



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Tween Bridge Solar Farm
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 1
Date:	24 June 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

AUDIO_TWEENBRIDGE_ISH3_SESSION1_2 40626

Wed, Jun 24, 2026 1:05PM • 1:43:54

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Tween Bridge Solar Farm, landscape sensitivity, flood risk, compulsory acquisition, planning balance, visual amenity, battery energy storage, flood zone 3b, drainage systems, environmental impact, construction measures, cumulative effects, surface water drainage, operational justification, public hearing., flooding concerns, solar development, surface water, drainage infrastructure, environmental impact, flood risk assessment, PV solar panels, runoff mitigation, planning balance, hectares, rainfall calculation, decommissioning assets, national priority, consultation process, flood event

SPEAKERS

Speaker 8, Speaker 11, Speaker 13, Speaker 5, Speaker 12, Speaker 10, Speaker 7, Speaker 3, Speaker 2, Speaker 6, Speaker 1, Speaker 4, Speaker 9

Speaker 1 00:05

Okay, good morning. Thank you all for coming. It's 10am and the hearing is now open. I would like to welcome you all to this issue-specific hearing. This is the third issue specific hearing for the Tween Bridge Solar Farm project. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly? And can everyone online hear me clearly? Could you raise a hand or give me some indication? Great. Thank you. Can I also confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced. Okay. Thank you. My name is Luke Simpson. I am a chartered town planner, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as the single appointed person, otherwise known as the Examining Authority, or Exa, to examine this application. I'm also joined in person by my colleagues, Sarah Norris and Jenny Savage of the Planning Inspectorate, and they are sat at the back of the room and handling the virtual components of the meeting are Harpreet Kur and Harry Davies. As I said yesterday, it's very hot day, and the Met Office has issued amber weather warnings for today and tomorrow. Please feel free to remove jackets and ties. I've gone with a tie today, which I think I might regret shortly. Please also raise your hand at any point if the heat is making you feel uncomfortable, and we can take a break if needed. There is water available at the back of the room. I think you all have water on your tables if you're set at one. I'm going to seek to streamline the hearing today as much as possible, given the uncomfortable conditions. As such, I've removed a few questions, but we only have three, three and a half hours, perhaps, because we've got compulsory acquisition hearing this afternoon, so we'd need to finish in good time for that. I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Could everyone please set all devices, laptops, and phones to silent? Toilets are located in the middle of the room, on the right-hand side, or the left, as you come in. I don't think there's a fire drill plan today, but if the alarms do go off, please exit through the doors behind me and meet outside the Tourist Information Center on the High Street. This hearing will follow the agenda published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on fourth of June 2026 the agenda is Examination Library Reference EV five double 01 It would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you. The agenda is for guidance only, and I may add other considerations as we progress, I will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions have been asked and responded to, but if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for me to prioritize some matters and defer other matters to further written questions, as I said, the hearing will need to finish by 1pm because we've got a compulsory acquisition hearing today at 2pm Today's hearing is being undertaken

in a hybrid way, which means some of you present, some of you are present with me here at the venue, and some of you are participating virtually on Microsoft Teams. A recording of today's hearing will be available on the Tween Bridge Solar Farm section of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing has closed. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into the microphone, stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak. Could you also ensure that you turn your microphone on and off accordingly? If you're not at a table with a microphone, then there should be a roving microphone, so please wait for one of those to be brought before you speak. A link to the planning inspectorate privacy notice was provided in the hearing notification. I therefore assume that everybody here today has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection. Connection laws. If you have any questions or concerns about this, then please speak to the case team after the hearing. I am now going to ask those of you who are participating in today's hearing to introduce yourselves.

Speaker 1 05:12

When I state your organisation's name, could you introduce yourself, stating your name, who you represent, and which agenda item you wish to speak on. If you are not representing an organization, please confirm your name, summarize your interest in the application, and confirm the agenda item upon which you wish to speak. Please, could everyone also indicate how they would like to be addressed? So, mr. Ms. mrs. etc. So I'll begin with the applicant who will be representing the applicant today. Please,

Speaker 2 05:50

good morning, sir. My name is Tom McNamara. mr. McNamara is fine. I act for the applicant in relation to this application for development consent. So, the applicant, RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited, and I am a legal director with the law firm TLT LLP. I will go through the rest of the team now.

Speaker 1 06:16

Okay, I can't hear you particularly.

Speaker 2 06:19

Should I get a bit closer? How's that?

Speaker 1 06:21

That's better, a

Speaker 2 06:21

bit better. Thank you. To my left, there I've got mr. Angus Duncan, who is development manager with the applicant. To my right, I've got mrs. Kate Curtis, Pegasus Planning, and mrs. Curtis will be able to speak to landscape and visual matters. To mrs. Curtis's right, I have Miss Beth King, who's a solicitor also with the law firm TLT. To Miss King's right, mr. Michael Baker, development manager with RWE. To mr. Baker's right, mr. Henry Scanlon, Pegasus Planning, and mr. Scanlon will be able to speak to planning balance matters to mr. Scanlon, right mrs. Rana Allidad, Pegasus planning, and mrs. Allidad will be able to speak to flood risk matters. And then finally, at the end of line, we've got mrs. Isabel Holland's Pegasus planning, and mrs. Hollands will be able to speak to you about the sensitivity test analysis, so that's the full team. I don't envisage anybody else needing to speak at this hearing, sir.

Speaker 1 07:31

Okay. Thank you very much. And for City of Doncaster Council, please.

Speaker 3 07:39

Thank you, sir. Andrew Shirikovsky for City of Doncaster Council. Mr. Shirikovsky is fine. I will answer points across the various items today, including covering planning balance item 3c. Other members of the team, firstly we have Emily Jones, who's attending virtually from Tetra Tech, dealing with landscape. To my left we have David Hornsby from Doncaster City of Doncaster Council, who may also join the discussion on landscape, so that's item three A, and also attending online we have Mr. Richard Campbell from City of Lancaster Council, who represents the LLFA and will speak in relation to item 3b flood risk, and I think that's everyone from our team to know something.

Speaker 1 08:44

Okay. Thank you very much. And for North Lincolnshire Council, please.

Speaker 4 08:51

Morning, sir. Paul Skelton, representing North Lincolnshire Council. Mr. Skelton is fine. To my right, we have Mike Robinson Smith from North Lincolnshire Council, representing the lead local flood authority, who will speak on flood matters where necessary, and also Emily Jones is representing both councils in terms of landscape matters, and that is it, sir. Thank you.

Speaker 1 09:22

Okay. Thank you very much. And do we have any statutory parties participating? I don't think we do. No. Okay, we'll move on to interested parties. Mr. Brooke, would you like to introduce yourself?

Speaker 5 09:45

Yeah, Michael Brooks, farmer off the Hatfield levels delegate for the whole of this area on the drainage Hatfield Doncaster East drainage board. And so I'll update you. I want to divide the area up. Into three areas north of the canal, from the canal to the M1 80, and then 180 south, and I'll update you as we go through on the risks of pumps being shut and the huge risk to flooding for us that want to continue to produce food for you. Thank you.

Speaker 1 10:19

Okay. Thank you very much. And Mr. Carr,

Speaker 6 10:22

John Carr, Mr. John Carr, resident and mechanical engineer. Thank you.

