

H2Teesside Project

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN070009

Land within the boroughs of Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees, Teesside and within the borough of Hartlepool, County Durham

The H2Teesside Order

Document Reference: 9.2: Statement of Common Ground between H2 Teesside Limited and the Environment Agency

The Planning Act 2008



Applicant: H2 Teesside Ltd

Date: December 2024

The Planning Act 2008
The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009
The H2Teesside Order 2021

Statement of Common Ground between H2 Teesside
Limited and the Environment Agency

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	EN070009
Application Document Reference	9.2
Author	AECOM
Approved By	

Revision	Date	Status
0	17.09.24	Draft
1	20.11.24	Deadline 4
2	18.12.24	Deadline 5

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) H2 Teesside Ltd. and (2) the Environment Agency

Signed.....
[Name]
[Position]
on behalf of H2 Teesside Ltd.
Date:

Signed.....
[Name]
[Position]
on behalf of the Environment Agency
Date:

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	5
1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground	5
1.2 Parties to the SoCG.....	5
1.3 The Purpose and Structure of this Document.....	6
2.0 ENGAGEMENT WITH THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8
2.1 Summary of Engagement	8
3.0 MATTERS AGREED	14
4.0 MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION	15
5.0 MATTERS NOT AGREED.....	27

TABLES

Table 2.1: Engagement between the Applicant and the EA	8
Table 3.1: List of Matters Agreed between the Applicant and the EA	14
Table 5.1: Summary of Matters Not Agreed.....	27

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') relates to an application (the 'Application') made by H2 Teesside Limited (the 'Applicant'), to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (the 'PA 2008') for the H2Teesside Project.

1.1.2 The Application has been accepted for examination. The Examination commenced on 29 August 2024.

1.1.3 The Examining Authority's ('ExA') Rule 8 letter (Annex B) dated 30 August 2024 confirms that the Applicant should prepare a SoCG with the Environment Agency ('EA') in respect of the Proposed Development.

1.2 Parties to the SoCG

The Applicant and the Proposed Development

1.2.1 The Applicant is a private limited company aiming to develop and operate the H2Teesside project, which is an approximately 1.2-Gigawatt Thermal (GWth) Carbon Capture & Storage (CCS) enabled Hydrogen Production Facility (the 'Production Facility') and associated connections ('the Proposed Development') on land in Redcar and Cleveland, Stockton-on-Tees, and Hartlepool (hereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Development Site'). The Proposed Development will support the decarbonisation of UK-produced natural gas in Teesside for use in industrial applications, thus helping to achieve national targets in relation to net zero. It will also be a key contributor to restoring manufacturing jobs in the Tees Valley.

1.2.2 The Proposed Development Site covers an area of approximately 508 hectares (ha) and is located primarily within the administrative boundaries of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC) and Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council (STBC). The Hydrogen Pipeline Corridor (refer to Figure 4-4 of the ES [APP-087]) extends further north-west to also include land within the administrative boundary of Hartlepool Borough Council (HBC).

1.2.3 The Hydrogen Production Facility will be located at the Main Site within the Teesworks development site, as shown in Figure 4-1 of the ES [APP-084].

The Role of the EA

1.2.4 The EA is a non-departmental public body, the purpose of which is 'to protect or enhance the environment taken as a whole', so as to contribute to 'the objective of achieving sustainable development' (Environment Act, 1995).

1.2.5 The EA is a statutory consultee in respect of all DCO applications that are likely to affect land in England. Annex D of Advice Note 11 'Working with Public Bodies' produced by the PINS sets out in detail the role of the EA in the DCO process, including the level of input and agreement that might be expected from the EA.

1.2.6 The EA's role covers various topics including:

- managing the risk of flooding from main rivers, reservoirs and the sea;
- regulating major industry and waste;
- treatment of contaminated land;
- water quality and resources;
- fisheries;
- inland river, estuary and harbour navigation; and
- conservation and ecology of the aquatic environment.

