



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Rosefield Solar Farm
Hearing:	Recording of issue specific hearing 3 (ISH 3) - Part 7
Date:	08 July 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.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:15 - 00:00:58:14

Okay. It's 155 now in time for the hearing to resume. Is the live feed working? Thank you. Okay, we're now on item 11, which is air quality. And this this question is really directed to Preston Farms. So, um, you know, we noted that a deadline three the applicants made a commitment T25 of rep 3-0 ten that, uh, battery energy storage system containers and transformer units would be offset at least 50m from the southern boundaries of fields D8 and D9 and the eastern boundary of field D9, uh, the closest of Preston Farms holdings, the proposed battery energy storage fuel systems.

00:00:58:16 - 00:01:50:02

So there was that commitment and a deadline for. Then the applicant provided a technical. Technical note to explain further analysis that had been done in respect of its battery energy storage system, plume assessment and moral to address concerns raised by Preston Farms and issues specific hearing one rep for Dash zero eight for taking into account the committed offset. And that technical note concludes that within the surrounding fields, the hydrogen fluoride one hour levels are below US Environmental Protection Agency Acute Exposure Guideline level one, which creates a notable discomfort, and with an applied 50 meter buffer between the best units and the Preston farm holdings, all would be below that level.

00:01:50:22 - 00:02:27:06

So it goes on to conclude that this therefore ensures that even if live shot livestock or workers were standing at the very edge of the adjacent fields to the best fields, D8 and D9, and weren't evacuated away during a best fire incident, which in itself is unlikely. Exposure to any contaminants would still be below the air quality objective on US EPA Acute Exposure Guideline level one limits. So basically my question is do you accept that? Um, and if not, what are you what are your comments?

00:02:29:01 - 00:02:33:24

Presumably you're aware of the commitment and you've read the response.

00:02:34:22 - 00:03:09:15

Uh, yes, sir. James Burton, um, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. Um, firstly, sir, uh, we have, um, we have no basis to dispute the science. However, there are two, um, especially important points to to make about what is being presented. The first is, as ever, matters are being judged by reference to human health thresholds, which is fine for humans.

00:03:09:22 - 00:03:50:08

But and you will anticipate what I'm going to say, it's not the right measure when one is considering animals and most importantly, their blood quality. So I'm not even saying, ah, what about the healthy animals? I'm being. As you probably see, we are very hard headed about this. It all comes down to the blood quality. So, um, there is a there is an issue there. And there is also an issue which is not is not acknowledged, as far as I can tell in that assessment, which concerns deposition upon the fields.

00:03:50:10 - 00:04:30:17

Now, all that said, and as we have said, and I hope clearly we acknowledge that, um, the risk of a catastrophic event with the best, which is what this is all concerned about, is very low. And that's why we make the suggestion, which we think is a pragmatic one. If it's as low as the applicant says. Surely there must be an insurance product the applicant can get, because what we don't accept is if the fire occurs, it would be anything other than a catastrophe for us.

00:04:31:11 - 00:05:04:13

Because once, once that that plume roll rolls over us, we can't then treat any animal that's within that plume as a safe donor until whenever it is, it's washed out. And we also can't treat that field or fields as a safe grazing field, which, as I say, has not I. That's not been assessed. Of course it hasn't. By the, by the individual who's who prepared that plume assessment.

00:05:04:15 - 00:05:19:29

But that's the practical reality. It's not about the human threshold assessment. It's about has the plume rolled over our grazing fields. If so, it's out of bounds. So I hope I hope that assists across the across the points. Thank you sir.

00:05:20:11 - 00:06:00:07

Okay. Thank you for that with the applicant I'd like to respond to that. It's a good point. Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths on behalf of the applicant, in just two very short points in response, because we've already covered this. I mean, first of all, um, helpful. The the farmers have said that there's no basis to dispute the science. And it goes back to the point that, um, what threshold should we use? Nothing is before us to say that we should be using a specific threshold because, as I mentioned earlier, the default mission highlights that there is no agreed threshold for noise or air quality.

00:06:00:09 - 00:06:30:09

So the applicant has done what it can. Um, in respect to the second point, as I said earlier, that's a commercial position that, um, is that is, in our view, not a planning, uh, consideration. You have the mitigation proposed in front of you with the buffer. You have the, uh, science in front of you. You have the technical port format, air quality experts in front of you.

00:06:30:14 - 00:06:37:08

Uh, that, uh, element is a commercial discussion between the applicant and Preston.

00:06:38:25 - 00:06:43:18

Thank you, sir. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Burton. Do you want to come back on that at all?

00:06:43:20 - 00:07:25:02

Yes, please. Thank you, Sir James Burton for Preston Falls and TCS. Um, obviously I've heard Mr. Griffiths say on more than one occasion now that he regards the suggestion of an insurance policy as a commercial matter, not a planning matter. That is not that is not followed. You are concerned with the impact upon a receptor. That is, a is a business. And, um, it's difficult to see why one would shut out from the categories of mitigation of the impact on that business a perfectly tangible, sensible, possible mitigation.

00:07:25:13 - 00:07:55:24

Um, which is which is what an insurance policy would be. Um, of course, that's different from the wider questions of what were the impact on public health be from the loss of that supply, those animals that were in bloom, not being used as donors for however long The field is not being used for grazing. But but that's a separate thing from the impact upon the business as a receptor, I suggest. Thank you sir.

00:07:56:15 - 00:08:05:27

Okay. Thank you. Do you want to come back on that point? Richard Griffiths, on behalf of that, can just very quickly, sir, you have our mitigation proposal in front of you. Um, and I'll just

00:08:07:14 - 00:08:45:26

refer you to paragraph 3.2.3 of, um, our response to action .45 for Marsh one where just on the threshold point, going back to that, um, the what we say as AGL one limits are designed to ensure reversible or prevent more minor effects in the most sensitive human populations. They are judged by our consultants to be the most applicable for comparison against animals. So the applicant has submitted the evidence we have that we think is appropriate regarding the impact you have that in front of you, you have the mitigation proposed.

00:08:46:06 - 00:08:50:12

Uh, um, I think that's as far as we can take this point. Okay.

00:08:50:14 - 00:08:51:15

Thank you for that.

00:08:52:04 - 00:09:21:27

Um, just wondering, Mr. Burton. I think at the last hearing, um, I was sort of reflecting that the people who have most evidence about the blood quality is your clients. Um, but I don't I don't think you've actually submitted any evidence to the to the effect of, say, stress or noise on the quality of the blood. Surely after years and years of operation, your clients would have that evidence.

00:09:22:22 - 00:10:13:13

Uh, James Byrne for Preston Farms and TS Bioscience is, uh, um, we have submitted that evidence. So we've submitted, um, our own direct evidence, which I hope you've read that even as regards the normal activity of sharing sheep, the stress that causes to the sheep has noticeable impacts on the quality of their blood. Now, um, our clients happily we how we are able to run have been able to run for 60 order years such a tight ship that incidence of contamination of the product are rare.