Speaker 1 10:31

Thank you very much. Okay, so some of today's questions of the applicant, few of them are for City of Doncaster Council and North Lincolnshire Council, based on the local impact reports, and what I'll typically do is hear from the applicant first, then followed by the councils and other interested parties, the applicant will have the final right of reply, and a discussion will be structured and led by me. So we'll now move on to agenda item two, which is, can I just check that there's nobody I've missed that wants to participate today first, I Okay, we'll move on to agenda item two, which is the purpose of the hearing. So this hearing is on environmental matters, the first of which is landscape and visual. I only have a limited number of questions on this subject. We'll then move on to discuss flood risk again. There are only a small number of questions following up from the answers already given at the previous issue, specific hearing, and in response to responses to risk questions. We'll then discuss the overall planning balance and general matters, which include battery energy storage, sensitivity test, and the applicant's change request. The purpose of the hearing is for me to get the information that I need in order to properly and effectively examine this application. The questions which I have are those which I consider warrant or would benefit from discussion in a hearing setting, and as I said yesterday, just because I

don't mention something, for example, a particular effect or an issue which you may have raised in a representation, that does not mean I won't be considering it. Okay, before we move on to agenda item three, does anyone have any questions about the purpose of the hearing? No. Okay, so agenda item three is environmental matters, the first of which is three a landscape and visual effects. I only have a handful of questions, and they relate to queries I have in relation to the local impact reports provided by City of Doncaster Council and North Lincolnshire Council. So I'd be grateful if the applicant could try and display the documents on screen as I refer to them. My first question relates to landscape character sensitivity, so if the applicant could please display paragraph 10.15 of City of Doncaster Council's local impact report, which is exam library reference rep 1062 so that's rep 1062 paragraph 10.15 and Perfect. Thank you. So, paragraph 10.15 states the LVIA addresses the Pete Moreland landscape character type and a Thorn and Hatfield Pete Moreland g2 character area that lie within the CDC area as identified in Don in the Doncaster Character Assessment 2007 the sensitivity of this area is assessed as high. Consideration should have been given to a sensitivity of very high, considering the nature of the proposals and the more detailed description of the landscape character areas, areas one and three. From the 2014 character assessment, I just wondered if City of Doncaster Council could please elaborate on why the nature of the proposals and the more detailed description of the landscape necessitate necessary necessitate a very high sensitivity I can. I respond

Speaker 7 15:30
on that one.

Speaker 1 15:32
Yes.

Speaker 7 15:33
Yeah, Emily Jones, representing North Inc. and Doncaster Council. Yes, it's it's to do with the detail that was looked at, so in the 2014 character assessment, there is a bit more detail in looking at these character areas, and on some of the character areas, it even suggests that they need to be looked in in further detail to see if they could be considered to be valued landscapes, so there is some very high sensitivities going on there, which we feel the detail is not being looked into. The response in the actual assessment is quite generic and very short, and we feel if the details were looked into more, it could result in different outcomes than is being assessed, such as very high could be the sensitivity, and I just feel without that detail we don't know if the results that are coming out of the assessment are correct.

Speaker 1 16:43
Okay, so is is the council asserting that the sensitivity should be very high, or is it just a possibility?

Speaker 7 16:54
It's a possibility. I would like to see that evidence of the staged approach being addressed to come to the conclusion rather than just jumping to conclusions, and at the moment I can't see, see that approach has been taken.

Speaker 1 17:11
What specifically within is it just the 2014 character assessment where we're talking about? Is that what the applicant you're suggesting hasn't had full regard to,

Speaker 7 17:25
I mean, that is just one of the examples. So, my concerns are that the applicant has used two character assessments, one which is 20 years old and one which is 27 years old, and there are other more up to date character assessments with more detail in that should they have used them may may or may not,

but I don't understand why you wouldn't use the up to date information that's available to you to influence your report.

Speaker 1 18:00

Okay, so they do. You know what those documents are? So we've got the 2014 character assessment.

Speaker 7 18:09

Yeah, so the 2014 Isle of Axome and Hatfield Chase Landscape Partnership assessment, and there's also a 2021 North Lincolnshire landscape character assessment by JBA have provided links, but maybe they've not come through in this, but yeah, yeah, there's two, they're not adopted by the council, which is their reasoning for not using them, but the adopted documents are 20 and 27 years old, so I would more incline to use up to date documents.

Speaker 1 18:47

Why would what you mean by adopted? Why aren't they adopted? And why? Who produce them?

Speaker 7 18:56

What the 2014 and 2021 So the 2021 North Lincolnshire landscape care assessment by JBA is part of the evidence base for North Lincoln's emerging local plan. The 2014 document, off the top of my head, I couldn't.. I'll, I'll get back to you to say what that was produced for, but that was produced by Fiona Fife Associates, so they're published documents that are really easily available on the internet. There's no reason not to refer to them.

Speaker 1 19:36

Okay, I mean, the, yeah, I understand the 2021 character assessment forms part of the evidence base, but I'm surprised the 2014 assessment that doesn't carry the same well hasn't been adopted. In your words,

Speaker 7 19:55

I'm using the words that the applicant has used for the reasoning for. Well, using the 20 and 27 year old character assessment.

Speaker 1 20:05

Okay. Thank you. Would the applicant like to respond? Hey

Speaker 8 20:13

Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, those two documents are those two character documents are still in play and have not been superseded by the documents that form part of the local plan evidence base, the Arlo Vax home and Hatfield Chase landscape character assessment, the status of that and the organization that has produced that is not particularly clear, the use of that document is not being flagged through our consultations with the with the local authorities, so we've taken the decision to use the documents that are currently in place and not superseded.

Speaker 1 20:58

Okay, wouldn't it? I mean, isn't it normal practice to have regard to documents forming the evidence base for the emerging local plan, particularly if they're much more recent?

Speaker 8 21:13

Hey, Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, yes, we have reviewed them, but we've not set out our set them out in the ES chapter specifically, but they have been reviewed as part of our baseline studies.

Speaker 1 21:30

Okay, but does that is that expressed in the assessment anywhere?

Speaker 8 21:36

I think it's expressed in our responses.

Speaker 1 21:39

Okay, so your responses suggest that you've reviewed them, but there's no analysis or written description of that review.

Speaker 8 21:50

No, that's

Speaker 1 21:51

correct. And Ms. Jones, what is the so with the 2021 landscape character assessment, what does that say that's different? What compared to these older character assessments?

Speaker 7 22:11

Well,

Speaker 1 22:13

in broad terms, it

Speaker 7 22:14

just has a different.. it's got up to date level of character detail in there, and one of my concerns in there is that for the Trent levels, for example, it has a comment that it says it recommends this area is put for consideration as an area of high landscape value, which to me indicates that some of these landscape character areas do have a particularly high landscape value. I don't really think that has been picked up on in the assessment,

Speaker 1 22:50

but is there a reason why that seems to that sort of assessment seems to have changed over time or developed as in in, in comparison to the older assessments,

Speaker 7 23:08

I don't have an answer for you on that one, because I guess I haven't - I haven't written either of these assessments. I guess it could be to do with evolving methodology, how things are looked at, or just the fact that you know there was, there were historically landscape designations in some of these areas, and they've been withdrawn, and maybe they were still there at the time of the other assessments. I'm not sure about that, but it's just that that that value has been identified, which to me appears to have been overlooked.

Speaker 1 23:48

Okay, and Ms. Curtis, I think a lot of the responses to the written question avoided. I think there was an avoidance of updating the actual documents, so for in this instance it would be helpful if the actual assessment reflected what you're suggesting it reflects in the in response to written question, which means updating the information, written information provided, rather than just responding to written questions without updating the documents, is that something that can be done in this instance? Okay,

Speaker 8 24:32

good. On behalf of the applicant, I think that would clear that this matter up if we added an extra section on both those documents.

Speaker 1 24:42

Okay, that would be very helpful. Thank you. Okay, does anyone have anything else to say on that particular issue? mr. Brooke,

Speaker 5 24:58

Michael Brooke. Uh, as a local landowner, we farm a lot quite a lot on the south and north side of the motorway, and some of the characteristics that you probably don't know about is that there are 1000s of tons of trees underground. We are affected every year by rising, we call it bug oak, which has done over 1000s of years, and such like that, and the peat soils are completely different to we even have peat under the clay and such like that on high levels, like and such like that, and we worry that the structure of the peat is going to be destroyed by the panels so yeah. Okay,

Speaker 1 25:45

okay, yeah. I see why you've mentioned that, because we were talking about the Pete Morelands.

Speaker 5 25:49

Yeah,

Speaker 1 25:50

thank you. Does the applicant want to respond on that point?

Speaker 2 25:57

Tom, that number on behalf of the applicant, so we, we probably don't have the specialists in the room to be able to deal with that, but we will take note of it, and we can, we can provide a written response as part of our written submission.

