

Planning Inspectorate
BUCKINGHAM AVENUE, SLOUGH, SL1
4PN

Reference: OR-0007684/01
Customer reference: EN0110013

22 July 2026

**Deadline 2 submissions response letter
The Droves Solar Farm**

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Thank you for contacting us.

This letter constitutes the Environment Agency's Deadline 3 response regarding the Deadline 2 submissions. Please see:

- [Appendix A:](#)
 - Our comments regarding the issues we raised in our Relevant Representation
- [Appendix B:](#)
 - Further comments on the draft Development Consent Order
- [Appendix C:](#)
 - A summary of our position

If you have any questions regarding our response, please contact
Nlteam@environment-agency.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely,


National Contact Centre: 03708 506 506
Nlteam@environment-agency.gov.uk
2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF

Appendix A – Our comments regarding the issues we raised in our Relevant Representation

A number of our issues from our relevant representation have not received any relevant updates in the deadline 2 submissions. We have not included them in this response letter, and are therefore considered unresolved. They are as follows:

- EA10
- EA11
- EA31
- EA33
- EA38
- EA41
- EA45
- EA47

We look forward to reviewing respective updates at a future deadline.

EA01 (Source Protection Zone)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that 6.3 Environmental Statement Figure 12.5 [\[APP-119\]](#) is unclear in regard to how the draft Order Limits, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) sites, substation sites and SPZs intersect.

We are unable to find any amended figures in the updated documents.

EA02 (Drinking Water Protected Area)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that Figure 12.12 [\[APP-126\]](#) does not show all of the drinking water protection designations, including the Drinking Water Surface Water Safeguard Zone and Drinking Water Groundwater Safeguard Zone. The reader is therefore unable to see these designations in the context of the draft Order Limits.

We are unable to find any amended figures in the updated documents.

EA03 (3D Representation of Groundwater)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that 6.3 Environmental Statement Figure 12.7 3D Representation of Groundwater [\[APP-121\]](#) is difficult to interpret, which limits its value. We requested additional views of the modelled area, with a clearer indication of view orientation and contouring of the groundwater surface, if applicable.

We are unable to find any amended figures in the updated documents.

We have reviewed the 8.14 Technical Information Note - Groundwater Elevation Methodology [\[REP2-029\]](#). We have no comments on this technical note for this issue.

EA04 (Groundwater Flow Direction)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that the groundwater flow direction shown in figures 12.7 to 12.16 may be inaccurate. We advised that the claims made in sections 12.6.37 and 12.6.38 of 6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 12: Water Resources [\[APP-061\]](#) should be revised, supported by new evidence.

We are unable to find any amended figures in the updated documents.

We have reviewed the 8.14 Technical Information Note - Groundwater Elevation Methodology [\[REP2-029\]](#). We have no comments on this technical note for this issue.

EA05 (Maximum Foundation Extents)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that figures 12.13 [\[APP-127\]](#), 12.14 [\[APP-128\]](#), 12.15 [\[APP-129\]](#) and 12.16 [\[APP-130\]](#) do not clearly define the area represented by the drawings, including view orientation, or the elevation values.

We are unable to find any amended figures in the updated documents.

We note that figure A12-1-10 provided in the 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#), appears to show no interaction between any of the Work Nos to a depth of 15m. This contradicts the statement in 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) Section 12.8.20, which states that a potential interaction of up to 1m has been determined for a small section of Work No. 4.

EA06 (Avoidance of Pipelines)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that figure 16.1 of [\[APP-131\]](#) didn't show the approximate routes of the former Ministry of Defence (MoD) oil pipeline or Exolum pipeline, which traverse the draft Order Limits.

Section 12.6.19 confirms that the Exolum pipeline does not run through the Scheme, however no further information is provided regarding the abandoned MoD fuel pipeline. We require the figure 16.1 to be updated with the approximate route of the MoD pipeline.

EA13 (Sensitivity Criteria for Receptors)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the sensitivity of receptors in table 12.2 of [\[APP 061\]](#), including Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and private groundwater abstractions for potable use, had been underestimated. This was because Water Framework Directive (WFD) status hadn't been used to characterise receptor sensitivity.

Tables 12.2 and 12.3 in 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) have been updated to include SSSIs and GWDTEs as high sensitivity receptors.

EA15 (Chalk Rivers)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the sensitivity of the receiving surface waterbody (River Nar) had been underestimated. Table 12.3 of [\[APP 061\]](#) doesn't not recognise that the River Nar and several of its tributary watercourses are defined as Priority Habitat Chalk Rivers.

