The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Our ref: XA/2025/100350/05-L01
Your ref: EN020026

Date: 10 March 2026

To whom it may concern

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY RESPONSE FOR DEADLINE 5.

SEA LINK, EAST ANGLIA AND KENT

This response constitutes the Environment Agency's Deadline 5 response.

We have reviewed the Deadline 4 submissions. Following our review, we respond to the outstanding issues raised within our Relevant Representation [RR-1586] and the subsequent response letters:

- Comments on any further information/ submissions received by deadline 1 and deadline 1A [REP2-050]
- Late Deadline 2 Submission - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority [REP2-144]
- Responses to ExQ1 [REP3-104]
- Comments on any further information/ submissions received by deadline 3 [REP4-185]
- Late Deadline 4 submission Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority [REP4-214]

We have also reviewed the Examining Authority's Written Questions 2 (ExQ2) [PD-021] dated 25 February 2026 and our comments are provided in the table appended to this letter.

This letter is therefore comprised of the following:

- Appendix A: Our response to documents submitted at deadline 4
- Appendix B: Summary of our position
- Appendix C: Our response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions 2

Yours faithfully

[redacted]
Planning Advisor

Direct e-mail NITeam@environment-agency.gov.uk

APPENDIX A – Our response to documents submitted at deadline 4

Please note that our response includes only those issues IDs for which the Deadline 4 submissions are relevant and seek to address. We have not provided further comment on issue IDs where no relevant documents, or substantive comments, were submitted at deadline 4. Therefore, these issues remain unresolved, and we expect that the Applicant will submit relevant information for them at deadline 5. These outstanding issue IDs are as follows:

- EA019
- EA040
- EA053
- EA064
- EA075

Please also see Appendix B: Summary of our position, for a tracker of which issue IDs are resolved and unresolved.

Requirement 6 - Construction management plans to be approved

We are pleased that we are now named as being a consultee for:

- Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (a)
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) – Suffolk (f)
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) – Kent (g)
- Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (LEMP) – Suffolk (h)
- Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (LEMP) – Kent (i)
- Material and Waste Management Plan (n)
- Drainage Management Plan - Suffolk (o)
- Drainage Management Plan – Kent (p)

We request to be consulted/an approving body for the following:

- Flood Management Plan (FMP) (q)
- Code of Construction Practice (r)
- Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC)

Requirement 11 - Removal of temporary bridges and culverts

We request to be consulted on/listed as an approving authority on requirement 11 (1), in regards to the temporary bridge over the River Stour (as stated in section 4.6.74 of REP1A-004).

EA001 Biodiversity

We do not consider this issue resolved.

Commitments B71 and NV03 in document Late Deadline 4 Submission - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority - 9.84 (B) Register of Environmental Commitments (REAC) [REP4-234] have not been updated.

B71 still states “During winter, construction work within 4 m of any watercourse areis only to be undertaken during 7am to 7pm, except during emergencies, to avoid disturbing otter during the core of the night.” These proposed construction timings over winter still include periods of darkness when otters are most active.

NV03 has not been updated to include specific reference to wildlife (namely nocturnal protected species) as a ‘sensitive receptor’.

EA002 Biodiversity
We do not consider this issue resolved.

Commitments B25, B46 and B47 in document Late Deadline 4 Submission - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority - 9.84 (B) Register of Environmental Commitments (REAC) [REP4-234] have been included in relation to water vole. We are content with the additional details provided regarding water vole watching briefs and timings prior to vegetation removal.

However, vegetation clearance should be undertaken following pre-commencement surveys as outlined in B01. If, as it is assumed in commitment B46, that any ditch may have water vole present, these surveys should be undertaken immediately before vegetation clearance, and any burrows should be identified either on the ground or on a site plan as detailed in Condition 7 of the Class Licence. We want the need for pre-commencement water vole surveys immediately before vegetation clearance be made clearer within these commitments.

For document 7.5.7.1 (C) Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan – Suffolk [REP4-065] we are satisfied with the wording in section 4.4.1 which now states that ditch reinstatement will be through the planting of mature emergent vegetation and not through natural colonisation.

However, this issue cannot be resolved until section 4.3.1 of the Document 7.5.7.2: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan – Kent [REP4-067] is also updated to reflect the same i.e. “Gaps in ditch marginal vegetation will be planted with mature emergent vegetation purchased from nurseries as requested by the Environment Agency”

EA009 Fisheries
We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We had raised concerns that Brook Lamprey had been omitted, but they are now included in Document 6.2.2.2 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 2 Ecology and Biodiversity [REP4-025].

EA010 Fisheries
We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

Please see EA009 above.

EA012 Fisheries
We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

Please see EA009 and EA010 above.

EA013 Fisheries
We are satisfied and consider this issue resolved.

We requested for the River Fromus Crossing a requirement for a soffit height of 4m, including a monitoring and contingency plan for invertebrates.

We have reviewed document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-217] and the wording we wanted has been included for (3) Bridge over the River Fromus.

EA032 Geomorphology
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the cable burial depth would not be deep enough to avoid the moving mouth of the River Stour. We requested that the cables be buried a minimum 3m below the bed of the low flow of the channel of the mouth of the Stour.

Commitment MPE02 in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] has not yet been updated to require the depth of the cable to be deeper than the mouth of the low flow Stour channel, in order to mitigate for the risk. Alternatively, the cable route needs moving further north away from the mouth of the Stour. The Applicant should also provide a comparison of the depth of the mouth of the low flow Stour channel with the likely depth of the cable.

Appendix C Pegwell Bay Indicative Landfall Layout within document 9.13: Pegwell Bay Construction Method Technical Note [REP4-229] shows there is only 350 m between the mouth of the Stour and the marine limits of deviation (green dotted line), showing movement of the mouth of the Stour northwards is still a risk.

