

Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Volume 4 – Technical Appendices

Technical Appendix A9.1 – Flood Risk Assessment

Document reference – EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1

Revision number 1

June 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Contents

A9.1.1	Introduction	3
A9.1.1.1	Background.....	3
A9.1.1.2	Methodology	3
A9.1.1.3	Guidance and Legislation.....	5
A9.1.1.4	Site Characteristics	6
A9.1.1.5	Flood Classification.....	7
A9.1.1.6	Flood Defences.....	10
A9.1.1.7	Pluvial Flooding	10
A9.1.1.8	Reservoir Flooding.....	17
A9.1.1.9	Flood History.....	18
A9.1.1.10	Flood Studies.....	21
A9.1.1.11	Tidal Trent.....	22
A9.1.1.12	Fluvial Trent.....	24
A9.1.1.13	River Greet	28
A9.1.2	Flood Risk Assessment	36
A9.1.2.1	Tidal.....	36
A9.1.2.2	Fluvial	37
A9.1.2.3	Pluvial	46
A9.1.2.4	Groundwater	52
A9.1.2.5	Reservoirs.....	53
A9.1.2.6	Sequential Test and Exception Test.....	53
A9.1.3	Solar PV Surface Water Management	56
A9.1.3.1	Construction Phase.....	56
A9.1.3.2	Operational Phase	58
A9.1.4	Work Area 5a: BESS Surface Water Management.....	66
A9.1.4.1	Fire Suppression.....	67
A9.1.4.2	Fire Suppressant Volume.....	68
A9.1.5	Work Area 5b: 400 kV Substation.....	68
A9.1.6	Work Area 4: substations Surface Water Management	69
A9.1.7	Conclusions & Recommendations	71
Appendix A: EA Correspondence.....		73
Appendix B: Infiltration Testing		74
Appendix C: Sequential Test.....		75

A9.1.1 INTRODUCTION

A9.1.1.1 BACKGROUND

- 1 This Technical Appendix (TA) presents the assessment of Flood Risk and surface water run-off management. This Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of an Environmental Statement for a solar PV (the Development) located on land to the northwest of Newark, in the Newark and Sherwood district, Nottinghamshire, East Midlands, which comprise the Order Limits.
- 2 The Order Limits form the Core Study Area (CSA) for this assessment.
- 3 The areas within the CSA are described in ES Chapter 5, Development Description, [EN010162/APP/6.2.5] as being one of the following areas:
 - Work Area 1: Solar PV;
 - Work Area 2: Cables;
 - Work Area 3: Mitigation/enhancement;
 - Work Area 4: Intermediate substations;
 - Work Area 5a: BESS;
 - Work Area 5b: 400 kV Substation;
 - Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation and connection point;
 - Work Area 7: Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection; and
 - Work Area 8: Access Works.
- 4 The layout of the above areas, including field numbers, is shown on ES Figure 5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.3.5.1].
- 5 Following consultee feedback, the following changes to the Development layout have occurred:
 - Removal of Work Area 1 in Fields 16, 19, 20 - 30, 45 and 58;
 - Reduction in extent of Work Area 1 in Fields 0, 7, 13, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42-47, 49, 51 - 53, 55 - 57 and 59;
 - Removal of sections of Work Area 2;
 - Removal of one substation in Work Area 4; and
 - Reduction in the Order Limits.
- 6 The Order Limits are located wholly within the administrative area of Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC).
- 7 Due to the rural setting in which the Order Limits are located, flooding from artificial sources (e.g., highways drainage) has been scoped out of the assessment.

A9.1.1.2 METHODOLOGY

- 8 Flood risk will be classed as Negligible (where little or no risk is identified), Low (where theoretical risk is identified but mitigating factors may influence flood levels) or Moderate to High (where modelled levels or historical events show risk to the Work Areas)).
- 9 Several factors will be considered when attributing the residual risk of flooding to the Development, including:
 - The depth of flooding;

- The hazard to life during flood water ingress;
 - The velocity of floodwater;
 - Flooding extent / ingress;
 - Type of infrastructure affected; and
 - Intervening structures / flood protection.
- 10 The conclusion section of this FRA provides justification for the risk category using professional judgement and experience of assessing similar types of projects / scenarios.

A9.1.1.2.1 Study Area

- 11 The Core Study Area is defined by the Order Limits. The Wider Study Area (WSA) is defined as a 5 km buffer of the Order Limits.
- 12 Where figures within this FRA show the CSA, this also refers to the Order Limits.

A9.1.1.2.2 Climate Change Allowances

A9.1.1.2.2.1 Fluvial

- 13 As the Development is Essential Infrastructure in Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification - Guidance to the NPPF¹ and will have a lifespan of 40 years (anticipated to be decommissioned from 2069) the Development is required by the Environment Agency (EA) Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances guidance² to account for a 23 % climate change (CC) allowance (Higher Central) for the 2050s epoch (2040-2069) for the Lower Trent and Erewash Management Catchment³.
- 14 Where fluvial modelling indicates that the required 23 % CC allowance is not available, then a higher proxy value will be used.
- 15 The Development has also been assessed against the Higher CC allowance of 38 % for the 2050s epoch as a validation check.

A9.1.1.2.2.2 Tidal

- 16 A 39 % CC (2050s epoch) allowance has been used to assess tidal flooding, while a 62 % CC allowance (2080s epoch) has been used as a validation check.

A9.1.1.2.2.3 Pluvial

- 17 The Lower Trent and Erewash Management Catchment peak rainfall Central Allowance of 25 % for the 2070s epoch will be used to assess pluvial flooding.

A9.1.1.2.2.4 SuDS

- 18 Whilst the Lower Trent and Erewash Management Catchment peak rainfall Central Allowance of 25 % for the 2070s epoch is required by the EA,

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/annex-3-flood-risk-vulnerability-classification>

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>

³ <https://environment-test.data.gov.uk/hydrology/climate-change-allowances/river-flow?mgmtcatid=3052>

consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) highlighted that a 40 % CC allowance should be used where possible.

- 19 As such, a 40 % CC allowance will be used for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) structures such as those which will serve Work Area 5a, BESS, and 5b, 400 kV Compound.

A9.1.1.3 GUIDANCE AND LEGISLATION

- 20 This document is intended to meet the requirements of:

- The EA⁴;
- National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1⁵;
- NPS for Renewable Energy EN-3⁶;
- NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure EN-5⁷;
- Nottinghamshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) 2021-2027⁸;
- NSDC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Update (2016)⁹;
- The NSDC ENV 13 SFRA Level 1 Refresh (September 2023)¹⁰;
- National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) – Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS;
- NFCC – Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS – July 2024 Update¹¹;
- The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems¹²; and
- The revised National Planning Policy Framework 2024 ('NPPF')¹³.

- 21 As outlined in NPS EN-1 (paragraph 5.8.15) the minimum requirements for FRAs are that they should be proportionate to the risk and appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the project. Importantly, this FRA should identify and secure opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding overall during the period of construction.

- 22 Throughout the early stages of the Development, design opportunities to identify existing pluvial flow pathways and extensive consultation with communities affected by pluvial flooding has been undertaken, with a view to identifying positive interventions to reduce the existing impacts of prolonged or intense rainfall events.

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice>

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1>

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5>

⁸ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/4346719/nottinghamshire-local-flood-risk-mangement-strategy-2021-27.pdf>

⁹ <https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/sfraupdate/>

¹⁰ https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/SFRA_Level_1_P04.pdf

¹¹ <https://nfcc.org.uk/>

¹² <https://www.nfpa.org/codes-and-standards/all-codes-and-standards/list-of-codes-and-standards/detail?code=855>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

A9.1.1.4 SITE CHARACTERISTICS

- 23 The Order Limits are shown on ES Figure 5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.3.5.1] as being to the west of the A1, north of the A617, east of Eakring, south of Egmonton, and to the north and north-west of Staythorpe. The Development essentially consists of discrete land parcels proposed to be occupied by solar PV panels and connected by cable route areas. The eastern side of the Development runs from the north of North Muskham to Egmonton in the north. The western side of the Development runs north-west from National Grid Staythorpe Substation and then splits at Maplebeck, with spurs running to Eakring in the north-west and Kneesall to the north-northeast, then connecting with the eastern side of the Development.
- 24 The CSA is generally in arable use, interspersed with woodland and some minor areas of pastoral use, as shown in Plate A9.1.1.


Plate A9.1.1: Greenfield areas - arable conditions west of Maplebeck



- 25 1 m resolution Lidar data¹⁴ shows that land within the CSA is generally gently sloping, with elevations from 6.85 m AOD in the west to 92.43 m AOD in the east, as shown in Plate A9.1.2.

¹⁴ <https://environment.data.gov.uk/survey>

Plate A9.1.2: Topography within the CSA




A9.1.1.5 FLOOD CLASSIFICATION

- 26 The EA Flood Map for Planning (2025)¹⁵ shows that the CSA is mostly located in Flood Zone (FZ) 1 (89.99 %), while 10.01 % lies in FZ 2 and FZ 3, as shown in Plate A9.1.3.


¹⁵ <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>

Plate A9.1.3: Flood Zones 2025



- 27 The following Work Areas are located outside FZ 2, FZ 3 and the future floodplain:
- Work Area 1: Solar PV (based on illustrative design);
 - Work Area 4: Intermediate Substations;
 - Work Area 5a: BESS; and
 - Work Area 5b: 400 kV substation.
- 28 As identified in the SFRA, minor areas of the CSA are located within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b), specifically Work Area 3: Mitigation, Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation and connection point, Work Area 7: Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection and Work Area 8: Access, as shown in Plate A9.1.4.


Plate A9.1.4: Flood Zone 3b (reproduced from SFRA)



- 29 The NaFRA2 dataset¹⁶ includes the 3.33 % AEP Defended CCP1 outline as the future functional floodplain, with the extents being very similar to the SFRA functional floodplain and is shown in Plate A9.1.4a.

¹⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/updates-to-national-flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-information>

Plate A9.1.4a: 3.33 % AEP Defended CCP1 Extents




- 30 No Solar PV or new aboveground ancillary infrastructure will be located in the functional or future floodplain.

A9.1.1.6 FLOOD DEFENCES

- 31 Existing flood defences are located adjacent to the River Trent and River Greet and are shown on Plate A9.1.5 and in Appendix A (EA Consultation).

Plate A9.1.5: Existing Flood Defences



- 32 The left (west) bank of the River Trent is flanked by embankments and naturally high ground which have a Standard of Protection between 1:2 and 1:10 (50 % annual exceedance probability (AEP) and 10 % AEP)¹⁷.
- 33 The operational National Grid Staythorpe Substation (Work Area 6) has a private flood defence scheme, which comprises 'hard' engineered walls and 'soft' spoil embankments to a level of 13.10 m AOD, as part of NSDC planning application 14/00091/ELE¹⁸.
- 34 The EA Asset Management Database¹⁹ shows that the defences adjacent to the River Trent have not been accounted for in the Flood Map for Planning.

A9.1.1.7 PLUVIAL FLOODING

- 35 The Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances Guidance (Environment Agency 2022)²⁰ state that 'for modelling large areas (larger than 5 square kilometres) with rural land use, direct rainfall modelling is unlikely to be appropriate'. As such, the initial constraints process used the best available dataset, which is the EA pluvial flood depth datasets (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 2025), which do not apply a CC allowance, as shown in Plate A9.1.6.


¹⁷ <https://environment.data.gov.uk/asset-management/index.html>

¹⁸ <https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=MZPFZLB08200>

¹⁹ <https://environment.data.gov.uk/asset-management/index.html>



²⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>



Plate A9.1.6: 1 % AEP Pluvial Flood Extents




36 Depths are shown in Plate A9.1.7 for specific areas of the CSA.

Plate A9.1.7: 1 % AEP Flood Depths (EA – RoFSW 2025)







- 37 Pluvial flood depths and flow routes at Calton-on-Trent (amongst other locations) have been verified by direct rainfall method (DRM) 2D pluvial flood modelling in Flood Modeller Pro using the parameters outlined in Table A9.1.1.