Table 12.3 in 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) has been updated to recognise the River Nar and several of its tributary watercourses as Priority Habitat Chalk Rivers, and therefore as high sensitivity.

EA17 (WFD Groundwater Bodies)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that table 12.6 failed to consider all WFD Groundwater bodies within the Hydrology Study as defined in figure 12.3 of [\[APP-171\]](#).

Table 12.3 in 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) has been updated to include the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk WFD Groundwater Body. It is described and screened out of further assessment as it lies outside the draft Order Limits area.

EA18 (Groundwater Levels)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that there was a lack of clarity regarding where groundwater levels have been recorded as artesian or sub-artesian. Furthermore it was not readily apparent how the recorded borehole groundwater level, and interpolated groundwater levels reported in Table 12.8 [\[APP-061\]](#) related to ground level.

Tables 12.7 and 12.8 in 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) have been updated appropriately and 8.14 Technical Information Note - Groundwater Elevation Methodology [\[REP2-029\]](#) is suitable.

We are content that the Applicant's hydrogeological conceptual model is suitable for this stage of the Proposed Development. We acknowledge that a post-consent programme of intrusive ground investigation and monitoring is secured under the 7.6.2 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked).pdf [\[REP2-023\]](#), which will be used to inform subsequent risk assessment and detailed design. The Applicant has confirmed that should recorded groundwater elevations be higher than is anticipated in the conceptual model, this will be accounted for in the subsequent Foundation Works Risk Assessments. This will ensure foundation construction works do not impact groundwater quality.

EA20 (Boreholes)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the BSG borehole groundwater depths have been reported inaccurately in section 12.6.50 of [\[APP-061\]](#) and requested that it should be updated to refer to the correct borehole groundwater depths.

Section 12.6.60 of 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) has been amended appropriately to refer to the correct borehole groundwater depths.

EA21 (Trenchless Installation Methods)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that the definition provided in table 6 [\[APP-186\]](#) was vague in regard to the trenchless crossing techniques, and therefore, mitigation measures to avoid impacts to groundwater may not be sufficient.

We require the 7.6.2 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked).pdf [\[REP2-023\]](#) to be updated to state that Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) works would be supported by a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment and Drilling Fluid Breakout Plan.

Please note this issue is linked with EA27.

EA23 (Interaction with Groundwater)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that section 12.7.7 of [\[APP-061\]](#) excludes key mitigation measures for trenchless installation methods, which could result in unacceptable impacts to controlled waters.

The Applicant has carried out a review of their conceptual hydrogeological model as reported in the updated 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) and 8.14 Technical Information Note - Groundwater Elevation Methodology [\[REP2-029\]](#). Furthermore, they commits to ground investigation, monitoring and the production of Foundation Works Risk Assessments (FWRA) post-consent, which will inform the detailed design. We note that although groundwater rest levels within the maximum anticipated depth of PV Array piling activities have been recorded within the draft Order Limits area, the results of modelling demonstrate that this is not anticipated to affect proposed PV Array areas (such as in Work No. 1).

EA24 (Foundation Work Risk Assessment)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the FRA [\[APP-170\]](#) stated that a FWRA would only be required if piling goes deeper than the highest recorded groundwater level.

The 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#) has been amended to state that all piling and foundation methods will be determined via a FWRA.

Further advice

6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) Section 12.8.28 and Water Framework Assessment Table 12-4 both state that "...a Foundation Works Risk

Assessment will **likely be required** to ensure piled foundations do not create additional contaminant pathways and any potential impacts on the underlying aquifers, such as turbidity, are managed.” We strongly recommend that Chapter 12 [\[REP2-011\]](#) and 6.4.1 ES Appendix 12.3 Water Framework Directive Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-013\]](#) are updated to make it unambiguously clear that a FWRA will be carried out for all piling and foundation works. This would be consistent with the statements in the 7.6.2 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked).pdf [\[REP2-023\]](#) and Flood Risk Assessment [\[REP2-019\]](#). We expect a FWRA to be carried out for PV piling works, should post-consent ground investigation and monitoring demonstrate that these may interact with groundwater.

EA27 (Hydrogeological Impact Assessment)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that the definition provided in table 6 [\[APP-186\]](#) was vague in regard to the trenchless crossing techniques, and mitigation measures to avoid impacts to groundwater may not be sufficient.

We require the 7.6.2 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked).pdf [\[REP2-023\]](#) to be updated to state that Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) works would be supported by a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment and Drilling Fluid Breakout Plan.