1.2.7 The EA also has a role as the regulator for the Environmental Permitting regime and is responsible for granting, regulating and enforcing Environmental Permitting requirements for any installation that requires an environmental permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (as amended).

1.3 The Purpose and Structure of this Document

1.3.1 The purpose and possible content of SoCGs is set out in paragraphs 58 to 65 of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government guidance entitled 'Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent' (April 2024). Paragraph 58 of that guidance explains the basic function of SoCGs as follows:

"A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence."

1.3.2 SoCGs are therefore a useful and established means of ensuring that the evidence at the DCO examination phase focuses on the material differences between the main parties, and so aim to help facilitate a more efficient examination process.

1.3.3 The purpose of this SoCG is therefore to summarise the agreements reached between the parties on matters relevant to the Examination of the Application and to assist the ExA. It also explains the matters which remain unresolved at the time of writing, but which both parties are working positively toward resolving. As such, it is expected that further iterations of the SoCG will be submitted to the ExA throughout the Examination and prior to the making of any DCO for the Proposed Development.

1.3.4 The SoCG has been prepared with regard to the above guidance and is structured as follows:

- Section 2 – sets out the engagement and related discussions held between the parties.

-
- Section 3 – sets out the matters discussed and agreed to date.
 - Section 4 – sets out the matters that are under discussion and to be agreed and the proposed way forward, where relevant.
 - Section 5 – sets out the matters, if any, where there is disagreement.

2.0 ENGAGEMENT WITH THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

2.1 Summary of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and the EA is detailed in **Table 2.1** below.

Table 2.1: Engagement between the Applicant and the EA

DATE	FORM OF ENGAGEMENT	DOCUMENT REF. (IF ANY)	DETAILS
4 October 2022	Virtual Technical Meeting		An introductory meeting was held to provide the EA with an introduction to the Proposed Development and agree what advice services the Applicant would seek from the EA under their DAS service.
17 March 2023	Letter		A pre-application advice on the Proposed development, in particular, all utility connection map and charge request form.
9 May 2023	Scoping Opinion	See Appendix 1E: Scoping Opinion Responses [APP-188]	<p>A written representation in response to PINS's consultation in relation to the application for a Scoping Opinion submitted to PINS by the Applicant on 6 April 2023.</p> <p>The EA provided a range of technical feedback to help inform the DCO Application. Key topics raised in the PINS Scoping Opinion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the Order Limits of the Proposed Development in relation to Flood Zones 2 and 3. • The need for appropriate assessment of the flood risk vulnerability of the Proposed Development and for this assessment to conduct a comprehensive assessment based on detailed data.

DATE	FORM OF ENGAGEMENT	DOCUMENT REF. (IF ANY)	DETAILS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A notification of flood risk information and other general environmental information held by the EA that could be used in developing the Applicant’s assessment. • A notification of EA proposed flood alleviation schemes which may interface with the Proposed Development. • A notification that various documents including but not limited to a WFD assessment and a Construction Environmental Management Plan; and various clarifications including but not limited to the drainage strategy and reclaimed water supply should be submitted in support of the DCO Application. • An early indication of potential licences that may be required for the Proposed Development including but not limited to a Water Resources Licence and Impounding Licence. • The need to provide a nutrient neutrality assessment and to ensure no additional nitrogen is entering the River Tees as a result of the Proposed Development. • The need to thoroughly assess the potential for the proposal to affect EA flood defence assets and notification that existing flood

