

Light Valley Solar

Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency

Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/08.26

October 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110012
APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)



**Light Valley
Solar**

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

Light Valley Solar

Deadline 3 Submission

Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN0110012
Application Document Reference	EN0110012/APP/LVS/08.26
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	October 2026	Deadline 3 Submission

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Terminology	1
1.3	Status of this document	1
2	Current Position	2

List of tables

Table 1	Current position of matters relevant to the parties' discussions	1
---------	--	---

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared to support the Examination of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for Light Valley Solar (the Proposed Development).
- 1.1.2 This SOCG has been prepared jointly by Light Valley Solar Ltd (the Applicant) and Environment Agency (EA) to clearly identify the current position of the respective parties on specific matters that are, or have been, under discussion. It seeks to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where there are points of agreement between the parties and where agreement has not been reached to date. It therefore aids the ExA in identifying any specific issues that may need to be addressed during the Examination and provides a structure to any further discussions for the parties engaged in the SoCG.
- 1.1.3 This document has been prepared in response to a specific request from the ExA as per the Rule 6 Letter [PD-004] issued on 19 June 2026.

1.2 Terminology

- 1.2.1 Section 2 of this document sets out the relevant matters raised through discussion between the parties. It provides a summary of the position of each party and identifies the status of discussions on each matter:
 - 1) “Agreed” means that a matter has been resolved between the parties and is not anticipated to be subject to further discussion.
 - 2) “Under discussion” means that a matter remains in active dialogue between the parties and a final position has not been reached.
 - 3) “Not agreed” means that the parties have established a final position that they cannot resolve the matter and will remain a point of difference.
- 1.2.2 In accordance with the request from the ExA in the Rule 6 Letter [PD-004], a **Low**, **Medium** and **High** ‘traffic light’ system is applied to each matter to indicate the likelihood of their resolution during the Examination period.

1.3 Status of this document

- 1.3.1 This document is in draft.

2 Current Position

- 2.1.1 Table 1 below provides a summary of the current position of the Applicant and EA.
- 2.1.2 Appendix 1 of this document provides a record of engagement undertaken between the parties in relation to the Proposed Development. This is limited to engagement which is materially relevant to the contents of this SoCG and does not seek to include every correspondence between the parties (e.g. that which was primarily administrative).

