

File Name: OES\_SEPT4\_ISH2\_PT3.mp4

File Length: 01:55:42

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:18 - 00:00:36:14

Good morning everyone. It's now at 10:00 and it's time for me to reopen this issue specific hearing. So welcome back everyone. Uh, can I just check with the case team at the recording and the live stream has commenced? Thank you. And also that everyone in the room can see and hear me clearly. Yeah. Also check with those who are online. If you can use the hand raise function to confirm that. You can also see and hear is clearly. Okay. I'm seeing some hands there. Thank you very much.

00:00:37:12 - 00:00:38:00

Um,

00:00:39:21 - 00:00:53:02

my name is Edwin Maund. I'm a chartered town planner and a planning inspector, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. And I just asked Mr. Jack to reintroduce himself to you.

00:00:54:22 - 00:01:05:27

Thank you. My name is Alex Jack. I'm a chartered transport planner and inspector, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be on the panel of inspectors. Thank you.

00:01:06:00 - 00:01:37:06

So together we form the examining authority for this application. Um, for those, uh, here in person, there's no planned fire alarm today. So in the event the alarm does go, please use the exits. Uh, marked. And the meeting places in the road outside the front of the hotel. Uh, toilets and facilities are available again out the back of the room, uh, down the stairs or the the lift. And they're available to the left of that.

00:01:38:03 - 00:01:48:14

Again, I remind everyone if they could make sure mobile phones are are switched off or to silent, and then just check to see if any members of the press are here today.

00:01:51:16 - 00:02:21:24

No. Okay. Thank you. So I think most people have been in attendance of either this issue, specific hearing or previous issues hearing. So with your agreement, I don't intend to go through the purposes as we did yesterday. Everyone content with that? Okay. Thank you. We obviously commenced going through the agenda yesterday and we will resume this morning on the transport section.

00:02:21:27 - 00:02:35:04

So if we can have that displayed with it's already there. Thank you very much. So I'll hand over to Mr. Jack then to, to commence uh, examination on transport matters. Thank you.

00:02:37:16 - 00:03:11:06

Thank you. So um, obviously going to start with item one here and the suitability of the route choice, um, regarding contract construction, traffic and, um, the Ragnall village, uh, HGV route. So Firstly, wood notes the content of the submissions that have been made at deadline two. And thank you for those. Are there any updates on the work on this work in particular since, um, the submissions at deadline two if I could start with the applicant, please.

00:03:13:00 - 00:03:18:10

Come with the applicant. I'm going to introduce, um, Mr. Gordon back in from Paul Fishman to to respond.

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

Good morning sir.

00:03:22:07 - 00:03:24:28

Um, Gordon Buchan for the applicant.

00:03:25:02 - 00:03:57:01

Um, so in terms of the, um, elements around the access strategy and in particular on Ragnhild Village, I'm very grateful for the, uh, the time that Nottinghamshire County Council officers have had with us. We've had some very clear discussions. We are currently awaiting the stage one safety audit of the proposed A57 junction as soon as I have that and the designer responds for that.

00:03:57:03 - 00:04:20:07

I will then be providing Hancock for the county Council. Further information on the as a full pack of justification for the access junction. It's not something that we've agreed as yet, but it's a matter that we're still in discussions with. And as soon as I have that information, I will make that available to the county council and to yourself, sir.

00:04:22:18 - 00:04:27:14

Thank you. Um, Nottinghamshire. Would you like to? Any comments on that?

00:04:28:06 - 00:04:39:15

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County council. Good morning sir. Um. Uh, no, that's that's the position where we are at the moment. Um, and awaiting that information and we'll be able to consider it in due course.

00:04:41:13 - 00:05:17:25

Thank you. Um, yeah, I know in the, um, submissions that have been that came in, um, it states that there's going to be this briefing note on the A20, A57 access point, which is what you've just referred to. Um, I'd just like to understand the full scope of that. Um, because obviously it's not just the access on the A57, is it? I think it's a potential knock on effects of HGV HGV routing through Ragnall village. So is is my understanding correct? First, um, and does the scope of that document contain anything else?

00:05:20:19 - 00:05:57:17

Thank you sir. Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the the proposed scope for that briefing note will be, um, a review of the, um, the traffic movements, both using the A57 junction or the alternative, which would take all construction traffic movements through the village of Ragnall. It will include a almost a kind of mini EIA review in terms of, um, the impacts that would have on the village and its inhabitants and the users of the road there would be very similar to what's in the the EIA chapter.

00:05:57:19 - 00:06:48:29

So it would allow a fair and reasonable comparison between the two documents there. It will also include the design elements of the the options, a review of the abnormal load access. Because obviously if that junction isn't available then abnormal loads would need to come through. So it will include swept path drawings for that that option as well. Um, and there is one other point which neatly escapes me just now, but it will almost be in itself a mini transport assessment, EIA um, assessment just on those, those options there to allow a fair comparison and include the stage one safety audit and the designers response for any issues identified in that auditor.

00:06:50:22 - 00:07:15:22

Great. Thank you. I was going to come on to the. The purpose of the access that you're proposing. And obviously the ale deliveries are going to be, um, yeah, an important part of that. And I think that was your main access point for all the deliveries. So yeah, I think I'm glad that that's all being, um, taken into account in that scope and look forward to seeing that. Is that going to be submitted at deadline three. Is that.

00:07:17:12 - 00:07:45:29

So? Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the the applicant, um, the safety auditor has been on site. I've been promised, um, the, uh, um, a copy of the safety audit next week. So I would imagine that everything will be ready hopefully in advance of D3. And if we can get that, um, to a promise the county council, I have that to them as swiftly as possible to allow sufficient time for Miss Hancock and her team to to review it as well.

00:07:48:24 - 00:07:58:13

Thank you. So will it be submitted to the examination at the same time that it's given to Nottinghamshire County Council to review? Or.

00:08:00:24 - 00:08:04:15

Is it being reviewed by Nottinghamshire County Council first and then submitted to us.

00:08:07:29 - 00:08:19:01

Sara Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, which I guess I'll suit you, sir. Um, I'm happy to review beforehand. Um, or formally in our response.

00:08:21:29 - 00:08:25:05

Yeah. Please. Yeah. If you could do that, that'd be great. Thank you.

00:08:28:21 - 00:08:49:28

Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. So it may be, um, some efficiencies if, uh, and forgive me if I send it to the council first and see if we can get an agreed statement, um, of whatever position the council is going to take. And then we could advise you there and send you a copy of that information there, if that would be a more efficient process.

00:08:50:04 - 00:08:52:12

Yeah, that sounds good. Thank you.

00:09:16:18 - 00:09:44:27

So something I'd just like to confirm with Nottinghamshire County Council. Obviously you referred, um, to our written questions about the new access on the MRN. Um, I was just trying to understand, is there a policy that the county council will have that prevents new access, new accesses on the MRN? Um, or is it a if they build it to the correct standards, then it will be it could be acceptable.

00:09:45:28 - 00:09:54:05

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, we do have a policy in our Nottinghamshire Highway design guide. Um, and.

00:11:28:08 - 00:11:30:06

Thank you. Okay.

00:11:35:08 - 00:11:45:21

I think that's the end of my questions for that agenda item. Is there any anyone else that would like to speak or provide information on this particular agenda item.

00:11:48:12 - 00:11:54:03

Okay, so we'll move on to abnormal individual loads. Um,

00:11:55:24 - 00:12:19:02

from the deadline to submissions, I wasn't entirely clear how much progress has been made on this area. Um, I'd like to start with National Highways, please, if they could explain the latest position from their perspective. Bearing in mind the representation they made at deadline two. Thank you.

00:12:22:13 - 00:12:53:18

Um, good morning, sir, from representing National Highways. Um, our position was, as per our response from the 21st of August. And we have a specialist abnormal loads team, and, um, we request that the applicant contact that team to identify the number of loads frequency. Timings of those so we can get a plan in place for um for abnormal indivisible load deliveries.

00:12:58:13 - 00:13:05:19

Okay. Thank you. Um, can the applicant confirm whether that has happened yet or not? Please.

00:13:08:06 - 00:13:39:26

Uh, Gordon Buckingham, on behalf of the applicant. So we had gone back to National Highways to, um, signpost where the abnormal load, uh, route survey is. It's contained within the the transport assessment document, and we've provided the signpost to that. We can provide further information in

terms of the number of loads. Um, although I think that information already within the documentation, uh, on that, um, and we had consulted with National Highways.

00:13:39:28 - 00:14:28:25

And the results of that consultation are already contained within the rear of the route survey report. But I can certainly provide the information that National Highways has requested there. The one that we can give an indicative timing just now, because obviously it's dependent upon the site being consented. Um, but we can make a rough estimation, uh, of that there. Um, I would note so I think in your question, you'd asked about the suitability of the network and the routes that are proposed within the strategic road network are part of the heavy and high load route map that National Highways has published, and I've not read out the the link because it's like reading out Morse code.

00:14:29:02 - 00:14:36:14

Um, it's quite long, but I can provide that as a supplementary, um, submission, if that would be of help or interest yourself?

00:14:36:16 - 00:14:40:27

Yes, please. If you could, that'd be good. Um, I think

00:14:42:17 - 00:15:14:02

if if National Highways are asking for additional information, such as the vehicle numbers, the number of vehicles and that timings, that sort of thing notwithstanding, what's already contained within the submissions have already been made. Uh, I think it would be preferable for that to be sent again. I'm just conscious that we are two months into the examination, and it doesn't appear that a lot of progress has been made on this issue.

00:15:15:24 - 00:15:21:09

Gordon, working on behalf of the applicant, I can have the number of loads and the indicative timing sent this afternoon.

00:15:23:03 - 00:15:23:26

Thank you.

00:15:25:18 - 00:15:51:05

Can I just clarify the National Highways? Are you asking for a particular contact at National Highways to be, Uh, in in the applicant to be in touch with rather than a particular, you know, can you clarify exactly what it is you're asking for, please, so that we can make sure that that, uh, that communications clear.

00:15:52:16 - 00:16:06:24

So no cochlear national host. Yes, we have a specialist national highways team that deals with abnormal loads. So if the information could be sent to them, um, they can review and ask the right questions. Should they have any. Once they've reviewed the information.