DATE	FORM OF ENGAGEMENT	DOCUMENT REF. (IF ANY)	DETAILS
			<p>standard of protection must be maintained throughout all phases of the Proposed Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on construction methodologies and maintenance activities in proximity to flood defences. • Recommendation on drainage strategy. • Requests that the future baseline considers the ongoing ecological recovery efforts taking place in the Tees Estuary. • Requests information on foul drainage be covered in the DCO application. • Notification of EA and Partner projects and an invitation for the Applicant to consider supporting them. • Information on certain aspects required to be assessed within WFD Assessment. • Query regarding noise and vibration effects on migratory fish.
12 June 2023	Virtual Technical Meeting		This meeting was to provide an overview of the work related to Water Framework Directive (WFD) impact assessment and the Nutrient Neutrality Screening and assessment.
14 September 2023	First Consultation (statutory consultation) in accordance with Section 42 of the PA 2008.	See Consultation Report [APP-030]	<p>The Applicant issued a Section 42 letter to the EA on 14 September 2023.</p> <p>The EA provided a range of technical feedback to help inform the DCO Application. Key topics</p>

DATE	FORM OF ENGAGEMENT	DOCUMENT REF. (IF ANY)	DETAILS
			<p>raised in the Statutory Consultation response included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and WFD Assessment should be submitted in support of the DCO Application. • Notes that flood risk mitigation will need to be included within the Proposed Development. • Notes that the Proposed Development Site may interact with EA flood defence assets. • Notes that existing flood standard of protection must be maintained throughout all phases of the Proposed Development. • Notes that the Proposed Development construction should be protective of relevant watercourses and other features of interest. • Notes mitigation factors considered to be relevant to environmental assessments. • Acknowledgement of the quantitative modelling undertaken. • Requests that an assessment of water availability should be provided. • Requests that proximity to landfill be taken into account in assessment. • Requests air quality assessment to also consider commissioning, tuning and optimisation processes.

DATE	FORM OF ENGAGEMENT	DOCUMENT REF. (IF ANY)	DETAILS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses potential scenarios and relevant licenses. • Requests additional consideration of various environmental factors.
October 2023	Environmental Permit Pre-application Meeting		Pre-application engagement for the Environmental Permit application was held to seek advice from the EA.
24 November 2023	Virtual Technical Meeting		This meeting was to provide an update on assessments related to Water Environment, including WFD impact assessment, the Nutrient Neutrality Screening outcomes, Hydrodynamic Modelling, and Flood Risk.
13 December 2023	Second Consultation (statutory and non-statutory) in accordance with Section 42 of the PA 2008.	See Consultation Report [APP-030]	<p>The Applicant issued a Section 42 letter to the EA on 13 December 2023 consulting it on a number of changes to the Proposed Development as a result of further design development and technical work undertaken and also responses received to the First Consultation.</p> <p>The EA provided a range of technical feedback to help inform the DCO Application. Key topics raised in the Statutory Consultation response included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A notification of EA proposed flood alleviation schemes which may interface with the Proposed Development and request for clarifying information to ensure there will be no impacts on EA flood defence improvement works. • Requests that additional ecological surveys are carried

DATE	FORM OF ENGAGEMENT	DOCUMENT REF. (IF ANY)	DETAILS
			out following Order Limits changes.
21 August 2024	Virtual Technical Meeting		This meeting was arranged to discuss Examination programme and actions, collaboration going forward and specific detail on EA Relevant Representations regarding flood risk.
4 September 2024	Consultation on proposed changes to the DCO Application.	n/a	A letter was issued to the EA on 4 September 2024 consulting them on a number of proposed changes to the DCO Application.
Deadline 1 – 17 September 2024	Statement of Common Ground	n/a	The Environment Agency and the Applicant engaged in discussions to agree the contents of this document, submitted into Examination at Deadline 1 [REP1-013]
7 November 2024	Email	n/a	The Applicant issued an email to the Environment Agency regarding the Part 2A Investigation site adjacent to the Proposed Development Site.
20 November 2024	Statement of Comment Ground	n/a	The Environment Agency and the Applicant engaged in discussions to agree the contents of this document, updated and submitted into Examination at Deadline 4.
18 December 2024	Statement of Common Ground	n/a	The Environment Agency and the Applicant engaged in discussions to agree the contents of this document, updated and submitted into Examination at Deadline 5.