Speaker 1 26:08

Okay. Thank you. Does anyone else want to raise any thing on the landscape character sensitivity? No. Okay, we'll move on to my next question, which relates to the proposed planting. Please, could the applicant display paragraph 10.22 of City of Doncaster Council's Local Impact Report, that's Examination Library Reference Rep 1062 Paragraph 10.22 10.22 Perfect. Thank you. So this paragraph states in part that the basis of the year 15 and decommissioning phase of the landscape assessment is that the embedded mitigation would have established to screen the development resulting in not significant effects, but there is no acknowledgement of the long term change in underlying landscape character due to the presence of the landscape mitigation, which is largely different to the existing landscape characteristics, so what I really want to know is the Council City of Doncaster Council asserting that there would be an adverse effect as a result of the proposed planting, and if so, is it possible that you could elaborate on what that might be? Plead.

Speaker 7 27:59

Hi, Emily Jones, representing North Lincoln Duncan Council. No, we're not saying that it's an adverse effect of the proposed planting. I guess it was more to highlight that these, the maturing hedgerows haven't been covered and mentioned, rather than we do acknowledge that in as the applicant has referenced, that some of the hedgerows could do with a gappy hedgerows, and in filling the hedgerows, and things like that, will be an improvement to the landscape character. So we're not saying that hedgerow planting is necessarily an adverse effect. I guess it was more to do with that, it is a change in

the landscape, and would like to see how that has been acknowledged and taken into account in the assessment, rather than just not referenced at all,

Speaker 1 28:54

so you're not necessarily saying that there's harm, but you're saying that the change in landscape character arising from the proposed some of the proposed planting measures haven't probably been considered, is that right?

Speaker 7 29:08

Yes.

Speaker 1 29:10

Okay. Would the applicant like to respond?

Speaker 8 29:17

Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, we do consider the decommissioning effects in relation to hedgerows, and they're summarized in the table at the end of the chapter. Magnitude is assessed as very low with the residual effect of moderate minor.

Speaker 1 29:38

Okay, so the table does that I don't, what, what is the table reference?

Speaker 8 29:44

Table reference is table six six,

Speaker 1 29:50

and that's part of the land chapter. Yeah,

Speaker 8 29:55

that's right.

Speaker 1 29:59

What is the. The examination library reference for the latest version. Do you know it is

Speaker 8 30:07

rep two 0.34

Speaker 1 30:12

Thank you. Can we display that on screen, please? I so brilliant, so say, does this table, can you explain where in the table the proposed planting is considered, and in terms of its effect on landscape character?

Speaker 8 30:56

I think in terms of decommissioning, we do it's a bit of a catch-all across all of the effects, rather than a detailed analysis of it.

Speaker 1 31:07

Yeah, I think that's the point that the councilor raising, though, that is a catch-all approach, as opposed to there's no.. well, I'm not suggesting this, but I think their assertion is that there's no analysis of some of or all of the proposed planting measures during the year 15 and decommissioning phase.

Speaker 8 31:31

Yes, the approach is that the hedgerows and the land would be handed back to the landowners for them to take back the land and do what, do manage them accordingly, how they want to.

Speaker 1 31:47

Okay, I think that there should be some more description in the assessment as to why you've arrived at the conclusions you have in terms of the decommissioning phase and year 15 in particular, focusing on the effects of proposed planting.

Speaker 8 32:14

Okay, we can, we can add a section on that. Yeah,

Speaker 1 32:18

all right. Does the council have any response to any of that.

Speaker 7 32:24

Emily Jones, representing North Lincolnshire and Doncaster Council. No, I think just that's a main point, is that there seems to be a bit of detail backing throughout, and might, yeah, welcome that to be added.

Speaker 1 32:39

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 9 32:43

Yes, mr. Brooke Michael Brook, local landowner.

Speaker 5 32:50

For some of the, this will affect some of the rural properties, like mine on Hatfield levels, and like John's on thorn levels, where hedges are going to be planted. The lady representing the applicant came out, and she saw what we're going to see out of my son's bedroom window, and such like that. You're going to plant a tree or two and a bit to hedge, but she said the hedge is only going to be allowed so high, right? So we're still going to see a meter of panels above the hedge all the time, so we're still going to be affected, and our properties are going to depreciate somewhat.

Speaker 1 33:37

Okay. Thank you. Does the applicant want to respond to that.

Speaker 8 33:43

Hey, Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, just to confirm that the hedgerows have been managed at three meters high, and in that section of the scheme we're planting, proposing to plant hedgerows, hedgerow trees, and a small section of woodland near the motorway over bridge.

Speaker 1 34:05

Okay, so mr. Brooke, are you, you're presumably referring to first floor windows, is that right?

Speaker 5 34:16

We've got more or less 300 degrees of panels and such like that on the edge, like, and such like that, and there's some where it can't be there, can't be hedgerows planted, because she's seen the lady where it's northern power grid, there's an electric line, and the hedge has got to be kept low under there, like, and such like that, there's problems.

Speaker 1 34:42

Okay. Thank you. What's the applicant's response on that?

Speaker 8 34:47

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, in particular reference to the over to the power line, we're showing an additional hedge row behind the power line to, to be in order to mitigate the. At the visual effects of the fencing and subsequent panels, because there is, we've acknowledged that there's an issue with the hedgerow needing to be maintained very low under the under the power line, and that can't be maintained at three meters, so we're we're supplementing that with an additional hedgerow beyond the line that makes sense,

Speaker 1 35:21

so the with regard to the first floor window issue, and obviously managing the hedgerows to three meters, obviously in the applicant's residential visual amenity assessment has that considered the effect from first floor windows.

Speaker 8 35:41

Yes, it has. Yeah,

Speaker 1 35:43

because I think in a lot of the conclusions are that the proposed planting would mitigate visual effects.

Speaker 8 35:51

Yeah, right, but obviously that's not impossible on first floor windows, but that's taken in the round as part of the residential amenity study, and looking at principal views, and downstairs, downstairs rooms views, main, main, main views.

Speaker 1 36:15

Okay. Right. Well, the next question relates to the residential visual immunity assessment, which is also known as the RVA. So, please, could the app can display paragraph 10.27 of City of Doncaster Council's local impact report, so that's 10.27 of document reference rep 1062 062 Okay. Thank you. Paragraph 10.27 suggests that the RVAA has not considered the effect of shortened views resulting from the proposed planting measures. I think, in particular, receptor 21 Mauds Bridge is mentioned. However, I just wanted to know, is the council alleging that there would be an adverse effect on amenity as a result of shortened views from planting sufficient to trigger a full RVA, and what is the assertion? What effects are being alleged in hi

Speaker 7 37:44

Emily Jones, representing North Lincolnshire and Doncaster Council. I guess this is back to some previous points that we just don't feel there's enough detail to make the course stated, so with the RVA, it's very brief, and not acknowledging that a view changes from open to very stunted is something that should be addressed in the RVA. Whether it will be adverse in the end or not, I don't know until that detail is presented,

Speaker 1 38:24

what is the applicant's response? Have has that been considered in the RVA into the effect of proposed planting on views?

Speaker 8 38:36

Okay, Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, yes, that has been considered as part of the RVA, the there is an element of inevitable effect here in terms of the proposal, and the best course of mitigation is to plant a hedgerow, but there's a balance here to be struck between maintaining open views, which would result in removal of whole, whole scale fields, because you can't, you just keep pushing, pushing it back, and and and the package of mitigation we have available to us.

Speaker 1 39:19

Okay, so where in the RVA has that is that are those considerations set out? Can you give me an example?

Speaker 8 39:31

I don't think I can give you a specific example, but they're considered in the, in the round in the assessment of the RVA.

Speaker 1 39:39

Okay, I think this is similar point to what I raised earlier. I appreciate that you say that it's been considered, but I'm not sure that it has been expressed in the reporting, so. Perhaps that's something that could be updated, unless you can give me some examples, I Okay,

Speaker 8 40:25

Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I think if you look through the residential visual amenity assessment, the narrative, whilst brief, does give the context and mentions offsets built into the scheme and associated mitigation.

Speaker 1 40:46

Yes, but I think what we're talking about is the effect of whether there are negative effects associated with the actual mitigation, and where, whether that has been set out. I

Speaker 8 41:01

think it's been considered in the round, but not necessarily specifically stated.