Table 1 **Current position of matters relevant to the parties' discussions**

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
Water resources				
RR ref EA01	Electromagnetic fields	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail had been provided in the Application regarding the possible impact of EMFs on fish. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be updated to confirm that the detailed CEMP will set out the electromagnetic field mitigation measures. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] and the Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] are satisfactory and allow this issue to be resolved. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA01 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) and Design Parameters and Commitments document have been updated. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA02	Fish eDNA Survey	In its RR, the EA set out that the fish habitat assessment concludes that the Hagg Lane Drain and Mearley Drain are unsuitable for fish and have therefore been scoped out of the eDNA survey. The EA consider that it has not been clearly demonstrated that this is an acceptable approach.	The Applicant's approach to fish surveys and assessment was previously discussed and agreed with the EA within a meeting held on 04 March 2025. A response was issued to EA02 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014].	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Having reviewed the Applicant's response, the EA position is that the Applicant's response is satisfactory. The EA confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA03	Fish Spawning and Migration Periods	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that noncommittal wording (e.g. "where practicable") has been used to describe the implementation of mitigation measures relating to avoiding periods of fish spawning and migration when conducting noisy construction activities. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the outline CEMP will be updated to remove noncommittal wording and to provide further detail on timings of works and mitigation. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the revisions made to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] are sufficient to address their concerns regarding fish spawning and migration periods. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA02 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments and make a specific commitment in relation to fish spawning periods. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA04	Lamprey Migration Period	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that an incorrect migration period had been stated for river lamprey and sea lamprey. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the outline CEMP and the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment will be	A response was issued to EA04 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP and Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		updated to include the correct river lamprey and sea lamprey migration periods. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that they are satisfied that the correct migratory times will be avoided based on updates to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] and sHRA [REP2-023 and REP2-024]. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA05	Atlantic Salmon Egg Incubation Period	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that an incorrect egg incubation period had been stated for Atlantic salmon. The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014] was sufficient to address the Environment Agency's concerns relating to this matter. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA05 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA06	Culverts	In its RR, the EA stated that culverts may be proposed on watercourses, including the Selby Dam and that any culvert replacement should be replaced with a clear span bridge to improve aquatic habitat and connectivity. Consideration should be given to using clear span bridges instead of culverts for any new proposed watercourse or ditch crossing and justification provided where culverts are still proposed. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it understands the position laid out by the	A response was issued to EA06 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated to account, where appropriate, for the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant [...]	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Applicant in their response and note the commitment to preserve the natural watercourse bed in the DCO Requirements. In respect of otters, the EA noted it was pleased to see confirmation that replacement or new culverts will be designed to ensure that they allow for passage of mammals. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] are satisfactory in respect of fish protection, and free passage of fish and otter in any culverts proposed. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA07	Open-Cut Trenching	In its RR, the EA stated that open-cut trenching will be used to cross low value watercourses including ditches, but there is no consideration within the Application of how this could impact mammals. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the Applicant has committed to incorporating reinstatement of bankside habitats into the outline CEMP, as we recommended. The EA confirmed the issue would remain outstanding until Table 3-13 of the outline CEMP had been updated to include the additional detail described in [PDA-014]. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] in relation to	A response was issued to EA07 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		reinstatement of bankside habitat are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA08	Otter and Water Vole Mitigation During Decommissioning	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that there was an omission of otters and water voles from Table 3-3 of the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the Applicant has committed to adding otter and water vole avoidance and mitigation measures into the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA08 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oDEMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA09	Wheel Washing	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-192] states that there will be wheel wash facilities, but it does not explicitly state that vehicles will be washed prior to entering the site. There is also no mention of how wash water will be collected and disposed of. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [APP-193] would be updated to include further details of	A response was issued to EA09 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oOEMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		how wash water will be managed to ensure contaminants do not enter local watercourses. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092] and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA10	Foul Waste	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail had been provided in the Application regarding the fate of foul water. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that the outline CEMP [APP-192], outline OEMP [APP-193], outline DEMP [APP-194] and Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy [APP-182] would be updated to include further details on how foul drainage will be managed to ensure contaminants do not enter local watercourses. The EA were also pleased to see that the discrepancies between the documents on foul water and effluent would be corrected, and that Table 7-1 within Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment [APP-180] would be updated to consider potential impacts from welfare facilities. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates that have been made to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and	A response was issued to EA10 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP, oOEMP, oDEMP, Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy and Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved. The oDEMP will be updated for Deadline 4.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		REP2-090], outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092], outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094], Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086], WER Assessment [REP2-081 and REP2-082] and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] are satisfactory. The EA recommends that the Applicant clarifies the wording in the outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094] on the topic of foul waste management so that it aligns with the wording used in the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090], outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092] and C127 within the Commitments Register REP2-069 and REP2-070] (i.e. sealed cesspool or package treatment plant). As it stands the outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094] currently only covers how foul water drainage systems will be managed as they are capped off and removed. Despite this recommendation, the EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA11	Sealed Drainage System	In its RR, the EA set out that there is no firm commitment to the use of a fully sealed drainage system at the BESS. The ODS states that the proposed foundation types are not expected to materially affect the surface water drainage design or assessment at the ES stage, however it is unclear how this conclusion has been reached. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it was pleased to see that Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy [APP-182], the outline OEMP [APP-193] and the outline Battery Safety Management	A response was issued to EA11 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oOEMP, Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) and Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Plan (BSMP) [APP-196] would be updated to clarify that the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will be fully sealed. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086], outline BSMP [REP2-097 and REP2-098] and outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092] confirming that drainage systems will be fully sealed are satisfactory and should prevent the risk of contamination in the event of a fire. The Design Parameters and Commitments [REP2-021 and REP2-022] has also been updated to confirm foundation/piling maximum depths. With those details established, and a commitment to Foundation Works Risk Assessment in the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090], the EA are content with the approach taken by the Applicant. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA12	Valves and Penstocks	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail provided in the Application regarding the automatic self- actuating valves, their maintenance schedule and fire suppression systems. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it would review the updated Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment [APP-180] once available.	A response was issued to EA12 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Relevant documents have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the WER Assessment [REP2-081 and REP2-082], Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] and Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA13	BESS and Substation Drainage	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail regarding BESS and substation drainage had been provided in the Application. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it requests further details of the systems to be put in place to prevent pollutant release in the event of a reasonable worst-case major incident. The EA noted that Section 5.5.9 of Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy [APP-182] states that "where no mains drainage is available, treated surface water can be discharged via soakaway providing appropriate containment and management measures are in place". This would introduce the potential for pollutants to be discharged from the Substation drainage systems directly into groundwater. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the current commitments around 'sentinel' type monitoring systems at the BESS outfall are insufficient and they are concerned that there is a risk that spills and leaks during normal BESS operation could go unnoticed. The proposal to	A response was issued to EA13 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Relevant documents have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant will continue to engage with the EA and will submit updated documents where required at Deadline 4.	Under Discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		consider 'sentinel' monitoring systems for the BESS compound drainage system is not yet as secure in the Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086] or outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092] as they would expect and there lacks adequate explanation of how substation drainage will be managed. Additionally, the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] currently does not refer to the consideration of sensor-based systems at the BESS outfall, as indicated in WR-EA-013 within The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 Statutory Bodies [REP2-118]. C131 within the Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] also does not specifically refer to the substation. The EA seeks confirmation from the Applicant as to whether additional water quality monitoring, potentially including sensor-based systems, will be informed by risk assessment and options appraisal at the detailed design stage, the results of which will be incorporated into the detailed Drainage Strategy.		