00:16:09:06 - 00:16:12:25

Do you have those contact details for that specialist team.

00:16:14:28 - 00:16:45:10

So I'm going back on behalf of the applicant. Um, I will contact Mr., uh, the contact for National Highways straight after this session. I will have that information. I will copy it to him and I will copy it to the, uh, the Abnormal Loads team, which I think is the generic abnormal loads at the National Highways. Co.Uk email address but I'll copy the parties that we've been in discussion with, with National Highways and so that, um, um, that they're aware that the information has been sent.

00:16:46:25 - 00:17:14:09

Okay. And so is that also going to come to us? Is it supplementary information or is it information that we already have? If it's something that we already have, then I don't think you need to send it to us again. But it's obviously just then a question of, um, as part of your submission after this, letting us know which elements that you're referring to so that we, we have those connections to the examination library.

00:17:15:11 - 00:17:32:11

Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So just in terms of if it won't be a huge submission, it will be one page. So for efficiency, I'll submit it to you as well, so that you have that information to hand. And you can see that it has been actioned. Thank you.

00:17:43:00 - 00:17:49:04

Are there any other parties that would like to raise any issues on abnormal indivisible loads?

00:17:53:19 - 00:18:02:24

Okay, so moving on to the next item, which is the design and location of um, individual access points.

00:18:07:16 - 00:18:33:18

I mean, we've we've touched on one already that we've been discussing, and I know that there have been conversations going on about regarding, um, whether safety audits should be undertaken for certain, uh, access points within Nottinghamshire. So I'm just wondering what the latest position on that is, please. Starting with Nottinghamshire.

00:18:34:16 - 00:19:14:24

Sir Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, the request is outstanding. Um so I, we, we spoke about it and I don't believe there's currently an intention to carry out audits, but it's something we would anticipate. Um, our policy that we referred to regarding the access onto roads. Um, is that including includes that there should not be a road safety problem or where road safety problem can be removed? Um, and I feel that, you know, sort of generally speaking, we would anticipate a road safety audit to, um, answer that aspect of our policy.

00:19:21:08 - 00:19:22:27

Would you like to come back on that?

00:19:24:04 - 00:20:07:29

Yeah. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so we've had discussions with the council. Um, the applicant has advised that two safety audits are being undertaken just now with the, uh, the

junctions that are that we're noted as potentially being of most concern. Um, the applicant has advised that the detailed design process contained within the Draft of Development Consent Order provides for the full um technical review, a design elements of each junction and crossing point and that with within those um, a stage one and stage two safety audit would be provided at that time.

00:20:08:05 - 00:20:27:07

We've advanced two those being the junctions of concern. And we know that the council has asked for for all. I'm in discussion with my client on that. Um, but there each junction point would have a safety audit undertaken as part of the detailed design pack Post termination.

00:20:29:24 - 00:20:39:04

Hey. Thank you. Um, and which the two junctions that you're referring to is that one of the new A57 junction and.

00:20:41:20 - 00:21:04:14

Uh, yes. Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So it's A57 junction and it is the most easterly junction on road Wood Lane, which is a, uh, um, a junction that is bisected by the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Council boundary. Helpfully, um, but it is those two points there. So.

00:21:06:13 - 00:21:22:21

Okay. Thank you. And in terms of the policy that you were referring to about, um, new access, is, is that the policy just for, uh, new accesses onto a road or the MRN or is it more than that?

00:21:24:02 - 00:21:57:24

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. It's set out in, um. Access to classified roads. Um, so we would anticipate. I appreciate that the DCO allows for safety audits to be carried out when the, um, accesses are in detailed design, and a stage one two audit would be undertaken at that point. But our, our general, um, approach is that a stage one should feed into the acceptability of the principle of a junction in the first place.

00:21:57:26 - 00:22:10:06

So, um, that's why we would anticipate one, um, at this point, because it may, uh, it may come back that one of the accesses isn't suitable for more.

00:22:12:21 - 00:22:27:22

Okay. Thank you. Um, and so the access is that you're requesting safety audits for. are all onto classified roads. Is that correct?

00:22:28:20 - 00:22:40:26

Sarah Hancock County Council. Um, yes, it would be, um, that that's what we would expect as a minimum, ideally all of them, but um, as a minimum, the classified roads.

00:22:44:16 - 00:22:45:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:52:00 - 00:23:15:01

Just one point of clarification. Obviously, we've got two county councils and you've raised specific concerns. Can I just clarify the position of Lincolnshire County Council, please? Um, and whether it's because the access points in Lincolnshire you're content with or you just have a different policy approach with regard to safety audits.

00:23:16:22 - 00:23:17:07

Good morning.

00:23:17:09 - 00:23:17:24

Sir.

00:23:17:26 - 00:23:42:23

Ian Field for Lancashire County Council. We don't have the same policy, but we have reviewed the information that has been provided for each of the accesses. The visibility displays the swept path information, and at this stage we are content that in principle those are acceptable. And then the detail can follow on. In a normal section one eight for application data for standard vehicle access crossings.

00:23:44:01 - 00:23:46:01

Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

00:23:58:26 - 00:24:04:05

Is there any further points that you would like to raise on that particular item?

00:24:05:26 - 00:24:08:23

Gordon Buchan above the applicant. Not just now, sir. No.

00:24:11:23 - 00:24:44:12

Sir. Hancock, Nottinghamshire County council. Um, I've raised with Gordon this morning. Um, the, Design of the proposed junction on the A57. I believe it may tip into requiring a ghost island junction looking at the traffic flows. If you refer to CD 123 of the design manual for roads and bridges, um, the the flows going in, if you convert those to PC, use it. Um requires further investigation on that front.

00:24:45:07 - 00:24:48:05

Sorry, what's PCU for those who are not.

00:24:49:05 - 00:25:04:17

Sorry, sir. Um, Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. So passenger carrying unit um and therefore an HGV would take up the length of more than two cars. So it counts as slightly more than two cars or a passenger carrying unit.

00:25:09:14 - 00:25:10:08

Okay.

00:25:12:19 - 00:25:18:28

What's your response to that. The implications of that Or do you agree with it?



00:25:20:09 - 00:25:49:00

Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So that that will be part of the briefing note that we're providing and that will include a review of the traffic flow movements at that point. Um, we only discussed it, uh, first thing, uh, today. So I will have a full response on that in that briefing note. And hopefully we can, um, reach agreement on the the form of the junction prior to the next, uh, hearing session.

00:25:51:09 - 00:26:29:13

I'm just mindful that if the position that Nottinghamshire County is identified is correct, the landscape is likely to change with the ghost island. And so it's just the broader implications of needing more space for a ghost island that possibly is not currently considered. So, um, we need to under that understand that and whether You have space within the current red line to facilitate that ghost island. If that conclusion is what is reached, because obviously the implications go beyond just the specifics of the design.

00:26:29:15 - 00:26:30:05

So

00:26:31:24 - 00:26:39:16

please look at that, because we obviously need to understand more broadly the the those implications.

00:26:41:07 - 00:26:41:29

Thank you.

00:26:54:27 - 00:26:58:05

Any further comments? No. Okay.

00:26:59:29 - 00:27:03:00

So moving on to um,

00:27:04:25 - 00:27:08:23

item two, which is uh.

00:27:12:06 - 00:27:12:28

Sorry.

00:27:13:09 - 00:27:45:11

Sorry, John. John Barker, on behalf of West Lindsey District Council. Um, in terms of, uh, design and location of individual access points, we'd just like to raise the issue of gate G that we raised in our, uh, comments on on deadline one documents. Um, the, uh, when we raised this initially in the local impact report, um, the, uh, the access appears to be about six, 6.5m wide.

00:27:45:18 - 00:28:22:04

Um, and the the response to written reps, uh, item 58 says that, uh, the six meter width, uh, will allow HGVs to pass. Um, but um, also noting that the the updated uh outline construction and

environmental management plan talks about um and a minimum offset from retained hedgerows of five meters and the, um, the vegetation removal plans don't indicate that the hedgerow on the north side of that access is to be removed.

00:28:22:14 - 00:28:37:02

We're just curious as to how, um, you can keep a minimum offset from the retained hedgerow of five metres on a 6.5m access and still allow, uh, HGV to pass along that access.

00:28:41:29 - 00:28:51:08

Is it possible to display the plan of that access, so that we can better understand the specifics that Mr. Barker has raised?

00:29:22:27 - 00:29:28:16

They were just trying to work out which is the right plan so that we can give the person that. The right document to share.

00:29:29:12 - 00:29:30:06

Thank you.

00:31:21:03 - 00:31:44:19

So we've got the plan up showing the access. Um, um, it might just be helpful. Sorry for Mr. Barker. So it's the, um, accession here, and I understand that you're saying, is that compatible with, um, the, uh, hedgerow removal? Is that relation to the, um, uh, vegetation removal plan? Is that the two documents that's attached to the, um, lamp?

00:31:45:22 - 00:32:22:21

John Barker on behalf of Westminster District Council. Yes. Um, so the vegetation removal plan in the back of, uh, it shoots 12 in the back of check. What document is the outline? Uh, landscape and ecology management plan shows, Is the hedgerow and its less the access pass, as in the bell mouth onto the A1 double three and more. The, uh, the access itself, um, which is quite, quite long, uh, along the north side of the reservoir.

00:32:23:08 - 00:32:31:00

Um, so I say shoot 12 of those of the retained of the vegetation removal plan. So.

00:32:33:26 - 00:33:04:14

Uh, so it doesn't indicate that the hedge on the north side of that access is to be removed, or it doesn't appear to, um, as it shows an existing hedgerow in, in green. Um, and then, as I say, the, the offset, uh, indicated in the most recent, um, uh, an outline construction environmental management plan is five metres from a retained hedgerow, which doesn't seem to be achievable at this location.

00:33:06:00 - 00:33:21:14

Thank you for that clarification. So I think we've got both documents so I can understand the point. I think it might be one we need to take away because it's quite detailed and requires a sort of crossover of specialists. But, um, I've understood the point. We've identified both areas that that are being referenced. So we can take that away.

00:33:22:06 - 00:33:23:11

Okay. Thank you.