Section 1.7.24 of document 6.2.4.1 Part 4 Marine Chapter 1 Physical Environment [REP4-027] states “Ongoing maintenance dredging carried out by the local port authority has also proved to be an effective measure in helping to stabilise the channel position for navigation purposes and further reduces the risk of future channel migration.”

This could be an alternative solution to this issue. A commitment to dredging by the applicant in combination with the local port authority, if the mouth of the Stour were to move into the marine limits of deviation during the lifetime of the project. Although not ideal, dredging would be a suitably low impact method of controlling the movement of the mouth. We want to avoid any risk of the construction of a retaining wall/scour protection.

The Environment Agency should be included as a named consultee for REAC Number B68 within documents 7.5.2 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP4-223] and 9.83: Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP4-232]. Any infrastructure related to the cable, be it above or below ground, would become an issue if scouring were to occur

EA041 Water Quality
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the disposal of contaminated construction and concreting water, as-well as rainfall runoffs from the batching plant area, may introduce contaminants into the receiving water environment.

We are pleased with the changes made to commitment W26 in the document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] however, we want it confirmed in which documents will further water quality monitoring details be provided in, to ensure that we are consulted on it in future. The Securing Mechanism for W26 is listed as being the Outline Code of Construction Practice, and we are not listed as a relevant consultee for this. We wish to be listed as a relevant consultee or for W26 to be secured by document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] for which we are a listed consultee.

GG17 in the REAC [REP4-235] has not been updated so we wish to reiterate our previous comments that it is unclear what these measures are, and how water is intended to be disposed of.

9.17.1 Suffolk Drainage Strategy [REP3-060] and 9.17.2 Kent Drainage Strategy [REP3-061] have not been updated, so we wish to reiterate our previous comments that sections 8.1.8 [REP3-060] and 8.1.9 [REP3-061] still have no commitment to provide the timing for in-situ pours, or for control concrete washout.

Additionally, there is a difference in wording between sections 8.1.14 [REP3-060] and 8.1.15 [REP3-061], as the first for Suffolk states “Provision of a suitable vehicle wash area on hardstanding which drains to foul or suitably treated on site”, whilst the latter for Kent only says “which drains to foul”, so we seek clarification if this is correct. It is unclear if it is treated on site, or if disposal offsite or discharge to the water environment is proposed.

We have reviewed the document 7.5.2 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP4-224] and acknowledge the details of the Marine Pollution Contingency Plan in Table 1-5. Table 1-6 Landfall Commitments and Mitigation Measures, REAC Number LVS05 is about Drilling Fluid management; however, it is not as detailed as sections 1.10.42 - 1.10.46 were, so we have concerns about where all the previous details are now captured.

Please note this is linked to EA046.

EA043 Water Quality
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that dewatering of both rainfall runoffs and potentially elevated groundwater at the construction site.

We are pleased that we are now named to be consulted on the Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan in the document: 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-217].

We still wish for document 9.7 Applicant’s Schedule of Changes to the Draft Development Consent Order (Clean) [REP4-227] to be updated to include the Environment Agency as a named consultee for requirement 6, specifically (o) Construction Drainage Management Plan and (q) Operational Drainage Management Plan.

We are pleased that in the document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235], GG15 has been updated to include silt fences, however the requirement should be explicit with recognition for permits if there is any chance of contamination (Discharges to surface water and groundwater: environmental permits - GOV.UK), rather than saying only “agreement of appropriate authority”.

For commitments W20 and W24, we need to see a commitment for the applicant to eventually provide a SuDS maintenance schedule to ensure that the proposed filter drains/swales/header drains remain in good condition.

In conjunction with EA046, we seek clarification how the Applicant would determine that any dewatering discharges are free from contamination. Whilst, GG15 commits to silt traps, and W20 to silt fences or silt screens, water quality monitoring, as requested in issue EA046, will help provide confidence that there is no risk of deterioration.

Please note, this issue is linked to EA045.

EA045 Water Quality
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the pumping (over pumping) process may allow silty water to enter the water course downstream.

We are pleased that we are now named to be consulted on the Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan in the document: 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-217].

We still wish for document 9.7 Applicant's Schedule of Changes to the Draft Development Consent Order (Clean) [REP4-227] to be updated to include the Environment Agency as a named consultee for requirement 6, specifically (o) Construction Drainage Management Plan and (q) Operational Drainage Management Plan.

Documents 9.17.1 Suffolk Drainage Strategy [REP3-060] and 9.17.2 Kent Drainage Strategy [REP3-061] have not been updated, so we wish to reiterate our previous comments that we still have concerns over "discharging into a watercourse" and comments of the dewatering system being "generally clean". We require this wording to be amended to state that the dewatering system will be clean.

In conjunction with EA046, we seek clarification how the Applicant would determine that any dewatering discharges are free from contamination. Whilst, GG15 commits to silt traps, and W02 states silt fences or silt screens, water quality monitoring, as requested in issue EA046, will help provide confidence that there is no risk of deterioration.

Please note, this issue is linked to EA043.

EA046 Water Quality
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that there would be impacts to water quality for the WFD watercourses Hundred River and River Fromus, especially during the construction and decommissioning phases. We requested regular water quality monitoring to be carried out both during and after the construction and decommissioning phases.

While the amendments to W26 in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235]] are positive, we would prefer for the monitoring pre-construction to be monthly, in line with other projects. We also need it confirmed in which documents further water quality monitoring details will be provided in, to ensure that we are consulted on them in future. Additionally, the Securing Mechanism for W26 is listed as being the Outline Code of Construction Practice, and we are not listed as a relevant consultee for this. We wish to be listed as a relevant consultee or for W26 to be secured by document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] for which we are a listed consultee.