3.0 MATTERS AGREED

3.1.1 **Table 3.1** below sets out the matters agreed between the parties.

Table 3.1: List of Matters Agreed between the Applicant and the EA

MATTER AGREED	AGREED POSITION
DCO requirements	Except where noted in Section 4.0 of this SoCG, the EA have no comments on any other part of the draft DCO.
Eels Regulations	It is agreed that no abstraction from the estuary is proposed for the Proposed Development and therefore no Eels Regulations compliance issues have been identified.
Carbon Capture	It is agreed carbon capture performance will be monitored as a requirement of the site Environmental Permit and be part of the Process monitoring requirements.
Habitat Classification	It is agreed the Applicant’s use of the Phase 1 habitat survey classification is suitable.
Impact to Species	Following the production of an amended Framework CEMP submitted into the Examination at Deadline 2, it is agreed the issues raised by the EA regarding INNS, otter and water vole are being addressed appropriately.
Energy Efficiency	It is agreed the Applicant is considering appropriate technologies to maximise energy efficiency as part of the Proposed Development.

4.0 MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION

4.1.1 This section sets out the matters under discussion between the parties and the proposed way forward. **Table 4.1** provides a summary of the issues raised between the parties.

Table 4.1: Summary of Matters under Discussion between the Applicant and the EA

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
1.	Flood risk	<p>Where compounds can only be located in Flood Zones 2 and 3 for operational reasons mitigation measures are presented in the Flood Risk Assessment ('FRA'), ES Chapter 9 'Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources' [APP-061] and the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') [APP-043]. The construction compounds are of temporary nature and management of flood risk is a common requirement of Delivery Partners and their supply chains. Mitigation measures for temporary construction and enabling works are presented in the FRA, ES Chapter 9 and the Framework CEMP.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is classified as 'Essential Infrastructure' in line with NPPF Annex 3: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification. Essential Infrastructure is defined as <i>“Essential utility infrastructure which has to be located in a flood</i></p>	<p>EA have concerns about construction compounds located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (EA Relevant Representation 1) and EA are not satisfied with evidence that the proposed operational infrastructure in Flood Zone 3 will remain safe in times of a flood (EA RR2).</p> <p>EA have concerns that the temporary construction and enabling works are not adequately considered within the FRA (EA RR3).</p> <p>D2 update: EA accept temporary compounds will only be located in Flood Zone 3 where operationally required. Although the compounds are temporary in nature, what is classed as temporary is variable.</p> <p>The EA expect the Applicant to consider mitigation and management of any flood risk for any construction compounds within FZ2 and FZ3 or within 16m of any tidal statutory main river.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p><i>risk area for operational reasons ...</i>". Due to the connections required and the infrastructure needing to be connected to, some pipelines and infrastructure will be required to be developed in areas identified as Flood Zone 2 or 3. However, largely this proposed infrastructure will be underground; those elements that aren't (e.g. Above Ground Installations) are typically unmanned and access is normally only required for planned maintenance which can be scheduled to avoid any flood risk events.</p> <p>Details regarding watercourse crossings are provided in Section 9.5 of ES Chapter 9 'Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources' [APP-061] and confirms the crossing of the River Tees and Greatham Creek (and adjacent water features at Seal Sands) will be underground via trenchless technologies (Horizontal Direction Drilling ('HDD') or Micro Bored Tunnelling ('MBT')).</p> <p>No element of the Proposed Development is classed as Highly Vulnerable infrastructure – in contrast, the nature of the Proposed Development has low vulnerability, being underground or</p>	<p>If mitigation for the temporary compounds is not being considered within the FRA, the FRA should be updated to indicate where this associated flood risk has been considered.</p> <p>The EA requests to see copies of the Flood Risk Management Action Plan and Final CEMP, once finalised location of temporary compounds are agreed.</p> <p>If development is classified as essential infrastructure, this needs to be consistently reflected throughout the DCO documents. Some documentation fails to state whether this infrastructure will remain operational in the event of a flood.