Table A9.1.1: 2D Pluvial Flood Model Parameters – Carlton-on-Trent

Return Period	1 % AEP
Storm Duration	3 hours
Season	Summer
FEH Rainfall Design Depth	55.314 mm
Rural runoff	55 %
CC Allowance – Central 2070s²¹	25 %
Drainage / Infiltration Allowance (0 or 12 mm)	0 mm ²²
Manning's n Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodplain - mature row crops²³: 0.035; • Roads: 0.01; • Buildings: 0.01; and • Woodland: 0.1.
Model Timestep	0.5 second
Grid Resolution	2 m
Height Data	1 m LiDAR, 2022
Data Stamping (OS MasterMap)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings – Raise +2 m; and • Roads – Depress -0.1 m.
Mass Error	0.0 %
Largest Courant (Cr) Value	3.5

³⁸ Storm durations used in modelling reflect the nature of the catchment assessed. As the CSA is predominantly rural, the peak 1 % AEP event has been assessed in accordance with the parameters outlined within the Table in Section 4.2.1 of the EA's *What is the Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map?* Report (version 2.0 April 2019).

³⁹ An Active area for the 2D domain was chosen based on the area of interest, i.e., areas modelled to flood on the EA's pluvial flood depth datasets (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Depth).

⁴⁰ Outputs from Flood Modeller, using the Alternating Direction Implicit (ADI) solver on a 2 m grid resolution, show a good correlation with the EA's modelling (also see Plate A9.1.7) for the area upslope of Carlton-on-Trent, as shown in Plate A9.1.8.

²¹ <https://environment-test.data.gov.uk/hydrology/climate-change-allowances/rainfall?mgmtcatid=3052>

²² Monte Carlo approach used to derive the national default 12 mm per hour drainage rate value disappplied due to rural catchment

²³ Manning's n for Channels (Chow, 1959)

Plate A9.1.8: 1 % AEP Flood Depths – Raincloud 2D Modelling





Plate A9.1.8: 1 % AEP Flood Depths – EA 2025 model



A9.1.1.8 RESERVOIR FLOODING


- 41 The eastern section of the CSA is modelled to flood should there be a breach in the retaining walls of the reservoirs outlined upstream of the CSA, specifically those identified in Table A9.1.2.

Table A9.1.2: Reservoirs which could affect the CSA in a breach event

Reservoir name	Approx. Distance to CSA
Blithfield	75 km south west
Carsington	45 km west
Derwent	59 km north west
Foremark	51 km south west
Howden	59 km north west
Ladybower	48 km north west


- 42 The extent of reservoir flooding which interacts with the CSA largely follows the corridor of the River Trent. The Fluvial Contribution and Wet Day scenarios are shown in Plate A9.1.9.

Plate 9.1.9: Reservoir Flood Extents



- 43 Should there be a breach of reservoir retaining walls when river levels are within normal range, then only a very minor area of the CSA, in proximity to Work Area 7, Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection, is modelled to be within the flood extent, as shown in Plate A9.1.10.

Plate A9.1.10: Reservoir flood extents – Dry Dy Scenario



- 44 The SFRA identifies reservoirs within the administrative area of the LLFA and these are noted to be downstream of the CSA, and are listed in Table A9.1.3.

Table A9.1.3: Reservoirs downstream of the CSA

Reservoir name	Approx. distance to CSA	Catchment
Ash Buffer Lagoon, Besthorpe	3.1 km east	River Trent
Rufford Lake	4.1 km west	River Maun
Sherwood Forest Lake	4.8 km west	River Maun
South Farm Reservoir 1	10.2 km north west	River Maun
South Farm Reservoir 2	10.2 km north west	River Maun
Thoresby Lake (Upper)	11.2 km north west	River Maun
Thoresby Lake	11.1 km north west	River Maun



A9.1.1.9 FLOOD HISTORY

- 45 Anecdotal evidence suggests that the eastern section of the CSA has previously flooded from fluvial sources, principally the River Trent.
- 46 The EA historic flood outline dataset also indicates that the CSA has previously flooded, as shown in Plate A9.1.11.

[illegible]

- Page 19

Plate A9.1.12: Recent Flood Outlines



- 48 From public feedback, attendance at Parish Council meetings and NCC's Section 19 reports (reports which investigate significant flood events), it is evident that areas surrounding the CSA have previously flooded from pluvial sources, with the following communities affected:
- Maplebeck²⁴;
 - Sutton-on-Trent^{25,26};
 - Carlton-on-Trent²⁷;
 - Weston; and
 - Caunton²⁸.
- 49 2D direct rainfall modelling has been undertaken for this FRA in Flood Modeller to verify surface water flow pathways and predict flood depths during a range of storm return periods for several communities in proximity to the CSA.
- 50 The area around Maplebeck was initially investigated as an area of concern following feedback from the Parish Council regarding the existing pluvial flood risk and the effects of Storm Babet (October 2023).
- 51 The Flood Modelling exercise for Maplebeck is discussed in Section A9.1.3.2 of this FRA.

A9.1.1.10 FLOOD STUDIES

- 52 Following feedback received from the EA during the Scoping stage, outputs from a number of flood studies within the Wider Study Area were obtained, including:
- Tidal Trent, Jacobs, (2023);
 - Trent and Tributaries at Newark SFRM2 (2011);
 - Halcrow, July 2011 plus the EA climate change (2020 rerun);
 - Mill Dam Dyke, Tidal Trent Tributaries, Jeremy Benn Associates (JBA) (2022);
 - River Greet, Nottingham Tributaries SFRM, JBA (2014);
 - River Maun at Mansfield, HR Wallingford (2021); and
 - Slough Dyke, Tidal Trent Tributaries, JBA (2022).
- 53 Outputs from the River Maun, Slough Dyke and Mill Dam Dyke do not encroach on the CSA and are therefore not discussed further within this FRA.

²⁴ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/fbznep5u/maplebeck-s19-storm-babet-oct-2023.pdf>

²⁵ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/vvhcdwlc/sutton-on-trent-s19-storm-babet-oct-2023.pdf>

²⁶ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/1529265/suttonontrentsection19flooding.pdf>


²⁷ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/1494226/carlton-on-trent-section-19-report.pdf>

²⁸ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/yqjcqi1z/caunton-s19-storm-babet-oct-2023.pdf>

A9.1.1.11 TIDAL TRENT


- 54 Outputs from the Tidal Trent, Jacobs, (2023) Flood Study show that the extents for the tidally dominated 0.5 % AEP 2021 (Upper End) scenario do not encroach upon the CSA, as shown in Plate A9.1.13.

Plate A9.1.13: Tidally Dominated 0.5 % AEP 2121 (Upper End) scenario




- 55 The fluvially dominated 1 % AEP + 39 % CC (2050s epoch) and 62 % CC (for the 2080s epoch (2070 – 2125)) defended scenario outputs show that a minor section of Work Area 3, Mitigation / Enhancement, shown to be diverse grassland on the Sitewide Plan of the LEMP, would flood to a depth of 0.6 m, as shown in Plate A9.1.14.

Plate A9.1.14: Fluvially Dominated 1 % AEP + 62 % CC scenario



- 56 No other work areas are located in the fluvially dominated 1 % AEP + 62 % CC defended scenario extent.
- 57 The Combined Breach of defences outline shows that whilst several breach scenarios marginally encroach upon the eastern section of the CSA, no flood outline extends into any of Work Area other than Work Area 3, Mitigation / Enhancement, proposed to be diverse grassland, as shown in Plate A9.1.15.


Plate A9.1.15: Combined Tidal Breach Outline



A9.1.1.12 FLUVIAL TRENT


- 58 Outputs from the Trent and tributaries at Newark SFRM2 Flood Study show that the extents of the 1 % AEP event do not encroach upon the Solar PV area (Work Area 1) and marginally encroaches on the Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection (Work Area 7) and National Grid Substation Connection Point (Work Area 6) as shown on Plate A9.1.16.

Plate A9.1.16: 1 % AEP – River Trent



- 59 As the Development will have an operational life of 40 years the Development is required to be assessed against the 1 % AEP + 23 % CC allowance in accordance with 2050s Higher Central allowance for the Lower Trent and Erewash Management Catchment. In the absence of a modelling study incorporating a 23 % CC allowance the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC event has been used as a proxy and the extents encroach further into the eastern section of the CSA and specifically into Work Area 3, Mitigation / Enhancement, Work Area 6, National Grid Staythorpe Substation, and Work Area 7, Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection compared to the 1 % AEP as shown in Plate A9.1.17.


Plate: A9.1.17: 1 % AEP + 30 % CC – River Trent



- 60 Work Area 1 (Solar PV Area) has been designed to avoid the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC extent, based on the illustrative design.

Plate 9.1.18, shows that new above ground development in Work Areas 1 and 4 (e.g. Solar PV, substations etc.) have been located outside the 1 % AEP 2036-2069 flood extent.

Plate 9.1.18: 1 % AEP Defended Extents (CCP1)




- 61 The Canal and River Trust are currently in the process of building two variable height weir structures at points along the River Trent, with these being used to generate hydroelectric power. Hydroelectric schemes will have a failsafe whereby the weir can be lowered during flooding events, and therefore the schemes should have no impact on flooding to the

Development. This failsafe mechanism means the weirs pose no flood risk to the Development and are not considered further within this FRA.

A9.1.1.13 RIVER GREET


- 62 The Flood Map for Planning shows that the eastern access track to the BESS/400 kV Compound (Work Area 5a and 5b) borders Flood Zone 2 and 3, as shown in Plate A9.1.19.

Plate A9.1.19: Flood Zones in south of CSA



- 63 Outputs from the River Greet Flood Study (JBA 2014) and the River Greet Climate Change Scenarios, (EA 2021) show that the 1 % AEP, 1 % AEP + 50 % CC and the 0.1 % AEP events only encroach upon the southern section of the CSA, specifically the Consented Staythorpe BESS (Work Area 6) and National Grid Substation Point of Connection (Work Area 7), but does not encroach upon the Solar PV Arrays (Work Area 1), Intermediate Substations (Work Area 4) and BESS (Work Area 5a), as shown in Plate A9.1.20.


Plate A9.1.20: Modelled River Greet Flood Extents – JBA 2014 and EA 2021



- 64 As such the discrepancy between the pre-NaFRA2 Flood Map for Planning and the outputs from the River Greet flood studies was queried with the EA who responded stating *“We are sorry that we cannot explain why Flood Zone 3 is of a lesser extent than the 2004 1 % AEP JFLOW outline to the north west of Averham. Flood Zone 3 in the wider area has utilised part of the River Greet 2008 model but this is of a smaller extent than the current Flood Zone 3 as shown below (Flood Zone 3 in darker blue and the 1% AEP 2008 River Greet model in lighter blue). The Flood Zone outline does not align to a modelled outline or recorded flood outline. The Flood Zones in this area were last updated in 2014 and unfortunately our records do not answer your question.”* (see Appendix A).
- 65 Following a meeting with the EA, it was suggested that whilst the source of the discrepancy could not be fully ascertained, the source of flooding could possibly be attributed to flood waters from Car Dyke / Pingley Dyke. To verify this Raincloud undertook a 1D-2D linked hydrological model of the watercourse in 2024, derived from LiDAR. The model was updated in March 2025 to include a culvert carrying the A617, following consultation comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) from the EA.
- 66 The culvert was surveyed on 28th March 2025 by Greenhatch Group and is shown in Plate A9.1.21.



A photograph of a small stream flowing through a wooded area. The stream is surrounded by trees and dense vegetation, with a large tree trunk visible on the left bank. The water is dark and reflects the surrounding foliage.

