yours sincerely

  
**Planning Advisor - National Infrastructure Team**

Direct e-mail [james.cordell@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:james.cordell@environment-agency.gov.uk)

**Appendix 1** – Response to documents submitted at deadline 2

**Appendix 2** – Environment Agency Work Package Tracker

Cont/d..

## Appendix 1

### Groundwater & Contaminated Land

<b>EAGWCL-001 &amp; EAGWCL-007</b>		
<p>3.1 Draft DCO, Requirement 21 (2)</p> <p>Outline CEMP, Table 3.10</p> <p>Outline OEMP, Table 3.11</p> <p>Outline DEMP, Table 3.17</p>	Issue:	<p>Procedure for previously unidentified contamination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement 21 (2) could still be improved - current procedure in DCO is confusing and may miss a large part of the site</li> <li>CEMP requires additional detail - proposed process does not include seeking regulatory approval</li> <li>Procedure in OEMP and DEMP may not be sufficient</li> </ul>
	Impact:	Site workers may not follow an appropriate process.
	Solution:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement 21 (2) to be rephrased to incorporate all parts of the Proposed Development, not just that of the area for site investigation. This can be achieved by removal of “in the area for site investigation” and “within such areas”. I.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“(2) If, during the carrying out of the authorised development in the area for site investigation, contamination not previously identified is found to be present within such area(s), no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the relevant planning authority) must be carried out on the area(s) on which the contamination has been found until a remediation strategy detailing how such contamination must be dealt with has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.”</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Request that any contamination assessment report and remediation strategy, as outlined in the oCEMP, be agreed with the relevant planning authority prior to commencement of the remediation works proposed.</li> <li>Copy procedure from CEMP (when updated) to be used in relevant sections of the OEMP and DEMP.</li> </ul>
Additional comments:	<p>In response to our previous comments the applicant was concerned that “additional text sought to be included is purely precautionary”. We are now proposing removal of some text, no additional text. The argument that the DCO requirement is “due to the potential for contamination in a specific area of the Order Limits” holds no weight, as unexpected contamination could be encountered anywhere.</p> <p>We are in favour of the precautionary approach to which the applicant refers. The applicant previously has expressed an</p>	

intention to consider reasonable worst case scenarios in their design (ES Volume 1 Chapter 2, Section 2.5.22).
--

<b>EAGWCL-002</b>		
Volume 2 Chapter 7: Section 7.4.11, Section 8.4.37  6.21 Appendix 8.2 Preliminary Risk Assessment – Part 1: Table 9	Comments:	We are satisfied with the approach taken and results presented. We note that neither referenced document been updated to reflect the additional information obtained.

<b>EAGWCL-003</b>		
Volume 2 Chapter 8: Table 8.4	Comments:	<p>The referenced document has not been updated. We are satisfied that the applicant's meaning for major and moderate adverse events are in agreement with our own.</p> <p>If a WFD water body already has the lowest possible classification, it does not mean that further environmental protection is not necessary. The magnitudes of impact defined apply regardless of current classification, as it is the potential effect of an activity under consideration. Effective mitigation measures should be sufficient to prevent events which could adversely change a WFD water body status.</p>

<b>EAGWCL-004</b>		
Volume 2 Chapter 8: Section 8.4.38 Groundwater, Table 8.7	Comments:	We are satisfied with the approach taken and discussion presented. We note that the referenced document has not been updated to reflect the additional information obtained. As proposed, we look forward to seeing the full response after the updated datasets have been received from both the Environment Agency and the local planning authorities, to ensure that a correct revision of the text and assessment is presented.

<b>EAGWCL-005</b>		
Volume 2 Chapter 8: Section 8.5.4	Issue:	No commitment for foundation works risks assessment (FWRA) or equivalent, other than comments in Table 3.5 which have not been updated during this review. The proposed piling risk assessment does not include any non-piled foundations.

	Impact:	No assessment of risks posed by non-piled foundations may lead to harm to controlled waters.
	Solution:	Ensure risks to controlled waters from non-piled foundations are specifically considered. This could be within a specific FWRA, or by another method agreed with the EA.
Additional comments:	The applicant's response does not fully address our comment. The protocol for previously unrecorded contamination may not be sufficient for foundation works where contamination is likely or has previously been proven by pre-construction site investigation works. The proposed piling risk assessment could be modified to encompass all foundation types.	