</p> <p>Section 9A.9.26 of the FRA refers to 'recovery time' from a major flood event, yet there should be no need for this if plant is designed to remain operational during a flood event.</p> <p>Any above ground infrastructure, classified as essential infrastructure and within FZ3 are required to remain safe and operational in the event of a flood. The Applicant needs to provide evidence the Above Ground</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>designed to be exposed to the elements. Locations where further detailed design is required is proposed to be managed through the process of Protected Provisions and Requirement 11 [AS-017].</p> <p>Existing above ground pipelines including those in the Linkline corridor are appropriately designed, protected and maintained in accordance with pipeline design standards and legislative requirements.</p> <p>D3 Update: It is currently expected that temporary compounds would be in place for approximately 2 years for satellite compounds, and 3 years for the Main Site compound.</p> <p>Once the precise location of the temporary compounds within FZ2 and FZ3 are finalised, mitigation requirements will be considered on a site-by-site basis. Any mitigation measures will be outlined in the details to be provided pursuant to Requirements 11 and 15 of the draft DCO. The EA will be consulted on the Final CEMP and Flood Emergency Response Plan as per Requirement 15 of the draft DCO.</p>	<p>Infrastructure within FZ3 can remain dry for the lifetime of the development using a 1 in 200 year flood event plus climate change allowance including a 600mm freeboard to be used as the design flood level. The Applicant should also provide evidence which demonstrates existing above ground pipelines meet design standards to be flood resilient.</p> <p>The EA are satisfied with the approach to assessment of temporary construction and enabling works within the FRA however state the FRA should be updated stating flood risk surrounding temporary and enabling works are being considered and reference the documents these assessments can be found in. The EA can review construction methods through a Final CEMP or protective provisions if agreed.</p> <p>D4 update: The EA are broadly satisfied with the Applicant’s response regarding construction compounds located within flood zones. Once greater knowledge of finalised locations and risks are provided, the EA will review and comment on them as part of DCO Requirements 11 and 15. The EA would expect an updated FRA to be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 11. This will enable the EA to appropriately</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>Infrastructure built as part of the Proposed Development will be designed to remain operational during flood events. Critical plant infrastructure will be identified to be protected from flooding and appropriate mitigation included in the design.</p> <p>Recovery time includes time to assess the potential impact from flooding such as corrosion or water damage and maintained as needed. Recovery time also includes taking equipment down for maintenance following an event which may have compromised performance and should be checked in accordance with best practice. It also includes maintaining or rebuilding flood defences if required to ensure integrity has not been compromised.</p> <p>Above ground pipelines will be assessed for flotation, and if susceptible, appropriate restraints put in place. New pipelines constructed for the Proposed Development will be built in accordance with CIRIA guidance, which means that it will be designed to remain operational during the range of flood events referenced.</p>	<p>assess the flood risk mitigation. The wording of Requirement 11 should be updated to reflect this. The Applicant may also want to consider as mitigation, elevating the foundations of the compounds above the design flood level. This can be done by using stilts, piers, or raised platforms (EA1).</p> <p>The Applicant has determined that most above-ground pipeline corridors are pre-existing and would not be able to be raised but will be assessed for flood resistant design. We accept this approach. Confidence in flood safety would need to be ensured and formalised under Requirements 11 and 15. Newly installed pipework should remain safe throughout its lifetime and not increase flood risk elsewhere. The EA advised the Applicant to include within the FRA the details that have been provided within their recent response to our comments. The EA advised the Applicant to consider the heights of new and existing pipelines within areas of flood zone 3 against the design flood event and provide details on how they will ensure ongoing flood resilience and flood safety (EA2).