Plate A9.1.22: Car / Pingely Dyke – Model Cross Sections



- 68 The culvert has been modelled using the following parameters which are derived from survey:

1D Embedded Structure Editor

	Id	Name	Node 1	Node 2	Structure Type	Sub type	Length	Include bend	Invert drop	Edit	Distribution Factor
▶	0	CulvertMar25_FromSur...	0.ci	0.cond.DS	Culvert	... Circular	30	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.240	 	1 ▼

CONDUIT CIRCULAR: 0.cond.US

Node Label

0.cond.US

Comment :


Geometry


Distance to Next Conduit: Elevation Of Invert: Diameter:

Friction

Equation: Value Below Axis: Value Above Axis:

Table A9.1.4: 1D-2D modelling parameters

Return Period	1 % AEP
Storm Duration	43 hours
Season	Summer
FEH Hydrograph	<div>  <p>The hydrograph plots show the simulation results for a 1% AEP event. The 'Total Flows' plot indicates a peak inflow of 16.0 m³/s and a peak outflow of 15.8 m³/s, occurring around 21.5 hours. The 'Model Convergence' plot shows that the simulation converged successfully for all timesteps.</p> </div> <pre> Datafile: ...014_GNR\FM\CARDYKE\NETWORK\CARDYKE_1AEP.DAT Results: ...FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP.zzn Ran at 21:02:40 on 30/08/2024 Ended at 21:03:46 on 30/08/2024 Start Time: 0.000 hrs End Time: 43.000 hrs Timestep: 1.0 secs Current Model Time: 43.00 hrs Percent Complete: 100 % Simulation time elapsed (s): 40 run completed Number of unconverged timesteps: 0 Proportion of simulation unconverged: 0.00% ***** Mass balance summary ***** Mass balance calculated every 300.0s Initial volume: 5495.73 m3 Final volume: 26133.9 m3 ----- Total boundary inflow : 0.131259E+07m3 Total boundary outflow : 0.129184E+07m3 Total lat. link inflow : 0.00000 m3 Total lat. link outflow: 0.00000 m3 ----- Max. system volume: 108661. m3 Max. volume increase: 103165. m3 Max. boundary inflow: 16.0460 m3/s Max. boundary outflow: 15.7780 m3/s ----- Net increase in volume: 20638.2 m3 Net inflow volume: 20754.2 m3 Volume discrepancy: 116.078 m3 Mass balance error: -0.11% (of peak system volume) Mass balance error [2]: -0.01% (of boundary inflow volume) ***** End mass balance summary ***** Writing binary results to D:\Raincloud\Projects\014_GNR\FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP.zzn outputting max/min/means to D:\Raincloud\Projects\014_GNR\FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP.mmm Convergence plot saved to D:\Raincloud\Projects\014_GNR\FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP_005.bmp </pre> <p>Peak flow: 16.046 m³/s</p>

<p>CC Allowance – Central 2080s</p> <p>39 %</p>	 <p>Datafile: ...FM\CARDYKE\NETWORK\CARDYKE_1AEP_39CC.DAT Results: ...FM\CARDYKE\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP_39CC.zzn Ran at 21:07:40 on 30/08/2024 Ended at 21:08:45 on 30/08/2024 Start Time: 0.000 hrs End Time: 43.000 hrs Timestep: 1.0 secs</p> <p>Current Model Time: 43.00 hrs Percent Complete: 100 %</p> <pre> Simulation time elapsed (s): 39 run completed Number of unconverged timesteps: 0 Proportion of simulation unconverged: 0.00% ***** Mass balance summary ***** Mass balance calculated every 300.0s Initial volume: 5495.73 m3 Final volume: 38922.9 m3 ----- Total boundary inflow : 0.182412E+07m3 Total boundary outflow : 0.179063E+07m3 Total lat. link inflow : 0.00000 m3 Total lat. link outflow: 0.00000 m3 ----- Max. system volume: 156777. m3 Max. [volume] increase: 151282. m3 Max. boundary inflow: 22.3040 m3/s Max. boundary outflow: 22.1705 m3/s ----- Net increase in volume: 33427.2 m3 Net inflow volume: 33491.1 m3 Volume discrepancy: 63.9531 m3 Mass balance error: -0.04% (of peak system volume) Mass balance error [2]: -0.00% (of boundary inflow volume) ***** End mass balance summary ***** Writing binary results to D:\Raincloud\Projects\014_GNR\FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP_39CC.zzn outputting max/min/means to D:\Raincloud\Projects\014_GNR\FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP_39CC.mmm Convergence plot saved to D:\Raincloud\Projects\014_GNR\FM\CarDyke\1D\1D_CARD_UNSTEADY_1AEP_39CC_003.bmp </pre> <p>Peak flow: 22.304 m³/s</p>
<p>Boundaries</p>	<p>Upstream: QT Downstream: Normal Depth</p>

Drainage / Infiltration Allowance (0 or 12 mm)	0 mm ²⁹ (Green-Ampt not applied)
Manning's n Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Floodplain - mature row crops³⁰: 0.035 Channel - clean, straight, full stage, no rifts or deep pools: 0.03
Model Timestep	1 second
Grid Resolution	2 m
Height Data	1 m LiDAR, 2022
Data Stamping (OS MasterMap)	None
1D Mass Error	0.11 %
Largest Courant (Cr) Value	2.4

⁶⁹ Flood extents from the initial analysis show a good correlation with the outputs from the NaFRA2 data (see Plate A9.1.19), whereby the embankment on the south side of A617 Road acts as a topographical barrier to flood flows, with flows constricted north via the culvert under the A617, as shown in Plate A9.1.23 and A9.1.24.

²⁹ Monte Carlo approach used to derive the national default 12 mm per hour drainage rate value disappplied due to rural catchment

³⁰ Manning's n for Channels (Chow, 1959)

Plate A9.1.23: 1 % AEP outputs from 2025 1D-2D linked modelling





Plate A9.1.24: 1 % AEP + 39 % CC outputs from 2025 1D-2D linked modelling



- 70 Flood extents for the 1 % AEP and 1 % AEP +39 % CC do not encroach into Work Areas 5a or 5b.

A9.1.2 FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

A9.1.2.1 TIDAL

- 71 Outputs from the Tidal Trent 2023 flood model (see section 1.10) show that the CSA would not flood during both the 0.5 % AEP (2121 UE scenario) with defences in place and 0.5 % AEP flood defence breach scenarios, ensuring the Development would be safe for its lifetime (40 years, through to 2067 from the assumed commission date of 2027).
- 72 The fluvially dominated 1 % AEP + 62 % CC defended scenario outputs show that a minor section of Work Area 3, Mitigation/Enhancement (Fields 18 and 390) would flood to a depth of 0.6 m.
- 73 Works Area 3, Mitigation/Enhancement, will comprise grassland in the affected area. As such, the minor area located in the tidal flood extent is compatible with the EA's "Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk 2024" Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) research report³¹.
- 74 No other Work Area is located within the tidal flood extents of the River Trent.

³¹ https://www.gov.uk/flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-research-reports/working-with-natural-processes-to-reduce-flood-risk-2024?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=govuk-notifications-topic&utm_source=a06ab0c7-b939-430c-a4b4-14734d0c1c23&utm_content=weekly

- 75 As such, the risk of the Development flooding from tidal sources is Negligible.

A9.1.2.2 FLUVIAL

- 76 Work Area 1: Solar PV, based on the illustrative layout, is located outside Flood Zones 2 and 3.
- 77 Regardless, flood zones do not account for CC and as such, each source of flooding is assessed in the following sections in accordance with the NPPF and NPS documents.
- 78 As the Development is Essential Infrastructure and will have a lifespan of 40 years (anticipated to be decommissioned from the end of 2069) the Development is required to account for a 23 % CC allowance for the 2050s epoch (2040-2069) for the Lower Trent and Erewash Management Catchment.


A9.1.2.2.1 River Trent (Fluvial)

- 79 As shown in Plate A9.1.4, the only aspect of the Development located within the 1 % AEP flood extents of the River Trent is Work Area 3, Mitigation / Enhancement, which will comprise grassland, scrub, scattered trees and an orchard. As such, this is compatible with the EA's "Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk 2024" FCERM report.
- 80 The 1 % AEP extent also marginally encroaches into Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation, which has private flood defences, and Work Area 7: Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection, which included flood resilient design as part of NSDC planning application reference numbers 22/01840/FULM and 24/01261/FULM).

A9.1.2.2.1.1 Climate change scenarios


- 81 The A46 upgrade DCO application to the east of the CSA has modelled the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC (2080s epoch Central Allowance) flood scenario for the fluvial River Trent. Outputs from the model, made available by Skanska, show that there is a marginal increase in the extent of flooding (within the CSA) during the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC (2080's epoch Central Allowance) flood scenario compared to the 30 % CC scenario, as shown in Plate A9.1.25.


Plate A9.1.25: 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and + 39 % CC scenarios



- 82 Compared to the 30 % CC scenario, the 39 % CC allowance leads to a marginal increase in the extent of areas modelled to flood within Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation, as shown in Plate A9.1.26.


Plate A9.1.26: 1 % AEP + 30 % and 39 % CC scenarios³²





- 83 The EA 1 % AEP undefended CCP1 dataset (2036-2069) shows Work Area 6 is almost entirely located outside the flood extent (i.e. the main platform area), as shown in Plate A9.1.27.

Plate A9.1.27: 1 % AEP undefended CCP1



- 84 Given the time-limited nature of the operational phase of the Development, the conservative approach of applying 30 % CC allowance, in the absence of the 23 % CC allowance for the 2050s epoch, is acceptable and should there be a delay in the completion of the construction of the Development, resulting in the operational phase extending into the 2080s epoch, then the design of the Development will ensure compliance with the 39 % CC allowance i.e., no electrically sensitive equipment flush to ground, as shown in Plate A9.1.28 which illustrates a typical arrangement within substations.

Plate A9.1.28: Typical substation connection arrangement



- 85 All new aboveground infrastructure i.e. solar PV (Works Area 1), substations (Work Area 4), BESS and substation compound (Work Area 5a and 5b), are located outside the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC extent from the River Trent.
- 86 Work Area 2, Cables, (including jointing bays) will be below ground and will therefore not influence conveyance or displace floodwater.


- 87 Work Area 3, Mitigation/Enhancement areas located within the flood extent of the River Trent 1 % AEP + 30 % CC, will comprise grassland, scrub, orchard, scattered trees and arable fields. As such, this is compatible with the EA's "Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk 2024" FCERM research report. No dense planting (woodland or orchards will be planted in Flood Zone 3).
- 88 Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation is located within the 1 % AEP + 23 % CC extent (30 % CC used as proxy) and is mostly modelled to flood to depths of less than 0.1 m (i.e. within the main platform area), as shown in Plate A9.1.26.
- 89 Similarly, using the 39 % CC allowance as a sense check, Work Area 6 could flood to a nominal depth of less than 0.1 m (i.e. within the main platform area).
- 90 The National Grid Staythorpe Substation has private hard (walls) and soft (embankments) defences to a level of 13.10 m AOD. As such, Work Area 6 is unlikely to be inundated during the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC events, should the Development operate marginally into the 2080s epoch.
- 91 Work Area 7, Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection, will utilise the existing infrastructure associated with the Staythorpe BESS (construction due to commence at the time of writing). The Staythorpe BESS design included flood resilience measures and the critical aspects of the scheme are located outside the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC extents. As such, connecting the Development in Work Area 7 to the existing 400 kV infrastructure will be within an area not modelled to flood during the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC event.
- 92 Work Area 8, Access, will utilise existing roads or be flush to the existing ground level and will therefore not influence conveyance or displace floodwater.
- 93 The commitment in the oEMP is that should the Development lifetime be anticipated to extend into the 2080s epoch, as a result of delays to the construction programme for example, then modelling will be undertaken in year 2069 using the appropriate climate change allowances at the time, in consultation with the EA (and other regulators). Should modelling results show that the Development has the potential to interact with flood depths then the Development design will be altered accordingly to ensure that flood storage and conveyance is maintained for the River Trent. This could involve raising the PV Arrays (subject to negligible loss of storage and conveyance), the removal of the first row of panels on a PV table or removing the mounting system and associated infrastructure from the modelled extent.
- 94 As such, the risk of flooding from the River Trent (fluvial) is Low.

A9.1.2.2.2 Moorhouse Beck

- 95 Only Work Area 2, Cables, i.e., below-ground structures and Work Area 3: Mitigation / Enhancement are located within the 1 % AEP flood extents of Moorhouse Beck.

- 96 Work Area 1 and 4 have been located outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the future floodplain (2036-2069) associated with Moorhouse Beck, as shown in Plate A9.1.29.

Plate A9.1.29: Moorhouse Beck – Flood Zones



- 97 Wrack marks, as shown in Plate A9.1.30, were observed along the stretch of Moorhouse Beck adjacent to Fields 0 and 57 to be at less than 50 % channel depth following a persistent rainfall event (week commencing 30th September 2024), where the area received 175 % of the 1991-2020 average rainfall in September 2024³³, suggesting a capacity to convey substantial flows without becoming bankful.


³³ https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/metofficegovuk/pdf/weather/learn-about/uk-past-events/summaries/mwr_2024_09_for_print_v1.pdf

Plate A9.1.30: Wrack marks on Moorhouse Beck following persistent rainfall



- 98 Plate A9.1.31 shows a cross section through the floodplain suggesting that should Moorhouse Beck overtop its banks then floodwater will spread over a wide flat area to shallow depths, and not interact with electrically sensitive infrastructure in Work Area 1, Solar PV.