00:10:13:27 - 00:10:59:28

But, um, that's a that's a respectfully that that's a different matter from have we developed delivered evidence that noise stresses animals impairs the quality of the blood? Yes. We have equally that, um, any form of stress impairs the quality of the blood. Yes. And that contamination necessarily impairs the quality of the blood. Yes, yes, yes, we have now, um, our clients, um, you'll obviously understand that we'd rather not go shouting to our clients that we are threatened as we are,

00:11:01:18 - 00:11:17:24

for obvious reasons. Um, but our clients do on occasion have to return a bag to us because of contamination. If you if you are looking for

00:11:19:12 - 00:11:28:20

something more along those lines, we can take that away. But, uh, Mr. Presson can perhaps say something more.

00:11:28:22 - 00:11:39:18

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. Sorry. Just to add a little bit more so that we identified the different types of contaminants from environmental or the other biosecurity.

00:11:39:21 - 00:11:40:06

Threats.

00:11:40:08 - 00:12:12:28

Through various diseases and other pathogens in terms of the actual issues of the blood, the kind of most common things, not that they are common. I would like to reiterate for the public record, but are the impact on clotting factors which reduces the available the usable amount of blood. So for example, in the shearing example that doubles the amount of clotting factors. So our wastage more than doubles. And in that period when that occurs there's also linked to stress um concerns around early lysis of the blood cells.

00:12:13:00 - 00:12:44:03

So that potentially reduces shelf life and has issues with ultimately diagnostic capabilities in the blood plate. Early lysis has to do with basically a breakdown of the red blood cells which bacteria grow on. Um, and then finally, there are also instances whereby, um, we are more likely to see, uh, contaminations linked to animals potentially being stressed for a variety of environmental factors. So that might be something like salmonella.

00:12:44:05 - 00:13:12:17

And, um, without having the exact details in front of me as an example. Very unusually, on the day of the site inspection, we actually had four contaminations, which is which is well beyond, uh, the normal scope of what we have. I'm not trying to sort of say why that was or blame anyone here, but that, that, that is like a real world example. And, um, is very much not, not within the normal round of a standard deviation for us.

00:13:13:04 - 00:13:13:19

Okay.

00:13:13:21 - 00:13:14:23

Thank you for that.

00:13:15:13 - 00:13:17:12

Uh, I think there's some hands up. I don't know who.

00:13:17:14 - 00:13:18:00

Put the hand up.

00:13:18:02 - 00:13:20:13

First. Perhaps, Mr. Hamilton? Perhaps.

00:13:20:15 - 00:13:57:28

Uh, yes. Thank you, sir. Uh, Helen Hamilton, on behalf of the Canadian Solar Action Group. Um, as you may have seen, the Clayton Solar Action Group has an expert, Professor Dobson, who has raised concerns about the methodology and the assumptions that have been made in the claims assessment. He's not here and I'm not an expert, so I can only sort of reiterate what he says firstly about the level of risk, this assumption that the probability magnitude of an event happening only in more than 1 in 5000 years.

00:13:58:00 - 00:14:32:14

And he's explained why that's misleading and wrong. And the applicant has also provided a piece of summary research from the states looking at, um, the some very high level analysis of, um, of the deposition of pollutants following battery fires in the United States. And that's rather contradicted. And it actually does say that it was drafted before the, um, Moss landing and fire.

00:14:32:16 - 00:15:05:14

And one of the appendices that that Professor Dobson has referred to as report looking into the consequences of the fire at um at Moss Landing, and one of one of the conclusions of this which we can submit into the inquiry, is that the incident calls attention to the limitations of standard environmental sampling protocols. So conventional soil sampling depth, such as the commonly used top six centimetres soil, and they fail to detect thin, spatially heterogeneous deposition layers and so on.

00:15:05:16 - 00:15:36:06

And it's talking in particular in that case about um a particular metals deposited following a best fire. Um, Professor Dobson is also particularly concerned about PPM 2.5 and Pm10, all of which will have, um, consequences for human and livestock health. So, um, so I would just like to draw attention to the very significant concerns that the Clyde and Solar Action Group.

00:15:36:08 - 00:15:45:27

Have um, have made about the way that the assessment of risk from Best Fires has been approached in this application.

00:15:45:29 - 00:15:50:01

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turner, and I'll ask the applicant to respond.

00:15:52:17 - 00:15:53:22

Yes. Thank you.

00:15:53:24 - 00:16:06:00

Alan Turner representing Greg Smith, MP for May Buckinghamshire. Um, yes. We two are very concerned, um, with the

00:16:07:24 - 00:16:09:29

chances of a fire

00:16:11:27 - 00:16:50:01

in best. Um, the they are far more frequent than I think many people realize. Sorry, my voice is going a bit the, uh, I would like to draw, uh, the inspectors attention to, um, the environmental hazards and emergency department of the UK Health Security Agency, a government agency who have drawn up reports on fires in best installations.

00:16:50:03 - 00:17:23:13

And I think one of the one of the points that comes across quite strongly is that whilst there are variations in reports on the impact of carcinogenic materials that are that are found in plumes from fires, best fires, they tend to look at one or perhaps up to ten units that are actually on fire.

00:17:23:15 - 00:17:56:21

Whereas I think the the point that's often overlooked is that the where the fire authorities are involved. They, they their policy in general is to allow the fires to burn out their own accord. Now, that could be over a period of weeks. So you have a plume, uh, which is going to extend over a much longer period of time than just one, uh, perhaps 24 hour incident.

00:17:57:02 - 00:18:24:18

And that really needs to be taken into account when looking at the serious nature of a fire. Uh, best fire. And, um, for example, the, uh, I'll read you just a line from one of these, uh, where a thermal runaway that spreads beyond 12 units, for example. Um, the.

00:18:26:19 - 00:19:17:26

Where it's quite often noted by applicants or there will be no noticeable discomfort. That's bound to be unreliable. And it clearly states on that the where the. There is a high probability that a lithium ion fire will be left to burn out for days or weeks due to fire and rescue services potential protocols. This prolongs the potential exposure of nearby residents to toxic gases, and it goes on to list all of those, um, that will be, uh, included and would represent a severe chronic health risk, um, which otherwise would not be considered in the acute exposure guideline level one analysis.

00:19:17:28 - 00:19:39:26

So I and the other the other point as well, to bear in mind, is where a fire will be left for weeks to burn out of its own accord. There is a much higher risk of ground contamination as well, water sources, and

00:19:41:12 - 00:20:13:18

I just don't think that's been taken into consideration sufficiently. It's an area that requires a lot more investigation. Um, and we have such serious concerns over this. It's not good for the environment. It's not good for anybody that lives nearby. And as we've heard, it's certainly not good for press and farms. Um, bio sciences. It it's a real issue, and I don't see that there's a way around it.

00:20:15:03 - 00:20:38:08

These units are there as a commercial moneymaking operation. They're nothing to do with making the environment better. They are. These installations are actually a threat to the environment rather than saving the world. So I think I'll leave it at that at the moment. Thank you.

