Sheila and Jane Pumfrey Nov 12th 2025 (Fire and pollution concerns)

Fire risks and lack of clarity

Writing as concerned resident**s** of North Clifton.

We had hoped that a representative from our local action group, who was taking part in the open hearings on the 6th of November 2025, could present these concerns on our behalf. However, due to time constraints and the complexity of the issues involved, it has not been possible to do so. Therefore, as requested and agreed to on the day, we are submitting this statement in writing to ensure that our objections are formally recorded for the Planning Inspectorate's consideration.

As we know, our action group recently submitted Freedom of Information requests to both Notts and Lincs Fire and Rescue Services and have additional written directly to both Fire Chiefs. Yet, although being submitted on the 10th of October, we have only just received replies to the FOIs, stating that both services need a further 20 days to respond, and I understand we are awaiting reply from the fire chiefs themselves (the fire chief letters were sent out on the 31st of October).

The Environment Agency has been telling us what the Fire Services *will* do, but we have not heard directly from the Fire Services themselves. This lack of clarity is concerning. We have also been unable to locate any formal submissions from either Fire Service on the NSIP website. If they exist, we would appreciate clear direction to where they can be found.

We are told there is a "two-hour fire-fighting run-off capacity." However, this figure is vague and potentially misleading — described as two hours at 1,900 litres per minute, yet a single modern fire tender can discharge roughly double that rate. This raises serious questions about whether the stated containment capacity is sufficient in the event of a major fire, and there are many instances of fire services and health and safety groups issuing guidance that clearly states otherwise.

Furthermore, it appears that Fire Services – despite us thinking this was a requirement - are not recording — or at least not publishing — **data on the amount of water or foam used** in large-scale incidents. We have examined reports from **other significant BESS fires**, such as the Essex case, and this lack of transparency is deeply concerning.
Reference: Essex Fire Service, EIR 1769 / March 2025 / Incident 265149 BESS. Quote: "During the incident, the firefighting tactics employed would have been intermittent (the application of water only being used when required to protect the risk) therefore **it would not be possible to provide an exact volume of water used**"

ALSO: In response the applicants response of D3 submissions ExQR28, Q1.0.19. "The UK Health Security Agency has also undertaken a review of the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan and concluded that as it is; a rural site, there are a limited number of residential receptors nearby and within the modelled hydrogen fluoride (HF) plume area, it is anticipated that the public health impacts from a controlled burn approach would probably be low"

Q. Can the applicant confirm that the UKHSA were made aware that the BESS is in a drinking water protected area and 92 PCS units are located in flood zones (16 flood zone 2, 76 flood zone 3)

Finally, when the suitability of the Eastern BESS site is questioned, in response to our last questions, the developers reassure us that prevailing winds blow from the West – so not towards the nearby reservoir. Apart from this very obvious overly simplistic view, after reviewing detailed weather data, we can confirm that winds blow from the East approximately 9% of the time. Are we truly prepared to rely on the wind blowing from the “right” direction for such an important issue of public safety? We believe this to be an inadequate and dangerous assumption.

In summary, the lack of direct engagement from the Fire Services, the ambiguity around fire-water containment, and the questionable reliance on weather patterns all point to a troubling gap in preparedness and risk assessment for this project.

Thank you, Jane and Sheila Pumfrey