Speaker 1 41:06

Okay, I think it's something that should be included, if possible. Please. Okay. All right. Is there anyone who wants to add anything on the residential visual amenity assessment? Yes, mr. Carr,

Speaker 6 41:34

John Carr, resident property number 44 They, when I brought this matter up earlier, they said that there was already an existing hedge between myself and the panels, which are only 40 odd meters from me to the west. That edge is not evergreen, and it's very poor quality and I possibly digress slightly here. I think, given that there's panels on all four sides of me or moving 40 meters, that's a fire risk that's hazardous to my health. If argument's sake, those panels caught fire, I've got no means of escape. I'm blocked off by hedges, rails.

Speaker 1 42:30

Yes. Okay. I think that is more of a health and safety fire risk point. We're focusing on landscape, but I take your point, and I have. I do remember reading your representation, but you can make further representations tomorrow if you're attending on that point, but in terms of the hedgerow, what are you suggesting? What would you prefer?

Speaker 6 42:57

There should be an evergreen, an evergreen one on the panel side,

Speaker 1 43:04
okay?

Speaker 6 43:04
To cover it, minimum, you know, evergreen, because non-evergreen in the wintertime is non-existent, is it?

Speaker 1 43:13
Okay. And thank you, the applicant. What are you familiar with the property being referred to, and is this something that can be addressed?

Speaker 8 43:25
Pick Curtis, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, my colleagues have visited Property Reference 44 and we have, we've developed some embedded mitigation to this scheme in terms of the layout of the of the panels, but we've also added considerable landscape mitigation to the landscape proposals. There is a slight difficulty with evergreen planting in terms of using native material that we can only really use holly, but we could maximize the balance of holly in that in those mixes in the detailed landscape proposals, so that's something that could be accommodated

Speaker 1 44:14
well, given that mr. Carr specifically mentioned it. Is it something that could be included specifically in the landscape and ecological management plan, we

Speaker 8 44:27
could include a note on the on the landscape proposals, the specific notes to follow through into the detailed landscape design, so that that's accommodated.

Speaker 1 44:37
That would be useful. Thank you.

Speaker 8 44:38
But just to note, we wouldn't be able to use sort of Lelandi I hedging, for example, which would be evergreen, because it would not be, you know, appropriate. Yes,

Speaker 1 44:47
yeah. Okay, mr. Carr, did you want to respond at all? Preferably fireproof. I approve. Okay, we can discuss that. Tomorrow, if you're, if you're here, okay? I don't have any other questions on landscape and visual effects. Is there anyone else who would like to say anything in relation to landscape and visual effects before we move on to discuss flood risk? Okay. Okay, so item 3b is flood risk. My first question relates to the need to locate a substation and battery energy storage system, partly within flood zone 3b Sorry, I'll give you a bit of time to move. All right, okay, so as I said, my first question relates to the need to locate a substation and battery energy storage system, partly within flood zone 3b In my first written questions, which are exam library reference PD 010 question seven point 0.31 asked the applicant to explain whether there are any operational reasons why parts of the development need to be located within flood zone 3b The applicant provided a response at rep 2087 2087 so that's rep 2087 page 244 Response to written question seven point 0.31 and the applicant's response states in part that 132 kilovolt substation is required in this location to provide adequate coverage for the scheme and to deliver an efficient design that minimizes system losses and cable costs, and I'm just wondering

if the applicant could elaborate on this, and I would like to see evidence to support that assertion as well.

Speaker 10 47:25

Ron Ali Duda, speaking on behalf of the applicant on flood risk. I would like to start by saying that the applicant has sought to a very practicable to avoid placing any infrastructure between floods on 3b but as you mentioned rightly, there are a limited number of basically a section of best as well as the substation, which is which are placed within flood zone 3b I would like to clarify that for that particular best placed within flood zone 3b that's basically 11% of that particular best compound being placed within flood zone 3b and 1.2% of the substation is being placed within flood zone 3b So that's just a two clarification I would have liked to make to make first, they are being placed within parcel a 20 and as you rightly mentioned, we previously responded that there are several operational reasons for placing those within floods on 3b extent with regards to the substation, basically the 132 kilowatt substation is needed to be in this location to provide the adequate coverage for the scheme, and to deliver the efficient design that minimize system losses and cable costs. As we said previously, the best compound is required to be co-located with the 132 kilovolt substation, as it's of sufficient size to accommodate the best, and also to ensure that the system losses and costs are basically minimized. The capacity of this substation plays a role in the sitting of the best compound. We understand that the assumption has been that the seven substations are equal in size, but in reality they will have different capacities as the PV units cannot be split evenly, owing to the different size and separation of the land parcels. So not every substation will have enough capacity to connect to the best compound. There are other reasons as well. The other reason is basically to ensure that they are located outside the topper zones of existing wind turbines. This is necessary to maintain appropriate safety stand-offs, distances from the wind turbines, because typically wind turbine tip height plus a 10% buffer. Needed, and to ensure safe and reliable operation of critical infrastructure and compliance with established safety requirements. So, also I would like to add that Parcel A enables the best to be located furthest away from residential receptors in terms of noise and benefits from an elevated existing noise environment associated with the operation wind form, so the nearest I would like to add that the nearest dwelling is located approximately 2.8 kilometer from the parcel, a best location, which is significantly greater than the majority of alternative substation locations. Also, the presence of existing wind form increases baseline noise levels within the area, reducing the potential for operational noise effects. Also, another reason is basically, is actually flooding, which I like to add, Parcel A provides one of the largest areas adjacent to 132 kilowatt substations capable of accommodating this particular best compound, while some other substations are located in areas of lower flood risk, there is insufficient, insufficient adjacent land available to accommodate a best compound of the required size at a lower basically flood risk, hence we have basically chosen, or these areas have been chosen, so this is this is this is the operational justifications for for placing best and that substation within flood zone 3v B.

Speaker 1 51:43

Okay. Thank you for the detailed response. The so you're saying 11% of the best at 1.2% of the substation is there seems that there should be some wriggle room, I mean, because there's some flexibility in the design, so isn't there any means by which freebie can be avoided without changing the work plans?

Speaker 10 52:16

Ranali Duan is speaking on behalf of the applicant. My understanding is that this will be basically finalized at detailed designer stage, so the orientation and exact location of the best and the substation is not fixed yet, and this is something that will be basically looked at in more details, and potentially, as we said, we will basically look into it will avoiding it as best as possible, but it may not be possible. So

Speaker 1 52:47

I'm just wondering, why that process can't take place now. I know you've given me a lot of explanations, but if there is flexibility, I would like to know, effectively

Speaker 2 53:05

on behalf of the applicant, so we can take that away. I think, obviously, there's a difference between the flexibility that does exist by the works plans and the detailed design requirement. The next question is whether we can accelerate that process, so as to essentially avoid flood zone three be at this at this point, that's a question that will need some technical input. So, I can't confirm whether or not we can do that now, but we can certainly take it away and look at

Speaker 1 53:34

it. Yeah, I think it's worth what, worth your while, because say I reached a conclusion that the location within free B wasn't justified, it might have bigger implications than if you'd given evidence to support the assertion that actually we can do this within the current parameters, if you like. Do you see what I'm saying?

Speaker 2 54:05

The applicant, yeah, I understand everything there, sir. So we will go away and consider that. Obviously, our baseline position is that we think there are.. there is an operational justification for sighting infrastructure in flood zone 3b but we will take in hand an analysis of what can be done in that location and whether there is sufficient room to maneuver at this point.

Speaker 1 54:35

Okay, that'd be useful, because we are talking about very small percentages, so Sorry, sir,

Speaker 2 54:43

mr. Barker, mr. Baker, sorry. Yes, you would like to just add something.