</p> <p>The FRA should be routinely updated when details regarding mitigation are known. Whilst mitigation for temporary works may come as part of the finalised</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>Where existing above ground pipelines are under the control of a third party the Applicant cannot demonstrate that the pipelines meet design standards.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the FRA does not need to be updated as detailed mitigation measures are not yet known and will be determined pursuant to protective provisions and requirements.</p> <p>D5 update: There is no need for the DCO to require that the FRA itself is updated post granting of the DCO.</p> <p>Requirement 11 requires details of flood risk mitigation for both the construction and operation phases, and a flood emergency plan to be approved in consultation with the EA.</p> <p>In order to be able to demonstrate that flood risk is 'mitigated', the Applicant would have to show that they do in fact 'mitigate', which would necessitate some form of modelling to show that they work. If</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP), the final FRA should also include site specific flood risk mitigations and measurements for the temporary compounds in mAOD, relating foundation levels to site specific design flood levels (EA3).</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>that was not provided then the flood risk would not be able to be shown to be mitigated.</p> <p>It is therefore the details of those mitigation measures that is the important step to ensure flood risk is managed and enable the EA to appropriately assess the flood risk mitigation measures proposed. Updating 'the FRA' itself would be a paper exercise in that context and is not considered necessary (EA1 + EA3).</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the FRA at Deadline 5 to account for the EAs comments in relation to EA2.</p>	
2.	Water Quality Modelling Report	<p>The Applicant has provided responses to the requested information/clarifications on this report [APP-193] set out in the EA's RR.</p> <p>D3 update: The Applicant has provided clarification on scenario 3 [REP3-006] and awaits feedback from the EA.</p> <p>D5 update: Location D was chosen because it is closest to the proposed discharge point. Location B is closer to the River Tees and water quality in this</p>	<p>The EA is considering the information provided by the Applicant and will confirm shortly whether it is content with this report.</p> <p>D2 Update: EA have reviewed the additional information / clarifications provided by the Applicant and are satisfied with the modelling report.</p> <p>The EA ask for clarification on the maximum percentage above ambient that is achieved under scenario 3.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>location may be influenced by diluting River Tees water during the tidal cycle. This is less likely at Location D.</p> <p>The concentration of benzo(g,h,i)-perylene is modelled as showing maximum increase in deeper waters for three reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plume dilutes rapidly as it rises and spreads, even at low tide, and modelled concentrations in the surface waters do not exceed the values used to map the zone of elevated concentrations over a scale which can be resolved by the model. 2. The CORMIX modelling shows that the plume only reaches the surface during the low tide and minimum current conditions – the far field model results show average impacts over a number of tidal cycles so this short-duration impact is not visible in the surface layers. 3. The plume only reaches the surface with concentrations of benzo(g,h,i)-perylene above the EQS when tidal currents are extremely low. This only occurs in the 	<p>D4 update: We require justification about why location D was chosen to represent the ambient concentration, as location B has the highest maximum concentration. We also require an explanation as to why the concentration of benzo(g,h,i)-perylene is expected to increase within the two deepest water layers if the plume is buoyant.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>CORMIX modelling during the lowest tide and minimum current conditions. At most times in the tidal cycle, the currents increase significantly and the mixing plume is strongly deflected sideways and dilutes rapidly within the deeper water layers. Unlike DIN, there is insufficient mass of benzo(g,h,i)-perylene in the effluent to generate a mixing zone within Tees Bay which results in a measurable increase in benzo(g,h,i)-perylene in the surface layers of the water column.</p>	
6.	Habitat enhancement	<p>The Applicant will engage in further discussion on this matter with the EA.</p> <p>D5 update: The Applicant is currently in discussions with a number of stakeholders regarding environmental enhancements however these are unlikely to be committed to before the end of the Examination process. The Applicant would welcome continuing dialogue with the EA beyond the Examination process on this matter.</p>	<p>The EA welcomes that the Applicant has undertaken initial discussions on opportunities for habitat enhancement that contribute to achievement of Water Framework Directive ('WFD') objectives in the Tees estuary area (EA RR19) and is open to discussing this further with the Applicant.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