<b>EAGWCL-006</b>		
Volume 2 Chapter 8: Table 8.7	Comments:	The applicant's clarification supplied in the Relevant Representations (RR) response is welcomed. The referenced document has not been updated, and it would be beneficial if the submitted documents are updated accordingly for completeness. RR responses might not be referred to during the construction and operational phases and these details may be missed.

<b>EAGWCL-008</b>		
6.2.1 Volume 3 Appendix 7.5, Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan	Comments:	A hydrogeological risk assessment has been added to oCEMP Table 3.5, to be secured through requirement, and added to Commitments Register as C84. We are satisfied with this response.

<b>EAGWCL-009</b>		
6.2.1 Volume 3 Appendix 7.5, Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan	Issue:	Applicant proposes "It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ." Elsewhere, cables deeper than 0.9m is specified.
	Impact:	Conflicting information. Potential for shallow cables to be left in the ground and cause harm to sensitive receptors after decommissioning.
	Solution:	Suggest this line in Appendix 7.6, Table 3.17 be updated to be consistent with other documents.
Additional comments:	We are generally satisfied with the applicant's response to EAGWCL-009, albeit the applicant has not provided a demonstration that cables left in-situ indefinitely would not pose a potentially significant source of contamination to controlled waters. Including consideration for total cable removal at this stage, with reference to legislation at the time of decommissioning, is welcome.	

EAGWCL-0010		
6.2.1 Volume 3 Appendix 7.13 Outline Export Cable Route Construction Method Statement  REP1-075 Response to Relevant Reps	Issue:	No response given to this comment in <i>REP1-075 Response to Relevant Reps</i> .
	Impact:	This issue is not resolved.
	Solution:	Provide a response.
Additional comments:	<p>The referenced document has not been updated. It is unclear if response has been provided elsewhere, but the issue is not included in REP1-075.</p> <p>For completeness, the issue was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Issue</b> - <i>The report does not include a commitment to producing a drilling fluid breakout plan to manage risk of 'frac-out'. The production of standalone, site specific frac-out risk assessments and bentonite fluid breakout plans are committed to in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan. These should also be referred to in the Outline Export Cable Route Construction Method Statement. No reference is made to the preparation of a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment for watercourse crossings.</i></li> <li>• <b>Impact</b> - <i>If not adequately assessed and managed, loss of drilling fluids could impact controlled waters.</i></li> <li>• <b>Solution</b> - <i>The Applicant should refer to production of Hydrogeological Risk Assessments, frac-out risk assessments and drilling fluid breakout plans in this Method Statement.</i></li> </ul> <p>oCEMP Table 3.5 still mentions "A standalone, site specific frac-out risk assessment", but this section has not been updated since our review.</p>	

EAGWCL-011		
6.2.1 Volume 3 Appendix 7.2, Table 4-1  Appendix 5.9 Outline Design Parameters	Issue:	Applicant's response is satisfactory, but all of the relevant documents have not been updated.
	Impact:	Responses given here might not be referred to during the construction and operational phases and these details may be missed.
	Solution:	We recommend that Appendix 7.2, Table 4-1 is updated for completeness and consistency throughout the documents.
Additional comments:	<p>The applicant's response is satisfactory, but the referenced document has not been updated. It would be beneficial if the submitted documents are updated accordingly for completeness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 7.2, Table 4-1 has not been updated</li> <li>• Appendix 5.9 has been updated but no relevant information has been added (Table 2.1, Work No. 2)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline Operational Management Plan Table 3.11 has an additional row which includes relevant information as mitigation</li> <li>The Conceptual Drainage Design in REP1-060 7.11.1 Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (Rev 2) (Section 5) has been updated - confirmation of impermeable lining is given as 5.1.3</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>EAGWCL-012</b>		
Volume 1 Chapter 5, Section 5.4.38	Comments:	<p>The applicant's response is satisfactory, but the referenced document has not been updated. It would be beneficial if the submitted documents are updated accordingly for completeness.</p> <p>The Conceptual Drainage Design in REP1-060 7.11.1 Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (Rev 2) (Section 5) has been updated. Confirmation of automatic closure of the penstock valve is given as 5.1.2.</p>

<b>EAGWCL-013</b>		
6.2.1 Volume 3 Appendix 7.11 Outline Battery Safety Management Plan	Comments:	The relevant section of the referenced document has not been updated, even though the applicant states that this will be done.