We also request that post-construction monitoring (i.e. into operation) is carried out to ensure that water quality returns/remains at baseline as it transitions into “business as usual”.

We request that this commitment is secured in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] so that we are consulted on this.

EA065 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that the sequential approach within Flood Zone 3 was not being clearly applied to avoid Flood Zone 3b.

We welcome that the applicant has assessed the storage lost because of the pylon structures within the River Stour Floodplain (in Kent) and that the applicant has committed to compensatory storage for this.

We note that a map in the document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] is included of the functional floodplain for the River Stour which is welcomed but more widely across the scheme area we still need an assessment of functional floodplain, particularly with respect to any built development which may fall within the functional floodplain.

We still require an assessment of the loss of floodplain storage and associated impact for the temporary attenuation pond 640430, 262030 in Suffolk and the temporary haul roads within the functional floodplain for the River Stour in Kent.

EA066 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue resolved.

As previously stated in our previous response (ref: XA/2025/100350/02-L01, dated: 09 December 2025) there is a statement in Ex 1.3.2 within the document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] that: “With these measures in place, the residual risk of flooding during the construction phase has been assessed as low risk for all sources, except where it locally increases to medium.” We note that this relates to all sources. It is unclear as to where the flood risk has been increased during the construction phase from low to medium. It needs to be made clear that flood risk should not increase, so we require the Applicant to change the wording.

Document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] has not yet been updated, however the applicant confirms within document 9.101: Kent Onshore Scheme – Fluvial Flooding from the River Stour [REP4-096] that they need to do compensation and that this mitigation “will be secured through the addition of a new commitment to the relevant control document (e.g. Application Document 9.84 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP3-078]) at the next appropriate deadline”. This is welcome and we look forward to reviewing this.

EA068 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We welcome the addition to commitment W02 in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] that there will be no open cut crossings of main rivers.

However, the applicant should not have stockpiles within Flood Zone 3b in any circumstances, rather than just “where practicable”. We need the applicant to commit to positioning stockpiles/storing materials outside of the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) and they should endeavour to store these outside of Flood Zone 3 completely, where feasible. We are content with a buffer zone of 15m from a main river (16m where river is tidal) if this is also outside of FZ3b and ideally, also outside of FZ3.

We consider this to be achievable for the Suffolk side of the project. We encourage the applicant to engage with us for the Kent side of the project as we recognise the above may be more difficult to achieve.

Please note, this issue is related to issue EA076.

EA069 Flood Risk

We do not consider this issue resolved.

It remains unclear as to whether the applicant will reinstate all land levels to pre-construction levels within 5 years of commencing construction following temporary works.

Commitment W06 within document 9.83: Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP4-232] states “Temporary haul routes within Flood Zone 3 and areas of high and medium risk of flooding from surface water will be removed at the end of the construction phase and the ground surface will be reinstated to pre-project levels, except in instances where the ground level has been adjusted as part of the Proposed Project subject to the provisions of the draft DCO in Article 27 (see Application Document 3.1)”. This commitment is only for temporary haul roads, we want the ground surface to be reinstated to pre-project levels, for all temporary works and for it to be clear that this will be done within 5 years of commencing construction following temporary works.

Requirement 9 “Reinstatement schemes” within document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-217] states land “is to be reinstated to a condition suitable for its former use, or such condition as the relevant planning authority may approve, within 12 months of completion of the construction of the stage of authorised development for which it was required”. If the wording is updated to include that ground levels will be reinstated to pre-project levels for all temporary works that could resolve this issue.

Requirement 27 “Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised project” within document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-217] paragraphs (5)(i) and (6)(h) state that the undertaker is not required to “restore ground levels adjusted as part of the authorised project”. Where land is within a Flood Zone, we would expect ground levels to be reinstated to pre-project levels, within 5 years of commencing construction following temporary works. This is to limit flood risk being increased on or offsite.

Please note, this issue interlinks with EA075 and EA089.

EA070 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that details were omitted regarding temporary attenuation ponds and outfalls within floodplain. There were no details regarding their construction method, and the expected changes in ground level in order to construct these temporary features.

The applicant has now provided further clarification in document 9.90: Applicant's Response to January Hearing Action Points from Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Deadline 4 [REP4-086] on why Flood Zone 3 cannot be avoided, as well as confirmation that the 2 temporary attenuation ponds in Flood Zone 3 would be in place for a two-year period. This additional information is welcomed.

However, to progress the assessment, we still require the applicant to supply the following information:

- The volume of storage that will be lost.
- An assessment of impacts to third parties.
- Details of the proposed compensatory storage.
- Confirmation of whether the works fall within Flood Zone 3b.
- An evaluation of any adverse effects on existing flood flow routes.
- The crest level of the storage embankment.
- Sufficient design information to support decision-making.

If either of the attenuation ponds are within Flood Zone 3b, the applicant should be mindful of the requirements of the Exception Test: specifically, that there should be no net loss of floodplain storage and that the development must not impede flood flows. The crest level of the attenuation pond should be above the 1 in 100-year flood level

We note that commitment W31 in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] states that drainage ponds will be removed and land-levels re-instated following construction. However, this does not commit to floodplain storage compensation during the construction phase.

Please note, this issue relates to issue EA075 and issue EA091.

EA076 Flood Risk

We do not consider this issue resolved.

We were concerned that wording within mitigation commitments GG14 and W02 reflected activities occurring 15m from watercourses.

We welcome the update to commitment W02 to say "prevent storing of soil stockpiles within 15m of a main river (16m where river is tidal)" in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235].