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
RR ref EA14, 15 and 16	Firewater and post incident recovery plan	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail had been provided in the Application regarding testing of any contained runoff following a fire at a BESS compound and the disposal of firewater. There is no commitment in the post-incident recovery plan or the WER to the cleaning/decontamination of the firewater drainage system prior to valve re-opening. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it notes the Applicant's confirmation that the suppression system would only discharge water. The EA noted that documents would be updated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086], outline BSMP [REP2-097 and REP2-098], outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092] and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this EA14 is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA14, 15 and 16 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Relevant documents have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees EA14 and EA16 are resolved. The Applicant will continue to engage with the EA in regard to EA15 and will submit updated documents where required at Deadline 4.	EA14 and EA16 agreed.
		Regarding EA15, the Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086] states that the requirement for an Environmental Permit would be identified and progressed at detailed design [stage] once final drainage arrangements are confirmed, and prior to commencement of the regulated activity. This appears to relate specifically for discharge of uncontaminated firewater. It is unlikely that an Environmental Permit for the discharge of		EA15 under discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		firewater, pending contamination testing, from the BESS drainage system would be granted pre-emptively prior to operation of the Proposed Development. The EA requests that this text is amended to reflect the likelihood that application for such a Permit would be sought once firewater requiring management was present. EA15 remains outstanding. Regarding EA16, the EA position is that the updates made to the WER Assessment [REP2-081 and REP2-082] and outline BSMP [REP2-097 and REP2-098] mean that there is now a satisfactory level of detail provided on the post-incident recovery plan. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA17	Battery safety	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail had been provided in the Application regarding the storage and disposal of damaged or end-of life batteries. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that documents would be updated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates regarding battery replacement in the outline BSMP [REP2-097 and REP2-098] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response has been issued to EA17 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oBSMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA18	Construction methodology	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient detail regarding the 'construction methodology' mitigation	A response was issued to EA18 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		measures had been provided in Table 3-13 of the oCEMP. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that the oCEMP would be updated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] regarding fuel and oil storage and disposal of water from concrete during construction are satisfactory. The EA also noted the significant improvements made to C156, C172, C178, C180 and C187 within the Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] which cover the topics of fuels, oils, chemicals and concrete, were welcome. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA19	Spill Mitigation During Operation and Decommissioning	In its RR, the EA stated that The outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (PSRP) suggests full mitigation measures will be included in the CEMP, but there are no references to the OEMP and DEMP. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that t the outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (PSRP) would be updated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the outline PSRP [REP2-099 and REP2-100] has been updated for consistency purposes as requested. The EA note that Section 2.4.1 of the outline PSRP [REP2-099 and REP2-	A response was issued to EA19 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The Outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP) has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved. The oOEMP and oDEMP will be updated for Deadline 4.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		100] states that emergency contact details will be listed within the final CEMP and Emergency Response Plan (ERP) and will be adopted and updated during each phase of development. The EA are of the opinion that it is not sufficiently clear that these details will be adopted in the detailed OEMP and detailed DEMP. Despite this recommendation, the EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA20	Storage of Substances during Decommissioning	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that Table 3-12 in the oDEMP does not state enough detail regarding storage and containment measures. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that the oDEMP would be updated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094] are satisfactory and now include references to pollution prevention. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA20 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oDEMP has been updated to reflect the EA's comments. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA21	Mitigation in WER Compliance Assessment	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that there was an omission of the outline OEMP and outline DEMP from the list of management plans which will contain embedded mitigation in Appendix 15.2 and the oPSRP. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations	A response was issued to EA21 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Appendix 15.2 and the oPSRP have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		(Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment and the outline PSRP would be updated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the WER Assessment [REP2-081 and REP2-082] and outline PSRP [REP2-099 and REP2-100] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA22	Commitments register	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that there are several commitments in the commitments register which do not contain sufficient detail to provide confidence in it as a mitigation measure. There are also no commitments with respect to Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) or concrete water disposal. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that a Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) commitment would be added to Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that in general the updates made to the Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] are satisfactory, but they request the addition of a similar commitment to C190 but for the decommissioning phase, secured via the outline DEMP. Site checks will be completed periodically by the Site Manager or a suitable delegate, secured by the outline CEMP, during the construction phase. There is no	A response was issued to EA22 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register and relevant management plans have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant confirms the suggested document updates will be made for Deadline 4. The Applicant would then consider this issue resolved.	Under Discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		equivalent commitment for the decommissioning phase. There is a risk that unsuitable conditions could go unnoticed and mitigated during the decommissioning phase.		
RR ref EA23	Drainage during Decommissioning	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that it is unclear how drainage will be managed during decommissioning. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that the oCEMP and oOEMP would be updated to explicitly reference the potential need for a Water Discharge Activity Permit. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the Applicant needs to provide clarification on why the potential need for a Water Discharge Activity Permit has been added and then deleted from the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070]. The EA anticipate that permits could still be required in construction phase. This seems to be in direct contradiction of what the Applicant has previously said in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014] where it states that the acquisition of a Water Discharge Activity Permit would be made explicit in the outline CEMP and outline OEMP.	A response was issued to EA23 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant will continue to engage with the EA on this issue and any required document updates will be submitted at Deadline 4.	Under Discussion
RR ref EA24	Water Quality Monitoring	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that the frequency and location of water quality monitoring is unclear in the Application.	A response was issued to EA24 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oPSRP, oCEMP, oOEMP and oDEMP have	Under Discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that the oPSRP, oCEMP, oOEMP and oDEMP would be updated to include a commitment for a monitoring plan. The EA requested a clear securing mechanism for EA review and approval of the PSRP. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] should be updated to make it clear that there will also be post-construction monitoring. The EA also request that the outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092] is updated to make it clear that there is also the purpose to check it has returned to baseline conditions as measures pre-construction. The EA also request that the wording of the outline OEMP [REP2-091 and REP2-092], outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094] and outline PSRP [REP2-099 and REP2-100] are amended to be in line with the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] which states that the monitoring plan will be developed in consultation with the Environment Agency. As it stands this is inconsistent across the documents. Additionally, the EA request that C30 within the Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] should be updated to clearly state that the monitoring plan will include sampling methodology, analytical suites and protocols for identifying and addressing nonconformance.	been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant will continue to engage with the EA on this issue and any required document updates will be submitted at Deadline 4.	