REP1-079 Ground Investigation Report	Comments:	The relevant section of the referenced document has not been updated, even though the applicant states that this will be done.
---	-----------	--

REP1-079 Ground Investigation Report	Issue:	Factual report submitted, not interpretative. There is no discussion of ground conditions. There is no assessment of the potential presence of elevated concentrations of contaminants of potential concern in soils or groundwater. No recommendations or conclusions are given.
	Impact:	This document cannot be used in isolation to demonstrate the presence or absence of contamination, and associated risks to sensitive receptors. We cannot agree to any land and groundwater contamination measures or conclusions until this work is done and supplied.
	Solution:	Provide an interpretative ground investigation report with conclusions and recommendations as necessary for this site.

Additional comments:	<p>The appendix title page is dated July 2025, but the appended report (ref. FAC-01, status Final) is dated 30/01/2025. It is unclear what, if anything, has changed since previous submission. The laboratory test report dates are prior to previous issue.</p> <p>Numerous samples were submitted without a sampling date or were stored beyond maximum holding times before testing (many in excess of 1 month), so are recorded as deviating. Results from these samples cannot be relied upon. We would expect to see comment and discussion of this in any interpretative report.</p> <p>PSL report Contract Number: PSL24/8929, date 06/01/2025 (Client's Reference: 2372986) has testing dates in December 2025. We assume this is user input error.</p>
----------------------	---

### **Biodiversity**

REP1-075 Response to Relevant Reps, RR.063 – Biodiversity Net Gain – Habitat Management	Issue:	It is still considered that the feasibility of some of the assumptions made within the BNG report remain to be demonstrated. For example, how can it be assumed that c.17km of ditches can be enhanced to good condition when control of water quality may not be entirely within the developer control (good condition requires 'good water quality with clear water')? Prescriptions to ensure requisite aquatic vegetation are also lacking from the LEMP. Similarly, it is unclear how the proposed created floodplain grazing marsh will be ' <i>managed to frequently wet</i> ' (as asserted in Table 4-2 of the BNG assessment (Appendix 6-10)).
	Impact:	Outcomes of BNG assessment may be overstated; potential risk the 10% gain in watercourse units is not achievable on site.
	Solution:	Ensure assumptions are realistic and demonstrated to be viable.
Additional comments:		

REP1-075 Response to Relevant Reps, RR.063 – Biodiversity Net Gain – Metric Calculator/BNG – Watercourses	Issue:	<i>'As part of this a separate watercourse map will be provided within the Appendix 6.10 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [APP-093] showing the location of all ditches and watercourses with appropriate colours to differentiate those in different habitat condition'.</i>  It would appear this map has yet to be produced
	Impact:	Habitat classifications used to inform BNG assessment have not been verified.
	Solution:	We would welcome opportunity to review the map alongside other information used to support habitat classification (distinctiveness and condition).

		Information presented within updated Appendix 6-3 paragraph 3.12.8 is noted, further supporting information is requested to support this assertion (that this watercourse is not 'other river or stream').
Additional comments:		

REP1-075 Response to Relevant Reps, RR.063 Culverting	Comments:	Comfortable with approach such to suitable EA consultation/ oversight on crossing designs.
---	-----------	--

### **Geomorphology**

7.15.1 Revision 2, Volume 7.0: Other Documents – Commitments Register	Issue:	8m minimum buffer for watercourses in commitment register, but 10m commitment for action C4 in Table 6.6 Environmental Measures and Securing Mechanisms.
	Impact:	Confusion between minimum buffers may be caused by lack of update to the commitments register.
	Solution:	Correct commitments register using the correct (10m minimum) buffer offset
Additional comments:		
6.6.1 Revision 2, Volume 6 Environmental Statement Volume 2: Aspect Chapters Chapter 6: Biodiversity – Table 6.6	Issue:	C2 - Trenchless Cable crossings
	Impact:	Using only a minimum distance from the watercourse banktop may locate the launch and reception pits (and joint bays) within the active zone of the watercourse. Depending on the geology, the depth of tunnelling below the hard bed of the watercourse may also not be sufficient to minimise fluid breakout.
	Solution:	Depths of drilling/tunnelling and distance of launch/reception pits from watercourse should be determined on a case-by-case basis and possibly require re-siting/micro siting of the crossing locations dependant on the geology and activity of the watercourse.
Additional comments:	Recommend site surveys/geotechnical investigations rather than just relying on desk study approach of using geological maps and limited borehole records.	