Plate A9.1.31: Moorhouse Beck cross section



99 Whilst Work Area 3, Mitigation/Enhancement, is located within the floodplain of Moorhouse Beck. Work Area 3 will comprise grassland, scrub and scattered trees. No blocks of woodland are located in Flood Zone 3. As such, this is compatible with the EA's "Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk 2024" FCERM research report.

100 As such, the risk of flooding from Moorhouse Beck is Negligible.

A9.1.2.2.3 River Greet, Pingley / Car Dyke

101 As outlined in Section A9.1.1.13, the A617 Road acts as a topographical barrier which restricts floodwater from the River Greet and Pingley Dyke from propagating north via a culvert towards Work Area 5a, BESS, and 5b, 400 kV Compound.

102 1D-2D modelling shows that no aspect of Work Area 5a or 5b are located within the extents of the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC event.

103 Similarly, Work Area 6 (excluding potential underground cable area) is located outside the extents of the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 50 % CC extents.

- 104 One of the two access routes (Work Area 8) to Work Area 5a is located within the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC extent and has a maximum depth of 0.14 m. Velocities are mostly below 0.1 m/s.
- 105 As such, the risk of flooding at Work Area 5a is Low.
- 106 The risk to the Development from the River Greet / Pingley Dyke is therefore Low.



A9.1.2.3 PLUVIAL


- 107 The majority (89.3 %) of the CSA is located outside areas classified as at risk of pluvial flooding for the 1 % AEP event, based on the EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) mapping.
- 108 Electrically sensitive infrastructure, such as inverters, will be located outside the 3.3 %, 1 % and 1 % AEP surface water flooding extent, as shown in Plate A9.1.7 of this FRA.
- 109 The CSA is in agricultural (arable and pastoral) use, however it is known that some areas are prone to generating substantial surface water run-off during extreme or prolonged rainfall events, which has been evidenced by properties downslope of the CSA being flooded.

A9.1.2.3.1 Work Area 1: Solar PV

- 110 The majority of Work Area 1 has been sited to avoid pluvial flood pathways and areas of pooling. Table A9.1.5 identifies fields in Work Area 1, Solar PV, Area are identified by the EA as being at risk of pluvial flooding, to depths of more than 0.3 m (filters out isolated modelled cells).

Table A9.1.5: Work Area 1 over 0.3 m pluvial depth

Field Number	Map
133 and 127	
96 and 104	



- 111 PV arrays will have a leading edge (bottom edge of panels) raised off ground level by approximately 0.5 m, with the exception of areas modelled to flood to a depth of 0.5 m or higher for the 1 % AEP + 25 % CC event (in accordance with Lower Trent and Erewash Management Catchment peak rainfall allowances (2070s)), whereby the leading edge will be higher, to allow for 300 mm freeboard to account for residual uncertainty in the modelling.
- 112 Pluvial flood depths have been verified by 2D direct rainfall modelling, as shown on Plate A9.1.8: 1 % AEP Flood Depths – Raincloud 2D Modelling of this FRA.
- 113 As such, the impact of pluvial flooding on Work Area 1, Solar PV, will be Negligible.

A9.1.2.3.2 Work Area 2: Cables

- 114 Cables will be located underground in waterproof ducting. Areas of cable trench excavations will not be left open for considerable periods of time therefore limiting the potential interaction with surface water.
- 115 As such the risk of pluvial flooding is Negligible.

A9.1.2.3.3 Work area 3: Mitigation/Enhancement

- 116 Work Area 3 is reserved for enhancement measures and these will be cognisant of existing flood risk from pluvial sources, and grassland upslope of these areas within these areas will serve to improve the downstream effects of run off.
- 117 As such, the risk of flooding to Work Area 3 is Negligible.

- 118 The beneficial impacts of enhancement on pluvial flooding are discussed in Section A9.1.3.

A9.1.2.3.4 Work Area 4: Intermediate Substations

- 119 No areas of Work Area 4: Substations are located within the modelled 0.1 % AEP pluvial outline.
- 120 As such the risk of pluvial flooding is Negligible.

A9.1.2.3.5 Work Area 5a BESS

- 121 As outlined in Section A9.1.1.7, sections of Work Area 5a, BESS, is located within an area modelled to be at risk of pluvial flooding, as shown on the EA long term flood risk map.
- 122 The EA pluvial flood map depths have been verified through 2D direct rainfall analysis for the 1 % AEP and 1 % AEP + 25 % CC, 3-hour event using FEH data, as shown in Plate A9.1.32 and Plate A9.1.33.

Plate A9.1.32: Modelled 1 % AEP Pluvial Flood Depth





Plate A9.1.33: Modelled 1 % AEP + 25 % CC Pluvial Flood Depth



123 The placement of above ground infrastructure will avoid areas for flooding greater than 0.4 m, with the exception of a very small area in the north of Work Area 5a. BESS units are generally not located flush to the existing ground and are elevated on corner blocks or a racking frame elevated from the ground, as shown in Plate A9.1.34.

Plate A9.1.34: Typical Corner Pads and racking on BESS units



- 124 As such, pluvial flooding should not pose a risk to the electrically sensitive aspects of the BESS units.
- 125 Management of surface water runoff from the Development is detailed in Section A9.1.4 of this FRA.
- 126 Based on the design of the Development to avoid placing larger above ground structures (e.g. substations) within the flow paths of surface water and the land management measures described in Section A9.1.3, the risk of pluvial flooding to and from the Development is Low.

A9.1.2.3.6 Work Area 5b: 400 kV Substation

- 127 As shown on Plate A9.1.32, 2D pluvial modelling shows that the 400 kV substation is not at risk of flooding from pluvial sources.
- 128 As such, the risk of pluvial flooding at Work Area 5b is Negligible.

A9.1.2.3.7 Work Areas 6 and 7

- 129 The existing or consented infrastructure within Work Areas 6 and 7 are shown not to be at risk of pluvial flooding on the EA flood map. Additionally, the infrastructure in these areas will be served by a formal drainage system designed to accommodate intense rainfall.
- 130 As such, the risk of pluvial flooding in Work Areas 6 and 7 is Negligible.

A9.1.2.3.8 Work Area 8: Access Works

- 131 Work Area 8 is principally within existing highways on the road network and is mostly free of pluvial flood risk, principally as a result of highways drainage.
- 132 The areas of Work Area 8 which are outside the existing highways are not shown to be at risk of pluvial flooding.
- 133 As such, the risk of pluvial flooding to Work Area 8 is Negligible.

A9.1.2.4 GROUNDWATER

- 134 Work Area 4, Intermediate Substations, Work Area 5a, BESS, and Work Area 5b, 400 kV Compound, are the main aspects of Development which have the potential to be affected should groundwater emerge at the surface, given that the PV arrays in Work Area 1 are elevated from the ground by at least 0.5 m, and Work Area 2, cables, are in waterproof ducting.
- 135 The EA Long Term Flood Risk service³⁴ reports “Flooding from groundwater is unlikely in this area”.
- 136 BGS borehole records^{35, 36, 37} approximately 30 m southeast of Work Area 5a show groundwater was struck at 3.0 m, 2.7 m and 1.8 m BGL, associated with sand and gravel layers at corresponding depths which overlay mudstone, indicating that the mudstone acts as a low transmissivity rock layer limiting infiltration at shallow depth, rather than the gravels being an extensive groundwater unit.
- 137 Table 4a of the SFRA identifies that Staythorpe Road, near to Work Area 6 and 7, has previously flooded from groundwater sources, however no records of groundwater flooding in the area surrounding Work Area 5a and 5b exist.
- 138 The PV arrays in Work Area 1 will be raised off the ground by at least 0.5 m on a racking system and therefore will not be affected in the event that groundwater emerges at the surface.
- 139 Cabling in Work Area 2 will be within waterproof ducting. The entry point of any cable or ducting into chambers should also be sealed to prevent water ingress.
- 140 Infrastructure in Work Area 5a and 5b will not be flush to ground level, e.g. by concrete feet, elevating the BESS units by approximately 0.3 m AGL, as outlined in the Pluvial Flooding assessment in Section A9.1.2.4. Should groundwater emanate at ground level within Work Area 5, it is likely to spread over a wide area at shallow depth. As such the risk of groundwater interacting with infrastructure within Work Area 5a and 5b is unlikely.
- 141 Infrastructure within Work Area 6 and Work Area 7 consented / operational and will have built in resilience, such as hard standing and impermeable membranes to prevent the upward movement of groundwater interacting with infrastructure within these areas.

³⁴ <https://check-long-term-flood-risk.service.gov.uk/risk>

³⁵ <https://api.bgs.ac.uk/sobi-scans/v1/borehole/scans/items/19366580>

³⁶ <https://api.bgs.ac.uk/sobi-scans/v1/borehole/scans/items/239130>

³⁷ <https://api.bgs.ac.uk/sobi-scans/v1/borehole/scans/items/238970>

142 As such the risk of groundwater flooding is Negligible.

A9.1.2.5 RESERVOIRS

143 The risk of flooding from the reservoir is reduced through regular maintenance by the operating authority and owner (identified in Table A9.1.2), with reservoirs in the UK having an extremely good safety record with no incidents resulting in the loss of life since 1925.

144 Whilst the consequences of flooding from dam failure are potentially high within the eastern and southern sections of the CSA, the Reservoirs Act 1975 requires all large reservoirs to be regularly inspected and supervised by reservoir panel engineers, making the risk of failure low.

145 Regarding Work Area 1: Solar PV, the extents would only encroach into one field (Field 182) and the leading edge of the panels would be above ground level by at least 0.5 m. As such, the potential for interaction with the electrically sensitive aspects of Work Area 1 is low.

146 The flood resilience measure in Work Areas 6 and 7 for fluvial flooding would minimise any potential impact under a reservoir breach scenario.

147 As such, the residual risk of flooding associated with reservoirs is Low.

A9.1.2.6 SEQUENTIAL TEST AND EXCEPTION TEST

A9.1.2.6.1 Sequential Test

148 Paragraph 5.8.9 of NPS EN-1 states that *“If, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), for the project to be located in areas of lower flood risk the Exception Test can be applied ... The test provides a method of allowing necessary development to go ahead in situations where suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available”*.

149 Paragraph 172 of the NPPF¹⁰ states that developments located within Flood Zone 3 should apply a risk based sequential test in order to steer proposed development towards areas classed as having a lower probability of flooding. (i.e. in Flood Zone 1). Paragraph 177 of the NPPF does, however, acknowledge that under certain circumstances it may not be possible to locate the development on land identified as having a lower risk of flooding and infrastructure can be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3 for certain infrastructure, subject to passing the Exception Test.

150 Utility scale solar farms can only be located where they can connect to the National Grid and the Applicant considered a number of search criteria in identifying suitable sites, as outlined in Chapter 4: Site Selection and Design Evolution [EN010162/APP/6.2.4] and Appendix C – Sequential Test Report, which consider how alternative sites have been appraised and how the design of the Development has evolved to sequentially developed to avoid placing the most electrically sensitive aspects in Flood Zones 2 and 3.

- 151 For these reasons the Development meets the requirements set out in Table 3 of the Planning Practice Guidance³⁸ and meets the requirements of the Sequential Test of the NPPF and NPS EN-1.
- 152 Paragraph 5.8.10 of NPS EN-1 outlines the Exception Test *“is only appropriate for use where the Sequential Test alone cannot deliver an acceptable site. It would only be appropriate to move onto the Exception Test when the Sequential Test has identified reasonably available, lower risk sites appropriate for the proposed development where, accounting for wider sustainable development objectives, application of relevant policies would provide a clear reason for refusing development in any alternative locations identified. Examples could include alternative site(s) that are subject to national designations such as landscape, heritage and nature conservation designations, for example Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and World Heritage Sites (WHS) which would not usually be considered appropriate”*.
- 153 Work Area 2: Cables and Work Areas 6: National Grid Substation and connection point and Work Area 7: Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection is classified as ‘essential infrastructure’ and is located within Flood Zone 1, 2 and 3 and has a low risk from all other assessed forms of flooding. As such, development that falls into this classification is subject to the exception test.