Please note this issue is linked with EA21.

EA32 (Drainage System)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that was unclear how the surface water drainage infrastructure at the BESS, Customer Substation, National Grid Substation and infiltration basin would be managed at decommissioning stage.

The 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#) has been updated to state that any infrastructure that is to remain in place after the lifetime of the scheme, will retain the drainage features which serve it. Furthermore, it will be the responsibility of National Grid Electricity Transmission (or the equivalent future regulator) to maintain effective drainage measures that remain in situ for the National Grid Substation and the Grid Connection Infrastructure, after the Decommissioning phase of the Scheme.

EA34 (Penstock Valve)

We cannot resolve this issue, however progress has been made towards resolution.

We were concerned that it was unclear within the Environmental Statement Chapter 12 [\[APP-061\]](#), the FRA [\[APP-170\]](#) and the outline Battery Safety Management Plan [\[APP-194\]](#) whether the automated penstock valve at the BESS, Customer Substation and National Grid Substation Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)/contaminated water tank would have a backup manual operation.

We note that the 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#) and 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) have been updated to state that automated penstocks with a manual override will be utilized to prevent fire suppressant reaching the infiltration components of the SuDS network.

There is no reference within the current 7.14 outline Battery Safety Management Plan [\[APP-194\]](#) to the inclusion of an automated penstocks with a manual override. We require the outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) to be updated to include this commitment.

EA35 (Removal of Captured Firefighting Water)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that there were insufficient arrangements to ensure that the removal of captured firefighting water would not pose a risk of environmental pollution.

The 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#) has been amended to refer to the same arrangements for the removal of captured fire water as mentioned in the 7.8.1 outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (Tracked) [\[REP1-055\]](#) (and [\[REP2-025\]](#)). We are therefore content to resolve this issue.

EA36 (Underground contaminated water tanks)

We cannot resolve this issue, however progress has been made towards resolution.

We were concerned that spent firefighting water was proposed to be contained within a dedicated underground contaminated water tank(s). This may result in the underground storage of hazardous substances within a Principal aquifer within Source Protection Zone 2, which may not be compliant with Position Statement D2 of [The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection](#).

Section 12.4.47 of the 6.2.1 Chapter 12 Water Resources (Tracked) [\[REP2-011\]](#) refers to the use of a sealed surface in the case of concrete foundations beneath the BESS, or an impermeable membrane or liner to ensure the drainage system is completely sealed. Section 12.4.45 also now states that drainage features will be cleaned prior to any shut-off valves being re-opened.

An outstanding item from the 8.4 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [\[REP1-067\]](#) for this issue is the following: *ES Appendix 12.2: Flood Risk Assessment [AS-053] will be updated at a future Deadline to confirm that, should there be space following the detailed design of the Scheme, then aboveground, impermeably lined detention basins will be favoured over belowground structures.* We have not been able to locate this statement in the updated 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#).

EA37 (Spills and Leaks – Bess and Substation Drainage Systems)

We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that there was an absence of measures to identify and manage the risk of pollution during normal operation of the BESS and Substation sites, when surface water runoff would directly infiltrate into groundwater and surface waterbodies.

The 7.6.1 outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked) [\[REP1-051\]](#) was updated at deadline 1 to confirm that drainage system outfalls, such as installing 'sentinel' monitoring systems, will quickly identify if pollutants are found to be entering the drainage system and enable remedial action. The 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#) has been updated at deadline 2 in alignment with the same measures.

EA42 (Missing Legislation)

We cannot resolve this issue, however progress has been made towards resolution.

We were concerned that two key pieces of guidance were missing from the list of guidance and legislation.

We have reviewed the 6.4.2 Appendix 12.2 Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [\[REP2-019\]](#), and note that the "EA – Approach to Groundwater Protection" and "National standard for sustainable drainage systems (SuDs)" have been included in section 12.4.1. To ensure that contractors act in accordance with the guidance, we request that the "EA – Approach to Groundwater Protection" and "National standard

for sustainable drainage systems (SuDs)” are included within the 7.6.2 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Tracked).pdf [\[REP2-023\]](#).

EA46 (Environment Agency Protective Provisions)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We note that protective provisions are still included for the Environment Agency within Schedule 15 part 5 of the 3.1.2 draft Development Consent Order (Tracked) [\[REP2-005\]](#). We request the removal of this wording to resolve this issue.

Section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 states that for certain types of consents, the relevant body must give permission for the legislation to be included in the DCO. We do not give permission for the inclusion of protective provisions.