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
RR ref EA25	Pollution Policy and Guidance	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that there are errors and omissions within the guidance and policy identified within the Outline CEMP and Outline Drainage Strategy. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that the oCEMP and Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy would be updated to ensure the correct pollution policy and guidance is cited. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-085 and REP2-086], outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] now cite the correct pollution policy and guidance. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA23 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP and Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA26	Degradation of Cables	In its RR, the EA noted that the Application states that it is anticipated that cabling would not be replaced during the operational phase. The EA note that there is a risk that should cabling degrade during the lifetime of the development it would release pollutants into the water environment. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that following the Applicant's confirmation that cabling will be designed to safely operate for the duration of the operational period of the Proposed Development, the Environment Agency	A response was issued to EA26 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP and Appendix 15.4 Outline Drainage Strategy have been updated to reflect the EA's comments. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.		
RR ref EA27	Impact on Groundwater Abstractions	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that Table 15-9 (Assessment of Importance) of Chapter 15 does not directly include groundwater abstractions as a receptor to impacts. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 [WR-EA-026] the EA noted that it considers abstractions for agricultural use (i.e. potentially for food production purposes) and unlicensed abstractions for potable use should be considered to be high sensitivity rather than medium sensitivity. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that Chapter 15 – Water Resources and Flood Risk [REP2-043 and REP2-044] now class licensed and unlicensed abstractions as 'High' sensitivity. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA27 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A response was issued to WR-EA-026 at Deadline 2 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that Chapter 15 and Appendix 15.3 have been updated for Deadline 2 to incorporate this change. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA28	BESS and Substation Interaction with Water Table	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that it is stated that foundation construction at the BESS and Substation sites is not anticipated to encounter groundwater, however the EA's review of available data indicates this may not be the case. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it looked forward to reviewing the updated	A response was issued to EA28 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. A response was issued to WR-EA-026 at Deadline 2 in The Applicant's Response to	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		oCEMP when this was available. The EA stated that there are approximately fifteen crossings proposed for trenchless methods which lie within groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 associated with public water abstractions and the majority of these are in areas with no superficial cover. The Applicant should ensure that Hydrogeological Risk Impact Assessments (including water feature surveys) are undertaken to inform the design of all trenchless crossings and that trenchless works are carried out in accordance with a drilling fluid breakout plan. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] provide results of proportionate assessment of dewatering impacts based on site-specific groundwater levels. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that Chapter 15 has been updated to incorporate this change and the commitment to a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment and a breakout plan is already incorporated into the oCEMP. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA29	Retaining Access to Monitoring and Sampling Points	In its RR, the EA set out that Chapter 15 states that there are no river flow or level gauging stations within the Order Limits or Study Area, and that five hydrometric monitoring stations are present within the Study Area. The EA stated that their records show there are several surface water and groundwater monitoring and sampling points within the Proposed Development footprint. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that Chapter 15 - Water Resources and Flood Risk should be updated to include the information set out in its response.	A response was issued to EA29 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A response was issued to WR-EA-028 at Deadline 2 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that Chapter 15 and Figure 15.4 have been updated for D2 to add the required details.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the submission of Figure 15.4 Groundwater and Surface Water Designations [REP2-052] adds an additional hydrometric monitoring point which they had identified. The EA notes that the Figure contains some errors and omissions, but the EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved. Figure 15.4 will be reviewed and any updates required will be made for Deadline 4.	
RR ref EA30	Retention of Cables Post Decommissioning	In its RR, the EA noted that decommissioning proposals include leaving most ground infrastructure below 1.2 mbgl in situ within Solar Development Sites. Cables left in situ may represent an unacceptable risk of pollution of controlled waters via degradation. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that the oCEMP would be updated to include a commitment relating to cable construction, as requested. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updated outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] contains a satisfactory commitment relating to the fate of cables post-decommissioning. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA29 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA31	Peat deposits	In its RR, the EA noted that the Cable Route Corridor extends through localized mapped deposits of peat. Unmitigated damage to peat deposits during the	A response was issued to EA31 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014].	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		construction phase could result in the release of contaminants which may affect water quality. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that this issue is considered resolved, given that they are satisfied that any required mitigation measures will be incorporated into the detailed CEMP as appropriate, which the Environment Agency will be consulted on. The Environment Agency confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA32	Thermal Pollution of Groundwater	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that thermal effects of buried cables have not been considered in the Application. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it looked forward to reviewing further details of this approach in due course. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the EA await consultation on the study.	A response was issued to EA32 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant can confirm it will share the study of thermal effects with the EA as soon as possible.	Under Discussion
RR ref EA33	WER Waterbodies within the Study Area	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that Table 6-1 in Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment lists all WER waterbodies within the Order Limits but does not include WER water bodies within the Study Area.	A response was issued to EA33 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Appendix 15.2 has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that additional waterbodies would be added to Table 6-1 of Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment. However, the Applicant should provide justification for screening out the Derwent Sherwood Sandstone. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that they are satisfied that the additional WER waterbodies have been added to the WER Assessment [REP2-081 and REP2-082] and justification has been provided for the decision to screen out Derwent Sherwood Sandstone due to distance and absence of hydrological connection, as requested. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to WR-EA-031 at Deadline 2 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment has been updated for Deadline 2 to include justification for screening out the groundwater body. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA34	Dewatering and GWDTEs	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that GWDTEs should be clearly included as examples of sensitive receptors in section 15.8.7 of Chapter 15. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that trenchless crossings may require local dewatering of launch and reception pits, which could affect Burr Closes SSSI if unmitigated. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that Section 15.8.7 of Chapter 15 – Water Resources and Flood Risk [REP2-043 and REP2-044] should be updated to commit to	A response was issued to EA34 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A response was issued to WR-EA-032 at Deadline 2 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that Chapter 15 has been updated has been updated for Deadline 2 to include this change. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant will continue to engage with the EA	Under Discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (HIA) for trenchless watercourse crossings, and for other trenchless crossings where works may interact with groundwater in Principal or Secondary aquifers. This should also be captured in the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090].	on this issue and any required document updates will be submitted at Deadline 4.	