A9.1.2.6.2 Exception Test

- 154 Paragraph 5.8.11 of NPS EN-1 clarifies that *“Both elements of the Exception Test will have to be satisfied for development to be consented. To pass the Exception Test it should be demonstrated that:*
- a. The project would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and*
 - b. the project will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible will reduce flood risk overall”*.
- 155 Paragraph 5.8.29 of NPS EN-1 also requires a sequential approach to be applied to the layout and design of projects with more vulnerable uses being located on parts of the site at lower probability and residual risk of flooding by using SuDS.
- 156 The two criteria set out in the Exception Test that should be applied to developments are:
- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
 - b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.
- 157 The Development will contribute to the decarbonisation of energy supply infrastructure, therefore contributing to wider sustainability aims, including Net Zero.

³⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

- 158 The Development is located primarily within Flood Zone 1, with a small footprint of the Work Area 3 located within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Areas of Work Area 3 located in Flood Zone 3 will comprise grassland, scrub, an orchard and scattered trees, which is compatible with the EA's "Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk 2024" FCERM research report.
- 159 Work Area 2 (Cables) will be located entirely below ground and in waterproof ducting, ensuring no loss of floodplain storage or conveyance.
- 160 Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation, is located in Flood Zone 2 and, despite modelling showing shallow depth inundation for the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC (i.e. less than 0.1 m depth), is unlikely to flood due to the presence of private flood defences which serve the operational substation with an elevation of 13.10 m AOD.
- 161 Work Area 7: Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection has incorporated flood resilient design and the connection point is likely to be in an area modelled to be outside the 1 % AEP + 39% CC.
- 162 The Development will incorporate planting and land management measures (RSuDS) which will reduce the potential for an increase in surface water runoff rates;
- 163 Hardstanding areas will be served by surface water drainage infrastructure (SuDS) to limit surface water runoff to greenfield (baseline) rate up to the 1 % AEP + 40 % CC event.
- 164 The Development is classed as Essential Infrastructure, as per Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification, of the NPPF, which is appropriate in the Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, in terms of flood risk vulnerability.

A9.1.2.6.3 Conclusion

- 165 The Development is essential energy infrastructure and Critical National Priority infrastructure, as recognised by NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3.
- 166 The aspects within Work Areas 2, 6 and 7 pertain to the infrastructure required for connecting to the operational National Grid Staythorpe Electricity Substation. Consequently, the positioning of the cable and associated infrastructure has been determined as the optimal route between Work Area 5a and Work Area 6, with no other 'more suitable' locations available.
- 167 The urgent need for renewable energy supply and therefore the need to maximise energy generation where there is available grid capacity, there is therefore strong operational reasons for the inclusion of Work Area 2: Cables and Work Areas 6 and 7 in their locations.
- 168 As such, the Sequential and Exception tests are passed i.e. the Development is located appropriately (Essential Infrastructure in Flood Zone 1, 2 and 3), as per EA Flood Risk and Coastal Change Guidance.

A9.1.3 SOLAR PV SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

A9.1.3.1 CONSTRUCTION PHASE

A9.1.3.1.1 Pollution Prevention

- 169 Given the relatively short construction phase and gently sloping land within the OL, it is not anticipated that significant amounts of sediment will be generated. The Development will adhere to a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), to be secured by DCO Requirement and based on the Outline CEMP provided in ES TA A5.3 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]), which will ensure compliance with the relevant guidance.

A9.1.3.1.2 Run-off Rates

- 170 Rural Sustainable Drainage Systems (RSuDS) are not a new concept, but they are not widespread in the rural environment and can present many opportunities for improving the management of water at source. They are a collection of physical structures used to mimic natural processes. In rural environments, it is an approach for managing the detrimental impact of rainfall on fields where run-off is a major threat to the flora, fauna and chemical status of our surface waters.
- 171 RSuDS slow down or prevent the transport of pollutants to watercourses by breaking the delivery pathway between the pollutant source and the receptor. By intercepting run-off and trapping sediment before it leaves the field they help maintain and manage the provision of good water quality by preventing the loss of soil, chemicals, nutrients, and faecal organisms. A further benefit is their ability to temporarily capture water and slow down flow. This can reduce localised flooding and provide valuable aquatic habitats in the form of micro-wetlands for farmland wildlife and will encourage the downward movement of water to recharge aquifers.
- 172 Research in the United States by Cook & McCuen (2013) meta-analysis outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge.
- 173 Milazzo et al. (2023)³⁹ reviews the role of grassland for erosion and flood mitigation in Europe and provides quantification that permanent grassland mitigates better runoff than arable land.
- 174 Whilst the Natural England Technical Information Note 101 (TIN101) “*Solar Parks: maximising environmental benefits*” has been archived, the principles relating to solar parks, their siting, their potential impacts and mitigation requirements for the safeguarding of the natural environment are still relevant.
- 175 TIN101 states:
- “The key to avoiding increased run-off and soil into watercourses is to maintain soil permeability and vegetative cover. Permeable land surfaces*

³⁹ The role of grassland for erosion and flood mitigation in Europe: A meta-analysis. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment Volume 348, 1 June 2023, 108443
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2023.108443>

underneath and between panels should be able to absorb rainfall as long as they are not compacted and there is some vegetation to bind the soil surface”.

- 176 As such, a suitable grassland sward will be developed in areas underneath the PV arrays before the construction phase.

A9.1.3.1.3 PV Array Installation

- 177 Whilst the PV arrays and racking system does not involve the installation of hardstanding, the installation methods could lead to soil compaction if not managed properly.
- 178 Installation of the racking system (mounting frame) should only occur when soil conditions are suitable, e.g., dry enough that tyre imprints are not deeper than a specified depth when tracking across land. The Construction Contractor will be responsible for monitoring conditions, in consultation with the Ecological Clerk of Works, in accordance with a Soil Management Plan (an outline SMP is provided as TA A17.2 EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2).
- 179 The mounting framework is likely to be delivered by a vehicle with a trailer and is unlikely to cause soil compaction.
- 180 The racking system will then be pile driven into the ground to a depth of typically 1 to 2 m, depending on ground conditions using similar tracked mini pile driver machinery, as shown in Plate A9.1.35.

Plate A9.1.35: Mini pile driver examples



- 181 The PV modules are likely to be secured to the racking system by hand and therefore soil compaction is unlikely to occur during this stage, as shown in Plate A9.1.36.

Plate A9.1.36: PV module installation⁴⁰



- 182 Should vehicles cause compaction during the installation of the PV arrays then this will be ameliorated using typical small-scale horticultural machinery, as outlined in Section 5 of the oSMP (TA A17.2 EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2)

A9.1.3.2 OPERATIONAL PHASE

- 183 RSuDS components from the construction phase (grassland) will remain in place for the operational phase of the Development.
- 184 The raised nature of PV Arrays will not prevent soil from absorbing rainwater as the panels will not be placed directly on the ground and each PV Row will be separated, with the same area of soil / grassland available for infiltration as per the baseline scenario.
- 185 Once rainfall has fallen off a PV Array, the water will be able to spread and flow along the ground under the PV Arrays evenly into the rain-shadow of the row below, so as to mobilise the same percentage of the ground for infiltration as was available prior to the installation of PV Arrays.
- 186 The PV Array will comprise rows of solar panel modules mounted on metal frames and pile driven into the ground to limit the footprint of PV array units.
- 187 The panels would be mounted at approximately 0.5 m from the ground at the lowest point, depending on modelled flood depths, there will be a requirement to raise the leading edge of the PV arrays in some areas.
- 188 Installation of the PV arrays does not involve the introduction of hardstanding at ground level meaning the superficial cover for the majority of the Site will remain the same as the baseline.
- 189 As the baseline vegetation is arable crops the establishment of grassland will be beneficial in terms of vegetation cover and soil stabilisation, as the land will not be tilled.

⁴⁰ Keele University

190 Additionally, the PV array tables will have regular rainwater gaps to prevent water being concentrated along a single drip line. As such, rainfall landing on the solar panels will drain through rainwater gaps and infiltrate into the ground beneath and between each row of panels, as shown in Plate A9.1.37.

Plate A9.1.37: Rainwater gaps on PV array table





- 191 Control of run-off from the PV Arrays will be implemented through the land management techniques based upon RSuDS methods that will be implemented before the construction phase, in accordance with the EA's guidance⁴¹, shown in Plate A9.1.38.
- 192 The limited installation of impermeable surfaces will prevent a significant increase in surface water run-off.

⁴¹https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/291508/scho0612buwh-e-e.pdf


Plate A9.1.38: Established grassland and vegetation cover at Solar Farm



- 193 The exact grass seed mix will be determined, as outlined in the Outline LEMP (TA A5.1 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]).
- 194 The grassland will be managed through an initial and long-term management plan and should be secured through the LEMP.
- 195 The promotion of managed grassland will prevent surface water from the drip line from compacting the ground and therefore limit the potential for rilling and soil mobilisation.
- 196 As outlined in Section A5.5.4.5 of the oOEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5], maintenance of solar farm equipment and other regular equipment used onsite, such as any operational vehicles, tools and machinery will be carried out by the relevant operational staff. The maintenance will be carried out based on specific guidance and method statements by appropriately trained staff, in line with the required maintenance schedules. This will minimise the risk of compaction of soils and pollution of watercourses.
- 197 It should also be noted that large woodland strips will be established along with wildflower meadow, which will be largely outside the fence, as shown on the masterplan (Figure 5.2 [EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]) and Outline LEMP [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]. These measures will also help to slow surface water before entering the wider hydrological network.
- 198 As discussed in Section A9.1.1.7, several communities surrounding the Development suffer from pluvial flooding as a result existing runoff pathways concentrating flows to urban areas during heavy or prolonged precipitation events.

- 199 Maplebeck has a history of pluvial flooding as run-off cascades from the elevated agricultural land to the west, north and south.
- 200 A 2D direct rainfall model was established to model the baseline flood routes and depths and model the effect of the introduction of grassland under the PV arrays and woodland planting.
- 201 Areas of woodland and grassland were attributed a Manning's N roughness value and added to the model as polygons.
- 202 The OS buildings and roads layers were also stamped into the LIDAR data to ensure flow pathways were accurately represented.
- 203 Mass balance error for all simulations was 0.0 %.
- 204 Plate A9.1.39 shows the location of RSuDS measures within the Development in relation to Maplebeck.

Plate A9.1.39: RSuDS / enhancement areas associated with the Development



- 205 Plates A9.1.40 and A9.1.41 show the maximum flood depth for the 1 % AEP for the baseline 1 % AEP and 1 % AEP with wildflower / grass mix under the PV array scenarios.

Plate A9.1.40: Maplebeck 1 % AEP – Baseline





Plate A9.1.41: 1 % AEP – Grass Mix under PV Arrays



- 206 Grassland has a marginal benefit in reducing maximum flood depths for the 1 % AEP event compared to the baseline scenario.
- 207 There is an opportunity to provide additional natural flood management (NFM) measures within the CSA which have a positive effect on the


downstream environment, without necessarily improving the flooding situation within the CSA and the measures will be brought forward as part of a separate Town and Country planning application.

- 208 The cumulative effect of the Development and the NG+ NFM schemes is assessed in ES Chapter 9: Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9].

A9.1.3.2.1 Steeper Slopes

- 209 It is reported in Schwyter & Vaughan (Soil Science Laboratory Manual)⁴² that the amount of soil erosion is directly related to the amount of surface water run-off, which depends on the water infiltration rate and the percentage of the slope. The steeper the slope and the less rapid the water infiltration rate, the more rapid the water run-off rate for a given soil.
- 210 It is noted within the Soil Science Laboratory Manual that most soils will generate rapid or very rapid surface water run-off with slopes between 6 to 12 %, regardless of soil type.
- 211 80 % of Work Area 1: Solar PV is on slopes of less than 6 %.
- 212 Work Area 1: Solar PV is mostly shallow sloping with steeper slopes confined to the banks of drainage ditches and isolated areas, as shown in Plate A9.1.42.

Plate A9.1.42: Slope within Work Area 1



- 213 In areas where PV Arrays run parallel to a slope of 6 % or greater, active measures such as berms, stone filter drains (as shown in Plate A9.1.43) and swales will be incorporated to slow the flow of surface water run-off as part of construction SuDS, which could be retained for the operational phase of the Development. Filter drains would measure 200 mm width and 300 mm

⁴² Introduction to Soil Science Laboratory Manual

depth in the form of a linear scrape which is backfilled with clean, uncompacted Type 2 or 3 aggregate.