However, we want a commitment that the buffer of 15m from a main river, and 16m where the main river is tidal, should, in addition to stockpiles, be for:

- Compound areas

- Heavy machinery
- Materials that could move in a flood event

We believe this is achievable for the Suffolk side of the project. We encourage the applicant to engage with us for the Kent side of the project as we recognise the above may be more difficult to achieve.

Commitment GG14 in document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] is specific to the storage of fuels/oils/chemicals and stipulates a minimum buffer of 10m from watercourses. We would prefer this commitment to also be updated to clarify that fuels/oils/chemicals should be stored 10m from a watercourse, unless the watercourse is designated as a main river, and then fuels/oils/chemicals should be stored 15m from a main river, and 16m where the main river is tidal. If the applicant is unable to commit to this, we ask that they clarify why and then we can state if we agree if the additional distance from main rivers is reasonable or not.

Please note, this issue is related to issue EA068.

EA079 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue resolved.

We previously raised there was a lack of quantified assessment of the rate of coastal erosion at the landfall location over the lifetime of the project.

The applicant has not updated document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] to include the estimated rates of erosion. We welcome that further analysis of erosion as part of commitment MPE08 within document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235], however this relates to offshore exposure and is unclear what offshore is defined as in this context.

Document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] provides limited detail regarding predicted coastal erosion at the Suffolk landfall over the lifetime of the development. In particular, the Flood Risk Assessment does not summarise the erosion rates, climate change assumptions, or how these relate to the proposed cable burial depth and the conclusion that flood risk would not be adversely affected.

Commitment MPE06 within document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] will include monitoring of beach profiles considering erosion rates and the landfall sites at the Suffolk landfall site. If there was a risk of the cable becoming exposed leeward, we would expect the applicant to commit to beach recharge.

This issue relates to 2WE5. in the ExA 2 questions.

EA081 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue to be resolved.

We previously raised that the bridge over the River Fromus may be retained after operation phase without an adaptation plan for future flood risk.

Document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] has not yet been updated, but we are providing a further response to our Deadline 2 Response letter [REP2-050] so there's no ambiguity and to provide the applicant with clarity on how we think this issue can be resolved.

The proposed Fromus crossing does not interact with Flood Zone 3b or Flood Zone 3a, as set out in document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-292] and confirmed by the applicant's hydraulic modelling. However, the proposed crossing, if retained, is likely to alter the future Flood Zone 3 flood extent as implied by the sensitivity test related to the manning's value.

We note that the applicant opted to reduce the roughness value within the updated modelling when compared with the Environment Agency's original Manning's n value and this has reduced the flood risk within the outputs. Whilst we acknowledge that there is some degree of subjectivity to the roughness value, as for example these will change seasonally, the applicant acknowledges that an average value has been used and there is a sensitivity within the model to this value being changed. For example, in the design event (1 in 100--year plus 29% climate change scenario), when Manning's roughness is increased by 20%, the model shows flooding on the right bank (western floodplain) of the River Fromus at grid reference E: 638760, N: 262270. This sensitivity should inform the resilience of the crossing and if it is shown to adversely affect the access road, constrict flood flow routes, or if the bridge is to be retained post decommissioning, then we would anticipate the bridge design, and specifically the rampart and western approach road, to account for this sensitivity to the manning's n value. This is illustrated in Figure 24 on page 20 of Appendix B (Fromus Hydraulic Modelling Technical Note) within document 6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-292].

As the western bridge rampart is raised above the design flood level, we have no concerns regarding flood risk impacts on the rampart itself or elsewhere during the proposed lifetime of the development. The changes in water levels identified when comparing the baseline and proposed (with bridge) scenarios in the design event roughness sensitivity test occur only near the bridge rampart and remain within the order limits for the development. Our concern relates specifically to the western access road leading to the bridge rampart and to the potential constriction of flow

routes. In the hydraulic model, this road is not raised and is represented “at grade”.

We therefore request that the applicant confirms whether this section of road would be inundated during the design event roughness sensitivity test, and whether access would be impeded under such conditions. Given the model’s sensitivity to Manning’s roughness at this location, we consider it prudent for the applicant to ensure that the approach road is raised at E: 638760, N: 262270 to maintain safe and reliable access during the design event or consider decommissioning the bridge after the operational phase noting the sensitivities to roughness and also longer term climate change when considering the credible maximum scenario. If the bridge is to be left in situ beyond the development lifetime and not decommissioned, consideration must be given to how the structure will be maintained and who the asset owner would be. Retaining the structure in perpetuity without an identified owner or maintainer could give rise to flood risk issues both at the crossing and approach road itself and elsewhere

EA083 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue to be resolved.

We asked that appropriate mitigation is in place within Document 7.5.3.2 CEMP Appendix B Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) to ensure the River Stour (Kent) is protected in relation to the overhead line crossing.

Commitment W33 has been added to document 9.84: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235] to highlight mitigation that will be in place to prevent falling debris – in the form of debris netting under the temporary bridge. It states that details and a method statement for the scaffolding will be included within the final CEMP.

While it is good that this has been included, we want to see a high-level method statement about the bridge design and how the River Stour will be protected during the construction, use and decommissioning of the temporary bridge.

We recommend more detail is provided upfront regarding the River Stour crossing design; however, we appreciate that detailed designs will be submitted during the Flood Risk Activity Permitting (FRAP) application. It is crucial that we work with the Applicant on these designs early, as the Applicant should be aware that a FRAP may not be forthcoming, regardless of the Development Consent Order being approved.

We request to be consulted/an approving body for the Outline code of construction practice.

EA088 Flood Risk

We do not consider this issue to be resolved.

Previously we stated that details relating to HDD exit pits and the use of rock bags/concrete mattresses had been omitted.