00:20:38:10 - 00:21:08:12

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, we responded to the the two people, please. Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant, um, I'm going to bring in Mr. Paul Gregory, our battery safety testing consultant, and, um, Adam Dawson, uh, air quality consultant. Ask, um, to respond to. I hope they're online. I can see initials that match those names, so hopefully they're there. Um, there are key four key points in response to two speakers.

00:21:08:14 - 00:21:46:12

One, um, uh, is the level of risk and probability and methodology, uh, the deposition of pollutants and reference to Moss Landing fire. Um, and then the chance of fire, the claim that's far more frequent than, uh, people realize and then the Ukhsa and their position, I would just highlight that we have a statement of common ground with the Ukhsa, who have stated that our plume assessment provides a logical approach and assesses the worst case scenario of chemical emissions concentrations during a best fire event at relevant receptor locations.

00:21:46:21 - 00:22:03:00

Um, so those are the key four points. Um, I'm not going to go into policy position on storage. That's before you in the NPS to deal with the last point. I don't think that's necessary, but I'll now hand over to, um, Mr. Gregory and or Mr. Dawson to cover those points.

00:22:06:18 - 00:22:07:15

Hopefully.

00:22:13:26 - 00:22:15:23

Not. Um.

00:22:18:18 - 00:22:22:16

Ah, yes. There's there's one on the screen. Excellent. Uh. Thank you.

00:22:25:06 - 00:22:51:19

Afternoon, sir Paul Gregory for the applicant. Um, yes. So I can run through the majority of those points raised, and that's no issue. Uh, however, I think it would be useful, uh, for Fred and Dawson just to emphasize the scope and the methodology used in the plume study and to correct sort of 1 or 2, uh,

00:22:53:06 - 00:22:58:15

uh, sort of conclusions that were made on, on that study before I give evidence.

00:22:58:20 - 00:22:59:22

Yes. Yeah. Please do.

00:22:59:24 - 00:23:00:12

That.

00:23:04:28 - 00:23:38:09

Yes. Adam Dawson, on behalf of the applicant, uh, I think as Mr. Griffiths said, the methodology was agreed with the UK HSA, uh, the Division of Plume Assessment dispersion modeling as seen in Group 3042, uh, using advanced Gaussian plume model. Uh, the methodology used was in line with modeling guidance, but definitely in QM, and considered the most commonly commonly cited pollutants of concern from past events. I think the key thing to point out that this included political particulate matter.

00:23:38:11 - 00:24:10:11

Both Pm10 and PPM 2.5. So we believe that has sort of been adequately addressed. There's also as well as we have as well as considering acute levels of exposure. That was also exposure considered on a chronic level, uh to the to and consideration to the annual means for the air quality standards. So that is in relation to the specific acute fire incident.

00:24:10:13 - 00:24:17:04

But however, we have considered the impacts on chronic, uh, health air quality standards.

00:24:21:23 - 00:24:29:03

I think it might be best. Hand over to Paul now. Unless I. Unless anyone feels I've missed anything. I can come back to it.

00:24:30:17 - 00:24:31:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:24:45:04 - 00:24:46:02

Paul Gregory.

00:24:46:04 - 00:24:46:19

For.

00:24:46:21 - 00:25:18:03

The applicant. Yeah. So, um, thanks for explaining the methodology there, Adam. Um, so if I just pick up on sort of safety and risk assessments and some of the comments that were made by Miss Hamilton, Mr. Turner. Um, so section 6.1.1 of the Outline Battery Safety Management plan, Rep 2073 stipulates, uh, the detailed design phase would consider the life cycle of the battery from cradle to grave.

00:25:18:11 - 00:25:50:21

A large number of studies would be undertaken with a focus on fire risks, including, but not limited to studies in line with risk analysis and management tools such as hazard and operability analysis and hazard identification analysis. Failure modes and effects analysis. Both High Risk Assessments and Dangerous Substances and Explosive Atmospheres Regulations 2002 to see to inform the overall design, solution and agile methodologies applies during the engineering design phase for fire safety analysis.

00:25:50:26 - 00:26:21:04

Risk assessments tools such as failure modes and effects analysis reports specifically focus on a range of failure mechanisms and identify how to prevent or mitigate credible failure scenarios. The analysis are updated based on any changes of the project context and during the design process from the selected contractors. In case of any deviation from the initial set of technical requirements. This will be finalized before construction commences, as now mandated under NFPA 855 2026.

00:26:21:06 - 00:26:51:16

The applicant will only be able to select a best system that has undertaken large scale fire testing at the detailed design stage, the selected best large scale fire testing data will be leveraged to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools, which will be utilized together with detailed consequence modeling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. This is stipulated in the outlined Battery Safety Management Plan. Pre-construction requirements. Um.

00:26:51:19 - 00:27:38:06

The comment on the layers of protection analysis by Professor Dobson, which was referenced by Miss Hamilton. Uh, the first initial low power analysis that was included, uh, was an internal, uh, assessment by the applicant for their engineering team, uh, because with regards to best safety, on site Safety is the primary concern where the first responders are site operatives, and the initial layers of protection analysis was amended as errors were found in the original calculation and further barriers were added to the load for analysis based on the applicant's understanding of the concept, design and battery technology.

00:27:38:08 - 00:28:08:08

Emphasizing that this is a concept design based just on the current best systems available on the market, um and minimum qualification, qualification and procurement checks will be carried out prior to selecting a suitable and good quality best supplier. The logo was updated and the applicant believes that this updated assessment remains generally conservative. It isn't expected that the order of likelihood of failure will not vary significantly when the final paper is carried out.

00:28:08:10 - 00:28:42:09

This will be carried out at pre-construction stage once the final battery chemistry and specification have been confirmed at post consent stage, so will be recalculated based on the updated best technology information. A detailed design, which is secured through the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan and by requirement six of the draft DCO at this stage of the design. The low power is indicative and estimated. Each barrier system is an independent event. Therefore, the probability ratings can be stacked up against one another in the low power analysis.

00:28:42:11 - 00:29:15:01

Calculation. The current value has been based on engineering judgment and tests estimates to provide an order of magnitude of failure. Um, the current value. The values assigned or the applicant's assessment based on credible layers of protection in accordance with documentations such as that produced by DMV, specifically for the assessment of best safety, and a traditional risk based assessment which evaluates impact versus likelihood, shows that the risk from an assessed pollutant is considered low or very low.

00:29:15:03 - 00:29:53:07

The analysis takes into account that the best incident is extremely unlikely, with a low estimated occurrence of once every 5804 years, and the impacts from such an incident are demonstrated to be minor. Evidence indicates that dispersion of known pollutants to the nearest receptors, including Preston's landholdings, is sufficient to ensure that significant discomfort thresholds are not expected to be exceeded, specifically at the AGL one level. Um, so that's just summarizing the, uh, DCO, uh, level risk assessments.