Speaker 11 54:48

Thank you, Michael Baker, for the applicant. I'm Development Project Manager. I'm not an engineer, I'm a town planner, but obviously I work very closely with our engineers. I think just to clarify, how we've drawn those squares and why we. Haven't been flexible so far, so we have to take the worst case footprint based on what, say, the biggest equipment available from the type of manufacturers that would be that could be on the list, and so that's why the squares, if you like, are as big as they are. We don't know the manufacturers, and we don't know that during this process, because that's something that happens after consent, once we are able to let those sorts of contracts, as Tom said, we will take it away and have a look at it with our engineers, but I just wanted to let you know that's why those squares are drawn where they are, they're a worst case footprint based on the information that we know now of what could be on the site.

Speaker 1 55:39

Okay. Thank you, and we with regard to the system losses, is it possible that evidence can be provided to support that assertion?

Speaker 2 55:56

Tom, at the bottom of the applicant, I will look to mr. Baker again. Here, I don't want to say yes, and then planning else to be no. So

Speaker 11 56:04

we should be able to provide sort of calculations based on that. It'll just be the formulas that we use to calculate those sorts of losses and the constraints that we work within when we're doing our design.

Speaker 1 56:15

Okay, because you have to bear in mind the requirements of MPSEM one, which I think are that there need to be operational reasons, and I'm not sure we've got, I've got the explanation, but not necessarily the evidence to back that up. Does City of Doncaster Council have anything to add on on those points,

Speaker 3 56:47

Andrew Koski, City of Doncaster Council, I'll hand over to my colleague Richard Canton. I'll just remember just a comment for myself, so I have to say my reaction was the same as yours, and therefore it seems quite obvious to at least ask the question as to whether or not there isn't scope here to actually look again at the design, so the comments are welcome from the from the applicant, but it does seem like a very obvious question to raise, but I'll hand over my to my colleague Richard Campbell, who may have further more detailed comments from the LLFA.

Speaker 1 57:22

Thank you.

Speaker 12 57:24

Thank you, Richard Campbell, City of Doncaster Council. We don't have any comments in relation to this. As a lead local flood authority, we're a statutory council to you for surface water only, and I think it's the exception and sequential test that you're referring to as part of this question. Those tests are normally applied before we see the application to consider, but I'll be happy to take that away and speak to our planning colleagues and provide a written response after this meeting, if that's okay. Thank you.

Speaker 1 57:48

Okay. Thank you very much. Does anyone else have anything to say on the flood zone 3b issue? mr. Brooke,

Speaker 5 58:00

Michael, on behalf of the local drainage board. This is the area north of the canal, as such three pumping stations on the cards, like I told you at the last meeting. Elmhurst is likely to go, it's a coal authority one, and it drains all that land back on the borders of Moor ends and back to the industrial estate of Coleman Road, all the water goes north there, and that's going to do away, so all that water is going to go to the New Zealand pump, and it's going to struggle, do gentlemen, farmers recently on mr. Burt Whistle, neighbors are very concerned. He sold a big block of land to the chicken factory. Is that up for development? They're very worried that'll be extra runoff water, and also you mentioned yesterday about the Moore Edges Road. There's 80 acres there south of the Mooredes Road. Planning has been applied for before, and it's going to go ahead. There'll be houses on there before long, and it's a very wet area, and that water's got to go somewhere. It'll affect all the system on the North Salt Drain, so that's my opinion on that area for now. Thank you.

Speaker 1 59:26

Okay. Thank you. So, mr. Brooke mentioned a couple of developments. I don't know if you're familiar with those. So, mr. Brooke, what are they? So, you, you mentioned 80 acres south of

Speaker 5 59:39

Moore, more edges, yeah, right from the Rugby Club, opposite there, Rugby Ground, Coleman Road, Crossroads, around to the east. It'll be the next blocking farm that's going to be built on.

Speaker 1 59:52

Is that presumably residential?

Speaker 5 59:54

Yeah, hopefully.

Speaker 1 59:56

And it's you saying there was a planning application or.

Speaker 5 1:00:00

Was I think they've applied before, so when mr. Root from Kroll applied, he owns quite a lot of that land in that time, and so no, it's the next on the cards,

Speaker 1 1:00:13

and the other one was,

Speaker 5 1:00:15

yeah, the land to the north of the industrial estate, which has been changed ownership, and they're worried that some of that could be developed into whether sheds or houses.

Speaker 1 1:00:26

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 5 1:00:27

Yeah,

Speaker 1 1:00:28

thank you. So, if the applicant.. I don't know if you are familiar with either of those developments, but if you are, is it possible that you could consider whether you have considered those in your assessment. Accumulative effects is that

Speaker 10 1:00:49

Ron added on speaking on behalf of the applicant. Yes, we will go back, review, and we can basically confirm that.

Speaker 1 1:00:55

Might, yeah, it might need a bit of digging, obviously, because we don't have specifics, but I'm sure it can be done, okay? Any other? Yes. Thank you. All skeleton, North

Speaker 4 1:01:10

Lincolnshire Council. The 3b issue in the infrastructure is absolutely North Lincolnshire issue. It's probably a moot point, because you've, you've, you've got the point, but we would have expected this to be addressed in the sequential test.

Speaker 8 1:01:27

The sequential test, I

Speaker 1 1:01:28

think, is just focused on

Speaker 4 1:01:30

kind of the bigger picture rather than the site-wide sequential test. So just wanted to make that point, but I think my colleague, Mr. Robinson Smith, has probably got some points to raise as well. Thank you. Okay, Mr. Robinson Smith,

Speaker 13 1:01:50

Mike Robinson Smith. I'm the lead local flood authority for North Links Council regarding flood zone 3b. We have raised this point with the same point that you've raised yourself multiple times, and given the applicant multiple opportunities to relocate, or give sufficient evidence operationally or capacity wise to relocate or provide ample evidence that it actually needs to be within flood zone 3b regarding the percentages, as the applicant said, is 11% of this best facility being in flood zone 3b it's kind of an irrelevant point, really. If it's 2% it makes no difference, because once it's compromised, it's 100% that's compromised, and I'm not sure if the applicants actually evidence the environmental impacts of a base facility being compromised, because if flood water inundates the lithium ion batteries, you get thermal runaway, which effectively creates an explosive. It basically, it basically explodes. So, it's like you would do on a Tesla battery on your car. If you start slicing into batteries, they're generally popped, don't they? It's exactly the same, but on a large scale. So, all of the drainage systems that are being placed for this, once that's compromised, if you get thermal runaway, will effectively not work, it's all of the firewalls, all of the PFAS chemicals, all of the environmental hazards that it would associate with breach drainage systems that had contained it, generally wouldn't, wouldn't facilitate conveyance or be sealed systems anymore, but that's also the point of if you're in flood zone 3b which is a 3.3% plus event, which is fairly common now, I mean, I'll go into that in a sec, but once these systems are compromised, you, they've got wide, wide-scale environmental issues, and that's that's a pollution issue, like some of these chemicals could last forever in the system, mean that they're obviously forever chemicals, is then if we hand that back over to agricultural land, is you can't really till and farm the land because it's had widespread contamination, so it's no longer suitable for that. So, there is a lasting impact of these facilities. So, this 11% is once it's compromised, it's effectively 100% and relocating it on an area that's 1800 hectares by 11% is surely a small margin, and no justification for operational benefit is surely warranted there, just for, I guess, a comparison for future events is we're looking at 2070s your one in 200 year event will potentially be a one in 10 event on a tidal scale. Now that the trend areas are often tightly well, there is a tidally influenced as well as fluvial, which obviously backfills for the system when it's tid locked, but that one in 200 year event will be a one in 10 by 2070 from what's predicted under the Environment Agency's policies and justifications. So, the 3.3% will almost be a daily occurrence when it rains. So, these areas of floodplain storage will be vitally important, and any compromise on that for flood storage or anything will effectively be inundated all the time, that is, that's a real concern within the lifetime of this development. Thank you.

Speaker 1 1:04:49

Okay, so I think I take your points, and then we'll see what the applicant says, but I presume they'll say that the these areas. Is yeah, they're flood zone 3b but they'll all be raised above the flood level. What would be your response to that point?