The document 9.13: Pegwell Bay Construction Method Technical Note [REP4-229] still does not confirm locations or distances from the main river or defence line.

EA089 Flood Risk
We do not consider this issue to be resolved.

Previously there was an omission of details regarding mitigation for storage of materials within the River Stour floodplain.

We note the applicant has stated within Document 9.101: Kent Onshore Scheme – Fluvial Flooding from the River Stour [REP4-096] that we do not require compensation for temporary works. This is incorrect.

As stated in part 2 of our deadline 2 response letter [REP2-144]:

> We would not be requiring compensation for works in tidal areas or areas which have tidal/fluvial cross-over. However, floodplain compensation is required for any areas of development in fluvial areas, to manage the flood risk associated with the River Stour floodplain. This will ensure that the permanent and temporary elements of the scheme are not displacing fluvial flood storage, and increasing flood risk elsewhere.
>
> Given the proposed temporary nature of the bridge (we assume 5-years given the length of the construction phase), associated temporary works, and the large size of the Stour floodplain, we will ensure compensation requirements are proportionate and reasonable.
>
> Compensation for temporary works should be balanced against the commitment to fully reinstate the land to its pre-construction condition upon removal.

Within Document 9.101: Kent Onshore Scheme – Fluvial Flooding from the River Stour [REP4-096] the applicants state “Final floodplain storage compensation proposals would be presented by the appointed contractor and this mitigation will be secured through addition of a new commitment within Application Document 9.84 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC).”

We look forward to reviewing this and ask the applicant to confirm within that commitment how the compensation will be provided.

Please note, this issue interlinks with EA069.

EA091 Flood Modelling
We do not consider this issue resolved.

Previously, we stated that the flood map for planning NAFRA2 data hadn't fully been considered for two temporary attenuation ponds, joint bays and a temporary crossing (S/WA/0057).

We have not been provided with all of the requested information raised in our Deadline 4 Response letter [REP4-185]. Therefore, this issue is unresolved.

We note and welcome commitment W31 in document 9.83: Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP4-232] to remove the temporary attenuation ponds after 2 years.

As noted in issue EA070 as well, we still require the applicant to provide clarity on the flood risk impacts associated with the temporary attenuation pond at grid reference 640430, 262030, including any loss of floodplain storage and the associated requirement for compensatory storage, particularly where impacts to third parties may occur. If the attenuation pond lies within Flood Zone 3b, the applicant should be mindful of the requirements of the Exception Test: specifically, that there should be no net loss of floodplain storage and that the development must not impede flood flows. The crest level of the attenuation pond should be above the 1 in 100-year flood level.

Please note, this is related to issue EA070.

APPENDIX B – Summary of EA Position

Subject	Relevant Rep Reference	Deadline 1
Biodiversity	EA001	Not Resolved
Biodiversity	EA002	Not Resolved
Biodiversity	EA003	Issue Resolved
Biodiversity	EA004	Issue Resolved
Biodiversity	EA005	Issue Resolved
Biodiversity	EA006	Issue Resolved
Biodiversity	EA007	Issue Resolved
Biodiversity	EA008	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA009	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA010	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA011	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA012	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA013	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA014	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA015	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA016	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA017	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA018	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA019	Not Resolved
Fisheries	EA020	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA021	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA022	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA023	Issue Resolved
Fisheries	EA024	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA025	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA026	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA027	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA028	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA029	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA030	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA031	Issue Resolved
Geomorphology	EA032	Not Resolved
Water Resources	EA033	Issue Resolved
Water Resources	EA034	Issue Resolved
Water Resources	EA035	Issue Resolved
Marine	EA036	Issue Resolved
Marine	EA037	Issue Resolved
Marine	EA038	Issue Resolved
Marine	EA039	Issue Resolved
Water Quality	EA040	Not Resolved

Water Quality	EA041	Not Resolved
Water Quality	EA042	Issue Resolved
Water Quality	EA043	Not Resolved
Water Quality	EA044	Issue Resolved
Water Quality	EA045	Not Resolved
Water Quality	EA046	Not Resolved
Water Quality	EA047	Issue Resolved
Waste	EA048	Issue Resolved
Waste	EA049	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA050	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA051	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA052	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA053	Not Resolved
GWCL	EA054	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA055	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA056	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA057	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA058	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA059	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA060	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA061	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA062	Issue Resolved
GWCL	EA063	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA064	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA065	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA066	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA067	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA068	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA069	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA070	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA071	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA072	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA073	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA074	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA075	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA076	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA077	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA078	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA079	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA080	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA081	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA082	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA083	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA084	Issue Resolved

Flood Risk	EA085	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA086	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA087	Issue Resolved
Flood Risk	EA088	Not Resolved
Flood Risk	EA089	Not Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA090	Issue Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA091	Not Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA092	Issue Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA093	Issue Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA094	Issue Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA095	Issue Resolved
Flood Modelling	EA096	Issue Resolved

APPENDIX C – Our response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions 2