00:33:53:24 - 00:34:01:07

So moving on to, um, the second part of this agenda item. Um,

00:34:03:03 - 00:34:16:23

I would like to start with, uh, passing places, Crabtree Lane, Moor Lane, the approaches there. Has there been any progress since deadline two on that, specifically.

00:34:18:14 - 00:34:45:11

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yes, sir. We've identified, um, suitable. Um well it's the it was um design guidance for HS2 and uh, that included passing places on rural roads. So we are applying that um, and I think that has been successfully um, so we're happy.

00:34:46:13 - 00:34:52:07

Good. That's good to hear. Thank you. Um, the applicant got any comments on that specifically.

00:34:53:12 - 00:34:56:14

Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant? No, but I'm very grateful.

00:34:59:05 - 00:35:07:23

Just for clarity. So that's both Crabtree Lane and Boar Lane that we're talking about. Yes, sir. Thank you.

00:35:21:13 - 00:35:51:04

So the changes that Nottinghamshire County Council raised at um, well, they stated in their submission at deadline to um relating to the study error study area and the rerouting, um, that may, may result in a different distribution of HGV around for construction vehicles. Is that assessment

00:35:52:23 - 00:36:05:00

does that require. I guess the first question is does that require a new assessment to be undertaken? I'm guessing the Johns is going to be. Yes. For that. Um, yeah. Okay. Start with that.

00:36:05:02 - 00:36:14:17

Uh, Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so, uh, the answer is no. Um, we've we've had a discussion, and I believe we've reached agreement on that point as well.

00:36:20:15 - 00:36:23:12

Okay. Nottinghamshire, if you've got any comments on that.

00:36:24:21 - 00:37:06:08

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, the primary one was uh, the routing through that appeared to be through Collingham. Um, which would have put an additional circa 200 vehicles

elsewhere. But it's been established that that number to the south of, um, north, I can't remember which north it is. Uh, one of the settlements on the A1, A11 33 was just accounting for lorry, um, movements between the quarry at best, Thorpe, and didn't include Cunningham, so they would basically be leaving the quarry and going to site and then coming back so they don't actually impact anywhere else on the network.

00:37:07:18 - 00:37:10:00

Okay, good. That's good to hear. Thank you.

00:37:15:12 - 00:37:49:09

Moving on to the construction staff travel plan, which is obviously, um, quite fundamental. And I think I mentioned this at the previous, uh, hearing. Um, I'm just I'd still like to understand a little bit more about how that is going to be secured, how those targets, how it's going to be enforced for the enforcing authorities if it needs to be. I note the comments, um, relating to there's going to be a contractual obligation.

00:37:49:11 - 00:38:03:18

The contractor will be the person that is responsible for it. Um, I just want a bit more reassurance, I think that there's something beyond that. How is that contractual obligation could be enforced essentially.

00:38:05:29 - 00:38:43:04

Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, um, in terms of the staff travel plan, sir, we've we've worked on a number of, of projects. Um, I've worked on a number of wind farm projects, some quite remote areas, and we've used the same kind of process there. So the contractor would have the contractual obligation of providing the staff travel plan. And this one's quite interesting because it's not similar to residential or commercial office blocks, which are more familiar territory for, um, travel plans.

00:38:43:10 - 00:38:56:12

Um, but on this one, um, it is going to be a contractual requirement. The contractor will be required to follow it. There will be measured against it by the applicant. Um, and it will be a, um.

00:38:58:04 - 00:39:31:02

I'm trying to remember that it'll be a KPI, um, element for them as part of their contract. It is a legal requirement because it will be secured through the draft, through the DCO, so that it is a legal requirement for them to, um, concur and to follow it and to monitor it and to implement it. So it is you have that reassurance that it will be there, it will be adhered to the applicant. You know, we're developing a site here for sustainable power. We need to have sustainable access during the construction process.

00:39:31:08 - 00:39:48:18

Um, to do that and, um, you can be assured that not only will the applicant be enforcing it through the, the contract, that you also have the security that it is a legal obligation under the development consent order, that it has to be adhered to.

00:39:51:16 - 00:39:52:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:39:54:08 - 00:40:07:03

And I just come back on that. Just explain to me how it is linked through to the DCO and how the authorities would know that it's being complied with.

00:40:09:26 - 00:40:50:28

For the applicant. Um, it's a plan that's secured within the construction traffic management plan. So via those means. So the requirement in the DCO to, um, comply and carry out the development in accordance with the approved TMP also includes the staff travel plan, approved as part of or as a sub plan to the construction traffic management plan. Um, I would think in practice. As for all of these measures, um, you know, we have monitoring and reporting measures in place in all the environmental management plans. Um, with the view, obviously to satisfy ourselves that they're being complied with, but also so that if the local planning authority had any concerns in that respect, they could ask us to demonstrate compliance and we would need to do that.

00:40:51:03 - 00:41:22:04

The construction Traffic Management plan also sets out various measures by which people can report concerns or complaints to the applicant if they have concerns in that respect, and I imagine that they would be quite quick to get in touch with the local planning authority as well. So I think there's, um, various measures and means there by which the that would be secured. As for any other sort of sub plan, um, secured via a management plan that's secured in the same way as if there was a specific requirement given it's part of the TMP.

00:41:22:10 - 00:41:23:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:41:30:00 - 00:41:40:18

That's the last of my questions on that item. Is there anyone else who would like to bring up any issues relating to management during construction?

00:41:44:13 - 00:41:45:14

Mr. white?

00:41:48:21 - 00:41:54:23

Hi. Yes, thank you very much. Um, I wanted to just bear with me while I.

00:41:54:25 - 00:41:55:10

Bring.

00:41:55:12 - 00:42:03:23

This up. Um, during the consultation phases, there seemed to be, unfortunately, uh, a complete lack of any.

00:42:03:25 - 00:42:04:10

Detail.

00:42:04:12 - 00:42:47:26

Regarding loss of local horse riders. There's a lot of, uh, questioning activity in this area, particularly around north and south Clifton. Um, during the discussions in the consultation phases as well, we spoke to, uh, concerned parties and, uh, they reported back that, uh, the discussions with on Earth were also very vague and very worrying. Um, as such, uh, a petition and a report was, uh, put together by Doctor Sarah Fletcher, who is a local horse rider, and many people, um, submitted their details to this report and signed this petition,

00:42:49:12 - 00:42:59:20

I'd like to confirm that one Earth have received this petition and the report from Doctor Sarah Fletcher. And have they responded to it?

00:43:06:27 - 00:43:07:20

Thank you.

00:43:09:27 - 00:43:21:00

Mr. white. Can I just clarify? I understand the connection for horse riders to transport matters. Is the report from Doctor Fletcher a transport report as well?

00:43:22:17 - 00:43:55:21

Well, of course, uh, uh, the way she's looking at it is a lot of these roads around here are used by Christian riders, uh, including bike lanes and, uh, some of the, uh, access roads and everything that could be used by one Earth. So it's a big problem. And the local equestrian uses, uh, Heavy lorries, etc. and increased levels of traffic. And and I understand that they're not happy with the responses so far from one Earth.

00:43:55:23 - 00:44:28:05

And I'd like to try to understand where this is going and how they plan to manage, um, this increase in size and regularity of traffic with respect to local riders. Um, there's a lot and they often include young children and young horses. And of course, there's people's lives at stake. And also, um, whether they're, they're covered by, um, indemnity insurance and all this sort of stuff, but mostly traffic.

00:44:31:10 - 00:44:49:11

Okay. Before I ask the applicant to respond, can I just clarify with the highway authorities whether they have any concerns about the arrangements that are in place for, uh, horse riders or pedestrians or cyclists with regard to the plans that have been presented to date.

00:44:55:12 - 00:45:18:23

Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council. Our Public Rights of Way team would have commented specifically on bridleways and the public rights of way off highway. Um, in terms of, uh, use of the roads, we've got no specific concerns with regards to, um, existing users.

00:45:20:22 - 00:45:22:27

Thank you. And from Lincolnshire.

00:45:24:28 - 00:45:32:15

Enfield. From Lincolnshire County Council. Um, we're the same. We don't have any specific concerns on the on the highways with regard to equestrian use.

00:45:33:11 - 00:45:36:19

Okay. Thank you. I can then come back to the applicant and.

00:45:37:09 - 00:46:06:05

It's common for the applicant. Um, on the consultation point, um, in line with the statutory duty we have had regard to that response to consultation and responses are included in relation to various comments around impacts on horse riders in appendix J to the consultation report. App 161 um, in terms of, um, how that regard has been taken into account and sort of the actual measures, um, for the scheme, I'm going to pass back to Mr. Buck. And just to talk more specifically about about that.

00:46:08:04 - 00:46:42:12

Thank you. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the Outline construction traffic management plan specifically mentions non-motorized road users, both pedestrians, cyclists and indeed equestrians. Um, that is um, I can get the reference for you in a moment. Um, but with respect to the specific point on equestrians, um, they the measures that are outlined will, um, the advising drivers of the potential Of equestrians in the area.

00:46:42:14 - 00:47:15:23

There will be specific training for HGV and LGV drivers to be aware of horse riders, and on what steps should be undertaken if they encounter a rider on a public road. Um, and there's detail there and um, section 11 .5.1 explaining what to do and how to pass a horse in safety that comes from the, um, the British um, Horse Society's guidance for dealing with, uh, construction, traffic and HGV interactions there.

00:47:15:25 - 00:47:35:12

So there will be specific training. And these can also be introduced, uh, as part of the daily two toolbox talks that HGV drivers and operators will have as part of the Outline Construction traffic Management plan, which will be secured in a full construction traffic management plan as part of the DCO.

00:47:46:28 - 00:47:47:20

Thank you.

00:47:54:26 - 00:48:04:04

Thank you. So moving on to agenda item seven. Hydrology, flood risk, water resources and the sequential test.

00:48:13:16 - 00:48:23:02

The first part of this item is relating to water resource availability and the implications this may have. Um.

00:48:28:23 - 00:49:08:04

Given uh, Anglian Water stated at deadline two that it's possible that insects may be refused water supplies over 20m<sup>3</sup> per day. Um, or the outlined measures that have been stated in the response in the applicant's response to question 12 .0.7. Do they ensure that delays the construction program will be avoided if Anglian Water are unable to meet the demand for water?