Speaker 13 1:05:10

Hi, Mike Robinson, Smith, Northlands Council. I guess raising it above the flood, different flood levels doesn't really work for drainage, because the below ground systems are at the very least surface level systems, so they'll be compromised regardless. Is there's no way to mitigate against that in a floodplain,

and by building it in any sense, even substations, whilst they're maybe small, and yeah, it might be small percentages in a floodplain that's only small itself. You have to offset that floodplain storage somewhere else, and that might only be a couple of millimeters, maybe a negligible, but for someone's house who's potentially located close to it, and the low point of a land drainage channel, for example, is that mitigation is the low point, it could be their front garden or their house that's compromised by that one one small percentage within a floodplain storage. It's obviously the idea of them.

Speaker 1 1:05:59

Well, we'll come on to flood storage in a minute, but my point about the raising of other flood level is, does that not address your concerns about the battery safety and pollution?

Speaker 13 1:06:17

Mike Robinson Smith off links mitigate against, for the, I guess, for the lithium ion of batteries, but the system itself is these systems can compromise themselves regardless. In flood zone one, they obviously have the high risk developments in terms of the need for fire safety protocols, and it has to be fully drained, fully drained, fully sealed system, so number 10 valves and everything, but if you then have these issues in a floodplain whilst it's flooding, the battery systems may be safe, but then full drainage system will still be compromised and obviously give the same outputs of exactly what I've just said.

Speaker 1 1:06:54

Okay. Thank you. Would the applicant like to respond, please? Thank you,

Speaker 10 1:07:02

Ron Ali, that is speaking on behalf of the applicant. Yes, thank you. I would like to go back to your question about whether raising the best unit above love level would address the concern. We have looked into this in more details, so basically, by we are basically by proposed by raising the best compound and infrastructure to 100 millimeters above one in 1000 year. This is this is a very highly conservative design standard, as was agreed with the Environment Agency, as well, we note that the flood zone 3b is defined using one in 30 year annual exceedance probability event. Review of the 2025 River Torn hydraulic model indicates that flood depths within the affected area during one in 30 year is generally between point one to point two meter across this particular area. By comparison, model flood depths for one in 1000 year annual exceedance are approximately between point six to point nine, and the proposed infrastructure are being are basically being raised to above this flood level data, plus an additional 100 millimeters as free board, so this basically makes the point for us that the proposals will remain above flood levels associated with the more basically with the more frequent one in 30 year, as mentioned by North Lincolnshire Council, that's basically that's that's my response in terms of the experiencing flooding during the more frequent event, and the residual risk is is considered to be low in that respect, so okay.

Speaker 1 1:09:03

Thank you, mr. Robinson Smith. Do you want to respond or

Speaker 13 1:09:10

like Robinson Smith? North links. So, assuming that we raised them, you'd still have the same issue with the drainage systems that need to be fully sealed, fully restrained, and can effectively because the content firewalls and PFAs chemicals just suit your daily operations. Is you can't really mitigate against that, because you can't raise the drainage system. So the same impact to the wider environment, and the water quality purpose is still there. It's you can't, if it wants their compromised, they'll still pump toxic

chemicals into the wider environment and have a massive impact on the area, which potentially could impact the trend, which is a highly sensitive area.

Speaker 1 1:09:48

Okay. Yes. mr. Brooke,

Speaker 5 1:09:52

Michael Brook, drainage board. Just a bit of historical here. One in 1000 years flooding, it's a joke, and. Uh, go back to, you'll all know when Tollbar flooded this time of the year, 2007 We got 10 inches of rain in 10 days now, and none of the ditches were done out. You've never seen so much plumbing water about. And then more recently, when Storm Babette hit us in October 22 I think this area there was pumping in New Zealand Pump and Medjol pump was pumping in to the North Soak, and then it was going back out again onto the land towards Kroll. It was there was a very serious incident there. You can contact our IDB engineers. It was ridiculous. The drains can't cope, and we do what we're going to get these issues, but no, that was serious, that area in that time.

Speaker 1 1:10:56

Okay. Thank you to the applicant of these extreme events been factored into the assessment at

Speaker 10 1:11:08

all? We have looked at one in 1000 year, as agreed with the Environment Agency, that's what's looked at, but in terms of drainage, I would like to make a point that the drainage is fully cut off and it's isolated and it's below ground, so it doesn't, it won't be affected by flood risk. It's, it's basically, it will, it's been fully explained in the, in the as part of the outline surface water drainage strategy in the FRA, so it's not something that will be affected by fluvial flooding or any other sources of flooding, because it's below ground and it's fully sealed, and we do have basically a mitigation and an approach in terms of how basically it's been to be content to make sure it's contained in an event of a fire, so contaminants won't be basically released into the into the wider water course environment,

Speaker 1 1:12:02

okay. I'd like to ask a question about flood storage capacity. So, could the app can please display North Lincolnshire Council's response to my first written questions, which I believe our rep 2101 and in particular, question the response to question seven point 0.31 so Yeah, so it's North Lincolnshire Council's response to ESQ one, which is rep 2101 and and it's their response to written questions seven point 0.31 Anyway, I'll just carry on. The local impact report states, in part, that the proposals do not provide adequate confidence that there would be no net loss of floodplain storage, or that flows will remain unimpeded, while some elements of the scheme are described as permeable or elevated infrastructure, such as best compound substations and associated hard standing, will introduce areas of displacement and potential obstruction, but the environment agency's response to the same question, which is Rep 2103 states in part the EA can confirm that the project will not impact on the available flood storage capacity within flood zone 3b so I'm just wondering whether North Lincolnshire Council disagree with the conclusions reached by the Environment Agency, and if so, why that, why that is, please do Mike

Speaker 13 1:14:27

Robinson Smith. I guess in a professional environment, there's always disagreements to start with, but it's the point of any impermeable area will have an offset to any floodplain storage, so that the point that the making is kind of wrong. In all fairness, it might only be negligible spaces and negligible storages compared to 1800 hectares, but that could still impact someone's house, someone else's land. It could offset this floodplain storage to somewhere else. It's hard. To determine what the impact is, without

specific modeling to determine that, which is obviously expensive. The applicant hasn't done it. We have no facility to do it, and the environment agency probably don't either. We'd have to invest real capital investment funds through that, but any type of offset for adding an impairable area obviously increases, reduces the floodplain storage. There's no other way to do that, and it might only be small, like I've said, but that doesn't mean that it won't have an impact on somebody else,

Speaker 1 1:15:28

right? So, are you sort of suggesting that there would be some impact? It might be negligible, but we don't actually know where that impact would occur. Is that right,

Speaker 13 1:15:41

Mike Robinson Smith? Yeah, that's that's correct. Obviously, we have no, we, we can only work on the worst case scenario unless the data says otherwise, effectively.

Speaker 1 1:15:50

Okay, that's a good point. So, that has the applicant considered that on the basis of a worst case scenario, I

Speaker 10 1:16:03

Rana Alida speaking on behalf of African, could you please repeat the question?

Speaker 1 1:16:07

Okay, mr. Robinson Smith is effectively saying yes, there might be a negligible impact on floodplain storage, but we don't know where that impact would occur because the applicant hasn't undertaken the specific modeling. What I'm saying is, what assessment has been undertaken, and has it been done on a worst-case scenario basis in terms of blood plane storage?

Speaker 10 1:16:41

Ron, I'd rather speak. speaking on behalf of the applicant. The short question is, we have not undertaken modeling in this instance, however, we basically looking at the extent of floodplain and looking at the proposed basically infrastructure within floods on 3b we are looking at something about point 1% across the wider side, so it doesn't seem to be, it wasn't considered as proportionate, and we basically had several engagement with the Environment Agency, as they are the statutory consulting for flood risk, part in particular, with regards to flood zones and fluvial, rather than because they are the main pain body. So the agreement was that we will look at it, and basically the environment agency agreed with the proposed approach in terms of the impact, we stand by it. We still believe that because the proposals include raising all the infrastructure, and the raising happens on basically either piles or very small 300 mil of gravel base, the impact is going to be negligible, considering the extent of the wider site in relation to that, so I think the question is whether it's not quantifying how very small volume of floodplain is being displaced locally, that the question I think, or the point to look at is basically the context of extensive river storm floodplain and the limited footprint of proposed infrastructure within that, basically within that wider floodplain, that's that makes it quite negligible from our perspective and our assessment.