We have engaged with the project team on 07 July 2026, and stated the following:

Section 120 of the Planning Act 2008 allows the inclusion of non-planning consents, permits and licences to be included within the DCO, removing the requirement for the Applicant to apply for them separately. This is called ‘disapplication’.

Section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 states that for certain types of consents, the Environment Agency must give permission for the legislation to be included in the DCO. These consents are listed in Schedule 2 of the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015, this list includes many of the permits and consents issued by the Environment Agency.

If Applicants are seeking to disapply any of the permitting legislation, they should contact the Environment Agency as early as possible. The Environment Agency will consider requests to disapply on a case-by-case basis. However, when approached, there are some principles the Environment Agency will consider following a disapplication request:

- The activity will have a low environmental risk,
- The activity should either be temporary, or it can be agreed as part of the construction phase,
- The activity will not require any on-going monitoring or subsequent enforcement of any defined limits,
- The activity is unlikely to be classed as high public interest or has the potential to generate high public interest. The Environment Agency will decide whether an application is of high public interest on a case-by-

case basis. To reach a decision, all relevant information is considered, including:

- Whether the interest relates to issues regulated under an environmental permit,
 - **We note that the Applicant is seeking disapplication for workings within work no.11, which falls within the floodplain of an ordinary watercourse. As previously stated, we do not believe these works would require an environmental permit.**
- The breadth and scale of interest – for example, the number of different sources such as individuals, interest groups, businesses, local councillors, media and whether there is ongoing engagement from the local MP,
- Whether the interest is, or is likely to be, sustained for a period of time.

The Applicant should provide sufficient information with their request to disapply for the Environment Agency to be able to make the above decisions about the activity.

When the Environment Agency have agreed to disapply their legislation they have developed a set of standard Protective Provisions, that are available upon request. It is important for the Applicant to note that the Environment Agency holds the ultimate decision and the right to refuse any request to disapply.

The Applicant stated that work in work no.11, may require a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP). As highlighted above, we do not believe these works would require an environmental permit. The area in question is the floodplain of an ordinary watercourse, rather than a main river, so a FRAP will not be required. Online [guidance](#) states that “You do not need flood risk permits to work on ‘ordinary watercourses’– usually small rivers, streams and ditches.” Furthermore, a FRAP is only required in regards to “activities carried out on the floodplain of a main river”.

EA48 (Permitted Preliminary Works)

We cannot resolve this issue.

We were concerned that the definition of “permitted preliminary works” includes ‘(d) *remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions*’, while the definition of “commence” excludes activities defined as “permitted preliminary works”, i.e. it does not include ‘remedial work in respect of any contamination or adverse ground conditions’. Therefore, the CEMP secured via

Requirement 13, only requires submission of a detailed CEMP prior to commencement. This means that remediation of the site could take place without the CEMP being approved or in place, and therefore without the controls and mitigation commitments offered by the CEMP.

We note that the 3.1.2 draft Development Consent Order (Tracked) [[REP2-006](#)] has been updated to make reference to a permitted preliminary works environmental management plan. Specifically, Requirement 13 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) has been updated to state that “The permitted preliminary works must be carried out in accordance with the permitted preliminary works environmental management plan”. We request that the Environment Agency is consulted on this permitted preliminary works environmental management plan. If an outline version of it is made available, then we also request to be consulted on this document.

Within our relevant representation [[AS-062](#)], we raised an issue the following issue which is still outstanding (see ID: EA48 below). The permitted preliminary works environmental management plan would have relevance to this issue.

ID: EA48 (Permitted Preliminary Works)		
Draft Development Consent Order [APP-018], Part 1: Preliminary. Article 2 ‘Interpretation’; Schedule 2 - Requirements	Issue:	The definition of “permitted preliminary works” includes ‘(d) remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions’, while the definition of “commence” excludes activities defined as “permitted preliminary works”, i.e. it does not include ‘remedial work in respect of any contamination or adverse ground conditions’.
	Impact:	The CEMP secured via Requirement 13, only requires submission of a detailed CEMP prior to commencement. This means that remediation of the site could take place without the CEMP being approved or in place and therefore without the controls and mitigation commitments offered by the CEMP.
	Solution:	We request that either ‘(d) remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions’ is removed from the “permitted preliminary works” definition, or Requirement 13 is amended to include the following clause, “for the purposes of 13(1) “commence” must

		include 'remedial work in respect of any contamination or adverse ground conditions'.
Additional comments:	If the Applicant can point to an alternative satisfactory control to the CEMP then we will consider that.	