00:49:10:20 - 00:49:33:13

For the applicant? The short answer is yes. I'm going to ask Mr. Craig Thwaites from Logica just to expand upon that. But the the basic point is firstly, that the assessment is overly conservative in that respect. But yes, um, in we would either be applying for that via the WRC with Anglian Water or there are other measures we can put in place that don't impact construction program. But I'll ask Mr. Thwaites to just explain that.

00:49:34:19 - 00:49:36:01

Yeah. Thank you. Um, Craig Thwaites.

00:49:36:03 - 00:49:37:12

On behalf of the applicant.

00:49:37:14 - 00:50:17:00

Um, just to set the scene briefly and provide the numbers that we're referring to. Um, so within item 7.6.24 of the, uh, chapter seven of the ES. Um, and for latest reference is rep 2024. Um, water demand during construction has been conservatively calculated to be 64.8m<sup>3</sup> per day. Um. However, as um, Miss Coleman referred to their conservative assessments. Um, and the reality is that we would expect, um, lower factors for peaking peaking factor, a number of personnel and, uh, water usage per person to be lower than the factors that we have used at currently.

00:50:17:08 - 00:50:54:02

Um, as indicated at item 7.6.27. Um, wherever possible, we will look to source water from non-potable sources, which could include utilizing existing abstraction, um, licences from the River Trent um or private suppliers to reduce pressure on the water company. However, the feasibility of that would need to be reviewed. Detailed design. Um. To be clear, Anglian Water, in their responses have not stated that they won't be able to supply greater than 20m<sup>3</sup>, but have said stated that if we go above that, then a water resource assessment would be required, as we've referred to.

00:50:54:07 - 00:51:04:07

Um. For information, we're currently completing the SRA, that water resource assessment and looking to provide that to Anglian Water as soon as possible to gain an understanding on their capacity.

00:51:07:13 - 00:51:11:20

Do you know the timeframe that you're working to to get that to Anglian Water?

00:51:16:06 - 00:51:19:18

At Craig site off the applicant and we're aiming to submit that this week.



00:51:21:08 - 00:51:42:20

Okay. Thank you. So, um, we have a representative from Anglian Water Online. Um, I think it's very Murphy Um, are you able to give us an indication if you receive that this week, what the time frame would be for you to be able to respond to it? Um.

00:51:43:05 - 00:52:17:18

Yes. Hello. It's Carrie Murphy from Anglian Water. Uh, yeah. I mean, it would be, I would say a couple of weeks. Um, the, the, the process that we would need to go through is actually look at the, the relevant water resource zone that we would be looking to supply the water from. Um, and it's a sort of two stage process. We look at which water resource zone it is and then also look at capacity and if the network would need any upgrades. Um, and obviously with this project it's, it's understanding where the water needs to go to within the site.

00:52:17:25 - 00:52:54:15

Um, but it would be helpful. Um, yeah. We'd be appreciate that engagement with the applicant because of the number of other n CIPs and other planned developments Elements in the area, which could impact on the amount of water that we could potentially supply. So I do believe doing that at this stage, rather than the detailed design stage, would be helpful for both parties and would be in accordance with the with N1 as well. So, um, I, I could come back with a more realistic, uh, timescale for responding on it.

00:52:54:17 - 00:53:05:09

I would need to speak to a colleagues in another, um, area of the business, but, um, I'd say it would probably be weeks rather than days, but certainly not months.

00:53:07:20 - 00:53:44:13

I'm just trying to think about when we might receive a a response or a clarification on the on the point of water availability, because your feedback to the applicant after your assessment. Our deadline three is the 16th of September, which is, Uh, just two weeks away. It's sounding unlikely that we'll get a response by then. Um, but again, I think obviously time is passing and the the need for that clarity.

00:53:44:18 - 00:53:51:03

Um, obviously we would wish to see that, um, sooner rather than later.

00:53:53:05 - 00:54:04:06

Harry Murphy for Anglian Water. Um, yes. I mean, as I say, I don't I'm not sure whether we could get anything by the 16th of September, but if there was another deadline after that.

00:54:05:12 - 00:54:42:22

Um, well, obviously there are, um, you know, if you look at the examination timetable, there are a series of deadlines running through, um, later in the year. But I'm just mindful that, uh, once you've gone back to the applicant, the applicant will no doubt have to assess your response and see where that takes them. Um. And then weather. And see. See where we we get to. But I think it's just a marker from us that, um, the sooner we can get to a position of clarity on it, uh, I think it's the better for everybody.

00:54:43:22 - 00:55:11:28

So I think probably what we will do is for deadline, for which is the 14th of October, if we've had the, um, response back from Anglian Water in time and to be able to consider it and, um, reach any agreement, then we'll report on that. But if we otherwise just provide an update in any event as to where, where we are on this issue at deadline for so that you're kept up to date. And obviously we'll make sure we keep doing that. Thank you. I think we've also got a statement of common ground that we can make sure we're keeping updated and record progress.

00:55:12:00 - 00:55:12:22

Thank you.

00:55:20:21 - 00:55:42:23

Sorry. Before we move on. One of the alternatives that I think you references in in the event that Anglian Water can't supply. Um, you make reference to possibly using tankard water. Can I just make sure that that calculation has been included in your traffic assessment.

00:55:44:04 - 00:56:04:03

For the applicant? Um, yes. I think there's a sort of, um, estimate and we'll probably confirm this with a bit more preciseness or specificity in writing, but it's around two. Um, HGV, I think HGV. Um, but two trips a day, which is um, which is accounted for in the traffic assessment. So there's no issues in that respect.

00:56:04:05 - 00:56:04:24

Thank you.

00:56:09:18 - 00:56:13:01

Anyone else have any comments on that topic.

00:56:16:03 - 00:56:19:24

Okay. So moving on to the next item. Um,

00:56:21:22 - 00:56:31:03

and the applicant please explain the potential impacts of a flood event during the construction phase of the proposed development.

00:56:33:05 - 00:56:41:12

As the adequate assessment of the potential impacts of flooding on the construction elements of the scheme being undertaken.

00:56:56:18 - 00:57:36:03

On behalf of the applicant. Um, just to touch, um, briefly, I guess on on the drainage point that you've raised. Um, and I think we'll come back to the, to the flood point as well. Um, so just to be clear, um, within table 3.5 of the Kemp and that's latest reference is rep 2049. Um, so within table 3.5 and we've set out flood risk drainage and surface water mitigation and management procedures during construction. Um, just to give a brief summary that includes provision of air pollution plans. Um,

storing machinery and spawning materials outside of the identified flood extent wherever possible, thereby minimizing the potential for contaminants.

00:57:36:08 - 00:58:11:12

Um, mobilization during a flood event. Um containment measures. Mixing and handling of materials in designated areas away from surface water drains. Um. Locating plant machinery away from surface water drains as well. Um temporary drainage systems. Um, to be developed to prevent runoff. Contaminate contaminated runoff with fine particulate from engineering. Any surface water drains without treatment. Um, which will include protection using sandbags, earth bunds, geotextile fences, straw bales, and proprietary um treatment where needed.

00:58:11:14 - 00:58:43:02

Um, as well as cutoff ditches. Um, silt fences around excavations, etc.. Um additionally, within the Kemp Um, we've indicated the following, which will further minimize potential contaminants to be mobilized and impacts on sort of construction during a flood event. So we stated the contractors will require will be required to produce a flood risk management action plan. Um, within the Kemp, which will provide details, um, of the response to impending flood and include the following.

00:58:43:04 - 00:59:15:13

Um, so 24 hour availability and ability to mobilize staff in the event of a flood warning. Um, all plant, machinery and material which is capable of being mobilized in a flood risk area will be moved by the contractor to safe locations. Um, details of the evacuation and closed down procedures will be provided. Um, arrangements for removing any potential potentially hazardous material. Um. And anything capable of becoming entrained in floodwaters, um, from the temporary works areas and the contractors to sign up to the EA flood warning alert.

00:59:15:15 - 00:59:46:21

Um, and describe that within their emergency response plan. Um, any actions that will be taken in the event of a flood in impending flood event. Um. Construction program. May. Someone else may be able to step in slightly. Um, but the that that will be laid out such that works within higher flood risk areas will be undertaken during drier than the dry season. Um, when it's less likely, um, you know, theoretically for, for a flood event to occur, um, thereby thereby further sort of minimizing risks to program.

00:59:46:26 - 00:59:48:26

Um, thank.

00:59:52:27 - 00:59:53:12

You and.

00:59:53:14 - 00:59:53:29

Sneddon, on behalf.

00:59:54:01 - 00:59:54:21

Of the applicant.

00:59:54:23 - 01:00:25:06

Just to further follow up on Craig's point around the construction program, um, particularly within the solar areas. Um, we're not expecting the construction to last the full duration of the, um, two year construction period for all of the solar areas there will be done in phases. Uh, as I think I mentioned in the first hearing, um, throughout the site. And these can be done based on a number of parameters.

01:00:25:08 - 01:01:00:13

One which would be the likelihood of the the ground becoming impassable due to heavy rain, which would obviously precede any flood situation on the site. So even if it's not going to flood, you would still try and do the the wet prone areas of the land outside of the potential flood season for that reason. Um, it would be typical at the detailed design stage to create a construction phase plan which would identify the different areas of the site and when the construction period would start within those and the duration.

01:01:00:23 - 01:01:28:21

Um, and one of the applicant is committing to make sure that the area is identified within the highest risk. Flood areas would be, um, constructed during the drier months, and obviously that it can rain heavy in June, as we all are aware, but that's the way that we would manage to reduce that risk of construction in the in the flood areas to avoid flood events.

01:01:38:02 - 01:01:38:24

Thank you.

01:01:44:07 - 01:01:49:21

Is any other IP's or attendees have any comments on that item?

01:01:57:13 - 01:02:05:12

Can I just get confirmation from the Environment Agency that their content with the program that the applicant has outlined in this respect?