RR ref EA35	BESS and Substation Interaction with Bedrock	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that there is potential for bedrock to be encountered at shallower depth than anticipated, resulting in increased potential for contaminative impact and/or creation of new flow pathways. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it would review the updated oCEMP once available. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] are satisfactory since a Foundation Works Risk Assessment (FWRA) will be required for any foundation solution likely to interact with, or else create a new pollution pathway to, a Secondary or Principal aquifer. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA35 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA36	Omission of Groundwater Units	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that several superficial and bedrock units have been missed from Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment.	A response was issued to EA36 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014].	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA requested that Section 4.3.3 of Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment is updated so that it directs the reader to Chapter 15 - Water Resources and Flood Risk for full details of the geological setting of the Proposed Development. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the update to the WER Assessment [REP2-081 and REP2-082] is satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-034 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment has been updated for Deadline 2 to include the additional cross reference to the relevant section of Chapter 15. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA37	Historic Worked Ground	In its RR, the EA noted that the GroundSure reports indicate the presence of localised areas of historic worked ground. The Applicant should commit to avoidance or investigation and remediation where necessary of any areas of historic ground working. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted it was pleased to see that the outline CEMP and Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register would be updated to commit to avoidance or investigation and remediation where necessary of any areas of historic ground working. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] and outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] are satisfactory.	A response was issued to EA37 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP and Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register have been updated. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA38	Infiltration into the Cable Trench	In its RR, the EA noted that Table 3-13 in the oCEMP and item 132 in Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register state that clay stanks or alternative impermeable material will be included at regular intervals along the length of the cable trench when passing close to Burr Closes SSSI to minimise the risk of the cable acting as a preferential flow path. The EA outlined that there is no mitigation provided to prevent infiltration into the cable trench. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted it was pleased to see that the oCEMP and Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register would be updated to correct the reference to the pipeline'. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] and Commitments Register [REP2-069 and REP2-070] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA38 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP and Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register have been updated. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA39	Watching Brief	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that Table 3-14 in the oCEMP should clearly state that construction personnel will be provided briefings and toolbox talks, identifying visual and olfactory indicators of contamination	A response was issued to EA39 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2.	Under Discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		and the need to implement the discovery protocol when these are encountered. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted it was pleased to see that the oCEMP would be updated to clearly state that construction personnel will be provided briefings and toolbox talks which will identify visual and olfactory indicators of contamination and the need to implement protocols when these are encountered, as requested. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that detail is missing from Table 3-13 within the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] regarding how construction personnel will be provided briefings and toolbox talks which will identify visual and olfactory indicators of contamination and the need to implement protocols when these are encountered. The EA also request that the requirement for a land contamination toolbox talk, linked to the contamination watching brief and discovery protocol, should be added to ensure that the toolbox talks are not overlooked by the Contractor.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant confirms that the oCEMP will be made for Deadline 4.	
RR ref EA40	HDD Method Statement	In its RR, the EA noted that it is confirmed that any works relating to HDD will be undertaken in line with a Method Statement. The EA outlined that this does not currently refer to the production of a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment for trenchless crossing works.	A response was issued to EA40 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that they are satisfied that the outline CEMP [APP-192] already includes a commitment to completing a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment for trenchless crossing work in Table 3-13, therefore this issue is considered resolved. The Environment Agency confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.		
RR ref EA41	Decommissioning of Cable Trench	In its RR, the EA noted that there is no reference to the proposed presence of clay stanks or alternative impermeable material in the cable trench in the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted it was pleased to see that the oDEMP would be updated to include a commitment for appropriate mitigation to be applied for impermeable structures such as clay stanks where removal of cabling is taken forward. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the outline DEMP [REP2-093 and REP2-094] are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA41 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oDEMP has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA42	Roles and Responsibilities	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that it is unclear in the oPSRP which key roles and responsibilities apply to which phases of the Proposed Development.	A response was issued to EA42 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oPSRP and oDEMP have been updated.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted it was pleased to see that the oDEMP and oPSRP would be updated to clarify details surrounding roles and responsibilities. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the outline PSRP [REP2-099 and REP2-100] regarding which key roles apply to which phases of the Proposed Development are satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA43	Pollution Incidents	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that some potential environmental incidents are not included in the list of pollution related issues included in section 2.1.1 of the oPSRP. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted it was pleased to see that the oPSRP would be updated to include further details on issues including application of pesticides and/or herbicides, and management and maintenance of oil/water interceptors, if present. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the outline PSRP [REP2-099 and REP2-100] has been updated to include further details on issues including application of pesticides and/or herbicides, and management and maintenance of oil/water interceptors, if present. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA43 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oPSRP has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
RR ref EA44	COMAH	In its RR, the EA noted that reference is made to 'Consultation with the Pipeline Operators and HSE' for any decommissioning works falling within identified COMAH sites. The EA consider that this may be an error as the development is understood not to include a pipeline component or be subject to COMAH. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that this issue is considered resolved, since the Applicant has confirmed that the Proposed Development does not include a pipeline and will not be subject to COMAH regulations. The Environment Agency confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.	A response was issued to EA44 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA45	Flood defences	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that insufficient assessment of the impact of the proposed cable route corridor on flood defences is included in the Assessment. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it would expect to see a commitment to monitoring the defences whilst works take place. Additionally, the Applicant should commit to producing a contingency plan for if embankments become damaged or start to collapse during works. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] has been updated to include the requested commitments in relation to the monitoring	A response was issued to EA45 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The oCEMP and Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register have been updated. These were shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-041 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		of flood defences. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA46	Design flood level	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that a specific height for the design flood level has not been specified in the Application. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the Applicant has proposed reasonable finished floor levels based on the 1 in 100-year plus 31 / 30% adopted climate change allowance plus 300 mm freeboard or set to the height of the credible maximum scenario (whichever is higher). The Environment Agency confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.	A response was issued to EA46 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA47	Solar PV Panel Freeboard	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that solar PV panel freeboard above the design flood level is not clear in Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment. The influence of the solar PV panels on flood flows is also not clear. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it did not agree with the Applicant's response to this issue. The EA stated that solar panels should not be inundated in the design flood event. Where panels are located within the design flood extent (such as Site 1), they should be raised such that the panels themselves remain above flood levels. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the FRA [REP2-	A response was issued to EA47 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-042 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that the FRA has been updated for Deadline 2 and includes the commitment to apply these parameters where solar panels interact with the design flood event (Solar Development Site 1). The Design Parameters and Commitments Document has also been updated for Deadline 2 to reflect this commitment.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		079 and REP2-080] has been satisfactorily updated to state that minimum finished floor levels for flood sensitive assets and solar PV panels within the design flood extent of Solar Development Site 1 will be set at the 1 in 100 year event plus a 31%/30% climate change allowance and 300 mm freeboard, or the credible maximum flood scenario, whichever is greater. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA48	Offsite Flood Risk	In its RR, the EA set out that Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment confirms that there will be a 4mm increase in flood depth in Site 1, and as such a 4mm increase in flood depth is estimated across the whole site. The EA note however, the FRA does not state where these increases will occur and if they will have offsite impacts. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that solar PV panels themselves should be raised above the design flood level within Site 1 as noted within our response to EA47 and any volumetric and level change calculations should be updated to reflect this change. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the additional detail added to the FRA [REP2-079 and REP2-080] on the impacts on flood risk elsewhere and the hydraulically connected floodplain is satisfactory. The EA are satisfied that there will be minimal impact on the whole floodplain.	A response was issued to EA48 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-043 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that the FRA has been updated for Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.		
RR ref EA49	Land raising	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that there is a potential loss of floodplain storage at substations. There should be a commitment within the DCO to compensate for any land raising within the design flood extent. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that the Applicant must ensure that sufficient wording is included within Design Parameters and Commitments document. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the additional text added to the outline CEMP [REP2-089 and REP2-090] and FRA [REP2-079 and REP2-080] relating to localised changes in ground levels is satisfactory. The EA are also satisfied with the proposal for the full assessment of impacts to be secured within the detailed CEMP for which the Environment Agency is a named consultee for the discharge of this Requirement. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA49 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The Design Parameters and Commitments Document has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-044 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies, stating that the oCEMP and FRA have been updated for Deadline 2. The updated text was agreed with the EA via email on 25/08/26. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA50	Breach location	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that Breach Location 1 may not represent the full residual risk to Solar Development Site 4. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that no further action is	A response was issued to EA50 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		required. The Environment Agency confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.		
RR ref EA51	Functional floodplain	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that it is not clear whether any aspects of the development fall within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA asked that the Applicant confirms if any aspects of built development fall within the Functional Floodplain for Site 1 based on the Lower Ouse and Wharf Washlands model output data. The EA suggested presentational changes to Figure 15.10. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that sufficient additional detail regarding the use of the 1 in 30-year (3.3% AEP) extent for the definition of Flood Zone 3b has been provided. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA51 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-045 in The Applicant's Response to Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies stating that no built development is understood to fall within the functional floodplain on Solar Development Site 1. Figure 15.10 has been updated and submitted at Deadline 2. The FRA has also been updated as part of the Deadline 2 submission to include further details on Flood Zone 3b. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA52	Fencing	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that locations of proposed palisade fencing and general fencing has not been provided in Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA noted that it was pleased to see that the Design Parameters and Commitments would be updated to state that where fencing intersects flood zones it should be	A response was issued to EA52 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The Design Parameters and Commitments Document has been updated. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		designed to ensure blockage risk is kept to a minimum and that there are no impacts on flood flow routes. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates made to the Design Parameters and Commitments document [REP2-021 and REP2-022] are satisfactory as they now state that where fencing intersects flood zones it should be designed to ensure blockage risk is kept to a minimum and that there are no impacts on flood flow routes. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	
RR ref EA53	Hydraulic modelling	There are some uncertainties which remain in the modelling which could have an impact on the assessment of flood risk. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the Environment Agency confirmed in their Deadline 1 response [REP1-019] that this issue is considered to be resolved.	A response was issued to EA53 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A meeting was held on 02/07/2026 with the EA to discuss the EA's comments on flood modelling. It was agreed on the call that Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment would be updated to include displacement calculation, revised freeboard commitments for solar panels on Site 1, and subsequent conclusions on assessment of impacts. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
RR ref EA54	Requirement 10 Surface and Foul Water Drainage	In its RR, the EA noted that is not listed as a named consultee for the discharge of Requirement 10 (Surface and Foul Water Drainage). Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the Draft DCO [REP2-004 and REP2-005] which now includes the Environment Agency as a named consultee for the discharge of Requirement 10, is satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	A response was issued to EA54 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The DCO has been updated to add the EA as a consultee to this Requirement. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA55	Requirement 13 Draft Development Consent Order	In its RR the EA raised that it is not listed as a named consultee for the discharge of Requirement 13 (Operational Environmental Management Plan). Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that the updates to the Draft DCO [REP2-004 and REP2-005] which now includes the Environment Agency as a named consultee for the discharge of Requirement 13, is satisfactory. The EA confirms that this issue is resolved in their D3 response.	The Applicant notes this issue is resolved. A response was issued to EA55 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. The DCO has been updated to add the EA as a consultee to this Requirement. This was shared with the EA and submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA56	Requirement Wording	In its RR, the EA noted that numerous Requirements in the draft DCO state that detailed management plans "must be substantially in accordance with" the outline version of the management plan. The EA consider that using the term "substantially" results in a Requirement being unenforceable and is not precise.	This is not agreed by the Applicant. A response was issued to EA56 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. A response was issued at Deadline 2 to WR-EA-049 in The Applicant's Response to	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it maintains its position on this matter. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that they maintain their position on this matter.	Submissions Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Bodies. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant maintains its position and will be retaining the word "substantially" in the drafting of its requirements.	
RR ref EA57	Environment Agency Protective Provisions	In its RR, the EA set out that it considered that the Protective Provisions included in the draft DCO for the protection of the Environment Agency do not match the EA's standard Protective Provisions. Having reviewed the Protective Provisions submitted at Deadline 2, the EA is content and therefore gives its consent under section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 in article 6 of the draft DCO.	The Applicant has agreed to amend the Protective Provisions to align with the EA's requests. This was shared with the EA and the updated DCO submitted at Deadline 2. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant agrees this is resolved.	Agreed
RR ref EA58	Discharge of Requirements Procedure	In its RR, the EA set out that as a named consultee on the discharge of several Requirements, it requests the provision of at least 21 calendar / 15 business days in which to respond to the discharge authority. In its response to Applicant's responses at D1 the EA stated that it does not agree with the Applicant's response to this issue. This is something that the EA is asking for across all NSIPs. Having reviewed the Applicant's response and updated documentation, the EA position is that no changes have	A response was issued to EA58 in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]. Following the EA's latest comments, the Applicant's position is that it does not propose to make the requested change by the EA.	Not agreed.