Speaker 1 1:18:45

Okay, so it's suggesting that the environment agency are on board with the fact that you haven't provided the modeling,

Speaker 10 1:18:54

that's correct, and the only point that the environment agency were raised, the environment agency basically looked requested as part of the relevant representations to look at one in 100 year 2025 river torn model plus climate change events, that's that's what they looked and requested, and the only point they raised was regarding possible raising of access tracks, which we looked into that in more details. We identified that there are possibly two locations of access tracks with about a length of five to 10 meters that may be required to be raised. Bear in mind that the access tracks are also permeable in nature. We provided details, basically zoomed in locations, looking at the levels as well as the contours. We provided that information to the Environment Agency, and they have confirmed in their last response that they are basically satisfied, and they do not consider that the proposals increase flood risk.

Speaker 1 1:20:00

Okay, all right. Would the council like to respond at all?

Speaker 13 1:20:08

Mike Robinson Smith, I've got nothing left to add. It's obviously a decision that you, you make, and the year probably won't agree on that point.

Speaker 5 1:20:17

Okay, yeah, I think we've established the point of difference, and if they can be expressed in the statement of common ground, I'd appreciate it. Yes, mr. Brooke Michael Brooke from the drainage board, as I mentioned before, you're going to damage the land drainage systems and the land itself, where the panels are going, are going to hold water, and the runoff is going to be faster. And I haven't.. I was told, I told you previously, it came to me from the Coal Authority, from Chris Crow Wilshire on Friday at a meeting, that their Coal Authority has five site solar sites to the west of here, and they have a great faster runoff when it does rain up to 25% faster runoff, so all the drains have got to cope with that faster water. Okay.

Speaker 1 1:21:19

Okay. Thank you. So, do you have a response on that point in terms of the coal authority?

Speaker 10 1:21:25

Ronald is speaking on behalf of the applicants. I confirmed that we are not proposing any structures on any overland surface water flow routes. We have looked at, looked at it into detail, looked into this detail and looked at the Environment Agency surface water flood maps and I confirmed that we are not proposing any structures on any overland surface water flow routes or basically any areas that are over 300 millimeters of ponding, so considering that proposals are also raised. We are not increasing, basically we are not changing flows on any of these land drainage or over land flow routes, or causing any basically detrimental impacts to those land drainage systems, and we are also complying with the buffer requirements requested by by the Board Internal Drainage Board, as well as the Environment Agencies, and the North Lancashire City of the Doncaster City of Doncaster councils.

Speaker 1 1:22:32

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 2 1:22:34

So, so just to supplement what Mrs. Allen has said there as well, I think this was a point that Mr. Brooke raised at the issue-specific hearing in April, and in case it's useful, by way of reference for Mr. Brooke in rep one hyphen 046 which was the applicant's written summary of submissions at that hearing, specifically at paragraph 5.6 point two, we set out the measures that will be implemented during

construction and operation to ensure that there wouldn't be damage to existing drainage assets, and those measures form part of the development consent order, and therefore be legally binding obligations on the applicant. So, hopefully that will be helpful.

Speaker 1 1:23:18

Yes, that's useful. Thank you. Okay, in terms of mr. Brooks mentioned earlier of the extreme flood events, I think you mentioned two different events, storms, what I'm relatively confident that FRA is flood risk assessments can consider specific events beyond just your one in 101 in 1000 so I'm wondering if that's something that can be addressed in the flood risk assessment,

Speaker 10 1:24:05

one in 1000 fluvial event is the most conservative event that we agreed with the Environment Agency. We looked into one in 100 year flood climate change, and one in 1000 is still proved to be higher and wider in terms of flood extents and levels, we also looked into tidal scenarios, still one in 1000, 1000 fluvial assumed to seem basically proved to be the highest and the widest extent, so I think this is this is the the highest level we could have a look, and it's a very basically conservative approach, and the fact that we are also looking at an additional 100 millimeters of buffer in terms of freeboard, I think that's that's another layer of basically protection that we can. Do other than that, I don't know. How we haven't got anything else beyond one in 1000

Speaker 1 1:25:06

Okay, I think I'm talking about historic events, though. We

Speaker 10 1:25:09

have looked at historic events, right? We have looked at into details, and we have not. Basically, I think that's been explained and covered in the in the flood risk assessment. That's that's there.

Speaker 1 1:25:22

Okay, as long as maybe it'd be worth checking whether the events mentioned by mr. Brooke could be

Speaker 10 1:25:28

sure. I think it would be also very helpful if one of the LLFAs would have any historic events that could share with us, so we can, we can basically look into it, because we have, I think we have exhausted all the existing materials.

Speaker 1 1:25:41

Yes, I don't know if that's something that the NLFAs do or can do.

Speaker 13 1:25:50

Mike Robinson Smith, North Links Council. It's not really something that we do. We would look at the same data that they've probably got access to for the over there modeled storm events and their historic data sets like they've said, the one in 1000 year is generally the worst case scenario for current, present day. I mean, obviously climate's changing, but it's yeah, in the models they're generally the most conservative and worst case event that's modeled.

Speaker 1 1:26:19

Okay, mr. Brooke, do you want to respond?

Speaker 5 1:26:23

Do you want me to deal with the other two blocks of land and my concerns now, or in a minute, or when? Is it in relation to flood, brack, and drainage? Yeah,

Speaker 1 1:26:33

yes. Because we're going to move on.

Speaker 5 1:26:36

All right. No. And then it gets it out way. Then let's go on to the block of land between the motorway and the canal. On this area, dirtiness pump is of great importance, right? It's up for refurbishments with the EA, and it'll cost a number of my fortune, but the water's got to go there. We're going to see increased water from Unity Development on the west side of the M 18, 3000 houses, and all these silly sheds that are going up. All that has to come through to us on the South SOAP, and I don't think it can cope. We also have in that area to Whitewell pump expected development. It's being put forward before the Brad home project, 200 acres north of the m1 80 roundabout. So there was two sheds covering 200 acres, and there's a fair bit of water or run off of them, so all that water has to come, we're going to the coal authority pump at not high levels is likely to go, so that's going to be affected. That's a coal authority pump that was put in for a purpose, because the land subsided a lot of this on the western edge, it's subsided right through from Birtwhistles right through to me on the south side, land's gone down and it's still going down, Grove House Farm again, the black ball, there's land still going down there because the water's running the wrong way and that's right on the edge of the fault we'll go further east now and I'll mention dirt, a bit more in a minute, but the black, the one at Belton Grange, which these chaps, Lincolnshire Council, will know about Sims Hill, Belton Grange, right next to Hurst Priory Golf Course, that could go. The EA wants to do away with that. Right, I talked to the previous landowner at a recent funeral, and he says if they do away with that, it'll just be a lake, because that was what was that put in for to drain that six or 700 acre around there, right back to the motorway. Now we'll go to the south side of me low levels pump is likely to be done away with, right. So that's going to be affected. That water is going to have to go to Duans, an extra 12 or 1400 acres. And then to cap it all, now at a recent EA Trent meeting, right, the A and various the IDBs, they're wanting to do a wave with four pumps on our southern boundary, starting with Talpits at the eastern side of Hatfield Moors, Good Copper, Santoft, Waterton, and West Moore again, Junction Four, back towards Arm Thorpe, so all the water from Doncaster Race Course, including the Hatfield Moors, is going to get to go an extra 8000 acres, he's having to go to Durant, as Pump, so that's going to put an awful lot of pressure on all those going. You'll worry, that's the ditch, the big drain to the east of Duans Pump takes it to Kidby, will never cope. Thank you. And I would like.. oh, just before I finish, farmers, that we had a big funeral three weeks ago, Robin Barker, he's got landing in this scheme, right? He died sudden, and there were several farmers there, and they said to me, you're going to suffer, and you want a crop loss compensation scheme, in whether it's to RWE, the EA, the coal authority, because you are going to flood, and, like I've said, all these ditches have to be done out every year, because with that flat, we're the lowest solar farm in the bloody country, aren't we? And water don't go pill, does it? Thank you.