00:29:53:15 - 00:30:31:28

Um, with regards to, um, propagation risk, uh, comments made on on last landing, for example, um, most current best systems are designed to safely burn out without internal fire suppression systems, which is to remove the risk of stranded energy in the battery system. So if the battery modules are still alive, the decommissioning process and transportation from site presents far more safety hazards. Large scale fire testing must be conducted to demonstrate that loss will be safely limited to one best enclosure without the intervention of firefighters.

00:30:32:12 - 00:31:02:28

Most of these best designs that have undertaken large scale fire testing between 2024 and the current day 2026, integrate prismatic cells and have demonstrated fire propagation does not occur to the best enclosures. Distances ranging from 15cm to 100cm to adjacent or back to back. Best enclosures with spacing of three to 3.5m across from the next row of best enclosures.

00:31:03:06 - 00:31:37:17

The Rose field illustrative design, which has been used to inform the environmental statement, uses a minimum separation of 3.5m, which is in line with an EPA and FCC guidance. Um, as witnessed during these significant number of best large scale fire tests, the peak of fire propagation of battery systems results in a maximum flame heights of 4 to 5m out of the roof of the base. Typically, these flames are channelled through roof level deflagration vents, resulting in peak flaming of 8 to 9m above ground level.

00:31:37:24 - 00:32:12:06

These current best designs integrate high levels of thermal insulation to prevent a best fire from spreading to adjacent enclosures. The insulation is designed to ensure that external heat from a fire does not increase internal temperatures of adjacent best to critical levels, i.e. more than 100°C um. Large scale fire testing involves deliberately burning a best enclosure to evaluate thermal exposure. Heat release rates, burn duration, maximum temperatures, and critically, the potential for fire propagation to adjacent base or associated equipment.

00:32:12:08 - 00:32:42:11

The purpose of this testing is to expressly to validate minimum required equipment spacing, and to demonstrate that cascading or multi best enclosure ignition does not occur where tested layouts and mitigation measures are implemented. These tests therefore explicitly address the type of multi best fire propagation risks, including scenarios involved in real world incidents, by requiring evidence that propagation risk is controlled through design rather than reliance on emergency intervention.

00:32:42:14 - 00:33:13:10

So with regard to, um, comments about best burning for days or weeks, um, that is just simply not the case for current best designs that have been through large scale fire testing and are designed, um, to, uh, to, to burn out without spreading to uh, to other best real world, worst case scenario. Best fires have involved fires that have generally consumed. Two best enclosures, i.e.

00:33:13:12 - 00:33:50:14

the fire is propagated from one best to another best unit. The worst case propagation of four best enclosures occurred in Lyme, New York, which involved battery systems integrating NMC pouch cells and air core modules uh, which were also involved in the Moss Landing fire. These incidents involve legacy best systems which have not undertaken large scale fire testing. Final comprehensive risk assessment reports, best design and site specific consequence modeling and detailed emergency response funds can only be drafted when based upon specific best design.

00:33:50:16 - 00:34:01:07

Selecting the detailed design stage. Key safety content requires that all equipment within the best areas defined and battery operating systems, uh,

00:34:02:27 - 00:34:53:10

operating limits and test data are fully defined and the failure protection system is also defined. Incident response tactics require significant test data and rigorous consequence modeling from the specific best design to develop safe protocols for incident response. Um, so as I've just described, they're the type of systems that would be considered, uh, for, for Rose field will have undertake, uh, this type of testing the, the Moss landing uh incident that was also referenced, uh, involved again, legacy systems that were not compliant with NFPA 55 integrating NMC pipe cells and air core modules that will not be considered for the proposed development.

00:34:53:12 - 00:35:28:12

The battery systems were housed in an old gas plant, integrating nearly 100,000 battery modules in over 4500 battery racks. Uh battery racks were double stacked in many locations and housed on two separate floors in some parts of the building. It is not credible to consider that the range and impact of a smoke plume generated from more than 55000 battery modules, which also burnt through a significant proportion of the power station roof, is the only way comparable to the impacts of the smoke plume generated from a fire within a single non-combustible current.

00:35:28:14 - 00:36:05:20

Best design, typically containing 40 to 60 batch factory modules. It should be noted that real world monitoring from the Moss landing incident, despite its scale and use of high risk NMC chemistries, indicated that air quality impacts in the surrounding area were generally transient and below public health thresholds. The County of Monterey webpage detailing MOS landing, air quality monitoring and sampling results is available, and the the link will be included in the post herring notes, and similarly, a 2025 environment protections.

00:36:05:22 - 00:36:40:06

The agency factsheet concluded that air quality monitoring during and after the fire identified no no risk to public health and muzzle loading incident response monitoring efforts focused on monitoring

hydrogen fluoride, hydrogen chloride, carbon monoxide, and hydrogen cyanide. 2.5 micron particulate matter ppm 2.5. Instrumentation. Along with the percentage of lower explosive limit gas measuring equipment, was used and recorded at high representative community breathing zones.

00:36:40:08 - 00:37:26:29

All instrumentation was calibrated daily or as per manufacturer's recommendations, and particulate matter equipment had a sensitive capability of recording one micron particulates, which were referenced also by Professor Dobson. Monitoring was conducted in close proximity and in residential areas up to four miles from the Moss Landing site. During this monitoring period. During the duration of the fire, all measurements were below site specific public health threshold actions, and the applicant emphasizes that even in a worst case scenario, such as the moss landing fire, this did not trigger mass evacuations and preliminary precautionary evacuation of 1200 people living in the closest proximity to Moss Landing was not triggered by air monitoring alerts.

00:37:27:07 - 00:38:08:21

Mission areas and these emissions in these areas initially evacuated never exceeded public health thresholds. Um, you know, again, just from a fire emissions perspective, um, with regards to Preston Farms, um, as already outlined in the report, that the wind direction, uh, to the closest fields there only occurs, um, in the unlikely event that a failure occurred only blows in that direction 5% of the time over a five year period.

00:38:09:09 - 00:38:32:22

Um, certainly, uh, when the system selected a detailed design, uh, particulate matter. Um, so with regards to, um, contamination of, uh, grazing lands that wouldn't come from, from gases, that would be particulate matter. And again, that is defined from the specific best system that will be supplied. So

00:38:34:22 - 00:39:24:24

own and could be tested to demonstrate that grazing land was, was safe for use, um, and that there were no issues from that perspective. Uh, and from a probability perspective, you know, there are more than 1600, uh, farm buildings involved in, in fires last year with nearly 70,000 acres of grasslands involved. I'm sure, as we're all feeling today, like I'm in my office here. Um, the weather has been exceptionally hot this year. And also, you know, from a business continuity perspective, uh, for Preston Farms, TCS Biosciences, you know, fire risks from wildfires not caused by, uh, best incidents, you know, is a far greater risk of disruption, um, to business continuity on their land.

00:39:25:01 - 00:40:05:28

Um, you know, and certainly with, with climate change, this is, you know, an increasing risk, uh, which we're seeing, you know, wildfire, uh, increases the best area. No will be designed that even if a best air failure occurs, that there isn't a risk of transference to surrounding grassland. And also, um, you know, unusually in a rural location that there is will be available, uh, a supply of firefighting water on site that, you know, could actually also be utilized by the Fire and Rescue Service for wildfire or local fire issues that we we might see.