Plate A9.1.43: Example filter drains at solar farms



A9.1.4 WORK AREA 5A: BESS SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

214 This section outlines how the Development will be designed to meet the requirements of:

- National Planning Practice Guidance (2014) (as amended 2022);
- The revised NPPF (as amended 2024);
- The Environment Act (2021);
- Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2015);
- Environment Agency (EA) - Rural Sustainable Drainage Systems (RSuDS)⁴³;
- EA - Pollution Prevention Guidelines (PPG) Controlled Burn: PPG28 (archived but still relevant);
- CIRIA - Containment systems for the prevention of pollution. Secondary, tertiary and other measures for industrial and commercial premises (C736);
- National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) – Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS;
- NFCC – Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS - July 2024 Draft Revision⁴⁴;
- NFPA 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems⁴⁵;
- Department for Business and Trade - UK Battery Strategy (2023)⁴⁶;
- Newark & Sherwood District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update (2016)⁴⁷; and
- Nottinghamshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) 2021-2027⁴⁸.

215 Runoff from the Site shall, in principle, replicate the quality and quantity of the runoff from the Site in its “greenfield” state, in so far as it is reasonable and practicable.

216 The existing greenfield average annual flood (Q_{BAR}) runoff was calculated as 4 l/s/ha, using the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (ICP SuDS) Mean Annual Flood and Institute of Hydrology (IoH) 124 methods using Info Drainage software, as shown in Plate A9.1.44.

⁴³ <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7b956b40f0b645ba3c541b/scho0612buwh-e-e.pdf>

⁴⁴ <https://nfcc.org.uk/consultation/draft-grid-scale-energy-storage-system-planning-guidance/>

⁴⁵ <https://www.nfpa.org/codes-and-standards/all-codes-and-standards/list-of-codes-and-standards/detail?code=855>

⁴⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-battery-strategy>

⁴⁷ <https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/sfraupdate/>

⁴⁸ <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/4346719/nottinghamshire-local-flood-risk-mangement-strategy-2021-27.pdf>

Plate A9.1.44: Q_{BAR} (Greenfield) Rate / ha

UK and Ireland Rural Runoff Calculator

ICP SUDS / IH 124	ADAS 345	FEH	ReFH2	Greenfield Volume												
<p>Method <input checked="" type="radio"/> ICP SUDS <input type="radio"/> IH 124</p> <p>Area (ha) <input type="text" value="1.00"/></p> <p>SAAR (mm) <input type="text" value="600.0"/> <input type="button" value="Map"/></p> <p>Soil <input type="text" value="0.470"/></p> <p>Region <input type="text" value="Region 4"/> <input type="button" value="..."/></p> <p>Additional Options</p> <p>Urban <input type="text" value="0.000"/></p> <p>Return Period (years) <input type="text" value="0"/></p> <p>Growth Curve <input type="text" value="(None)"/> <input type="button" value="Graph"/> <input type="button" value="Data"/></p> <p><input type="button" value="Calculate"/></p>																
<p>Results</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Region</th> <th>QBAR Rural (L/s)</th> <th>QBAR Urban (L/s)</th> <th>Q 1 (years) (L/s)</th> <th>Q 30 (years) (L/s)</th> <th>Q 100 (years) (L/s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Region 4</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>7.9</td> <td>10.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Region	QBAR Rural (L/s)	QBAR Urban (L/s)	Q 1 (years) (L/s)	Q 30 (years) (L/s)	Q 100 (years) (L/s)	Region 4	4.0	4.0	3.3	7.9	10.4
Region	QBAR Rural (L/s)	QBAR Urban (L/s)	Q 1 (years) (L/s)	Q 30 (years) (L/s)	Q 100 (years) (L/s)											
Region 4	4.0	4.0	3.3	7.9	10.4											

- 217 A SuDS option which will utilise a piped network to drain the BESS Compound to lined / compacted clay layer detention basins is proposed as a way of attenuating the increase in surface water run-off rates at the Development, with a positive discharge to the existing drainage ditch network onsite.
- 218 In the rare event of a battery unit fire the NFCC guidance recommends the ability to capture firewater and not have uncontained releases to the hydrological environment.
- 219 Discharge will be throttled using a Hydro-Brake or similar flow restriction device.
- 220 It will be the responsibility of the Development operator to maintain effective drainage measures and rectify drainage measures that are not functioning adequately. A nominated person will also have responsibility for reporting on the functionality of drainage measures. This is secured through the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, TA A5.5 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]).
- 221 Where areas remain positively drained through the lifetime of the Development, the SuDS measures serving these areas will be checked on a regular basis. Should drainage measures require dredging or unblocking, this will be undertaken as soon as practicable by a local contractor engaged by the management company.

A9.1.4.1 FIRE SUPPRESSION

A9.1.4.1.1 Procedure

- 222 In the rare event of a battery fire, the procedure outlined in the Outline Fire Safety Management Plan (included in the ES as TA A5.4 [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]) will be followed.

- 223 The Development operator will follow the accepted strategy of allowing a battery related fire to self-consume, reducing unnecessary risk of injury to site and firefighting personnel.
- 224 Should a fire occur, the effected enclosure will be allowed to self-consume until the fire is extinguished through consumption of the combustible materials within the battery container / enclosure. The firefighting procedure will be to apply water for fire suppression to adjacent BESS enclosures as a way of reducing the temperature of the adjacent containers.
- 225 As water will not be directly applied to affected BESS container, there is limited potential for suppression water to become contaminated.

A9.1.4.2 FIRE SUPPRESSANT VOLUME

- 226 Based on recommendations in NFPA 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems and NFCC – Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS, a burn time of 2 hours and a requirement of 1,900 l/min of fire suppression water has been used to calculate the volume of fire suppressant water required to be stored onsite in the event of a container fire.
- 227 This equates to 228 m³ of storage.
- 228 The SuDS structures serving each catchment of the BESS compound will be sized to accommodate the 1 % AEP + 40 % CC or 228 m³, and this will be sufficient for storing the full fire suppressant volume.
- 229 A penstock will be placed on the outlet of the SuDS structure and would be shut off in the event of a fire suppression event. It would remain closed until testing of the captured water has taken place. Water will then either be removed offsite by tankers to a licenced facility or discharged to the unnamed field drain (subject to agreement with the EA).
- 230 There will also be a lined (clay or synthetic liner) holding basin available for spent firefighting water to be pumped to in the event of a battery fire during heavy rainfall. As such, the SuDS system will not reach capacity during such an event.
- 231 It is recommended that the BESS Compound has a shallow bund or cut-off permitter drain to limit the potential for run-off to leave the Development and drain to the cellular storage.

A9.1.5 WORK AREA 5B: 400 KV SUBSTATION


- 232 Surface water for Work Area 5b: Substations will also be managed in a similar manner to Work Area 5a: BESS, i.e. will have a drainage system designed to attenuate the 1 % AEP + 40 % CC.
- 233 The SuDS system will discharge at greenfield rate to a watercourse / field drain, in accordance with the hierarchy of disposal options outline in the SuDS Manual.

A9.1.6 WORK AREA 4: SUBSTATIONS SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

- 234 Surface water for Work Area 4: Substations will also be managed in a similar manner to Work Area 5a: BESS, i.e. will have a drainage system designed to attenuate the 1 % AEP + 40 % CC.
- 235 Infiltration testing at each substation compound within Work Area 4 was undertaken in March to April 2025 and concluded that infiltration is not a viable disposal option due to the presence of clays and mudstone, which is essentially impermeable.
- 236 Infiltration testing results are provided in Appendix B of this FRA.
- 237 The SuDS system will discharge at Q_{BAR} to a watercourse / field drain, in accordance with the hierarchy of disposal options outline in the SuDS Manual.
- 238 Discharge rates per hectare (ha), derived from the IH124 method, and likely discharge destinations are provided in Table A9.1.6.

Table A9.1.6: Work Area 4 runoff destinations and rates

Work Area 4 Discharge Location	Rate (l/s/ha)												
	<div><div>UK and Ireland Rural Runoff Calculator</div><div><div>ICP SUDS / IH 124</div><div>ADAS 345</div><div>FEH</div><div>ReFH2</div><div>Greenfield Volume</div></div><div><div>Method</div><div><input checked="" type="radio"/> ICP SUDS <input type="radio"/> IH 124</div></div><div><div>Area (ha)</div><div>1.00</div></div><div><div>SAAR (mm)</div><div>600.0</div></div><div><div>Soil</div><div>0.470</div><div>Map</div></div><div><div>Region</div><div>Region 4</div><div></div></div><div><div>Additional Options</div><div><div>Urban</div><div>0.000</div></div><div><div>Return Period (years)</div><div>0</div></div><div><div>Growth Curve</div><div>(None)</div><div></div><div>20</div></div></div><div><div>Calculate</div></div><div><div>Results</div><table><tr><th>Region</th><th>QBAR Rural (L/s)</th><th>QBAR Urban (L/s)</th><th>Q 1 (years) (L/s)</th><th>Q 30 (years) (L/s)</th><th>Q 100 (years) (L/s)</th></tr><tr><td>Region 4</td><td>4.0</td><td>4.0</td><td>3.3</td><td>7.9</td><td>10.4</td></tr></table></div></div>	Region	QBAR Rural (L/s)	QBAR Urban (L/s)	Q 1 (years) (L/s)	Q 30 (years) (L/s)	Q 100 (years) (L/s)	Region 4	4.0	4.0	3.3	7.9	10.4
Region	QBAR Rural (L/s)	QBAR Urban (L/s)	Q 1 (years) (L/s)	Q 30 (years) (L/s)	Q 100 (years) (L/s)								
Region 4	4.0	4.0	3.3	7.9	10.4								
	<div><div>UK and Ireland Rural Runoff Calculator</div><div><div>ICP SUDS / IH 124</div><div>ADAS 345</div><div>FEH</div><div>ReFH2</div><div>Greenfield Volume</div></div><div><div>Method</div><div><input checked="" type="radio"/> ICP SUDS <input type="radio"/> IH 124</div></div><div><div>Area (ha)</div><div>1.00</div></div><div><div>SAAR (mm)</div><div>623.0</div></div><div><div>Soil</div><div>0.470</div><div>Map</div></div><div><div>Region</div><div>Region 4</div><div></div></div><div><div>Additional Options</div><div><div>Urban</div><div>0.000</div></div><div><div>Return Period (years)</div><div>0</div></div><div><div>Growth Curve</div><div>(None)</div><div></div><div>20</div></div></div><div><div>Calculate</div></div><div><div>Results</div><table><tr><th>Region</th><th>QBAR Rural (L/s)</th><th>QBAR Urban (L/s)</th><th>Q 1 (years) (L/s)</th><th>Q 30 (years) (L/s)</th><th>Q 100 (years) (L/s)</th></tr><tr><td>Region 4</td><td>4.2</td><td>4.2</td><td>3.5</td><td>8.3</td><td>10.8</td></tr></table></div></div>	Region	QBAR Rural (L/s)	QBAR Urban (L/s)	Q 1 (years) (L/s)	Q 30 (years) (L/s)	Q 100 (years) (L/s)	Region 4	4.2	4.2	3.5	8.3	10.8
Region	QBAR Rural (L/s)	QBAR Urban (L/s)	Q 1 (years) (L/s)	Q 30 (years) (L/s)	Q 100 (years) (L/s)								
Region 4	4.2	4.2	3.5	8.3	10.8								



A9.1.7 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- 239 The Order Limits are mostly located in Flood Zone 1 (89.99 %).
- 240 All new aboveground infrastructure within Work Areas 1, 4 and 5 are located in Flood Zone 1.
- 241 Infrastructure within all Work Areas will be located outside the 2076 and 2098 0.5 % AEP River Trent tidal breach event.
- 242 No built aspects in Work Area 1: Solar PV, Work Area 4: Substations, Work Area 5a: BESS or Work Area 5b: 400 kV substation are located within the extent of the 1 % AEP + 23 % CC (30 % CC used as a proxy) or 1 % AEP + 39 % CC events.
- 243 Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation is located within the 1 % AEP + 23 % CC extent (30 % CC used as proxy) and is modelled to flood to depths of less than 0.1 m (i.e. within the main platform area).
- 244 Similarly, using the 39 % CC allowance as a sense check, Work Area 6 could flood to a nominal depth of less than 0.1 m (i.e. within the main platform area).
- 245 The National Grid Staythorpe Substation has private hard (walls) and soft (embankments) defences to a level of 13.10 m AOD. As such, Work Area 6 is unlikely to be inundated during the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC events, should the Development operate marginally into the 2080s epoch.
- 246 Work Area 7 will utilise the existing infrastructure associated with the Staythorpe BESS (currently under construction). The Staythorpe BESS design included flood resilience measures and the critical aspects of the scheme are located outside the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC extents. As such, connecting the Development in Work Area 7 to the existing 400 kV infrastructure will be within an area not modelled to flood during the 1 % AEP + 30 % CC and 39 % CC event.
- 247 All electrically sensitive infrastructure associated with the Development will be located above the modelled depths for the 1 % AEP + climate change pluvial flood event.
- 248 The extent of reservoir flooding (Wet Day scenario) which interacts with the Development largely follows the corridor of the River Trent and presents a residual risk to the Development.
- 249 The Development is classified as Essential Infrastructure and is therefore compatible with Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3.
- 250 Groundwater levels are likely to be variable across the CSA, and were struck at 1.8 to 3 m BGL within Work Area 5a: BESS. BESS units will not be flush to the ground and will be elevated from the ground by approximately 300 mm. As such the Development will remain safe and operational should groundwater emerge at ground level.
- 251 Surface water run off from Work Area 1: Solar PV will be managed through RSuDS techniques such as grassland / wildflower, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. Where Solar PV in Work Area 1 is located on slopes of 6


% or greater, then additional measures to slow runoff, such as filter drains and berms, will be implemented.