7.	Protective Provisions and Section 150 Consent	<p>The Applicant notes this, and based the draft Protective Provisions on the Net Zero Teesside DCO and its understanding of the EA’s preferred drafting across multiple DCOs.</p> <p>D3 update: The Applicant has not sought to apply for both protective provisions and FRAPs – it has sought to disapply the latter.</p> <p>The Applicant will discuss with the EA to ascertain the information it is exactly seeking.</p> <p>D5 update: The Applicant is awaiting feedback from the EA on this matter.</p>	<p>The EA is considering the wording of the Protective Provisions contained within the draft DCO [AS-017] and will be unable to give Section 150 consent to the relevant disapplications within the DCO until it has confirmed it is content with those provisions.</p> <p>D2 update: The applicant should not apply for both protective provisions and flood risk activity permits, and should only progress down one route or the other.</p> <p>If the applicant wishes to disapply the Flood Risk Activity Permit, we require further details on the specific flood risk activities proposed as part of this work to determine their risk category.</p> <p>D4 update: The EA are still considering this matter and will provide feedback at a later deadline.</p>
8.	DCO requirements	<p>The Applicant awaits the EA’s comments on this matter.</p> <p>It will also provide an update in due course to the EA on proposed drafting to deal with the concerns raised by Anglo American in respect of the interaction with the existing Bran Sands permit.</p>	<p>The EA is considering the wording of Requirements 10, 11 and 12, 15, 21 and 28 to confirm whether it is content with the drafting.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>D5 update: Regarding Anglo American’s Bran Sands Permit (concerned with the control of leachate and landfill gas), the Applicant considers any activity from the Proposed Development will not result in additional leachate or landfill gas. To provide comfort on this point, the Applicant has proposed an additional groundwater and landfill gas monitoring point is installed and monitored to confirm no changes to the extant situation as a result of the Applicant’s activities. This matter will be resolved through protective provisions between the two parties.</p>	
9.	Permitting	<p>An application for an Environmental Permit was received by the EA on 14 June 2024.</p> <p>On 7 August 2024 the Applicant received a letter from the EA requesting missing information in the application. This information will be sent back to the EA no later than 11 October 2024.</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussion with the EA and expect that this supplementary information will enable our application to achieve duly made</p>	<p>The EA considers there is missing information in the Applicant’s Environmental Permit application and detailed the requirements by letter on 7 August 2024.</p> <p>Discussions with the Applicant on the EP application are ongoing.</p> <p>D4 update: The EA is currently considering the additional information provided by the Applicant.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		<p>status. The EP application reference is EPR/AP3328SQ/A001.</p> <p>D4 update: The Applicant sent the requested information for consideration by the EA on the 11 October 2024.</p> <p>The Applicant is awaiting feedback from the EA and anticipates a decision on Duly Making to be made during December.</p>	
10.	Adjacent site investigation	<p>The Applicant is discussing this with the EA to understand what effect (if any) this has on the Proposed Development and its assessments.</p> <p>D5 update: The Applicant has received further information on the Site from the EA and STBC. The Applicant has provided a detailed response on this matter within the Applicant’s Response’s to Deadline 4 Submissions, submitted into the Examination at Deadline 5 and awaits feedback from the EA on this matter.</p>	<p>EA notes that a site adjacent to a section of the proposed pipeline corridor is currently being investigated under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EA RR22).</p> <p>D5 update: The EA have provided the Applicant with further information on the Site.</p>

SOCG ID	MATTER	APPLICANT POSITION	EA POSITION
		In short, the Applicant can confirm there is no overlap between the Proposed Development and the Site subject to a Part 2A investigation.	

5.0 MATTERS NOT AGREED

5.1.1 Table 5.1 provides a summary of the matters not agreed between the parties.

Table 5.1: Summary of Matters Not Agreed

SOCG ID	MATTER	THE APPLICANT POSITION	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY POSITION