00:40:06:15 - 00:40:20:07

Okay. That's a that was a pretty comprehensive response. Um, can I just just ask I think you said the worst case scenario, uh, you envisage two, two units on fire. Is that correct?

00:40:21:27 - 00:41:01:09

No. So testing and consequence modeling should demonstrate that the loss of one, um, death from a fire should be a worst case scenario with regard to the failure mechanisms. So, for example, uh, what caused an issue that might result in a, in a fire? Um, then you potentially could have, uh, electrical issue, ground fault scenarios, which might typically would describe these as a block of BS, which again will depend on the best design and the layout.

00:41:01:11 - 00:41:31:27

But you might have say, for example, four Bess and a transformer. So that could be a credible issue, um, that you might be, uh, electrically abusing for best, which might result in the failure of more than one best from the the same fault scenario. However, as described in my earlier testimony, those once the design is known and the site layout, then failure modes. Effects analysis.

00:41:32:00 - 00:41:42:03

Hazard mitigation analysis. Look specifically at those types of scenarios to ensure that that does not occur.

00:41:42:15 - 00:41:54:08

Yeah, what I was going to ask was knowing the, you know, the worst case scenario, what is the predicted sort of duration of the of the fire, the worst case scenario of fire.

00:41:57:29 - 00:42:14:13

Um, Paul Gregory, the applicant. Um, so. Okay, we can we it is a little bit technical, but yeah, I'm happy to, um, to drill down into, um, into that. So, um, I just find my, my write notes here. Yeah.

00:42:14:15 - 00:42:34:00

So I don't want anything too technical. Okay, so the idea of sort of duration of one of these fires. So I think there was there was concern Mr. Turner was, was concerned that, um, you know, um, these sort of fires could go on for days and days depositing material of a wide area. So just, just wanted to sort of.

00:42:34:25 - 00:42:35:11

That sort.

00:42:35:13 - 00:42:36:05

Of idea.

00:42:36:13 - 00:43:07:05

Yeah. Okay. So Paul Gregory for the applicant. So that's just simply not credible for these type of designs we're looking at. So uh, the peak fire load for most current best designs. So, so bearing in mind sort of moving forward if, if consent is granted that you know, best designs sort of significantly change every 12 to 18 months. But so based on what we've seen in the world with the energy density that is currently commercially available. Um, basically when at 100% state of charge.

00:43:07:07 - 00:43:37:12

So when the battery has the most energy stored there, you know, that's your biggest fire risk. Um, typically we see, uh, the, the peak last between 1 to 3 hours. So that's when the most battery magic modules are involved. The gases from those battery cells are burning. So that that's typically used as the peak release rate, where flames will be at the the hottest and the highest height of release.

00:43:37:18 - 00:44:18:15

Um, typically then. Um, so that's 1 to 3 hours again, depending on the there are many variables in how a fire from propagate and, you know, other combustible materials involved. Uh, typically then you'd be looking between another 4 to 8 hours where you have a fire at a lower intensity, which reduces the impact of any fire and therefore any emissions. Um, so, so typically what we've seen during large scale fire testing is that, um, I say a rule of thumb is that most of these events, uh, are over within 12 hours because of the high levels of thermal insulation.

00:44:18:20 - 00:44:53:05

Uh, and typically, you might have quite a lot of plastics and battery modules, for example. So that will be smoldering away. And you'll see higher internal temperatures for for maybe 24 hours, but, uh, not a fire plume as such. So, um, I think often, um, Carnegie Road in Liverpool is used, you know, where, uh, water was, uh, sprayed directly on the, uh, on the battery system within the container, which is now not recommended practice and in fact is actively.

00:44:53:16 - 00:44:54:01

Uh.

00:44:55:03 - 00:45:35:19

Advised against by all the major regulatory and sort of research bodies that that went on for 56 hours, because basically you would extinguish the flames, but you will basically shorted the battery modules, therefore creating short circuits. And so you'll have a have a recognition, you know, that the systems now are designed with a thermal insulation and the battery systems and the spacing to ensure that it burns out very efficiently. And that by definition, as we saw with these Tilbury, that the fire service would be able to hand over within 24 hours back to the operator or any sort of post incident response.

00:45:36:04 - 00:45:44:00

Okay. That's that's great. Thank you. Any other follow on questions to what you just heard? Yes. Mr. Hamilton.

00:45:44:02 - 00:46:33:29

I can't promise that. I caught every word of that, sir. Helen Hamilton from Claydon Solar Action Group. Um, just one quick point. Um, I believe. Um, that we were told that there were no evacuation orders at Moss Landing. That's not correct. The local residents were evacuated, as confirmed in the report that I was referring to earlier. The other question. I wonder if, um, you might ask for clarification on it. Is this one in, um, 5804 year events? Is that does that apply to personnel per container, or are we talking about applying that to the whole development? Uh, and, and perhaps if we also added in stat craft and stat her as well.

00:46:34:01 - 00:46:37:00

Yeah. Okay. Grateful if you could answer that.

00:46:40:24 - 00:47:12:00

Uh, Paul Gregory for the applicant. Um, so I obviously I think my initial testimony contained quite a bit of information. So I did say that the Moss landing fire did not require mass evacuations. There was a preliminary precautionary evacuation of 1200 people living in the closest proximity to to the Moss Landing site. So that was people just over the freeway and within sort of about 150m. Um, the evacuation was not triggered by air monitoring alerts or i.e.

00:47:12:02 - 00:47:51:18

the air quality, uh, risk. Uh, it was just included in the emergency response plan, which had, again, the system hadn't undertaken any level of, uh, large scale fire testing or emission, uh, testing. Um, so these were precautionary bearing in mind these sort of, uh, US litigation culture, um, but, uh, air monitoring conducted in those areas throughout, um, the duration of the fire demonstrated that air emissions were at safe public health receptor levels.

00:47:51:29 - 00:48:48:24

Okay. Uh, and as I did, uh, again, described earlier with layers of protection analysis, um, that's more there's a more, uh, sort of internal stakeholder, uh, analysis using a concept design that won't be used in the scheme. And I went out to outline the, um, the catalogue of risk assessment, such as hazard mitigation analysis, failure modes, effects analysis, bow tie, uh, exercises, which is very much establish the actual risk of incidents, the types of failures, root causes, and making sure that prevention and mitigation measures are in place to minimise a the, occurrence of any event and be to to fully mitigate if a failure does occur.

00:48:49:09 - 00:49:35:03

Um with regard to the 1 in 5800 years. Um, that would be basically taking into account that a so, you know, you can get a failure of a of a cell in a module, um, for example, or cells that might not need lead to any sort of fire, um, or significant failure scenarios. Um, so with the uh, analysis that was conducted there, you'd be assuming that that would result in an event which, uh, evolved into a fire that, uh, basically, um, the plume impact analysis, plume assessment study, uh, went into the consequences of that event.

