

The Planning Inspectorate
[via Planning Inspectorate website]

Our ref: NA/2024/116840/05-L01
Your ref: H2Teesside
Date: 13 January 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**H2TEESSIDE PROJECT – ENVIRONMENT AGENCY COMMENTS ON DEADLINE
5 SUBMISSIONS
LAND EITHER SIDE OF THE RIVER TEES WITHIN THE BOROUGH OF
REDCAR AND CLEVELAND AND STOCKTON-ON-TEES ON TEESSIDE AND
THE BOROUGH OF HARTLEPOOL IN COUNTY DURHAM**

Please find enclosed the Environment Agency's (EA) comments on the Applicants Deadline 5 submissions, which were uploaded to the planning inspectorate website on 18 December 2024.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Yours faithfully,

Cameron Chandler
Planning Advisor

REP5-046 H2 Teesside Limited 8.25.8 Response to ExQ2.10 Geology Hydrogeology and Land Contamination Rev 0

REF.NO.	EA Comments
Q2.10.1	<p>Whilst there is no overlap between the Part 2A site and the Order Limits of the DCO, as the proposed works are immediately adjacent to the Part 2A site, there could be contaminated land impacts.</p> <p>We would request that the applicant confirms what works are proposed in this area, specifically if there is any breaking of the ground involved. If the works proposed involve breaking ground, we would request that further site investigation and assessment of risk is provided given the known contamination of the neighbouring site.</p> <p>If the works in this area pose a low risk, which do not include the breaking of ground, we would accept that no further assessment or consideration is required regarding the site.</p>
Q2.10.2	<p>We are happy to accept the applicant's response to this point, as long as flood protection will remain unchanged.</p> <p>The applicant has highlighted that they are aware of the EA's concerns regarding potential damage of the EA flood defence assets and will take this into consideration in the final design phase. Finalised methods and any potential risks to our flood defence asset should be assessed as part of protected provisions and requirement 11. Additionally, any potential interference with the structure or stability of the levee and potential of affecting its flood protection capacity should be considered as part of protected provisions and requirement 11. The applicant has stated this will be included within their final CEMP, which the EA have asked to review as part of protected provisions.</p>
Q2.10.3	<p>The EA agrees that we would like to see finalised drill routes and methods in pursuant of protected provisions. The EA is flexible regarding how and in which document this information is provided, as long as we are informed where this information will be held, all requested details are included as part of protected provisions and our flood risk concerns are satisfied with appropriate mitigation.</p>

REP5-049 H2 Teesside Limited 8.25.11 Response to ExQ2.15 Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources

REF.NO.	EA Comments
Q2.15.2	<p>The applicant has included more detail within document <u>EN070009-001329-H2T DCO 5.5 Pipelines Statement Tracked Rev 1 16 Oct 24.pdf</u> on the type of pipeline being utilised across the site. This has provided more clarity on which sections of pipeline will be</p>

	above and below ground and which pipeline which will use new or existing infrastructure. The applicant has also included an updated visual map for clarity. This will help us to assess associated risk in pursuant of protected provisions.
Q2.15.3	We have assessed the updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted with Deadline 5 documents. The applicant has taken our considerations into account regarding storage and compound sites. We expect to see further detail for temporary storage areas and associated mitigation as part of protected provisions and requirement 11.

REP5-051 H2 Teesside Limited 8.26 Applicant's Responses to D4 submissions and CA Reg RR

REF.NO.	EA Comments
EA1	We agree with the applicant's response in that we would like to see details of flood risk mitigation for both the construction and operational phases as part of requirement 11. We are satisfied with the applicant's response that they will provide evidence through modelling to support the effectiveness of the proposed flood risk mitigation measures. We acknowledge that including this information within the FRA is not strictly necessary. Whilst we believed the FRA would be the most appropriate and easily accessible location for this information, the EA is flexible regarding how and in which document this information is provided if all requested details are included as part of protected provisions and requirement 11.
EA2	We have assessed the updated FRA within deadline 5. We are happy the applicant is applying flood resilience design as described in section 9A.9.34 for the pipeline corridors. We are also pleased the applicant has stated in section 9A.9.30 that all critical infrastructure shall be raised above the design flood level. Furthermore, we still advise the applicant to consider exact heights (mAOD) for any newly built pipelines and pipe bridges that are above ground and within flood zone 3 against the design flood level (mAOD). This will help to determine flood risk and the most appropriate mitigation. This could be submitted as part of the design process.
EA3	As stated under reference 'EA1', the EA is flexible regarding how and in which document this information is provided, as long as all requested details are included as part of requirement 11 and our flood risk concerns are satisfied with appropriate mitigation.
EA8	We understand that Location D is closest to the discharge point. The points explaining benzo(g,h,i)-perylene are noted, and the details will be looked at in further detail at the permitting stage.

EA23

The EA's legal team are in the final stages of drafting a standard set of protective provisions for the EA, which will be shared with the applicant as soon as they are signed off for circulation.