01:02:07:12 - 01:02:40:20

Hi Sean Holland, the Environment Agency. We are happy with the mitigation effort in place. The only concern we have slightly Is that they are saying where possible they're going to put construction compounds, materials outside of floodplain or any concern is where that's not possible. What does that then mean for any offsite impact. So is that going to cause any water to be pushed anywhere else? Um, however, we understand that because they don't have a detailed plan of where all of their kind of compounds and materials are going to be, this might need to be a assessment undertaken at the detailed design stage.

01:02:46:08 - 01:03:00:02

Are you content then, that at this stage there is nothing there that would, um, get in the way of the principle of what the applicant is saying with the information that is currently available.

01:03:00:25 - 01:03:15:09

We are still having some discussions about getting some broader mitigation measures in for if that is an eventuality of having them in place. So I think we're still under discussion with the applicant about that. But in general terms, we are happy with the construction plans.

01:03:18:13 - 01:03:23:19

Okay. And so that's an ongoing discussion that will be developed through the Statement of Common Ground.

01:03:24:01 - 01:03:24:21

Correct.

01:03:25:03 - 01:03:25:25

Thank you.

01:03:29:28 - 01:03:40:00

And just in terms of the lead local flood authorities, again, I would ask for clarity from, from you as to your positions on this.

01:03:43:27 - 01:03:46:17

Well, Lawrence County Council, my colleague.

01:03:46:19 - 01:03:47:12

Jessica Glazebrook.

01:03:47:14 - 01:03:51:19

Is on the call. She represents the local flood authority and may be able.

01:03:51:21 - 01:03:52:06

To comment.

01:03:52:08 - 01:03:58:05

But it may be something we want to return to in writing on if she hasn't got an answer immediately.

01:04:00:01 - 01:04:00:22

Thank you.

01:04:03:05 - 01:04:04:04

Jessica Scarborough.

01:04:04:06 - 01:04:10:22

Representing Nottinghamshire County Council, lead local flood authority. It is something we would want to confirm in writing, but based on what has just been.

01:04:10:24 - 01:04:11:10

Said.

01:04:11:12 - 01:04:15:11

Um, broadly, we have no objections. And it sounds all right in principle.

01:04:19:03 - 01:04:20:05

Okay. Thank you.

01:04:20:09 - 01:04:22:17

Um, Lynn, Lincolnshire County Council.

01:04:23:11 - 01:04:24:03

Um, yes.

01:04:24:05 - 01:04:24:25

We prefer.

01:04:24:27 - 01:04:25:12

To.

01:04:25:14 - 01:04:27:00

Come back to you in writing. Thank you.

01:04:28:07 - 01:04:28:24

Okay.

01:04:28:26 - 01:04:29:18

Thank you.

01:04:35:17 - 01:04:38:16

Does the applicant want to come up with any follow up?

01:04:40:22 - 01:04:41:27

No. Thank you. Sir.

01:04:49:22 - 01:04:57:17

Moving on to the flood risk assessment. Um, I just wonder if I could ask the Environment Agency, um,

01:04:59:03 - 01:05:14:08

for their consideration on the revised Fra and whether the mitigation has been secured is adequate and have their concerns that have been previously raised been satisfactorily addressed. Thank you.

01:05:18:26 - 01:05:53:29

Sean Holland for the Environment Agency, and we have reviewed the Fra that got, um, issued at deadline to the last deadline. And, um, we are still checking against all the mitigation that's been put

in place. So the new calculations for, um, capacity that might be lost due to so panels, supports and the panels themselves. Additionally, the um, capacity that might be lost due to wider structures. Um, there are a couple of points we need to discuss with the applicant about the voided structures.

01:05:54:04 - 01:06:28:12

Um, so under my understanding, again, they don't have a detailed plan of where they will be putting all the investigations. And there's been sessions previously about assessing whether all of them will be border structures or whether they will look at different methods of plotting compensation being provided. Um, this is something we're having ongoing discussions about, and we are looking to ask the applicant to put in more commentary around their decision to use void structures, as we view this as a last resort, not a first case choice in providing mitigation.

01:06:28:21 - 01:07:07:20

Um, additionally, we need to discuss with the applicant about wordings of a requirement to secure that this assessment of all those individual investigations is undertaken. Um, furthermore, we are talking to the applicant about their interactions with all the embankments that are currently on site. Um, and we still require some more information about how they will interact with those embankments. Um, in terms of a cable crossing going beneath them. Um, I understand they are looking to have no negative impacts on them, but at the moment we have very little information about the composition of those the foundations of the embankments.

01:07:07:22 - 01:07:36:24

So we need a little bit more information about that and how the applicant will the cable crossing will be interacting with those foundations. Um, we will respond in writing at the next deadline. Um, and give more detail on all of those specific concerns. Um, there does look like a lot of the issues we have in moving in a generally positive direction and that things are becoming resolved. Um, but yeah, we will give full detail in a written response.

01:07:39:02 - 01:07:57:20

Thank you for that. Uh, that response is very helpful, and it's good to hear there's some there's been some progress made. Um, I'm sorry if I can go back to the applicant now for a response. Um, and useful to try and understand the timescales that you're trying to work to there to, to get these resolved.

01:07:57:22 - 01:08:45:22

Thank you for the applicant. Um, yes. There have been positive discussions and we did meet with the EA, immediately after deadline to appreciate him. They didn't have very much time to have reviewed the documents by that point, so, but we appreciate the acknowledgement in that respect in terms of the discussions and that they are moving in a positive direction, which is also, um, our impression. Um, we agree that there is probably need for a requirement. So I think probably for deadline are three in the DCO, we will propose a requirement essentially, um, that we need to look at the detail of the drafting, but essentially securing the whether it requires sort of a rerun of the Fra at the point of detailed design, just to confirm that the impact on flood risk and floodplain storage is as, as in line with the Fra that exists at the moment.

01:08:45:25 - 01:08:56:02

Um, so we agree with those comments. So we'll take that action away. And um, and we'll obviously share that with the EA as well. And that can inform, um, the ongoing discussions with them.

01:08:58:02 - 01:08:59:14

Thank you. That's very useful.

01:09:02:16 - 01:09:31:18

Are you inserting for the applicant just on the voided structures underneath the inverter mounting? Um, that's not unknown in the solar world. Um, even for sites that are not within the flood risk zone. So we don't necessarily see that purely for flood mitigation purposes. Um, I have several sites where the inverters are built on voided structures that are not within the flood zone. So it's it is something that is done in the industry.

01:09:33:21 - 01:09:38:03

Just to explain that to me. So how.

01:09:40:19 - 01:09:45:18

The fact that they are used elsewhere outside of flood zones. How how

01:09:47:12 - 01:09:57:04

what's the relevance to the concerns the Environment Agency have raised with regard to this site and then being in the flood zone.

01:09:58:15 - 01:10:38:20

Uncertain for the applicant? Yeah, I think the environment agencies there said that they view voided structures as the the last resort for flood mitigation for, um, flood storage. Um, so they would usually see a concrete or, you know, soil build up within the flood zone to avoid something that can go in the flood water being elevated above it. And all I was saying was that I have other sites that were building where the preferred solution for the inverter mounting is on avoided structure anyway.

01:10:38:24 - 01:10:44:18

So not for the purpose of flood mitigation.

01:10:46:11 - 01:11:06:04

I think that's not the point the Environment Agency are making. I think they're saying that they shouldn't be there in the first place. And and it's they don't see it as mitigation there. So I think it's a slightly point that's at a tangent, if you like, to what you're saying. And obviously we need to

01:11:07:26 - 01:11:20:14

get that clarity as to the relationship between the two perspectives. I know the lady from the Environment Agency has come back online, so perhaps she has something further to say.

01:11:20:18 - 01:11:54:17

Yeah, I'll just clarify on what I meant by last resort. So in this terms I understand they're using voids to raise, um, the structures. So they are above flood heights. That is something that we understand happens across a lot of different sites. And it is used as a form of raising levels so that equipment is



safe. That is not our concern here. Our concern is then that is being used instead of providing compensation. So the footprint of those inverters, because there is now a void where it is being said that water can free flow in times of flood.

01:11:54:19 - 01:12:27:26

They are saying that they do not need to now compensate for that area because of the void. We normally say that void should be a last resort when looking to compensate for any capacity that might be lost. So if these structures weren't on voids and they were on the ground, that land would need to be compensated for. However, because they've put voids in there now saying they don't need to compensate, we would rather all that capacity that is lost, even if it is a void as there, because voids are inherently risky and they become blocked and they can be filled with sediment.

01:12:28:07 - 01:12:58:10

We would rather that the floodplain which is lost is mimicked on the edge of the current floodplain. So there is still the capacity to have that free flow of water and not reliant on it being free flowing through voids. I understand boys can be used for multiple different reasons, and we understand that they are used to raise it, but that was not the concern in this space and that was not where we were looking at for it not being the first choice. It is all about how they mitigate for the loss of floodplain. not raising the floor levels.

01:12:59:13 - 01:13:00:21

How do I explain to.

01:13:01:28 - 01:13:15:29

You and for the applicant. Yeah. Thank you. That does explain it. That was my understanding. Um, I was looking for an engineering point of view, just to say that there's no engineering restriction to doing that for the equipment.

01:13:16:25 - 01:13:18:01

Okay. Thank you.

01:13:20:03 - 01:13:52:09

I'm sorry. Craig. Craig Thwaites, on behalf of the applicant, quickly as well. Um, just just to be clear, um, between myself and Miss Holland and the rest of the Environment Agency team, we have been in discussions on this point. Um, and the commentary will be included within an updated version for a future deadline. Um, just to make the point that the, um, the, the current stage is estimates of where inverted structures might be. Um, and that's where I guess the, the, um, may can make it difficult to look on a case by case basis on what the potential flood compensation could be in some ways.

01:13:52:11 - 01:14:05:29

Um, However, the avoided structures that we would be looking to to put in place would have, you know, fairly significant clear spans. So to minimize that potential for obstruction, etc.. But we will be providing further commentary, as I say.

01:14:09:18 - 01:14:10:11

Thank you.

01:14:14:13 - 01:14:20:12

Any other IPS or councils have any comments there on the Fra?

01:14:26:12 - 01:14:27:05

Box.

01:14:27:17 - 01:14:30:12

Thank you sir. Heather Fox, North Clifton.