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	Environment Agency Response
Draft development consent order (dDCO)			
2GEN15. Local	Local Authorities and Environment Agency (EA)	Article 53 Article 53(2)(b) allows for complete closure of the navigation on health and safety grounds only. 53(3) secures that this is kept to a minimum period. Should additional wording be included to specify what is a reasonable period or any seasonal constraints where closure may be inappropriate. If yes, please include suggested drafting.	We are not the navigation authority for the section of the River Stour in Anglia that this project covers. The EA is responsible from Brundon Mill in the Parish of Sudbury in the District of Babergh in the County of Suffolk to the Cattawade Barrage, partly in the Parish of Brantham in the same District and partly in the Parish of Lawford in the District of Tendring in the County of Essex.
3. Ecology and biodiversity			
2ECOL19.	Applicant EA Local authorities	Potential ecological opportunities Applicant: Paragraph 1.35 of the Aquatic Ecology Survey Report [APP-104] suggests that the River Fromus has poor ecological status due to diffuse and point source pollution and barriers, issues which would be disproportionately expensive to fund. Blue Spaces – Saxmundham [RR-0589] also	We are nearly satisfied that the Applicant is adequately mitigating for any potential runoff from the River Fromus Bridge crossing. EA41 is still unresolved due to concerns the disposal of contaminated construction and concreting water, as-well as rainfall runoffs from the batching plant area, may introduce contaminants into the receiving water environment. However, within the Biodiversity Net Gain measures, the Applicant includes proposals to create two attenuation ponds either side of the River Fromus Bridge which will be primarily for drainage but will be

		suggests measures to improve the River Fromus. Does the applicant consider that there is any potential to address some of the identified constraints as part of the applicant's proposed biodiversity net gain (BNG) measures? EA and local authorities: To comment.	designed to improve biodiversity and habitat for riparian mammals. They will also be undertaking riparian enhancements along the River Fromus across a 500m stretch including wetland mix planting (particularly around the bridge) and reprofiling of the banks. This will likely lead to improvements in diffuse pollution issues. We agree that it would be disproportionately expensive to address any point source pollution issues. We look forward to the applicant addressing our comments on issue EA41.
2ECOL44.	Local authorities EA	**REAC provision B18** Confirm whether provision B18 of the REAC [REP4-235] provides sufficient detail to provide certainty regarding eel mitigation measures. Is any additional construction mitigation for eel required during eel migration periods in addition to the measures identified in the REAC for Minster Marshes and if not, why not?	We are happy with the wording of B18 but would expect to see detailed designs in relation to this, irrelevant of watercourse type, prior to any works taking place. In addition, any pumps used to pump surface waters during any relevant works should be fitted with 2mm mesh screens.
5. Water environment			
2WE1.	Applicant, SCC, KCC, EA	**Water environment – joint position statement** Notwithstanding previously submitted documents,	Please see at the end of this table where we have put our comments next to the applicants comments provided to us on 2 March 2026.

		representations and statements of common ground, the ExA requires a joint position statement on areas of agreement and differences with respect to meeting the relevant policy requirements in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN1 regarding: • Flood risk and assessment • Compliance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive • Sequential and Exception test (in answering clearly set out all reasonings relating to NPS EN1, paragraph 5.8.42)	
2WE2.	SCC, EA	**Need to relocate temporary drainage pond out of fluvial flood zone 3 in Suffolk** SCC and EA: Do the parties accept the applicant's response to AP85 [REP4-086], which concludes it is not necessary to relocate the particular drainage pond, or if not why not?	The applicant has now provided further clarification on why Flood Zone 3 cannot be avoided, as well as confirmation that the temporary attenuation pond would be in place for a two-year period. This additional information is welcomed. However, to progress the assessment, we still require the applicant to supply the following information: • The volume of storage that will be lost. • An assessment of impacts to third parties. • Details of the proposed compensatory storage. • Confirmation of whether the works fall within Flood Zone 3b. • An evaluation of any adverse effects on existing flood flow routes. • The crest level of the storage embankment.

			• Sufficient design information to support decision-making.
2WE3	EA, KCC	**Loss of floodplain storage** Do all parties agree with the findings of the Kent Onshore Scheme - Fluvial Flooding from the River Stour [REP4-096]? In answering, can parties specifically have regard to the requirements of NPS-EN1, paragraph 5.8.2 and address: • that floodplain compensation is required to ensure there is no net loss of storage, • that there is sufficient space to create the compensation areas within the order limits, and • if it can be appropriately secured through addition of a new REAC commitment?	We are not comfortable “agreeing” to findings within documents – but we can accept findings. We accept that floodplain compensation is required, as we have previously stated within our responses with regards to the fluvial floodplain. Without knowing the compensation strategy or the precise locations on where the applicant intends to compensate for flood storage, we’re unable to agree that there is sufficient space to create the compensation areas. The applicant would need to highlight where they intend to compensate for the loss of flood storage to confirm whether it is sufficient. The compensation strategy should demonstrate that there is sufficient flood volume storage and include calculations as to how the strategy has been considered. The applicant will be aware of the vast nature of the floodplain within the Stour Catchment and so will need to be careful as to designing a compensation strategy. The applicant has suggested that this can be added into a new commitment, however it will be important for the applicant to demonstrate that the compensation areas are sufficient and useful. So, whilst it is possible that this can be secured through a REAC commitment, we would like to see evidence of this first, and their compensation strategy should be forthcoming. Any new commitment should allude to the creation of a Floodplain Compensation Strategy and should be reviewed by the Environment Agency.

			We note that there is some temporary land raising relating to spoil, haul roads, and an attenuation pond in the functional floodplain. The applicant has not provided any detail on the volumes lost as a result of land raising as part of the construction phase of the development or committed to compensatory storage for temporary works. Whilst we acknowledge that these works are temporary in nature they have the potential to influence flood risk elsewhere. On this basis we require that the applicant provides detail on the volume of storage lost in the present day fluvial design event. If compensatory storage is not achievable for temporary works then the applicant should provide quantitative evidence that demonstrates the flood risk impacts will remain on-site and will not impact flood risk to third parties in line with EN-1 paragraph 5.8.12.
2WE5.	Applicant EA	**Flood risk assessment - coastal erosion** Applicant: Explain why you consider that the response to ISH2, Action Point 84 regarding coastal erosion and its potential to impact flood risk addresses the relevant EA matters raised in [REP4-185]? Address any outstanding matters in your response. EA: Confirm if the applicant's response regarding coastal erosion and flood risk as provided in response to ISH2, AP84	We have reviewed the Applicant's response to ISH2 Action Point 84 [REP4-086]. While the Applicant references paragraphs 4.3.23 and 4.3.24 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] (FRA) and supporting modelling within the Marine Physical Environment chapter of the Environmental Statement. The FRA itself provides limited detail regarding predicted coastal erosion at the Suffolk landfall over the lifetime of the development. In particular, the FRA does not summarise the erosion rates, climate change assumptions, or how these relate to the proposed cable burial depth and the conclusion that flood risk would not be adversely affected.