00:49:35:05 - 00:49:45:21

So looking at the, uh, the failure of of a single best and the fire emissions that that would contribute in the local environment.

00:49:46:27 - 00:49:54:01

So could you sort of simplify the basis of that calculation? Well the 1500. 5800.

00:50:01:08 - 00:50:01:23

Oh.

00:50:02:26 - 00:50:41:03

Okay. So as I described in my earlier evidence. Um, so this is an the applicant, the EDF engineering team. Um, so if required, they can go into more detail. Um, but basically it was used using the, uh, the current uh, current system on the market, which was evaluated by their team. It used uh, these uh, uh,

layers protection analysis and the formulas, uh, and the components that they assess, which is a widely accepted, uh, best safety, uh, analysis.

00:50:41:12 - 00:50:51:15

Uh, okay. If I could just stop you there. It sounds quite complex. I think to save time in the hearing. Perhaps if you could submit a note by deadline five.

00:50:52:17 - 00:51:19:04

Yes. So I, uh, it's programming for the applicant. Um, so I believe that this was also covered in the plume assessment study and also as part of, uh, relevant responses submitted at an earlier deadline. Um, so, yes, I think, um, perhaps, uh, content could be signposted to sort of clarify the details.

00:51:19:06 - 00:51:24:22

We do that by deadline five. That would be really good. Thank you. Any other questions, Mr. Turner?

00:51:27:06 - 00:52:08:27

Yeah. Thank you. Alan Turner representing Greg Smith MP. Uh, just a couple of very quick points that just, um, in response to that statement. Um, the UK health um Security Agency report also mentions the fact that to realistically reduce the risk of thermal runaway, um, in the event of a fire, that, uh, there should be a minimum separation between units of six metres rather than the 3.5 being mentioned in this application.

00:52:09:10 - 00:52:46:09

Um, and, ah, in relation to the length of time, uh, these fires can go on with and the fire and rescue Service policy, I would perhaps urge the inspectors to, um, inquire directly with the fire service, uh, rather than just take my word for it or the applicant's word for it. I'm sure they'd be born happy to, uh, enlighten you as to their policy in relation to leaving these fires to burn out.

00:52:46:15 - 00:52:48:23

Um, that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

00:52:48:29 - 00:52:52:08

Okay. You just want to round up with some comments on that.

00:52:54:26 - 00:53:06:11

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Jake, if Mr. Gregory has anything further to add. Um, otherwise, I suggest that we would respond in writing, as has been suggested consciously. Yes. Not other agenda items.

00:53:06:13 - 00:53:06:28

Yeah.

00:53:08:01 - 00:53:40:28

Uh, Paul Gregory for the applicant. Yes. So the, uh, allusion to distance spacing, as I've already referenced, that, um, large scale fire testing of the actual best system will use to, uh, establish final site spacing requirements. The indicative design was based on a system that had gone through large scale

fire testing, which demonstrated that propagation didn't occur at distances far closer than it's used on the scheme.

00:53:41:03 - 00:54:12:00

The six metres that's was alluded to is old NFC guidance, which has now been updated in 2026, where it references as. As I've suggested, that evidence based large scale fire testing is used to, uh, finalize equipment spacing so it is no longer, uh, six meters, is no longer used by NFC or any global.

00:54:12:02 - 00:54:36:09

It initially came from 2017 FM global um advice. Um and because uh, NFPA 55 in 2026 now requires large scale fire testing that is now obsolete advice so does not apply to the scheme and the just the indicative spacing for the illustrative design has was demonstrated through large scale fire testing.

00:54:37:10 - 00:54:40:01

Okay. Thank you for that, Mr. Burton.

00:54:42:07 - 00:55:16:19

Thank you sir. James Burton for Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. Um, it's somewhat concerning in the schema of what Mr. Gregory has set out, that it's being suggested that, um, all one needs to know about Preston Farms is that the area of our holding closest, which is the one to the south of the Bess, would, based on prevailing winds, only be affected 5% of the time.

00:55:17:07 - 00:55:51:15

As you can see from figure, I think it's figure errors, whatever it is. Figure two not ignoring the error reference source not found. As you can see from figure two says the plume Lines extend a long way indeed, and without wishing to labour the point. What matters to Preston Farms is not whether a human health impacts level is exceeded. Its. Has contamination followed? Sorry.

00:55:51:24 - 00:56:23:21

Over there holding over the livestock. And you can see in fact that as you saw on your site visit the I suppose one one of the main three donation centres, lower farm is actually within those lines. So that's what matters now. Mr. Williams has returned. He was in an urgent meeting and he's come back and I'll let him speak. But I just want to introduce the concept of if the animals are contaminated, there has to be there has to be a wash out period.

00:56:23:23 - 00:56:53:28

And we're not just talking a matter of hours or even necessarily days. There's got to be a washout period for the blood to regenerate, to cleanse, and so on. He may be able to tell you what that is, but it's not. It's not nothing. I hear what Mr. Gregory says regarding contamination of the fields. Great that the applicant is thinking about what they'd have to do to check that contaminated fields are safe to be grazed again, but clearly that would have to be done. I mean, Mr.

00:56:54:00 - 00:57:01:06

Williams may have something to say about the wash outfit, which might be relevant, bearing in mind, as you've heard repeatedly. We are at maximum capacity.

00:57:01:21 - 00:57:02:26

Thank you. Thank you.

00:57:04:29 - 00:57:39:20

Gareth Williams, bio sciences and Preston farms. And I must point out at this point, I'm not a vet, so I think that we probably should, um, seek some some further advice from our, our our, um, veterinary officer on this, but I think it's fair to say that there could be longer lasting impact, certainly, on the blood product that we derived from the animals on the donor blood products. Um, and I think they could even be some side effects that would render certain populations in the species potentially, um, unable to to be considered as donors going forward, given the welfare and ethics aspects that we have on the business.

00:57:39:22 - 00:57:52:15

So, um, yeah, I think we probably need to go and research that a little bit more. Um, and we'll put something in writing for deadline five. Okay. Thank you. With the applicant, I'd like to respond to any of that.

00:57:54:27 - 00:58:14:01

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Nothing further to say on those points just raised. I think the only thing I probably could have and should have mentioned was also that the applicant has a signed statement of common ground with Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority. That's document rep 4012 and all matters are marked as agreed. Thank you.

00:58:14:03 - 00:58:16:13

Okay. Thank you. Okay. Anyone else?

00:58:16:15 - 00:58:46:11

Sorry, sir. Sorry, I do apologize. One final point. Could I just through you, James breast farms. Um. And draw to the attention Mr. Gregory the where he's drawn. I'm not sure why he's drawn his. I think it's a blue line on his figure two to show the press and Heart Farms holdings. I know that you know that our holding extends well beyond that. But he's drawn the blue line where it is. And just in case he's being somehow confused by that, that's not the right extent of our holding. Thank you sir.