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
		been made to the discharge of Requirements procedure in the Draft DCO [REP2-004 and REP2-005] in respect of this issue.		
EA59	Permitted Preliminary Works – Surface Water Quality	In their D3 response, the EA included a new issue following the submission of a new document Permitted Preliminary Works Environmental Management Plan (PPWEMP) [REP2-113]. The EA raised concerns regarding how surface water quality would be protected, consistency across other management plans, impacts on timelines for establishing the water quality baseline, and the omission of key guidance relevant to the protection of water quality.	The Applicant will engage with the EA on this issue and the nature of the Permitted Preliminary Works (PPWs). In response to the comments about surface water, the Applicant refers to paragraph 1.7.6 of the PPWEMP which requires good practice measures are maintained to manage surface water impacts during the carrying out of the PPWs, and that such measures must ensure that surface water runoff is appropriately controlled and managed so as to avoid adverse effects on land, watercourses, drainage. Beyond this, the Applicant considers the nature of the PPWs do not create the need for a full drainage system to be in place (save for the Bird Mitigation Area, where the Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan is required to be approved before works can begin on this area). In response to the comments about welfare and waste, the Applicant will update the PPWEMP at Deadline 4 for further details on monitoring, welfare facilities and foul waste	Under Discussion

Row ID	Topic	EA position	Applicant position	Status
			and key guidance will be reviewed and updated where required. In response to the comments about monitoring, the Applicant will update the Outline CEMP at Deadline 4 to confirm that the CEMP monitoring plan would take account of what was developed for the PPWs.	
EA60	Mechanism for Review and Approval of the Preliminary Works Environmental Management Plan	In their D3 response, the EA included a new issue following the submission of a new document PPWEMP [REP2-113]. The EA raised concerns regarding how there is currently no mechanism in the draft DCO [REP2-004 and REP2-005] to secure review and approval of the PPWEMP [REP2-113], and to ensure that PPW do not commence until approval has taken place. If the PPWEMP [REP2-113] is insufficiently protective of environmental effects, these activities could impact controlled waters.	The Applicant will engage with the EA on this issue. The Applicant considers that there should not be a need for post consent approval of a PPWEMP (and notes that the list of PPWs has been carefully considered so as to not require prior approval). The Applicant is open to discussing whether additional controls are required in the PPWEMP itself to give the EA assurance on this matter.	Under Discussion

