
From: Derek Burles <[REDACTED]@redworth-products.com>

Sent: 19 May 2025 06:43

To: Cllr Linda Harman <[REDACTED]@ashford.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; Simon Lunn <[REDACTED]@lunnupstream.com>

Cc: Barrowman, Spencer <[REDACTED]@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Stonestreet Green Solar & KFRS & BESS

Dear All,

May I draw your attention to the input of KFRS in the form of a deadline 8 submission, reference REP8-031, under the heading of a 'Summary of Fire Authority Position and Risk Mitigation Considerations', in which it is incorrectly stated that the capacity of the BESS is 99.9MW, with the realistic expectation that the Risk Mitigation Considerations therein are based on the incorrectly quoted capacity.

The 99.9MW figure is often associated with the rated capacity of the development's solar array, when in fact it relates to the capacity of the Stonestreet Green Solar development at the point of connection to the grid, as determined by the applicant's grid connection agreement. The intended rated capacity of the solar array is 165MW, as obliquely revealed by the applicant via an SOCC document during the community consultation process. (The details of which were included in the Adequacy of Consultation document circulated to all interested parties on 31st January 2024).

As we know, the applicant has refused to provide a capacity for the BESS (or clarity of its purpose), as a result of which Sir David Melville estimated that, based on a rating of 99.9MW for the solar array, the capacity of the BESS was likely to be in the region of 400MW. On which basis it is reasonable to assume, taking into account the alternative 165MW solar array rating, that the BESS capacity lies somewhere between 400MW and 660MW.

Given that the probability of a thermal runaway event increases in proportion to the size of the BESS, the resultant risk to the community and the questionable characteristics of the KFRS input to date, is it not reasonable to assume that their current risk mitigation considerations are woefully inadequate and are worthy of at least further consideration or, more appropriately, independent third-party assessment?

With this in mind, I have copied this note to the PINS Case Manager, Mr Spencer Barrowman, seeking his and the Examining Authority's consideration of this serious situation, given that the Examination process is scheduled to close as of today's date.

All the best

DEREK BURLES

REDWORTH PRODUCTS

M: [REDACTED]

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72