## Water Quality

EASW-001		
Outline Battery Safety Management Plan	Issue:	Section 4.8 on the Post-incident Recovery and End of Life Management should make reference to how any containment basins/SuDS will be cleaned prior to penstock re-opening and allowing drainage.
	Impact:	In the event of a fire affecting the BESS, there is the potential for pollutants to attach to surface in the lined areas and these could be re-mobilised in surface water runoff and end up in the water environment unless the containment areas are managed after an event.
	Solution:	After an incident, the containment area would need to be thoroughly cleaned before any valves were re-opened and drainage can resume. Therefore, we would also advise against gravel substrates used in the BESS and Substation drainage systems.
Additional comments:		

Storage of Fuel, Oil & Chemicals		
Outline CEMP, Outline DEMP and Appendix 7.1: Stage 1 WFD Screening Assessment	Issue:	Table 3.5 of the CEMP and DEMP in the Spillage Risk topics and Section 5.1.3 of the WFD Assessment discusses certain measures for the storage of materials, such as fuel, oil and chemicals, however, further measures should be included in the WFD Assessment and the CEMP.
	Impact:	If refuelling and storage of fuels, oils and chemicals is not suitably managed then there is an increased risk of pollutants entering the water environment and decreasing the water quality.
	Solution:	Further mitigation measures should be clarified/added to the CEMP, DEMP and WFD Assessment.
Additional comments:	<p>Mitigation measures should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that all refuelling areas and storage areas for fuel, oil and chemicals are at least 10m away from the top of bank from watercourses.</li> <li>• All storage for fuel, oil and chemicals should be covered, where possible to prevent accumulation of rainwater. Where coverage is not adequate in heavy rainfall, the bunds may benefit from a valve to release any accumulated rainwater.</li> <li>• Where fuel and oil are stored in these bunded areas on impermeable surfaces, an oil separator (interceptor), or other device to remove oil from water, may need to be installed.</li> <li>• The CEMP should include the same details as the WFD Assessment, such as bunded areas will have a minimum capacity of 110% of the capacity of the containers.</li> </ul>	

Foul Water Strategy/Surface Runoff Disposal		
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	Issue:	<p>There is unclear detail about the foul water strategy during the construction phase. It is assumed to be portable welfare units in line with operation, but this is unclear.</p> <p>Table 3.5 of the CEMP has contradicting information about the disposal of site runoff and any associated foul water connection.</p>
	Impact:	It is hard to assess the foul water drainage strategy without the connectivity options and be confident it has been adequately provisioned during all phases.
	Solution:	Provide further information about which points of connections are being considered (if any), and what welfare facilities are being provided during construction.
Additional comments:	<p>Table 3.5 lists three different options for disposing of construction site run off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If “treated on site and discharged under a Water Discharge Activity Permit” is being consider then given the timeframe to determine environmental permits we encourage applicants to engage with us on permit requirements at the earliest possible stage. Guidance in relation to discharging and permits is available at the following links:</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Discharges to surface water and groundwater: environmental permits - GOV.UK</a></p> <p><a href="#">Get advice before you apply for an environmental permit - GOV.UK</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information in Table 3.5 says “Site drainage, including surface runoff and dewatering effluents, will be discharged to sewers”. However, if disposal to a public sewer for surface water runoff is the preferred option for surface water drainage, then it remains unclear why any foul water also isn’t being connected to a sewer. This is also in contradiction of Chapter 7 of the Environment Statements which said that “there will be no direct connection to existing foul infrastructure”.</li> <li>If foul water and surface water runoff from site are both being removed from site to an appropriate and licensed waste facility, then the other disposal strategies do not need to be included in Table 3.5. If road transport to an offsite disposal facility is required to remove foul water from portable welfare units or surface water runoff, then there should be regard for this within the waste management procedures.</li> </ul>	

	Our information about portable welfare units is obtained from the OEMP which states in section 2.10.1 that “During operation self-contained portable welfare units which store foul/wastewater for collection/emptying by specialist licenced contractors”, however this information is not present in the CEMP or in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement.
--	---