		[REP4-086] addresses the concerns expressed in this regard or summarise any remaining outstanding issues?	The Environment Agency therefore considers that further clarification would assist the Examining Authority in understanding how coastal erosion has been accounted for within the FRA.

2WE1. Water environment – joint position statement

Matter	Applicants Position	Environment Agency Position
Flood risk and assessment	The Applicant has prepared: **6.8 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-292]** which appraised flood risk to and arising from the Project from all relevant sources. **9.4 Supplementary Environmental Information - Flood risk assessment [AS-099]** which appraised the new EA Flood Map for Planning data set published in March 2025 and provided clarification on Project interactions with Flood Zone 3b. **9.101 (A) Kent Onshore Scheme - Fluvial Flooding from the River Stour [REP4-096]** detailing how the Kent Onshore Scheme would interact with the River Stour fluvial floodplain and how any impacts would be mitigated.	To address this question, we will go through section 5.6 and 5.8 of NPS EN-1 and highlight matters of concern in relation to the Environment Agency's remit: • 5.6.10 considers what aspects relating to coastal change the applicant should consider. We note as part of this, that the applicant should consider how coastal change could affect flood risk. This relates to our response for ExQ2: 2WE5. • 5.8.5 refers to climate change adaptation. The applicant has assessed climate change as part of their modelling. We agree with the approaches taken in terms of climate change assessment. Although we do have some concerns regarding the capacity for climate change adaptation in the context of the Fromus crossing – especially if the crossing is retained post-decommissioning.

	At Deadline 5 the following will be submitted: **9.99 Groundwater Flood Risk at Minster** – responding to the recent EA Groundwater Flood Warning that was issued for Kent and presenting an assessment of risk to the proposed Converter Station site, informed by site specific GI data. **9.122 Surface Water Flood Risk and Climate Change** – which presents and interprets information to address Suffolk County Councils request to provide surface water climate change flood maps (also providing information for Kent) In combination, these submissions, which have been informed by all latest available flood risk data provide for a robust assessment of flood risk to and arising from the Project. Measures securing flood risk mitigation and controls are detailed in **9.84 (B) Register of Environmental Commitments (REAC) [REP4-234].** These measures will ensure that the Project is safe from flooding over its operational lifetime and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.	• 5.8.6 refers to consideration of flood risk from all sources at all stages of the planning process. We interpret that statement to be inclusive of all phases of the development, inclusive of the construction phase, and in the event that components are retained post-decommissioning. The two key matters are the retention pond during construction and the Fromus crossing which may be retained post-decommissioned. • 5.8.7 relates to making infrastructure in flood risk sites safe for its lifetime. In the context of the operation phase, we consider the Fromus crossing to be the only matter of minor concern in Suffolk. • 5.8.9 (and 5.8.21) relates to the Sequential Test. It is for the Secretary of State to determine if the Sequential test has been satisfactorily demonstrated. • 5.8.10 relates whether it is appropriate to proceed to the Exception Test following application of the Sequential Test. It is for the Secretary of State, having regard to the ExA recommendations and the evidence provided, to form a view on whether this is acceptable. • 5.8.11 considers the Exception Test. We are broadly happy that the Suffolk side of the proposal considers part b of the Exception Test. As stated above the two key areas of concern in relation to this are the Fromus crossing and the placement of the attenuation basin. • 5.8.12 considers increases to flood risk elsewhere, loss of floodplain storage, and impact on flood flow routes. In

	The policy requirements set out in EN-1 with regard to flood risk and assessment have therefore been met.	the context of the proposed development, we have two outstanding concerns relating to the proposed Fromus crossing (constriction of flood flow routes) and temporary attenuation pond (flood storage as in Flood Zone 3 – however the applicant it yet to determine if this is Flood Zone 3b). It is our view that the applicant could address a number of outstanding issues relating to 5.8.12 if they ensured no net loss of storage during the construction phase, noting that this is more of a concern on the Kent side of the proposal. Additionally, 5.8.30 considers loss of floodplain storage and compensation. Also, 5.8.31 considers off-site compensation and flow constriction. • 5.8.13, 5.8.14, and 5.8.15 set out the requirements for a Flood Risk Assessment. These require that flood risk from all sources both to the development and arising from the development is considered, taking into account the development's vulnerability classification, as well as climate change impacts. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment that addresses these requirements although we have some outstanding concerns relating to specific aspects of the development which are highlighted in our response to 5.8.12 above. • 5.8.16 relates EN-1 to the PPG. We would like to highlight *Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 7-004-20220825* which relates to the proposed attenuation pond – the applicant should apply the avoid, control, mitigation manage hierarchy.