- ²⁵² In respect of flood risk matters, the Development is compliant with the NPS EN-1, EN-3, EN-5, NPPF and local planning policy, including Core Policy 10 Climate Change of the Amended core strategy DPD.

APPENDIX A: EA CORRESPONDENCE

APPENDIX B: INFILTRATION TESTING

APPENDIX C: SEQUENTIAL TEST



Flood Map for Planning:

The Flood Map for Planning is now classed as Open Data. As such it can be downloaded free of charge under an open data licence from the following addresses:

- <https://data.gov.uk/publisher/environment-agency>
- <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>

The flood zones on this map:

- refer to the land at risk of flooding and do not refer to individual properties refer to the probability of river and sea flooding.
- ignore the presence of defences,
- do not take into account potential impacts of climate change.
- This data is updated on a quarterly basis as better data becomes available.

Zone 1: Low Probability	Land having a less than 0.1% annual probability of river or sea flooding. (Shown as 'clear' on the Flood Map for Planning – all land outside Zones 2, 3a and 3b)
Zone2: Medium Probability	Land having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding; or land having between a 0.5% and 0.1% annual probability of sea flooding. (Land shown in light blue on the Flood Map)
Zone 3a: High Probability	Land having a 1% (1 in 100) or greater annual probability of river flooding; or Land having a 0.5% or greater annual probability of sea. (Land shown in dark blue on the Flood Map)
Zone 3b: Functional Floodplain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land having a 3.3% or greater annual probability of flooding, with any existing flood risk management infrastructure operating effectively; or • land that is designed to flood (such as a flood attenuation scheme), even if it would only flood in more extreme events (such as 0.1% annual probability of flooding). • Local planning authorities should identify in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessments areas of functional floodplain and its boundaries accordingly, in agreement with the Environment Agency. • (Not separately distinguished from Zone 3a on the Flood Map)

Probability	Percentage chance of flooding each year
1 in 2 year	50%
1 in 5 year	20%
1 in 20 year	5%
1 in 50 year	2%
1 in 100 year	1%
1 in 1000 year	0.1%
Surface Water Flooding	
1 in 30	High Risk
1 in 100	Medium Risk
1 in 1000	Low Risk

Updated Climate Change Guidance: On 19th February 2016, the [Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances](#) was published on www.gov.uk website. It has replaced previous guidance [Climate Change Allowances for Planners](#). The climate change guidance can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>

The climate change allowances provided with this RFI are a 20%, 30% and 50% increase in the peak river flow for the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (1 in 100 year) scenario. Please see the suggested allowance for your location and development in the links above. It is likely appropriate flood and climate resilience measures will need to be include

Breach Information: It is recommended that a site specific breach analysis is carried out for the site using the joint DEFRA/Environment Agency document Flood Risk Assessment Guidance for New Development (FD2320). This document can be downloaded directly using the following link ([FD2320.pdf](#)).

Defence Information Flood defence data is routinely updated and freely available at: [AIMS Spatial Flood Defences \(inc. standardised attributes\) - data.gov.uk](#) and [AIMS Asset Bundle - data.gov.uk](#).

Historic Information We have records of historic fluvial flooding at this location in **1932, 1947, 1977 and 2000**. Please note that we may or may not hold the original records in question. We do not make any claim as to the reliability of recorded flood extents or that all flood events in the area have been recorded. Please also be aware that flood defences may have been built subsequent to these historic flood events. Note - This information relates to the area the above named property is in, and is not specific to the property itself - it **does not** provide an indicator of flood risk **at individual property level**.

Surface Water & Drainage: The Environment Agency (empowered under the Water Resources Act 1991) concentrates on the major elements of the drainage system, managing flood risk arising from designated "main rivers" and the sea. The Flood & Water Management Act (2010) has given Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) responsibility for the management of local flood risk, which includes surface runoff, groundwater and flooding from ordinary watercourses (smaller rivers and streams). The LLFA for this area is **Nottinghamshire County Council**, and we recommend that you contact them with concerns about any flooding issues for this area. This area is also under the management of **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board**. This is due to the complex drainage system. Further information and maps for surface water, ordinary watercourses, and reservoir flooding can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk> ; [Reservoir flood maps: when and how to use them - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

Open Data Information: Many datasets are now classed as Open Data and as such can be downloaded free of charge under an open data licence from the following address: <https://data.gov.uk/publisher/environment-agency>

Permitting Information: Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, any permanent or temporary works in, over or under a designated main river will require an Environmental Permit for Flood Risk Activities from the Environment Agency. Any permanent or temporary works within 8 metres of the top of bank of a designated main river, or landward toe of a flood defence may require an Environmental Permit for Flood Risk Activities from the Environment Agency. In addition, any permanent or temporary works within the floodplain of a designated main river may also require an Environmental Permit for Flood Risk Activities. To find out whether your activity requires a permit or falls under a relevant exclusion, exemption or standard rule please follow this link: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>. The Environment Agency require access to the watercourse and free movement up to 8m from the river bank/ defence for maintenance purposes.

Please note that a permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted.


Strategic flood risk assessments: We recommend that you check the relevant local authority's strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA) as part of your work to prepare a site specific flood risk assessment. This should give you information about: the potential impacts of climate change in this catchment areas defined as functional floodplain flooding from other sources, such as surface water, ground water and reservoirs. This data has been generated by strategic scale flood models and is not intended for use at the individual property scale. If you're intending to use this data as part of a flood risk assessment, please include an appropriate modelling tolerance as part of your assessment. The Environment Agency regularly updates its modelling. We recommend that you check the data provided is the most recent, before submitting your flood risk assessment.

Flood Risk Assessment Advisory: All guidance on how to complete a full site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) can be found here: [Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#). Furthermore professional assistance can be provided by our planning officers, by contacting planning.trentside@environment-agency.gov.uk.

Extended Flood Map, centred on East of Newark on Trent [EMD307955]

Legend


- Statutory Main Rivers
- - - Defences
- Flood Storage Areas
- Flood Zone 3
- Flood Zone 2



Detailed Flood Map, centred on East of Newark on Trent [EMD307955]

Legend

- Statutory Main Rivers
- - - Defences
- ▭ Flood Storage Areas
- ▭ Flood Zone 3
- ▭ Flood Zone 2



Detailed River Network Map, centred on East of Newark on Trent


Legend

Detailed River Network

- Primary River
- Secondary River
- Tertiary River
- Lake / Reservoir
- Canal
- Canal Tunnel
- Extended Culvert
- Multiple Channel Culvert
- Underground River (potential sewer)
- Underground River (inferred)
- Underground River (local knowledge)
- Undefined

Detailed River Network

- Primary River
- Secondary River
- Tertiary River
- Lake / Reservoir
- Canal
- Canal Tunnel
- Extended Culvert
- Multiple Channel Culvert
- Underground River (potential sewer)
- Underground River (inferred)
- Underground River (local knowledge)
- Undefined




Internal Drainage Board Map, centred on East of Newark on Trent



Legend




-  Internal Drainage Board





© Crown Copyright and database rights 2023 . Ordnance Survey 100024198.

Surface Water Flood Map, centred on East of Newark on Trent [EMD307955]

Legend

-  Flood Extent 1 in 30
-  Flood Extent 1 in 100
-  Flood Extent 1 in 1000



Flood Defence Map centred on East of Newark on Trent

Ref: [EMD307955]



Scale 1:100,000


Date created: 23 May 2023

Legend

EMD Defences - March 2023

ASSETTYPE

- Bridge Abutment
- Demountable Defence
- Embankment
- Engineered High Ground
- Flood Gate
- Natural High Ground
- Spillway
- Wall




Modelled Flood Extents Map centred on East of Newark on Trent

Ref: [EMD307955]



Scale 1:100,000
Date created: 23 May 2023

Legend

 20 Year [Functional Floodplain Jan20]

SOURCE:

River Maun Flood Risk Mapping,
JBA, March 2007

Nottingham Tributaries SFRM,
JBA, January 2014


Mill Dam Dyke,
Tidal Trent Tribs, JBA, 2021

Slough Dyke,
Tidal Trent Tribs, JBA, 2021

Trent and Tributaries
Newark SFRM2,
Halcrow, July 2011

Tidal Trent,
Mott MacDonald, 2014

Climate Change Update,
Environment Agency 2021



Modelled Flood Extents Map centred on East of Newark on Trent

Ref: [EMD307955]



Scale 1:100,000
Date created: 23 May 2023

Legend

- Tidal Trent_tidal 1000yr
- SLOU_1000yr
- MILL_1000yr
- Greet_1000yr
- Maun_1000yr
- Newark Trent_1000yr
- Tidal Trent_fluvial 1000yr

SOURCE:

River Maun Flood Risk Mapping,
JBA, March 2007

Nottingham Tributaries SFRM,
JBA, January 2014


Mill Dam Dyke,
Tidal Trent Tribs, JBA, 2021

Slough Dyke,
Tidal Trent Tribs, JBA, 2021

Trent and Tributaries
Newark SFRM2,
Halcrow, July 2011

Tidal Trent,
Mott MacDonald, 2014

Climate Change Update,
Environment Agency 2021



Modelled Flood Extents Map centred on East of Newark on Trent

Ref: [EMD307955]




Scale 1:100,000

Date created: 23 May 2023

Legend

- Newark Trent_100yr+20%CC
- TT_100yr+20%CC
- Newark Trent_100yr+30%CC
- TT_100yr+30%CC
- Newark Trent_100yr+50%CC
- TT_100yr+50%CC



SOURCE:

Trent and Tributaries
Newark SFRM2,
Halcrow, July 2011

Tidal Trent,
Mott MacDonald, 2014

Climate Change Update,
Environment Agency 2021

Modelled Flood Extents Map centred on East of Newark on Trent

Ref: [EMD307955]



Scale 1:100,000
Date created: 23 May 2023

Legend


TT 100+20%CC_combined_breach_ext

SOURCE:

Tidal Trent,
Mott MacDonald, 2014

Climate Change Update,
Environment Agency 2021

© Environment Agency copyright and/or database rights 2022.
© Ordnance Survey copyright and/or database rights 2022.
All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence No 100024198.





██████████
Via Email

Our Ref: EMD-331357

Previous Ref: EMD-307955

Date: 30 November 2023

Dear ████████,

Enquiry regarding - Product 6- Missing data near Averham.

Thank you for your enquiry which was received on 24 October 2023.

We respond to requests under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

The JFLOW has been used to create flood zone 3 in this area, along with the older version of the River Greet model from 2008.

You can download the JFLOW model results using the link below and will need to look at grid square SK75:

[Defra Data Services Platform](#)

Please refer to [Open Government Licence](#) which explains the permitted use of this information.

Please get in touch if you have any further queries or contact us within two months if you'd like us to review the information we have sent.