Watercourse Crossing Depths		
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	Issue:	Table 3.5, in the watercourse crossing section includes inconsistent minimum depths below the watercourse in comparison to section 5.1.7 of the WFD Assessment. The tracked changes of the CEMP says route will be 2.5m below the bed, but the WFD Assessment still say 1.5m.
	Impact:	If depths are not appropriately beneath the bed of the watercourse, then it can increase the risk of contamination in the event of a drilling fluid breakout.
	Solution:	Amend the depth in the CEMP or WFD Assessment to ensure they are consistent.
Additional comments:		

Concrete		
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan  Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Section 5.4.43	Issue:	It is suggested that the substations and associated structures will have concrete slab foundations. However, there are currently no mitigations for this seen in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP).
	Impact:	Concrete can be a risk to water quality as it is a known source of hazardous substances, particularly during the curing phase.
	Solution:	The CEMP should be developed to ensure that risks of pollution as a result of concrete are adequately managed.
Additional comments:	<p>Further details which could be included in the CEMP and WFD Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify all areas where concrete works are proposed</li> <li>• Specify whether any of these will be cast in situ or precast and delivered</li> <li>• For in situ concrete pours, suggest timing, weather conditions, and runoff control. (These construction works should be minimised during heavy precipitation events and carried out during dry months where practicable.)</li> <li>• Describe containment measures for concrete washout (e.g. lined washout pits, bunded areas)</li> </ul> <p>Section 5.1.6 of the WFD Assessment does say “Particular care will be taken with the delivery and use of concrete and cement as it is highly corrosive and alkaline”, but further details are required.</p>	

Wash Out Water		
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan  Appendix 7.4 – Water Framework Screening Assessment	Issue:	Section 5.1.4 of the WFD Assessment says that “equipment and plant are to be washed out and cleaned in designated areas within the compound, where runoff can be isolated for treatment before disposal”, and section 5.1.6 says that “wash water will be prevented from passing untreated into watercourses” however it is unclear how wash out water will be retained and treated.
	Impact:	If wash water is not managed correctly, it can enter surface watercourses and then it has the potential to decrease water quality due to any contamination and sediment that may be present.
	Solution:	We recommend further mitigation measures to explain how vehicle wash out / wheel cleaning facilities will be managed are added to the WFD Assessment and the CEMP.
Additional comments:	<p>Mitigation measures associated with vehicle wash out and wheel washing facilities could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure these activities will be undertaken within a designated impermeable or lined area and should not be allowed to discharge into a watercourse or infiltrate to groundwater.</li> <li>• Sediment management measures (i.e. silt fencing) could be considered around the wheel washing.</li> <li>• Any SuDS incorporated around wheel washing facilities should provide sufficient treatment for suspended solids, metals and hydrocarbons.</li> </ul> <p>The site of these washdown and wheel washing facilities should be a minimum of 10m from top of bank of watercourses.</p> <p>If road transport is required to remove wash water to an offsite disposal facility then there should be regard for this within the waste management procedures.</p>	

PFAS in PV Modules		
ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Section 5.4.6	Issue:	Solar PV Modules are described as being bifacial with “PV cells and toughened glass on both the upper and lower surface.” It would be good to clarify that there is no PFAS in the materials or in any coating applied to the panels.
	Impact:	PFAS are ‘forever chemicals’ that will negatively affect water quality. Risk from PFAS can be increased during washing to keep them clean, for maximum efficiency of energy generation.
	Solution:	Check with panel manufacturers if the materials used have any PFAS risk.

Additional comments:	
----------------------	--

Septic Tank		
ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Section 5.4.44	Issue:	It is suggested that “waste water associated with welfare facilities will be contained in a septic tank”, however no provision of applying for an environmental permit in relation to foul water can be seen.
	Impact:	There is a requirement to ensure that foul water treatment and disposal is adequate to minimise risk to water quality. If not managed correctly it can greatly increase the about of nutrients, and other contamination, in receiving watercourses.
	Solution:	Foul water disposal strategy during all phases, construction, operation and decommission should be clarified. Permits for septic tanks should be applied for if it is determined that one is required. We also recommend that any foul water strategy is included in Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology, as currently the only information associated with this is that there will be “no direct connection to existing foul infrastructure.”.
Additional comments:	<p>If treatment and discharge at the site is required, you should consider any potential impacts of this discharge and confirm that a water discharge activity permit will be sought. If septic tanks are used this will still need to be assessed. Given the timeframe to determine environmental permits we encourage applicants to engage with us on permit requirements at the earliest possible stage. <a href="#">Septic tanks and sewage treatment plants: what you need to do: Apply for a permit - GOV.UK</a></p> <p>If road transport to an offsite disposal facility is required to remove foul water from the septic tanks via a tanker, then there should be regard for this within the waste management procedures.</p>	