00:58:46:13 - 00:58:48:21

Okay. Could you respond to that?

00:58:49:06 - 00:58:58:12

Give me selling on behalf of the applicant. I think all I can say is we'll review the line and confirm a deadline. Five whether it is in the correct place or what it's intended to show. Thank you.

00:58:58:14 - 00:59:28:14

Okay. Any other questions on air quality before we move on? No, I can't see anyone online either. Okay, we'll move on to item 13 now because we've we've already done item 12 cumulative effects. Uh, and in this item really I was trying to mop up, um, some issues that Buckinghamshire council still had in the statement of Common Ground. The latest one. Rep for Dash 019.

00:59:29:10 - 00:59:30:00

Um.

00:59:33:02 - 00:59:36:04

Basically I've just listed them. Um,

00:59:37:20 - 01:00:16:06

I think your position is that the assessment underestimates cumulative impacts from major local infrastructure, including HS2, east West rail, National Grid works and nearby solar best schemes. And then there's a limited analysis of how combined effects on landscape character, public rights of way tranquility and visual amenity compound harmful communities. I think we talked about that earlier. I think that we may have covered that off earlier, and then the applicant does not adequately consider combined ecological impacts on the burn wood landscape, particularly for bats and hedgerow and networks.

01:00:16:08 - 01:00:23:20

And again, we talked about bats. But if you could just give me the latest positions on that.

01:00:26:15 - 01:01:09:00

Thank you, Sir Daniel Gazelka, for the council. Maybe. I mean, I've got sort of the headline points that I can back very quickly, and then at least you'll have the list and. Thank you. Yeah. So you broke it down into methodology and then cumulative effects what you've just referred to there primarily. I'd say it goes to the latter, but I'll pick it up in a second. Um on method. Um, as you can see from the statement of common ground as well, some things are agreed when not raising issues with short and long list and things like. That said, I think, um, Miss Hearn had a discussion with the applicant about one more development to the north, what he's been in at First and Farm, which is a new, um, solar and best development coming forward to the north.

01:01:09:11 - 01:01:42:11

Um, so that's all fine from a perspective of method. Um, our concerns, which you'll have seen referred to in our submissions. Um, aspects of what we see as pigeonholing of effects and not combining them away. But you've just alluded to, um, we have concerns about you'll have seen through the applicant's assessment that it obviously has to take a view on how effective the mitigation measures of other schemes will be, and the applicant has effectively assumed that it will all be effective.

01:01:42:17 - 01:02:02:21

Um, and, and we say when you're assessing this and considering the wide range of very large national infrastructure projects and other projects that are around, that is a, um, too favourable a approach. Um, considering the, um, the lack of, um, the lack of.

01:02:05:06 - 01:02:41:03

Detail. But we actually have about how each finalized, complete, um, project is going to affect this area. And then coming to substance, as you've said, I mean, the context is, is pretty remarkable in this area. I mean, it does have a lot of very large, um, infrastructure being constructed here, both National grid, two railways, etc., um, and also large projects that aren't necessarily on the same scale. So you've

got random prison and things like that. Um, and so we have concerns about how all of that has been brought together.

01:02:41:05 - 01:03:12:27

The applicant, to be fair to them, does accept the some significant effects, um, going on here. Um, ultimately, as a matter of judgment, based on the information which is included in the information that's come out in the examination, we consider, it's under assessed in that context. Um, obviously, that ultimately is a judgment that, um, officers at the council have come to when considering all of the matters in the examination. Um, and so, uh, I think oh, and then one final thing.

01:03:12:29 - 01:03:44:24

Obviously, we we disagree with a lot of the underpinning analyses that we've gone through over the course of two days. You gave two examples at a moment ago. Obviously that flows through. And so because we disagree with the inputs, shall we say, we're always going to disagree about the outputs anyway. Um, so hopefully that gives you a sort of potted where we are. Um, I think as between the applicant and the council, it's unlikely there's going to be any further agreement on matters of substantive, um, cumulative assessment.

01:03:44:26 - 01:03:47:19

Obviously, some of the method is already agreed.

01:03:47:21 - 01:03:51:07

Okay. Thank you. With the applicant like to respond to that.

01:03:52:23 - 01:04:27:04

Elizabeth, on behalf of the applicant, certainly. Um, before I pass to our principal environmental consultant, miss Jade gardener from RSC, I'll just note, as you've already flagged, sir, that we covered some cumulative effects yesterday. Um, to do with transport, ecology, cultural heritage and landscape and visual to. So to the extent that there's anything you'd like to know further on those particular topics or might need to take it away because our experts aren't here. But based on the conversation so far, we're confined to method, so that's definitely something we can cover.

01:04:27:11 - 01:04:28:23

So I'll hand to Miss Garner.

01:04:30:12 - 01:04:31:04

Thank you.

01:04:31:06 - 01:04:33:18

Um, Jay Garner for the applicant. Um, yeah.

01:04:33:20 - 01:04:54:00

Firstly, thank you to Buckinghamshire Council for making us aware of this new development that we need to consider. Um, first of all, I just wanted to note that we will be updating the cumulative effect assessment at deadline five. Um, so we are aware of six developments, not including the one that has been noted to us today that will form part of that new updated cumulative effects assessment.

01:04:54:08 - 01:04:55:29

Um, sorry, what are those?

01:04:56:05 - 01:05:33:13

Um, so most of them are residential developments. Um, that have formed part of updates that we've been doing over the last few months. Um, we've got a proposed cut off date of this Friday for that assessment to allow us to, to do that work to submit that at deadline five. Um, so yeah, we appreciate the update from, um, Buckinghamshire Council. However, it's worth noting that from our initial review of that information that they sent over a couple of hours ago. That that's a screening opinion. Um, based on our methodology, um, a screening opinion wouldn't form part of the long list or the short list, because usually we wouldn't have sufficient information to undertake that assessment.

01:05:33:19 - 01:06:00:21

Um, however, I think it's probably worthwhile us having further discussion with Buckinghamshire Council over the next week or so. Um, to understand whether it is worthwhile whilst doing a high level appraisal of that. Um, from our initial review. Um, it is a solar and battery project and it is located in close proximity, connecting into the proposed East Claydon substation. So I think it probably does warrant a high level appraisal. Um, but yeah, we will discuss that with them in due course.

01:06:01:14 - 01:06:02:19

Okay. Thank you.

01:06:04:18 - 01:06:06:20

Do you think you wanted to come back on on that?

01:06:07:22 - 01:06:21:12

Uh, thank you sir. Daniel. Kazak. Um, I think the only thing we would say is we'd welcome that as well. Yeah, it's a very similar project. Um, and so, um. Yeah. Um, aside from that, I think the positions are staked out as, as okay. As has been described.

01:06:21:14 - 01:06:30:25

It's good to get confirmation of that and understand where the parties are, basically. Okay. Any other comments or questions on cumulative effects?

01:06:32:29 - 01:06:36:29

At all. In the room I can't see anyone online either.