Speaker 1 1:30:56

Okay. Thank you very much. So I mean, mr. Brook covered a lot there. I think some of the pumping station assertions were covered in your previous responses, but with regard to all the developments that mr. Brooke mentioned, obviously previously I suggested that you look at the cumulative assessment and try and establish whether you pick them up or not. Is that something that the applicant can look at?

Speaker 2 1:31:31

Tom Adam, on behalf of the applicant, I'm just going to turn to my right, I so we will take away the point about other developments, and we'll come back as part of our written submissions, as you said, the

issue of the pumping rationalization proposals was covered in some detail at the last hearing and our detailed response on that is contained in the written summary that I mentioned, and just to emphasize the point our scheme does not affect any of those pumps and that is a matter that has been agreed with the Environment Agency, and I should also emphasize that we have been dealing with both of the internal drainage boards, and this matter has never been raised by the internal drainage boards, certainly not with the people we've been, we've been dealing with, so we don't think that that is an issue that's germane to your consideration, sir, but we will come back to you on the point about developments, and we'll confirm that at deadline three.

Speaker 1 1:32:48

Okay, I think I've got the - I've established a point as a difference between Mr. Brooke and the applicant on flood risk, and I don't have any other questions on flood risk, and we're short of time. Are there any other questions on flood risk before we move on? Yes, Mr. Carr.

Speaker 6 1:33:11

Thank you. Sorry for my rude interruption yesterday at the wrong time. Oh,

Speaker 1 1:33:16

no, that's fine. I A

Speaker 6 1:33:23

John Carr, resident mechanical engineer. As a former project engineer, I know only too well the golden rules of any successful project, ignoring budgets. One, attention to detail. I'm sorry, but sadly lacking here. Two, do not lose sight of the objective. I think this is too large and too ambitious. Number three, always bear in mind the fundamentals. So, what are the fundamentals? The fundamentals, the area was shaped by the Ice Age and the retreating ice pack, resulting in large, boggy, marshy landscape until the 17th century, when King Charles the First commissioned Cornelius Vermuden to drain the area. To date, the area is very productive, reclaimed marsh fen of various grades. It's totally dependent upon mechanical drainage to protect local homes, businesses, and farms from flooding, it is by nature very low-lying land, and the more observant will have noted how the local road network is raised well above the land during the winter months. Large areas of standing water can be seen due to the soil being saturated. I am not a soil scientist, but I do know that different soil types absorb and hold different amounts of water. Now, if you cover that area with a non-permeable surface, such as solar panels, or worse still, concrete rafts with solar panels mounted, even in an inter. To pattern the area of soil available to soak up water is vastly reduced. Water falling on the panels will run to the lowest point and fall vertically, forming many rivers or streams draining directly to the lowest point. This is surface rotor runoff. I do actually live right next door to a main artery drain called the Anchor Drain, and during winter time monitor the water levels, which at times comes very close to overtopping, and would most certainly not cope with vast quantities of extra runoff. Our WE seemed to have ignored or turned a blind eye to this and focused on water levels that do not come into contact with the panels. This land is therefore not suitable for this type and size of project, and is passed will result in large scale flooding of homes, businesses, and farms. I've done a quick calculation, and 10 millimeters of rainfall under certain circumstances over a 24 hour period, say over just one hectare produces 100 cubic meters of water, that's 100 tons over 2000 hectares, that is 200,000 cubic meters at a conservative 25% estimate extra runoff, that's 50,000 cubic meters, 50 million liters, 50,000 tons, 20 millimeters will be double that, 30 meter millimeters will be treble of extra water, given what we've been told, that certain pumping assets are all introducing intrinsically linked, are to be decommissioned shortly. Can RWE offer any reassurances, or perhaps we should look at it a different way? If this was a 2000 hectare housing development with roofs, drives, roads, and gardens flooding issues would be top of the agenda with vast underground surface water storage tanks, or as further north at the Amazon building, a large lake

had to be constructed to take the extra surface water. Once again, this land is not suitable without major drainage infrastructure works. Sorry, but our WA should have done the fundamental homework first. Thank you.

Speaker 1 1:37:28

Great, thank you very much. Mr. Carr, would the applicant like to provide a response?

Speaker 2 1:37:35

Tom at the moment, on behalf of the applicant, I'm happy to do that. I've made some notes as quickly as I could, so apologies if I don't get through all of the points, and we've taken a note, and we can provide a written response, obviously. But just to pick up, I've got six points I'd like to just pick off, if possible. The first is a small one that Mr. Carr referred to, the project being too ambitious, too large scale. We don't accept that one one only has to look at the policy in the net in en one en three there is a critical national priority for solar development this is a large scale proposal and we say it's entirely in line with that critical national priority, which exists, so that was point number one. Mr. Carr referred to raising, and I think it's specifically in the context of the m1 80 being raised, but of course our proposals have baked into them the rate the raising of infrastructure, and it's consistent with the one in 1000 year flood event, plus 100 mils of freeboards, so we do have raising of infrastructure built into our proposals, so I don't think there's anything in that concern. Mr. Carr mentioned that there was a concern about the effect of solar panel foundations or mounting structures on surface water drains, and our assessment show that those elements of the infrastructure have negligible impact on surface water flows, and those are matters that we have got the regulator, the Environment Agency comfortable with. So, again, we don't accept the idea that the solar panel structures would have those negative impacts that Mr. Carr mentioned. I think in linked to that, Mr. Carr mentioned a concern about a drain in proximity to his property, but that was in the context of, say, of talking about the potential impact of extra surface water runoff from solar panels, but because I've said that our assessments show that those elements of the infrastructure wouldn't have those impacts, we don't accept that by extension, we don't accept there'll be extra flooding of the drain, Mr. Carr said that. This proposal could lead to large scale flooding of homes, businesses, and farms, but our assessments conclude that that wouldn't be the case, and again, we've generally got the Environment Agency comfortable with those conclusions, so we don't accept that idea either, and point number six, my notes are not particularly good here. I think it was again raising the point that major infrastructure of this type needs to be suitably designed and well designed, and we would say that we emphatically met that test. This project has been several years in the making. It's been the product of an extensive consultation and environmental impact assessment proposed process, and that's led to a detailed and well-considered proposal, which we say should be granted consent, so hopefully that's helpful by way of an initial response to the points Mr. Carr raised, and as I said, we'll reflect everything in detail in our written summary of case for this hearing.

Speaker 1 1:41:13

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Carr. Did you want to respond?

Speaker 6 1:41:16

Yes, please. You seem to be in denial about runoff. If I may, I'll give you a simple analogy. If you take a glass of water and I pour it over your hand, that water will run straight off. If I then take the same glass of water and tip it over your head, only part of that will hit the floor, the rest of it will be soaked into your clothing and your hair, and as for the roads, all the roads around the aisle are all raised above land level. Thank you.

Speaker 1 1:41:51

Okay,

Speaker 10 1:41:53

if I may.

Speaker 1 1:41:54

Yes,

Speaker 10 1:41:55

can I respond to some of the questions from from our perspective regarding the PV solar panels, I think the point is there's grassland underneath PV panels, and therefore that would basically ensure risk of channel flows between the panels are mitigated, so land won't be better and it won't be impermeable, so any basically rain water, any surface water runoff from the panels will basically infiltrate into the ground as is currently, so that there won't be any changes, which is with that respect into the into the ground, and also there is surface water drainage strategy and sots in place to make sure that any runoff from the infrastructure is basically has been mitigated, so the aim is to not increase any surface water runoff rates from the development, that's the aim of surface water drainage strategy, and that's what's been assessed as part of the flood risk assessment.

Speaker 1 1:42:59

Okay. Thank you. I do need to move things along because we're running out of time, and we need a break, a short break. We're going to come on to overall planning balance after we've had a short break. I'm not sure we're going to get through all of the general matters, but that's not necessarily a problem, I can pose a lot of those as written questions, but we'll see how we get on, we might be able to smash through it all. So, what we'll do is, we'll have a break, 15 minutes, returning at 12, and after which we'll cover item 3c which is overall planning balance. So it is now 1143 and the hearing is adjourned. Thank you.

1:43:47

Bye.