01:14:31:04 - 01:15:09:05

I'm really struggling to understand how they have used a quantifiable number for the volume for the assessment of structures on the floodplain. I've read the four virtual meetings between the EA and the applicant, and at no point in that meeting Eating. Did the Environment Agency agree to using solely quantifiable. And I think, sir, if you reread those four meetings, you will discover that the Environment Agency repeatedly stressed the need for fluid flow direction.

01:15:09:07 - 01:15:44:16

And I'll use the word they use interrogated within these. And at the fourth meeting, One Earth outlined that approach, but failed to mention that the EA was still asking for the flood flow directions to be interrogated within that scheme. Now, in order to understand this, if you suddenly imagine the the Trent were to come through those doors with the volume that we've got set out now, it would behave differently would be the same volume.

01:15:44:18 - 01:16:08:14

But if we pushed all that to one side, the water would behave differently. You'd have the same volume of water, but it would behave differently. And I cannot begin to understand how 1.5 million panels, plus the other bits on a floodplain of this size, can have no impact on the way the water behaves.

01:16:10:27 - 01:16:11:18

Thank you.

01:16:13:11 - 01:16:20:10

Before I come back to the applicant, we've got Mr. White. You have your hand up. Do you have an additional point? And then I'll come to Mr. Fox.

01:16:22:10 - 01:16:56:27

Yes. Thank you. David White, on the senior to action group and representing 95% of the communities of North and South Clifton. Um, I just wanted to reiterate what Heather was saying and severe concerns from the vast majority of the people in these communities. Um, quite recently, there has been some very, uh, severe flood events, as we know, in this area. And these two communities have suffered quite badly through having to work tirelessly to try and hold back some of the floodwaters ourselves.

01:16:57:09 - 01:17:35:06

We can send some details in and, uh, photographs and things, and we've had to bring our, at our own expense, uh, irrigation pumps to hold back some of the floodwaters, particularly due to what we mentioned, the last hearings, which was the Environment Agency flood gates. I understand the Environment Agency, uh, weren't aware of this issue for whatever reason. Um, this community, uh, there was flooding in south Clifton and, uh, North Clifton worked tirelessly 24 hours using volunteers on two hour stints to hold back the floodwaters.

01:17:35:08 - 01:18:24:01

And again, we were all volunteers and we all worked through the night for several days. Um, we barely hung on, uh, at a couple of these, uh, flood events. And again, it's down to the Environment Agency gates, which control runoff from these communities back into the Trent. And if the Trent is too high, those gates have to be closed. Now there is a area of solar panels at the top of the village, and people are very concerned that channeling, which does happen with these solar panels and the channeling where the solar panels will be, uh, pointing channels, uh, the floodwater and the rain towards the village and exactly where the lower points are.

01:18:24:03 - 01:18:49:14

And, uh, we are very concerned about those panels being there. It's a small area. We would ask the applicant to please consider not putting them there. Uh, because just a small, tiny 1% or 2% rise in, uh, water coming into the village instead of soaking through the land could push us over the edge. I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

01:18:51:01 - 01:18:55:27

Can I clarify with you? The area you're talking about is that adjacent to the reservoir?

01:18:56:04 - 01:18:57:16

It is. So. Thank you.

01:18:57:19 - 01:18:58:15

Thank you.

01:19:13:10 - 01:19:18:00

Can I come firstly to the Environment Agency and see your response

01:19:19:15 - 01:19:31:01

to what Mrs. Fox has said about the the flow channel, the flow direction and whether you have outstanding concerns in that respect? Before I come back to the applicant.

01:19:31:21 - 01:20:02:17

Hi, Sean Holland for the Environment Agency. Um, this is something we have discussed over a long period of time with the applicant. Um, because yes, it is not just about capacity of water that will be displaced, but it's also about where it will be displaced and where this water may end up. Um, this is something that I think is still under discussion. Um, we are still reviewing the latest information about this displacement of water. Um, and we're looking to send comments in writing over the coming period of time, probably the next week or so.

01:20:02:21 - 01:20:26:12

Um, but yes, this is a point we're still discussing and still have concerns around. Um, there may be a form that the applicant can provide a bit more evidence of where the water may go. There is talks of maybe doing a model run that shows where the water may go in this circumstance. Um, this is all something we are in discussion with the applicant about, and we are still reviewing the latest Fra.

01:20:29:13 - 01:20:32:09

Okay. Thank you. If I return to the applicant.

01:20:35:08 - 01:21:10:00

Craig Bates, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes, I agree to some extent with. With what Miss Holland said. Um, in the the discussions have been ongoing for a fairly lengthy period of time. Um, just to clarify, um, in terms of meeting minutes and where this is kind of evidenced. Um, so in a meeting held on the 26th of September, um, modeling queries was a particular specific agenda point, um, in which we discussed the potential increase in flood risk and how we address that. Um, there were references, um, within peer comments and within those discussions to potentially doing, um, some additional model runs.

01:21:10:05 - 01:21:47:29

However, it was um, the EA uh, suggested that other quantified methods could be undertaken and to, to, to assess that. Um, and that's the route that we've gone down through discussions with Environment Agency. And they've obviously previously reviewed those, those numbers and are currently reviewing them at the moment. Um, I think the point on the Miss Holland has made, um, with regards to uh, flows, flow directions, etc.. Um, we'll have to take that away and discuss that, uh, again with the Environment Agency to to try and gain an agreed approach and which will obviously also form part of the same of common ground.

01:21:50:11 - 01:22:02:15

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Sorry, Mrs. Fox, I did say I would come back to you and I neglected to do so. So sorry. Is there a point that you'd wish to make? The microphone, please, Mr. Fox?

01:22:04:19 - 01:22:05:15

Um.

01:22:06:07 - 01:22:42:04

I've got fundamental problems with the frayed frame. I think it fails to account for both, um, site specific and cumulative flood risks, relies on outdated methodologies, and overlooks critical empirical research. It also disregards, um, limited capacity of local authorities to monitor the enforcement and mitigation measures. Um, and I think approval should be withheld. It doesn't it doesn't in any way demonstrate that there will be no flood for increasing flood risk.

01:22:43:03 - 01:22:47:25

I will be putting in a submission on this, but I just want to make the point.

01:22:49:04 - 01:22:49:28

Thank you,

01:22:51:15 - 01:22:54:23

Mrs. Foulkes. You also wanted to come back, I think.

01:22:55:07 - 01:23:26:06

Fox resident in North Clifton. Yes. I would like to come back to the applicant re saying that the AA agreed to a quantifiable method, but they did, but with the proviso that flood flow directions were included. They said it twice. I mean, there is some confusion on their notes because in the notes it does say PS on one telephone call and PPG on another, but they did not agree solely to that. They there had to be flood flow directions included.

01:23:26:08 - 01:23:37:18

But on the fourth meeting, as I say again on the fourth meeting, when the approach was outlined, there was no mention of the flood flow directions being included. Thank you.

01:23:38:10 - 01:23:38:29

Thank you.

01:23:42:16 - 01:24:02:16

That's our symbol for the applicant. Just to pick up on the discrepancy on the PSP. Apologies. It should have been. Yes. Um, so that's a clear one that can be addressed. Um, with regards to the flow, um, directions, as I say, I think that's something that we'll pick up in another meeting with the Environment Agency to get an understanding of what the requirement is.

01:24:08:07 - 01:24:08:22

Sorry.

01:24:08:24 - 01:24:09:09

Great.

01:24:09:11 - 01:24:41:29

Great. Let's jump off the app. And if I can just step in one more time. Um, the, uh, just just to, I guess, um, uh, provide the context of flood flow directions. Um, the similarly, as with the inverter void structures, um, the solar panel, uh, structures, mounted power mounting structures. Um, will be clear span. Um, and should be allowing flood flows to continue, sort of as they would in as close as they would in the natural scenario, and allow any debris to continue to flow either through or around if there was some buildup.

01:24:42:02 - 01:24:44:00

So just to provide that context as well.

01:24:45:06 - 01:25:24:24

That's not the case. It in all locations, is it because you recognize that in some of the locations your panels are going to be within the water, and so it won't be just an open span frame? The panels would be creating a barrier that you need to consider. So you need to make sure that you do a full assessment

of the consequential effects of the work that you're proposing to undertake within the respective flood zones, and be clear on how that affects the water within the site.

01:25:24:26 - 01:25:30:09

Consequential effects beyond the site. And and.

01:25:32:27 - 01:26:07:03

If your view is that it wouldn't change the flow direction, then I need to understand how you come to that conclusion, bearing in mind that you are placing structures in the way of what. Otherwise there would be nothing there. And just. I'm not a water engineer, but it just seems to me hard to understand that it wouldn't have an effect to one degree or another, having a physical barrier, which

01:26:08:26 - 01:26:32:25

there will be potentially a large number of panels because 53% of your site is within the flood zone. Uh, I don't know. I can't think of the top of my head, the proportion of your panels that would be ultimately submerged. But you may be able to help us with that, but it's going to be quite a large volume, isn't it?

01:26:34:27 - 01:26:45:18

Based on part of the applicant. So is 3% of the total pannier panel areas that could be submerged in that design flood event, which is the 100 plus 39% climate change scenario.

01:26:46:12 - 01:26:49:00

But it's 3% of a very large number.

01:26:51:03 - 01:26:51:22

Yeah.

01:26:54:26 - 01:27:12:28

We look forward to your detailed submissions explaining and also from the Environment Agency, um, their detailed explanation and whether you're in agreement or not, so that we can understand where that's taking us. Thank you.

01:27:29:20 - 01:27:38:02

Moving on to item four. This part of the agenda. Um, and so on. If I start with the Mr. White.

01:27:44:10 - 01:27:48:01

Mr. white, is there something you need to raise on this?

01:27:50:25 - 01:28:22:19

Uh, yeah. I'm sorry. Uh, David White, representing say no action group and 95% of the community of North and South Clifton. Uh, I don't think we had a response to my, uh, question on the Environment Agency gate and the village of North Clifton barely hanging on, doing two recent flood events. The Environment Agency, um, recognizing the importance of these, uh, flood gates that they have to close during flood events. And, uh, about the panels, I don't think this was responded to when I put my question.