01:06:38:19 - 01:06:47:19

Okay. So that means we moved to review of actions for today. Can you please go through the actions that we've noted?

01:06:55:00 - 01:07:20:26

Certainly says so. I've used yesterday's list to continue the numbering to run because it's all part of issue specific hearing. Three. So under item eight, which was population, the applicant is to submit as

an appendix to chapter 14, A note to clarifying how effects on individual receptors under the assessment areas sorry on individual receptors

01:07:22:16 - 01:07:53:22

on agricultural businesses and effects on non-agricultural businesses have been considered in the Population Assessment Action 25. The applicant is to explain how professional judgment has been applied in the assessment in the summary table at the conclusion of the chapter. Action 26 is for Prestons and TCS. Please correct me on this one. I don't think I captured it correctly, but to provide an animal movement plan for the purposes of responding to the proposed construction access route.

01:07:54:15 - 01:07:57:16

Sorry, Mr. Burton, would you like to comment on that one?

01:08:00:05 - 01:08:01:03

Oh, fantastic.

01:08:06:11 - 01:08:36:26

Um, action 27 For the applicant and Preston, HTC's following discussion between the parties. Submit and updated draft animal movement arc plan if and as refined for deadline five for the Preston's and HTC's action 28. Provide further information on whether it is possible to use fields adjacent to A23 to allow for separation and movement of herds, and any practical issues around different times of the year.

01:08:38:10 - 01:09:11:18

Action 29 for the Applicant update design commitment G2 to align with the most up to date draft animal movement arc in examination action 30 for the applicant in updating its preliminary biosecurity note, clarify references to operational compounds. Update the reporting of issues in terms of that 27247 basis and include a commitment that when detailed documents are submitted for discharge, that they include a consultation log with Preston's and HTC's.

01:09:13:01 - 01:09:36:15

Action 31 is with the applicant, and the Preston's and HTC's to submit a draft statement of common ground as soon as possible and at latest by examination close. Action 32 is with the Preston's and HTC's to clarify whether the letters of support were provided in the context of the applicant's mitigation package being offered.

01:09:38:04 - 01:09:40:12

Agenda item 12 health.

01:09:44:05 - 01:09:47:29

In relation to our plans, I hope we're not being asked to go around.

01:09:48:03 - 01:09:50:12

Yeah, sorry. Could you use the microphone so we could hear you?

01:09:51:10 - 01:10:08:08

Yes. James Burton for Preston Farms, HTC's. That action was just in the context of the letter from our vet. And that's important because I don't want my clients to have to go round everyone again. Like if the Royal College of Pathologists and so on and so forth.

01:10:09:05 - 01:10:13:05

Okay. Can we redraft that? Along those lines?

01:10:13:07 - 01:10:14:19

Yep. Certainly I can amend that.

01:10:14:29 - 01:10:15:19

Thank you.

01:10:17:17 - 01:10:39:12

So moving on to agenda item 12. Health action 33 is with the applicant to update the non-technical summary to take account of the health assessment. Action 34 is with the applicant to prepare a note on the methodology that has been applied in the health and Well-Being assessment, and how that relates to the October 2025 guidance.

01:10:41:26 - 01:10:59:17

Item sorry, action .35 is with the applicant and the council before deadline. Five Council to share best practice examples of how, in combination and into project effects have been addressed in other applications in more detail in order for the applicant to respond at deadline five.

01:11:01:21 - 01:11:38:08

Um, Action .36 is with the applicant to update the health and Wellbeing Summary statement to include references to the interrelationship report by deadline five. Agenda item nine. Soils. The Council is to update the Statement of Common Grounds with the applicant, with its latest position on soil matters. Action 0.38. With the applicant to provide, on or without prejudice basis information relying on the Council's interpretation of the guidance in terms of any impact to the Council's assessment and to the overall planning balance.

01:11:39:25 - 01:12:16:16

Action 0.39 is with the applicant to update the figure in the ALC report to clarify the auger surveying action point 40 is with the Council, um, in discussion with the applicant before deadline five clarify whether the Council is seeking any further amendments to the Outline Soil Management Plan in order for any necessary updates to be made for deadline five. Agenda. Item ten was noise and vibration. Action 41 is with the applicant to expand on its position that while there may be a slight effect on the acoustic character of the area, not so.

01:12:16:18 - 01:12:35:04

Not such that there is a change in the quality of life. So that quality of life point is what we'll be expanding upon. Action .42 is with the Council to again update the statement of common ground with the applicant with the latest position on noise matters, including providing more detail where matters are agreed.

01:12:37:09 - 01:12:46:18

Action 43 is with the action Group to provide evidence of impacts of noise and vibration from other solar sites on public rights of way

01:12:48:07 - 01:13:02:13

action 44 is with the applicant to submit information provided to Preston Farms and TCS in terms of the offer of temporary grazing land in parcel two, which is within the order limits and to be available during the construction period.

01:13:04:01 - 01:13:36:00

Action .45 is with the applicant to respond to Preston Farms deadline for submissions, including the further Sharp Acoustics report. Applicant 46 is sorry action 46 is with the applicant to submit the World Health Organization guidance the applicant has used as a point of reference at issue specific hearing. One action .47 is with the applicant to confirm implications of using percussive or rotary board piling from a construction perspective.

01:13:39:00 - 01:13:50:21

Agenda item 11 air Quality Action 0.48 is with the applicant to clarify the basis of the calculation of the one in every 5804 year event.

01:13:56:07 - 01:14:35:08

Action .49 is with the Preston's and TCS to provide any further advice or evidence from their vet on the long lasting impacts of contamination on the donor blood product and any other side effects. Action point 50 is with the applicant to review the plan at figure two, the blue line showing the Preston landholding in rep for 0855 and then agenda item 13 cumulative effects is with the applicant to consider whether updates to the cumulative assessment are needed to include a high level appraisal of the Firs in solar farm as needed.

01:14:35:17 - 01:14:40:08

Okay. Thank you. Any other comments on the action List tool?

01:14:43:17 - 01:14:46:15

Okay. Thank you. I'd be grateful if you could send a copy to the case team.

01:14:46:20 - 01:14:53:26

Certainly. We're also very happy to provide it to any other parties in advance of them being published, if that would be helpful. Sure.

01:14:55:24 - 01:15:20:29

Okay, we now moving on to the close then, um, so if you've spoken today, it would assist us if you could please provide a written version of your submissions by deadline five, which is Wednesday 29th of July, 2026. The recording of this hearing will be published on our website as soon as possible after the hearing. And thank thank everyone for their participation and your submissions for this hearing.

01:15:21:21 - 01:15:36:20

Sorry Danny for Council. No need to apologize. I also I didn't I was sort of crouched behind my screen. It's just to, um, just to let you know that the camps will be attending remotely tomorrow, so we will be there, but we will be online rather than in person. Just so you're aware.

01:15:36:22 - 01:15:48:12

No. Thank you. Yeah. Uh, and a reminder, there will be a compulsory acquisition hearing tomorrow morning here starting at 930. So this hearing is now closed. Thank you.