Substation SuDS		
ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development	Issue:	It is unclear if the substations will have their own area lined with impermeable membrane, like each BESS area, to contain any contaminants that could be mobilised in the event of a fire. In sections 5.4.42 – 5.4.46 associated with Work Area No. 3: Substations there is no mention of any lined areas or SuDS containment areas to prevent surface water reaching watercourses or infiltrating into groundwater under the Substation area. Therefore, the drainage arrangements do not appear to be adequate in the event of a substation fire, especially if they contain transformers that rely on oil as a cooling and insulating medium.
	Impact:	In the event of a fire, depending on the type of transformers used and methods to put out the fire,

		substations can pose an unacceptable risk to the water environment receptors and will deteriorate water quality unless it is contained sufficiently.
	Solution:	The substations designs need to include provisions for preventing contamination to water quality in the event of a fire.
Additional comments:	<p>If the substations do contain oil transformer, in the event of a fire, there would be a pathway for contamination to get into surface water runoff.</p> <p>In Appendix 7.4: Stage 1 Water Framework Directive Screening Assessment, section 4.1.3 says that “It is proposed that the drainage system and SuDS features servicing the BESS and Sub-station areas will be impermeably lined”, however this is not clear in Chapter 5 and Chapter 7 of the Environment Statements.</p>	

Water Quality Monitoring		
Appendix 7.4: Stage 1 Water Framework Directive Screening Assessment	Issue:	Section 5.1.6 of the WFD Assessment says that “Water quality monitoring of potentially impacted watercourse will be undertaken to ensure that pollution events can be detected against baseline conditions and dealt with effectively”. However further details of a water quality monitoring plan are requested.
	Impact:	If a monitoring plan is not suitably designed then it may not be able to detect relevant trends, if any, on water quality during the construction and operation phases.
	Solution:	The monitoring plan should reflect locational variation in the site. For example, monitoring upstream and downstream of any proposed water discharges or water crossings. Ideally the monitoring plan will include enough monitoring samples to detect any seasonal variation.
Additional comments:	We recognise that section 5.2 of the WFD Assessment says that the Water Management Plan (WMP), which will be submitted as part of the CEMP, will contain details of pre, during and post-construction water quality monitoring. However, we have not yet been able to review the WMP.	

HDD Breakout Plan		
Appendix 7.4: Stage 1 Water Framework Directive Screening Assessment	Issue:	Section 5.1.6 of the WFD Assessment says that a “site specific frac-out risk assessment will be produced prior to drilling the cable crossings”, however section 5.1.7 suggests there will be a “bentonite fluid breakout plan” in the CEMP.
	Impact:	HDD, or other trenchless installation methods, could impact the water quality of the water environment if not sufficiently managed.
	Solution:	We still need to be able to review a bentonite fluid breakout plan, and would recommend using consistent language of assessments and plans to

		avoid confusion with what mitigation measures are being implemented.
Additional comments:		

## Appendix 2

Subject	Topics	Assessment	Impact	Solution	Agreed requirement/ or updated assessment	Note:
Ecology and Biodiversity	Biodiversity Net Gain	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	<p>EAFBG-004 - Lack of detail on the creation and management of habitats through BNG processes.</p> <p>EAFBG-005 - Lacking detail in the BNG map in addition no BNG metric calculator is supplied.</p> <p>EAFBG-006 - Clarity needed on the watercourses included within the metric, some may be missed/classified as ditches.</p> <p>EAFBG-007 - Use of culvert as habitat type in post development scenario is not appropriate.</p>
	Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP)	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	EAFBG-012 - Post decommissioning plan needs putting in place to ensure left in situ cables don't have an adverse affect on water quality.