01:28:27:14 - 01:28:47:22

I don't think I would expect the applicant to respond on the location of panels adjacent to the reservoir. I think it's something they will take away and consider in light of the concerns you've expressed. But, um, just see if the Environment Agency would wish to say anything further in light of Mr. White's concern about the operation of the floodgates.

01:28:49:19 - 01:29:24:06

For the Environment Agency, and in terms of the operation of assets, we always ensure that any project that is going through, we try and uphold all access to all aspects and ensure that all emergency response is still going to be undertaken in the way it needs to be undertaken. Um, specifically in this area. Um, we are having discussions internally to ensure that access to all assets is upheld. I don't think we've had concerns about that before, and it's never been something that we have particularly been concerned by.

01:29:24:09 - 01:29:33:14

Um, I can take it away and I can talk to some of our asset people. So we have an asset team. I can talk to them just to double check with them, but it's never been a cause of concern before.

01:29:36:11 - 01:30:06:07

I'd appreciate if you did, because this issue was raised, um, at a previous hearing, and I think it has been part of some of the written submissions as well. And so I think that we did seek clarity from the applicant about the flood risk assessment, uh, recognizing the role of the flood gates. But again, it would be important for us to make sure that we have an understanding of the environment and agency's position on that.

01:30:06:20 - 01:30:20:05

So I can take that away and talk to our asset performance team to gain comment from them on it. And also, I can talk to our modelling specialists to ensure that the gates have been accurately represented in any model runs that have been presented.

01:30:21:06 - 01:30:22:00

Thank you,

01:30:23:21 - 01:30:27:11

Mr. White. Is that a legacy? Hand or have you come back here?

01:30:27:18 - 01:30:57:27

No. David White from the Zeno Action Group. 95% of communities of north and south Clifton. Yeah. I just wanted to thank you for the response from the Environment Agency. And also the point about the applicant will be looking at the field by the by the reservoir. And again, I want to stress, first of all, that Heather and Stephen Fox have, uh, the full support of uh, again, 95% of the communities of North and South Clifton, 95% plus.

01:30:57:29 - 01:31:32:07

So thank you to them. And these are very important points they're making, as you obviously recognize. Um, again, I want to stress, um, just 1 or 2% increase in flow into the village could push us over the edge. And Orsted have already been implicated in, uh, village, uh, floods on solar farms. I know, uh, you asked that the applicant didn't need to respond to those events, but there have been Orsted own solar farms that have caused flooding, and it's I just wanted to make that point.

01:31:32:09 - 01:31:33:03

Thank you.

01:31:36:04 - 01:31:42:13

Thank you. Um, I'll just come back to the applicant to see if there's any further response you'd wish to make.

01:31:44:04 - 01:32:17:09

It's come to the applicant. Um, no, sir. We don't have anything further to add. We've heard the comments, and Mr. Thwaites has indicated the areas that we're still working on with the EA. Um, there has been quite a bit of work done since the last hearings in terms of the sort of looking at the structural design of these structures and being able to confirm, um, impact on flood risk and floodplain storage based on the structures and um, and various other issues that were raised last time. And so we are um, and as the EA has mentioned, we're having positive discussions. So we will continue those ensuring we pick up the points that have been mentioned today.

01:32:18:01 - 01:32:18:25

Thank you.

01:32:23:12 - 01:32:59:01

Thank you. So moving on to the next part of the agenda. Um, and potential effects on drinking water and drinking water. Protected areas. Um, I'd like to start with the Environment Agency again, please. And, um, could you provide, uh, your assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development on drinking water supply, drinking water protected areas, and the suitability of mitigation measures through the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development? Thank you.

01:33:07:00 - 01:33:39:04

Hi, Lucy, for the Environment Agency. Um, so with regard to drinking water, um, so water sources used for drinking water supplies are currently protected under Water Framework Directive regulations to ensure that they aren't polluted. Um, and to minimize the need for additional, uh, purification treatment, which can obviously be recognised, be costly and resource intensive. Um, the Environment Agency is obviously supporting yourself, um, to recognize where there may be environmental risks.

01:33:39:06 - 01:34:11:10

Um, but ultimately it's down to kind of water companies to ensure compliance with drinking water directives. Um, and the priority Substance Directive, um, as regulated by the Drinking Water Inspectorate. Uh, with regard to the WFD kind of assessment, um, we are satisfied by that at the moment. There were a couple of changes that we suggested were being made to, uh, the construction environmental management plan and the same for the Operational and Decommissioning Environmental Management plan, um, that we've provided at the last deadline.



01:34:11:14 - 01:34:19:09

Um, and provided those are, uh, addressed, um, at the next point, which we're still kind of reviewing at the moment. Um, we're satisfied.

01:34:22:28 - 01:34:23:21

Thank you.

01:34:28:21 - 01:34:38:29

I'll just bring in Anglian Water. I think next on, on on this point, it's really a lot of comments that you have following your submissions at deadline too.

01:34:40:06 - 01:35:17:05

Um, no. I think just to reiterate what we had put in our response about, um, the the details aren't in the documents at the moment regarding management plans and that we would seek that there'd be more detail, which would give us more comfort, that, um, there wouldn't be sort of potential risks and, and pollutions, um, in the area of our sort of abstract, our abstraction location point and, um, yeah, the, the opportunity for us to, um, be consulted on those documents, um, further down the line.

01:35:19:05 - 01:35:23:26

That's great. Thank you. Um, yeah, we like to come back on that.

01:35:24:27 - 01:35:44:03

With the applicant. Um, I think we should be able to add and bin water as a consultant to those requirements. And I have seen that, um, submission from deadline to, um, you know, and, and we're obviously in discussions as well, so we can pick up the points in terms of any further revisions on the management plans that were mentioned.

01:35:47:06 - 01:35:47:29

Thank you.

01:35:51:09 - 01:35:52:12

Mr. Fox.

01:36:07:06 - 01:36:08:28

You put your microphone on, please.

01:36:10:14 - 01:36:21:09

The 2007 fluvial, fluvial and Fluvial flooding event and the 2013 tidal event are not referenced in the um fray.

01:36:22:27 - 01:36:33:24

Um, are we happy with the use of environment agencies, um, tolerances as a being allowed to

01:36:35:13 - 01:36:38:18

remove flood risk down to zero?

01:36:44:10 - 01:36:47:26

Thank you, Mr. White. Have you got an additional point?

01:36:57:09 - 01:37:29:13

Sorry. Excuse me. I have problems with the camera. Uh, David White, um, on the saying no to action Group representing 95% of the communities of north and South Clifton. Um, with regards to potential effect on drinking water. Um, we've been looking at, uh, obviously a lot of documents and in particular one dated 29th of July this year, the Environment Agency work package tracker, uh, many, many items not agreed with the developer. Uh, some of them are vitally important.

01:37:29:15 - 01:38:02:15

Uh, at one point the Environment Agency made was the fire fighting water containment. And online features associated with the best could cause contamination to the aquifer, which is obviously vitally important and concerning. And also, uh, with respect to underlying aquifers, presumed not to be connected to the extraction point which which again, is of some concern, um, because of the many, many items currently not agreed with the applicant, we wondered at what point they might be agreed.

01:38:03:09 - 01:38:31:23

Uh, we would have thought these are vital points. Is it usual that these aren't agreed at this stage? And if it is unusual, what are the delays and when will our communities have a chance to respond to these items? And I do apologize to everyone if some of these questions are a bit elongated, but please recognize where we are responding to the concerns of over 95% of people in these communities, which is well over 400 people.

01:38:35:11 - 01:38:40:08

Thank you, Mr. White. Um, I think I'll start with the applicant to respond first, please.

01:38:40:29 - 01:39:16:08

For the applicant, um, we've already indicated the positive discussions we're having with the EA, which the EA has confirmed as well. And we're aware of the the need to continue those to, um, to agree the outstanding items, to be fair to the EA as, as they've recognized as well. They only got the updated updated material addressing some of these points at deadline too. Um, so haven't had very long to look at them, but um, yes, as we've mentioned, as they've, um, recognized as well, we are progressing those discussions in a positive direction. Um, I'll ask Mr. Thwaites to comment on the Bess, which we've mentioned before, but I'll just get him to to cover that off.

01:39:17:07 - 01:40:01:06

Yeah. Craig Thwaites, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. The discussions around, um, firewater containment. Um, from the best, uh, areas has already been discussed in the previous, um, hearing. And we've provided responses, um, to written representations and relevant representations. Um, just to clarify and summarize again. Um, we are proposing, uh, an impermeable lining is provided beneath the best compound areas to prevent infiltration of any firewater. Runoff. Um, to the to the aquifer. Um, as part of the, uh, drainage strategy, we also are including an automatic penstock valve on the attenuation basin, which will be automatically triggered, um, if the fire in a fire event.

01:40:01:11 - 01:40:21:08

Um, I know that the Environment Agency have also made note of, uh, incorporating a manual, um, uh, a manual activation as well for just in case, sort of as a backup, um, which we can update within the, within the fray. Um, so, yeah, those measures, I think we've summarized them fairly clearly already.

01:40:23:08 - 01:40:47:18

Can you just. Um, I know we've moved on into the water, um, drinking water issue, but Mr. Fox did raise an additional point. Can you just respond to his concerns about the flood risk assessment and the tolerances that are included and the issue about the previous floods? Thank you.

01:40:47:24 - 01:41:18:13

Sure. Um, yes. Within the, uh, the flood risk assessment, we do have, uh, a figure illustrating where historic flooding has occurred. Um, we may have to relook, but we may not specifically mention the 2007 flood event. Um, but we can certainly review that in a minute detail and provide some further, information. We have responded as part of, I believe it was, uh, rep 1-131. Mr. Fox's written representation and our reference response is W.R. 71.

01:41:18:15 - 01:41:25:06

Um, I believe it's in there, um, relating to combined events with fluvial. Fluvial. Well.

01:41:27:18 - 01:41:32:05

Forgive me. Sorry. You may have to remind me just on the tolerance point, if you if you could reiterate the question.

01:41:32:17 - 01:41:34:21

But. Microphone. Mr. Fox, please.

01:41:35:17 - 01:41:40:19

Um, the tolerance points this that the you're wanting to use the, um.