Appendix 1: Record of Engagement

Date	Method of engagement	Purpose / description
22/08/2025	Meeting	The applicant provided an introduction to the Proposed Development
30/11/2025	Email	Update about scoping, non-statutory consultation and team changes
29/01/2025	Meeting	Flood modelling
28/03/2025	Meeting	Flood modelling
01/04/2025	Email to EA	The Applicant issued meeting minutes from 20/01/2025 meeting
03/04/2025	Meeting	River crossing techniques and scope of fish assessment
12/06/2025	Meeting	To outline the flood risk assessment to the EA
13/06/2025	Meeting	To discuss effects and mitigation related to Water Resources, Water Quality, Groundwater and Contaminated Land
23/06/2025	Meeting	To discuss Geomorphology, Biodiversity and Fisheries
05/08/2025	Email from EA	EA issued response to the Section 42 consultation.
06/08/2025	Email from EA	EA confirmed the EAs area team are happy for the Applicant to disapply and this would be the EAs preference over Flood Risk Activity Permits.
15/08/2025	Meeting	To discuss design flood level and freeboard heights
29/08/2025	Email from EA	To confirm no comments on meeting minutes from meetings on 23/06/25 and only comment on the meeting minutes from 13/06/25 was that Lucy Houghton (LH)(EA) needed to be added to the attendee list.
01/09/2025	Meeting	To provide and discuss our responses to the EAs S42 consultation
13/10/2026	Email from EA	EA emailed to request update on flood modelling on the project.
20/11/2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss volumetric assessment, watercourse crossings, flood modelling, issues tracker and consents and licences.
28/11/2025	Email to EA	The Applicant issued meeting minutes from 20/11/2025 meeting
09/12/2025	Meeting	Meeting to review the issues tracker.
19/12/2025	Email from EA	EA confirmed meeting minutes from meeting on 20/11/2025 were reasonable from the EAs perspective. EA confirmed as culverts are only proposed on Ordinary Watercourses/ditches and not on Main Rivers all design aspects would sit with the LLFA. The EA would only require evidence that the new culverts would not cause increased fluvial risk. This could be done by providing minimum soffit heights of the culverts 600mm above the 1 in 100 + CC level or modelling.
08/01/26	Email to EA	The Applicant issued meeting minutes from 09/12/2025 meeting
14/01/2026	Email to EA	Flood modelling logs issued to the EA.
14/01/2026	Email from EA	EA issued comments on Lower Ouse flood model.
16/01/2026	Email from EA	EA issued comments on Lower Aire flood model.
December to February 2026	Emails to EA	Applicant issued versions of multiple application documents for EA review.
January to February 2026	Emails from EA	EA issued comments on the application document shared by the Applicant.
30/03/2026	Meeting	General project management meeting. Discussed relevant representations, examination programme and hearing timetable.
30/03/2026	Email from EA	EA issued a copy of the EAs standard protective provisions.
14/04/2026	Email to EA	Applicant issued an extract of the issues tracker to the EA.

Date	Method of engagement	Purpose / description
07/05/2026	Email from EA	EA shared their Relevant Representation response to the Applicant.
20/05/2026	Email from EA	EA issued latest comments on flood modelling
28/05/2026	Email to EA	Applicant issued responses to the EA's latest flood modelling comments.
01/06/2026	Meeting	General project management meeting. Discussed preliminary meeting scheduling, issues tracker, SoCG and invoicing.
04/06/2026	Email from EA	EA sent copy of the issues tracker with latest EA comments.
04/06/2026	Email from EA	EA confirmed they do not have a dataset which breaks down Flood Zone 3a and 3b.
11/06/2026	Email to EA	Link to Relevant Representation responses sent to the EA
12/06/2026	Email from EA	Confirmed receipt and that the EA are reviewing responses and will flag where they don't agree with the comment.
15/06/2026	Email to EA	Confirmed Applicant is updating documents based on Relevant Representation responses and these will be shared with the EA so conversations can continue towards turning more items on the issues tracker green. Applicant confirmed a draft SoCG would be shared with the EA when prepared.
16/06/2026	Email to EA	Requesting a meeting to discuss the assessment of thermal effects of cabling.
16/06/2026	Email from EA	Confirmed meeting to be held on 22/06/26. Provided advice on assessment of thermal effects of cabling.
22/06/2026	Meeting	Meeting to discuss thermal effects of cabling and document updates following relevant representations.
22/06/2026	Email to EA	The Applicant issued meeting minutes from 22/06/2026 meeting.
02/07/2026	Meeting	Meeting to discuss EA flood comments
07/07/2026	Email to EA	Email to issue document updates to the EA following updates made in response to Relevant Representation comments.
16/07/2026	Meeting	Fortnightly project management meeting
12/08/2026	Email from EA	Email to forward on the EA's two responses submitted at Deadline 1.
18/08/2026	Email from EA	Email regarding EA27, Peel Hall Farm Drift OBH and Groundwater Level Measurements.
24/08/2026	Email from EA	Email to share an updated version of the SoCG and to request further information on EA49 Land Raising.
24/08/2026	Email to EA	Email to share proposed wording for EA49 to be added to the oCEMP and FRA
25/08/2026	Email from EA	Email to confirm the EA were satisfied with the proposed wording to be added to the oCEMP and FRA for EA49
14/09/2026	Meeting	Project management meeting
16/09/2026	Email to the EA	Email to the EA to request their consultation on the proposed change application.
16/09/2026	Email from the EA	Email to confirm the EA would respond to the Applicant on the proposed design changes.
28/09/2026	Email to the EA	Email to the EA to follow up on the SoCG and the EA's feedback on document updates.
29/09/2026	Email to the EA	Email to the EA to seek their feedback on the Change Application.
29/09/2026	Email from EA	Email to share the EA's comments on the proposed potential culverts over Dam Dike and Roe Lane Drain.

Appendix 2: Signing Sheet

Signature	
Name	
Position	
On behalf of	Environment Agency
Date	

--	--

Name	Annette Lardeur -
Position	Senior Development Manager -
On behalf of	Light Valley Solar Limited
Date	06 October 2026



Light Valley
Solar

W: Lightvalleysolar.co.uk
E: info@lightvalleysolar.co.uk