						<p>EAFBG-001 - Fish species missing from EIA, only river lamprey and sea lamprey have been assessed.</p> <p>EAFBG-002 - Protected fish species have not been included within Table 3-1 Extended Habitat Survey.</p> <p>EAFBG-003 - No fish species are included within the desk study (appendix 6.2).</p> <p>EAFBG-008 - Construction phase effects on mammals has not been identified.</p> <p>EAFBG-009 water vole populations/locations need to be considered when undertaking crossings.</p> <p>EAFBG-010 - a biosecurity plan should be developed including an INNS monitoring and eradication plan is developed.</p> <p>EAFBG-011 - Water vole survey was undertaken outside of optimal survey season</p>
	<b>Ecological Assessment</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	

	<b>Water Environment Report / WFD</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<p>EAFBG-012 - Watercourse sensitivity not identified correctly.</p> <p>EAFBG-011 - Impacts on WFD waterbodies through the use of culverts</p>
	<b>Flood Risk Assessment</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<p>EAFR-001 - panels indicated to be submerged by 600mm, assessment needed for the panels which will not remain operational, justification needed</p> <p>EAFR-002 - Proposals of voids under inverter stations which could cause increases in offsite flood risk, justification needed and maintenance plan.</p> <p>EAFR-003 - Construction phase impacts have not been identified.</p> <p>EAFR-004 - Details of proposed crossings (above and below ground) have not been provided, impacts on water course and flood defences need to be identified.</p> <p>EAFR-005 - Maintenance</p>

						plans for debris clearance and upkeep of panel legs have not been provided.
	Detailed Flood Modelling (Flood Risk Assessment)	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	<p>EAFM-01 - proposed bridges must sit above the design flood level</p> <p>EAFM-02 - Flood flows from areas where the panels sit below the design flood level could have an effect on flow rates which has not been quantified.</p> <p>EAFM-03 - Grid references for the catchments where the ReFH2 peak flows were calculated need to be included.</p>
Geomorphology	Water Environment Report / WFD	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	
Groundwater Protection &	WFD Assessment	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	

Contaminated Land	Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP)	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	
	Hydrogeology Sensitivities	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	Working on solution	<p>EAGWCL-003 - Greater clarity needed on WFD classification/magnitude of impacts.</p> <p>EAGWCL-006 - SPZs presumed to not be connected to the underlying Superficial Secondary A aquifers.</p> <p>EAGWCL-011 - Firefighting water containment and unlined features associated with the BESS could cause contamination to aquifer</p> <p>EAGWCL-008 - no commitment has been made to the production of a hydrogeological risk assessment for watercourse crossings.</p> <p>EAGWCL-012 - Automatic penstock valve not specified to ensure firefighting water does not discharge into surface water drainage.</p> <p>EAGWCL-013 - Uncited source of data supporting statement</p>

						associated with fire runoff water.
	<b>Surface water and Groundwater abstractions, pollutions incidents and discharge consents Report</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<p>EAGWCL-002 - No reference to private groundwater abstractions has been made and it is unclear what information sources have been used to identify the discussed groundwater abstractions.</p> <p>EAGWCL004 - Figure 8.7 shows additional groundwater abstraction point which may not be considered.</p>

	<b>Contaminated Land</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<b>Working on solution</b>	<p>EAGWCL-001 - Requirement 21 (2) of Draft DCO, incorporation of all parts of the proposed development to be included not just the area for site investigation.</p> <p>EAGWCL-007 - No commitment made to mitigate the risk of unexpected contamination being discovered.</p> <p>EAGWCL-010 - Drilling fluid breakout plan has not been included.</p> <p>EAGWCL-009 - potential for cables left in situ to cause contamination to groundwater.</p>
	<b>Piling Risk Assessment</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	EAGWCL-005 - no commitment to producing a Foundation Works Risk Assessment (this could be completed through the oCEMP)
	<b>Waste Management Strategy</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	
<b>Surface Water Quality</b>	<b>Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP)</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	
	<b>Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP)</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	
	<b>Modelling</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	

<b>Water Resources</b>	<b>Water Supply Strategy</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	EAWR-001 - Recommendation of a water resources strategy to ensure demands can be met.
	<b>Water Resources Assessment</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	EAWR-001 - Anglian Water asks for a Water Resources Assessment to be completed to understand water demands.
<b>Permitting</b>	<b>Consents Strategy</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	<b>Not Agreed</b>	EAGCC-01 - Delays to the delivery of the scheme where consents and agreements are insufficiently comprehensive , to ensure the EA can effectively deal with permit applications.