Appendix B – further comments on the draft Development Consent Order

Draft Development Consent Order

Procedure for discharge of requirement

As a named consultee on the discharge of several Requirements, we request that the provision of at least 15 working days (21 calendar days) to respond to the discharge authority is reflected in the draft Development Consent Order ([APP-018](#)).

Specifically, this should be addressed within Schedule 16 procedure for discharge of requirement, *Further information and consultation*, 3.(3). Ensuring this timeframe will give us sufficient opportunity to thoroughly review any discharge of requirement applications and provide considered feedback. Furthermore, this is in-keeping with the statutory 21-day response time for town and country planning applications. We therefore request the following wording is input into the Schedule 16 3.(3):

“If the provision governing or requiring the application specifies that consultation with a requirement consultee is required, the relevant planning authority must notify the requirement consultee within 10 working days of the receipt of the application that an application has been received. Thereafter the requirement consultee has 15 working days from the receipt of the notification in which to submit any representations relating to the application to the relevant planning authority. The relevant planning authority must notify the undertaker in writing specifying any further information the relevant planning authority considers necessary of that is has been requested by the requirement consultee within 10 working days of the receipt of such a request from the requirement consultee and or in any event within 25 working days of the receipt of the application (or such other period as is agreed in writing between the undertaker and the relevant planning authority)”

Appendix C – A summary of our position

Relevant Rep Reference	Deadline 3
EA01 (Source Protection Zone)	Not Resolved
EA02 (Drinking Water Protected Area)	Not Resolved
EA03 (3D Representation of Groundwater)	Not Resolved
EA04 (Groundwater Flow Direction)	Not Resolved
EA05 (Maximum Foundation Extents)	Not Resolved
EA06 (Avoidance of Pipelines)	Not Resolved
EA07 (Environmental Legislation)	Resolved
EA08 (Watercourse Buffers)	Resolved
EA09 (Otter and Water Vole)	Resolved
EA10 (Invasive Non-Native Species)	Not Resolved
EA11 (Waste Classification)	Not Resolved
EA12 (Flood Risk – BESS)	Resolved
EA13 (Sensitivity Criteria for Receptors)	Resolved
EA14 (Private Water Supplies)	Resolved
EA15 (Chalk Rivers)	Resolved
EA16 (Abstraction Licence)	Resolved
EA17 (WFD Groundwater Bodies)	Resolved
EA18 (Groundwater Levels)	Resolved
EA19 (Accuracy of Hydrogeological Model)	Resolved
EA20 (Boreholes)	Resolved
EA21 (Trenchless Installation Methods)	Not Resolved
EA22 (Shallow Groundwater)	Resolved
EA23 (Interaction with Groundwater)	Resolved
EA24 (Foundation Work Risk Assessment)	Resolved
EA25 (Construction Mitigation Measures)	Resolved
EA26 (Drilling Fluid Breakout Plan)	Resolved
EA27 (Hydrogeological Impact Assessment)	Not Resolved
EA28 (Spills and Leaks)	Resolved
EA29 (Unexpected Contamination)	Resolved
EA30 (Contaminated Soils)	Resolved
EA31 Removal of buried cables	Not resolved
EA32 (Drainage System)	Resolved
EA33 (BESS Mitigation Measures)	Not resolved
EA34 (Penstock Valve)	Not resolved

EA35 (Removal of Captured Firefighting Water)	Resolved
EA36 (Underground Contaminated Water Tanks)	Not resolved
EA37 (Spills and Leaks – BESS and Substation Drainage Systems)	Resolved
EA38 (Storage of Waste Batteries)	Not resolved
EA39 (Fire Suppressant Chemicals)	Resolved
EA40 (Spacing of BESS)	Resolved
EA41 (Thermal Effects of Buried Cables)	Not resolved
EA42 (Missing Legislation)	Not resolved
EA43 (Use of Concrete)	Resolved
EA44 (Wheel Washing Facilities)	Resolved
EA45 (Water Quality Monitoring)	Not resolved
EA46 (Environment Agency Protective Provisions)	Not resolved
EA47 (Requirement wording)	Not resolved
EA48 (Permitted Preliminary Works)	Not resolved
EA49 (Requirement 13 – Construction Environmental Management Plan)	Resolved
EA50 (Requirement 14 – Operational Environmental Management Plan)	Resolved
EA51 (Dedicated Contaminated Water Tanks)	Resolved