		We are working towards solutions with the applicant. We note that the applicant has partially addressed some issues, but more specificity focusing on each issue would help to ensure timely resolution. The applicant's response suggests that the project will be safe from flooding for its operational lifetime – we need the applicant to ensure this is the case for all phases of the development, and for any retained components (see highlighted text to the left). The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment [APP 292] (FRA) that addresses several of the core requirements of NPS EN-1, including flood risk from all sources, climate change allowances, and the need to ensure the development remains safe for its lifetime. The FRA engages with the Sequential and Exception Tests, and the consideration of climate change within the hydraulic modelling is considered acceptable. However, NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.41 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. Or, where it cannot be wholly avoided, that any increase can be mitigated to an acceptable and safe level. At present the FRA has insufficient information in relation to the temporary attenuation pond – see response to ExQ2: 2WE2 above. These relate to the loss of floodplain storage, ensuring no adverse effects on flood flow routes,

		and clarity on whether the proposed attenuation pond is in Flood Zone 3a or 3b. We are seeking clarity on the Fromus modelling. As the applicant is preferring to retain the crossing and modelling shows a sensitivity to manning's roughness, this raises concerns about the access to the rampart to ensure operability in times of flood and means that sensitivity testing of the proposed crossing becomes more relevant to design. Lastly, we have raised concerns relating to erosion and landfall at Suffolk – see EXQ2: 2WE5 for context. Given that coastal change may influence flood risk over the lifetime of the development, the FRA should explain whether erosion estimates have implications for the proposal. Until these issues are addressed, the FRA cannot yet demonstrate the development avoids increasing flood risk elsewhere, nor that residual risk can be mitigated to an appropriate level to satisfy paragraph 5.8.42.
Compliance with the objectives of the Water Frame work Directive	The Applicant is confident that mutually satisfactory wording of a Requirement regarding design of the Fromus bridge can be agreed. The Applicant is working with the Environment Agency to address outstanding concerns with regard to water quality matters. We are reviewing the EA submission **Comments on any further information/ submissions received by deadline**	We have reviewed document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-217] and the wording we wanted has been included for (3) Bridge over the River Fromus. We are satisfied with this wording and now consider issue EA013 as resolved. As stated for ExQ2 2ECOL19. we are nearly satisfied that the Applicant is adequately mitigating for any potential runoff from the River Fromus Bridge crossing.

	3 [REP4- 185] and propose to make further changes and additions to commitments within the Register of Environmental Commitments to provide the water quality safeguards that are sought. The Applicant has produced a robust WFD compliance assessment in accordance with relevant guidance and informed by several site specific surveys. Mitigation measures and controls will prevent waterbody deterioration, and the Project would not impeded implementation of any planned measures and objectives for waterbodies within the River Basin Management Plan. Notwithstanding the ongoing discussions described above, the Applicant has satisfied all the policy requirements in EN-1 with regards to WFD.	Issue EA41 is still unresolved due to concerns the disposal of contaminated construction and concreting water, as-well as rainfall runoffs from the batching plant area, may introduce contaminants into the receiving water environment.
Sequential and Exception test (in answering clearly set out all reasonings relating to NPS EN1, paragraph 5.8 .42 (In	The following is summarised against each bullet point of EN-1 para 5.8.36: • *The application is supported by an appropriate FRA* See response above	We wish for this question to be clarified before we respond, to ensure we are responding correctly. Should our response be relating to NPS EN1, paragraph 5.8.42 or NPS EN1 paragraph 5.8.36? We will provide our response by the next relevant deadline.

responding it is assumed this should be ref to EN-1 para 5.8.36)	• *The Sequential Test has been applied and satisfied as part of site selection* Flood risk was one of a wide range of factors included in the site selection decision making process. However, the linear nature of the Onshore Schemes, along with the multitude of social and environmental constraints, means that it is inevitable that not all parts of the Proposed Project can reasonably be located within areas at the lowest risk of flooding. • *A sequential approach has been applied at the site level to minimise risk by directing the most vulnerable uses to areas of lowest flood risk* This approach has been successfully applied, with all operational above ground operational assets (Substations, Converter Stations) situated in areas at low risk of flooding, with the exception of a small number of pylons that are part of the Kent Onshore Scheme (which for technical reasons could not avoid the floodplain and if subject to inundation would remain undamaged and operational). During construction, high risk flood zones have also been avoided for the most vulnerable temporary	

	works e.g site compounds and the majority of temporary drainage basins (with justification provided for the situation of a small number of basins in areas at higher risk – [**see REP4-086**]. • The proposal is in line with any relevant national and local flood risk management strategy Drainage designs have been prepared in accordance with the National Standards for SuDS as well as local Suffolk and Kent guidance. • *SuDS (as required in the next paragraph on National Standards) have been used unless there is clear evidence that their use would be inappropriate*; The Project design embeds SuDS to manage operational surface water runoff and is also committed to using suitable SuDS to manage construction worksite runoff. This is secured by REAC commitments W06, W11, W19, W20, W23 and W24.	

	• *In flood risk areas the project is designed and constructed to remain safe and operational during its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere.* Operational Project infrastructure in flood risk areas is limited to pylons and drainage outfalls. These are resilient to periodic inundation without damage or operational disruption. Mitigation (compensation storage) and suitable outfall design would prevent flood risk increases elsewhere. • *The project includes safe access and escape routes where required, as part of an agreed emergency plan, and that any residual risk can be safely managed over the lifetime of the development.* The proposed Converter and Substations would be accessed via routes that are not at risk of flooding. During construction, in the limited areas where construction activities would take place with a floodplain (namely pylon works in the Stour floodplain) these work sites would be managed by the Contractor in accordance with defined protocols for a flood emergency, such that residual risks would be low.	

	• *Land that is likely to be needed for present or future flood risk management infrastructure has been appropriately safeguarded from development to the extent that development would not prevent or hinder its construction, operation or maintenance* The Proposed Project would not impede or hinder any future flood risk management proposals or infrastructure. In conclusion, all the policy requirements set out in EN-1 para 5.8.36) have been satisfied. Supplementary details regarding these Planning tests are also provided in **Document 7.2 Planning Statement [AS-057].**	