01:41:43:16 - 01:42:14:06

The tolerance as a way of negating the actual increase in the actual loss of floodplain, um, or the storage and I, you know, if you if you if you keep doing that, we end up with a good, a nice flood and and if you're using a tolerance, it isn't zero, which I believe is required. You know, if there is still an increase in flood risk, irrespective of tolerance.

01:42:17:15 - 01:42:18:10

Mr. Thwaites.

01:42:20:21 - 01:42:54:25

Graduates on behalf of the applicant. I believe the tolerance being referred to is the five millimetres tolerance that has been agreed with the Environment Agency. Um, yes. So that is uh, has been referred to as sort of a relatively standard model tolerance. So on any Environment Agency model it could be plus or -five millimetres. Um, the, the discussions that have been had with the Environment Agency is

that, um, essentially if we're within that model tolerance, um, there will it's considered a negligible change. Um, and that's what's, that's what's, um, been updated within the flood risk assessment to refer to negligible.

01:42:54:27 - 01:42:55:27

But it's not zero.

01:42:56:23 - 01:42:58:27

Negligible is what I've referred to you.

01:43:00:29 - 01:43:02:01

Yeah. Microphone.

01:43:02:03 - 01:43:36:26

Mr. Fox, I think zero is what it's required on the comeback, on the um, in the response to my written representation, you stated that, um, um, the combination of both a fluvial and pluvial events are very rare. Well, we have 1 in 2007, and I thought flood risk assessments were meant to account for extreme, you know, extreme events. It isn't that extreme, really. It certainly didn't, uh, you know, it targets.

01:43:37:03 - 01:43:39:17

Yeah. Similarly with the tidal surge.

01:43:43:04 - 01:44:20:10

I think we have the point of concern or points of concern. I, I think it is a level of detail that, uh, a hearing struggles to, to manage. But I think we do need to get a clear, detailed response from the applicant and from the environment is because, um, we all need to have confidence that the flood risk assessment has been undertaken following best practice so that, uh, the information within it can be relied upon, uh, appropriately.

01:44:20:12 - 01:44:26:09

But also if there is a tolerance, as has been referenced, explaining

01:44:28:08 - 01:44:44:27

how that works and why there is a degree of flexibility. And, um, in this particular context, whether that tolerance is suitable in these specific circumstances.

01:44:46:15 - 01:44:47:10

Thank you.

01:44:47:28 - 01:45:21:29

Um, so we can definitely do that. I would just note on the negligible impact on slide risk. I mean, as soon as you have one panel in there, there is some very small negligible impact. So there is definitely in the decisions to date on solar. The most recent being um by Byers Gill. Um, even where there's negligible risk, that has still been found to be in compliance with the exception test in terms of no,

um, impact on flood risk in that sort of negligible situation. So we can also set that up, but appreciate we'll expand upon the EA tolerance and its application in this case as well.

01:45:23:18 - 01:45:33:22

Okay. Thank you. If you're going to make reference to bias Gil, then I think we'll need to understand the relative relationships between, uh,

01:45:35:12 - 01:45:59:20

the scale of, uh, the the size of the area that's in flood risk within that site, whether there's areas, um, that are at greater risk and so on. And bearing in mind we have areas where you're proposing panels that will be submerged, whether whether you're comparing an apple with an apple. In drawing.

01:45:59:22 - 01:46:09:14

Yes, that sounds good. And I think that probably comes in as well. And to your question around the, um, the use of the tolerance in the situation specifically to the circumstances here. Thanks.

01:46:09:20 - 01:46:10:14

Thank you.

01:46:26:15 - 01:46:32:02

If I can come back to Mr. White and then I'll come to the Environment Agency.

01:46:34:13 - 01:47:15:20

Thank you very much. David White, representing Senior Action Group and 95% of the communities of North and South Clifton. Uh, I just wanted to reiterate this, uh, to our containment, uh, item. That's part of the plans. Uh, communities, solar farms and councils and other interest groups are now saying because of real life situations, at two hours is simply not even close to what's required, which would involve firefighters having to make the choice between polluting the aquifer, possibly from with chemical runoff from any best fires, or

01:47:17:07 - 01:47:36:09

possibly allowing a realignment or a spread of a fire. I just wondered if the environment is in the app and the applicant can respond to this, and whether they truly believe, despite what all the others are saying, that a two hour firefighting window is suitable. Thank you.

01:47:39:04 - 01:47:42:01

Okay. Come now to the Environment Agency. Thank you.

01:47:44:27 - 01:48:14:01

Sean Holland for the Environment Agency. I'm aware we're kind of jumping around on a couple of different issues here. I just wanted to give a little bit of context for the tolerance discussion. And the Environment Agency does not have a set tolerance, and we do not have guidance that has a set tolerance in it, and tolerances are very much depending on the sites, the model, all of those elements. And we will give a full breakdown of this in written comment if the inspectorate would appreciate that.

01:48:14:14 - 01:48:16:29

Um, yeah. Yes we would. Thank you.

01:48:17:03 - 01:48:28:02

Yeah. It's it's not a kind of one. Tolerance is used for all sites and one tolerance is used as universal. It is much more nuanced than that.

01:48:31:02 - 01:48:44:27

Okay. It's helpful and look forward to seeing that written explanation as to, uh, how that particular element feeds into, um, the flood risk assessment for this case. Thank you.

01:48:52:25 - 01:49:04:23

And does the applicant wish to respond further to Mr. White's comment on the two hour window, or do you wish to respond in writing?

01:49:08:01 - 01:49:30:26

You and Sneddon for the applicant. Um. The two hour window comes from the National Fire Chiefs Council's guidance, um, for the fire water provision at utility scale best locations. Given that that's the guidance that we have, that's the minimum we would be providing. Um,

01:49:32:14 - 01:49:54:05

we are obviously still in discussions with the local fire services around the battery safety, uh, fire safety management plan. Um, and if the requirements change in future to have longer water storage durations, we would commit to provide that at the detailed design stage.

01:49:55:23 - 01:49:57:18

In terms of the fire spread,

01:49:59:09 - 01:50:23:01

there's outlined procedures within the FCC guidance around testing requirements for batteries, and we would also be using equipment that had been tested to that to ensure that fire doesn't spread from one container to another. Um, it's part of the established

01:50:24:18 - 01:50:54:11

requirement around how you space the best containers within the layout. I know there was some discussion yesterday around the size of the best compounds and where they are. Um, the reduction in spacing can be done based on a real life fire example, where they will basically put two containers next to each other and set one on fire to prove that it doesn't spread. To the container next to it.

01:50:57:16 - 01:51:03:05

Okay. Thank you. Um, Mr. White, you have your hand raised again.

01:51:05:19 - 01:51:08:22

Are you coming back on that point, or is this a new one?

01:51:08:29 - 01:51:10:27

No, I'm coming back on that point, if I may.

01:51:10:29 - 01:51:49:24

Again, I just I think we need to avoid the ping pong. Um, I think I would ask that you make your point clearly in the applicant then has the opportunity to respond. And if if you're not content with the response, then I think it's probably appropriate to follow that up in writing. So otherwise we're we're struggling to move through the agenda in a, in an efficient way. So, um, on this occasion, please make your point. But in future, can you make your point fully? And then the applicant can respond fully and we can then hopefully move through the agenda more efficiently.

01:51:49:26 - 01:51:50:19

Thank you.

01:51:51:12 - 01:52:35:22

I understand where you're coming from and again, I apologize if I'm causing delay. It's not deliberate. And again, we're representing hundreds of people here. And some of a lot of these people would expect me to make these points, if I may. I just wanted to make it a matter of public record that we're very concerned that the applicant is a is designing this around current rules, and they're not looking at real life situations and what is now starting to come out. And it does seem a case of in a lot of this situation where they're basically following the very minimum of standards and not considering, uh, findings that are currently being that are currently coming out and or concerns in all of the parties.

01:52:35:24 - 01:52:36:13

Thank you.

01:52:38:23 - 01:53:11:21

I think to be fair to the applicant, the answer that they gave previously did indicate that they would be keeping an eye on the latest standard. And as that if that was to change between now and the detailed design stage, they would seek to respond appropriately. So, um, I'm not sure that's a fair criticism, but, um, clearly we don't know whether that's going to change between now and the design, um, detail.

01:53:12:11 - 01:53:18:27

Um, so I don't know whether there's anything further you would wish to add, but, um, okay.

01:53:19:05 - 01:53:37:08

Um, no thank you. So you've covered the point, but I mean, in particular in relation to the best, the outlined battery safety management plan expressly says that it will comply with the most recent, you know, the most up to date guidance at the time. And there's definitely, um, across the whole scheme, no suggestion of in line with what Mr. White said. So I don't think I need to say much more on that.

01:53:38:14 - 01:53:39:15

Okay. Thank you.

01:53:42:24 - 01:53:46:24

Um, just coming up to 12:00. We're going. Going. Sorry,

01:53:48:11 - 01:53:56:15

I'm missing the hand. Sorry, Mr. Fox didn't see. Microphone I'm going to give your wife a ruler.

01:53:59:11 - 01:54:00:08

Strained yet?

01:54:01:05 - 01:54:21:15

It's taken 60 years. Um, the follow up on the point. It would be very helpful and avoid these questions at your meetings. If the written representations of members of the community were taken more seriously and answered um with consideration by the applicant.

01:54:25:22 - 01:54:28:09

Okay, well, I'm not sure I can respond.

01:54:28:11 - 01:54:51:15

Okay, just for clarity, if you count the number of times that they answer people's concerns on the consultation with exactly the same wording, totally neglecting all the substantial points, I'm not going back to consultation. It's the general point. The same applied to the written representations on flood risk. You know.

01:54:53:18 - 01:55:02:13

Well, I think I would pass that observation on to the applicant. And they can obviously consider how they wish to respond to in future.

01:55:04:03 - 01:55:29:09

Thank you. Um, we're obviously just coming up to 12:00, 5 to 12. We've been going for nearly two hours. It's probably sensible to have a bit of a break. Um, if we, uh, have 15 minutes. Is that sufficient for everyone? Um, on that basis, I think if we can return it 12:10. Um, so we're just to adjourn until then. Thank you.