Yours sincerely

██████████
Customers & Engagement Officer
East Midlands

For further information please contact the Customers & Engagement Team on 02084 747770

Direct e-mail:- EMDenquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk

Via Email

Our Ref: EMD-339002

Your Ref:


Date: 16 January 2024

Dear [REDACTED]

Enquiry regarding – flood data around Averham

Thank you for your enquiry which was received on 14 December 2023. Please see the response from our technical team below:

We are sorry that we cannot explain why Flood Zone 3 is of a lesser extent than the 2004 1 % AEP JFLOW outline to the north west of Averham. Flood Zone 3 in the wider area has utilised part of the River Greet 2008 model but this is of a smaller extent than the current Flood Zone 3 as shown below (Flood Zone 3 in darker blue and the 1% AEP 2008 River Greet model in lighter blue). The Flood Zone outline does not align to a modelled outline or recorded flood outline. The Flood Zones in this area were last updated in 2014 and unfortunately our records do not answer your question.



We will be updating our flood risk map products: Flood Zones (on Flood Map for Planning), Risk of Flooding from Rivers & Sea (RoFRS) and Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) in 2024/5 as part of the new National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA2). This should result in improvements to our mapping products, especially where we do not currently have any detailed local modelling. This may address the query you have with our flood risk products. Our new National Flood Risk Assessment

will bring many improvements to our flood risk information, including updated national modelling (which uses a better representation of topography and finer level of detail) as well as incorporating local detailed modelling where we have it. Therefore, we would advise waiting until after these are published to check our new flood risk information. In preparation for these changes, there is currently a pause on updates to these mapping products until NaFRA2 is released.

Our technical team are also happy to speak with you further on this matter, if you'd like to schedule a call.

We respond to requests under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

Please refer to [Open Government Licence](#) which explains the permitted use of this information.

Please get in touch if you have any further queries or contact us within two months if you'd like us to review the information we have sent.


Yours sincerely



Customers & Engagement Officer
East Midlands

For further information please contact the Customers & Engagement Team on 02084 747770

Direct e-mail:- EMDenquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk



Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Report on Soakaway Testing 1: Land off Caunton Road (472060, 362046)

Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists




SOAKAWAY LETTER REPORT

job number	date
site address	
written by	checked by
issued by	



Please consider the environment before printing this report.



<ENVIRONMENTAL> <GEOTECHNICAL>



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd
Offices 1 & 2 Barncliffe Business Park, Near Bank, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8LU
☎ 01484 604354 Company No. 5130864

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Limitations	2
3. Fieldworks	2
4. Geology	3
5. Strata Conditions	3
6. Insitu Testing	3
6.1 Soakaway Test	3
7. Discussion	4
8. References	4

Appendices

1. Site Plan
2. Trial Pit Records
3. Trial Pit Photographs
4. Soakaway Results



Report on Soakaway Testing



Location: **Land off Cauntun Road**
Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH

For: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Report No. C4946/25/E/7542

Report Date: May 2025

For and on behalf of **Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd**

	
Steven Hale BSc FGS Geo-environmental Technician	Imran Sakoor BEng FGS Geo-environmental Engineer

Report Summary¹

Item	Comments	Section
Geology	Superficial Geology – none. Solid Geology – Mercia Mudstone Group.	4.
Strata Conditions	Nominal thickness of topsoil overlaying clay representative	5.
Groundwater	No water strikes noted during investigation.	5.
Suitability of Soakaways	Not recommended.	7.

¹ This summary should not be relied upon to provide a comprehensive review. All of the information contained in this document should be considered.

1. Introduction

- i. We thank you for your request to undertake percolation testing at the above-mentioned site and take pleasure in enclosing the results of this work. The investigation was undertaken on the 8th April 2025 in accordance with your instruction to proceed. The site is centred on grid reference 472060, 362046. This report describes the work undertaken, presents the data obtained and discusses the results of the tests

2. Limitations

- ii. The recommendations made and opinions expressed in this report are based on the ground conditions revealed by the site works, together with an assessment of the site. Whilst opinions may be expressed relating to sub-soil conditions in parts of the site not investigated, for example between trial pit positions, these are for guidance only and no liability can be accepted for their accuracy.
- iii. This report has been prepared in accordance with our understanding of current best practice. However, new information or legislation, or changes to best practice may necessitate revision of the report after the date of issue.

3. Fieldworks

- iv. Three trial pits were excavated in order to undertake soakaway testing, the positions of which are shown in Appendix 1. The soakaway tests were undertaken at the base of the pit at depths rational to the construction of soakaways. The soils exposed in the trial pits were logged on site in general accordance with BS5930: 2015 +A1: 2020, and full descriptions are given on the trial pit records which are presented in Appendix 2. Photographs of the trial pits are included within Appendix 3.
- v. Once excavations were completed, the trial pits were carefully re-instated with the arisings. Whilst every care was taken during the infilling process, including compacting of the infill at regular intervals with the arm of the excavator, it should be appreciated that some mounding of the surface may have resulted. Moreover, the infilled soils may be subjected to settlement over time, such that a depression in the surface may also occur. Therefore, the locations of any pits undertaken in this investigation should be conveyed to the current site user, as the mounds or depressions associated with the pits may present a risk to current site operations. Furthermore, it must be realised that the infilled pits represent an area of disturbance within the site soils, thus the soils at the pit locations may vary characteristically compared to the undisturbed ground.

4. Geology

- vi. The available published geological data for the site has been examined and the following table presents the anticipated geology.

Table 1: Geological Data for the Site

Strata Type	Strata Name ²	Previous Name ³	Description ³
Superficial Geology	-	-	None indicated beneath the site.
Solid Geology	Mercia Mudstone Group	Red Marl	Dominantly red, less commonly green-grey, mudstones and subordinate siltstones with thick halite-bearing units in some basal areas.

5. Strata Conditions

- vii. In accordance with the geology of the area, the succession has been shown to include the following:

Table 2: Generalised Strata Profile

Depth m below ground level to underside of layer	Strata Type	Positions Layer Revealed	Groundwater Strikes m below ground level
0.30 – 0.35	TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT)	All	None
0.75 – +1.60	Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	All	None
+1.25	Firm, grey occasionally mottled reddish brown, very gravelly, silty CLAY. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	SA01	None

'+' denotes that the strata extended below the termination depth of the investigated positions, thus the extent of the deposit is only proven to the depths indicated.

6. Insitu Testing

6.1 Soakaway Test

- viii. On reaching the elected soakaway test depth, the pit was trimmed and squared as much as practicable. Water was then introduced into the pit at a controlled rate to prevent collapse of the sides and the level monitored at time intervals relative to a reference bar at ground level. The results obtained from the soakaway tests are presented at Appendix 4 and are summarised below:

² Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Map Sheets 113; Ollerton; Solid and Drift Edition, and Onshore Geoindex [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

³ Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Lexicon of Named Rock Units [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

Table 3: Soakaway Test Results

Location	Soakage Area Dimensions (average) (m)	Depths of soaked strata (m)	Soil Description (of soaked strata)	Infiltration Rate (m/s)	*Drainage Characteristics
SA01	0.30 x 1.60	0.97 to 1.25	Side – Very gravelly, silty CLAY Base – Presumed MUDSTONE bedrock	-	Practically impermeable
SA02	0.30 x 1.60	0.91 to 1.60	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA03	0.30 x 1.70	0.99 to 1.60	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable

- ix. During the soakaway tests the water level did not achieve a fall from 75% to 25% of the effective depth of the storage volume in all three trial pits. In all tests, the water level did not move, as such, the tests could not be completed within the scope of the method provided in BRE Digest 365 due to the poor soakage rate of the exposed soils. Due to the negligible water movement it was not possible to extrapolate the results obtained in order to obtain a soil infiltration rate.

7. Discussion

- x. The soils encountered beneath the topsoil were found to be typical of the weathered fraction of the underlying Mercia Mudstone Group. The strata conditions and subsequent drainage characteristics appear to be comparable across the site. In this instance, the infiltration testing has revealed that the soils have practically impermeable drainage characteristics. Therefore, soakaways cannot be recommended at this site and an alternative form of drainage should be adopted.

8. References

- Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365, *Soakaway Design*, September 1991.
- British Standards Institution (2015 +A1: 2020) BS 5930: *Code of practice for ground investigations*, B.S.I., London.
- Barnes, G. (2000). *Soil Mechanics Principle and Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, p.47.

Appendix 1

Site Plan



Notes:



Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd

Offices 1 & 2, Barncliffe
Business Park,
Near Bank,
Shelley,
Huddersfield,
HD8 8LU


Telephone: 0843 50 66 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk

Client:
Elements Green Trust Ltd

Job Number:
C4946/25/E/7542

Project Details:
Land off Cauntoun Road, Newark,
Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Scale:	Not to scale - reference only
---------------	-------------------------------



Appendix 2

Trial Pit Records



Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA01

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Caunton Road

Project No.
C4946/25/E/7542Co-ords: -
Level:Date
08/04/2025

Location: Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Dimensions
(m):

1.6

Depth
1.25

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.30			TOPSOIL (Soft, brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				0.75			Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	1
				1.25 1.26			Firm, grey occasionally mottled reddish brown, very gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							Extremely weak, weathered, grey MUDSTONE recovered as gravel. [MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP] End of pit at 1.25 m	2
								3
								4
								5

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny. 2. Trial pit refused on presumed bedrock.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA02

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Caunton Road

Project No.
C4946/25/E/7542Co-ords: -
Level:Date
08/04/2025

Location: Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Dimensions
(m):

1.6

Depth
1.60

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.35			TOPSOIL (Soft, brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.60			Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	1
							End of pit at 1.60 m	2
								3
								4
								5

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA03

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Caunton Road

Project No.
C4946/25/E/7542Co-ords: -
Level:Date
08/04/2025

Location: Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Dimensions
(m):

1.7

Depth
1.60

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.35			TOPSOIL (Soft, brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.60			Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.60 m	

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable



Appendix 3

Trial Pit Photographs



Photo 1: SA01



Photo 2: SA01 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Cauntton Road

Job No:

C4946/25/E/7542

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 1: SA02



Photo 2: SA02 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Cauntton Road

Job No:

C4946/25/E/7542

t. 0843 50 666 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 1: SA03



Photo 2: SA03 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Cauntton Road

Job No:

C4946/25/E/7542

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk


Appendix 4

Soakaway Results

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA01	Test No:	1	Date:	08.04.2025
Length (m):	1.600	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.25	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	
		Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
		0	0.970	110	0.970
		1	0.970	120	0.970
		2	0.970	130	0.970
		4	0.970	140	0.970
		8	0.970	150	0.970
		15	0.970		
		30	0.970		
		40	0.970		
		50	0.970		
		60	0.970		
		70	0.970		
		80	0.970		
		90	0.970		
		100	0.970		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.97		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.04	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.11		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.18	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.25		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.01

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.


Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4946/25/E/7542
Site:	Land off Cauntton Road, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA		

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA02	Test No:	1	Date:	08.04.2025
Length (m):	1.600	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.60	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	

Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
0	0.910	110	0.910
1	0.910	120	0.910
2	0.910	130	0.910
4	0.910	140	0.910
8	0.910	150	0.910
15	0.910		
30	0.910		
40	0.910		
50	0.910		
60	0.910		
70	0.910		
80	0.910		
90	0.910		
100	0.910		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.91		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.08	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.26		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.43	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.60		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.77

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.


Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4946/25/E/7542
Site:	Land off Caunton Road, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA		

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA03	Test No:	1	Date:	08.04.2025
Length (m):	1.700	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.60	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	

Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
0	0.990	110	0.990
1	0.990	120	0.990
2	0.990	130	0.990
4	0.990	140	0.990
8	0.990	150	0.990
15	0.990		
30	0.990		
40	0.990		
50	0.990		
60	0.990		
70	0.990		
80	0.990		
90	0.990		
100	0.990		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.99		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.14	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.30		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.45	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.60		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.71


(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4946/25/E/7542
Site:	Land off Caunton Road, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA		



Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Report on Soakaway Testing 2: Land Adjacent Ossington Lane (477350, 364723)

Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists




SOAKAWAY LETTER REPORT

job number	date
site address	
written by	checked by
issued by	



Please consider the environment before printing this report.



<ENVIRONMENTAL> <GEOTECHNICAL>



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd
Offices 1 & 2 Barncliffe Business Park, Near Bank, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8LU
☎ 01484 604354 Company No. 5130864

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Limitations	2
3. Fieldworks	2
4. Geology	3
5. Strata Conditions	3
6. Insitu Testing	3
6.1 Soakaway Test	3
7. Discussion	4
8. References	4

Appendices

1. Site Plan
2. Trial Pit Records
3. Trial Pit Photographs
4. Soakaway Results



Report on Soakaway Testing

Location: **Land Adjacent Ossington Lane**
Ossington Lane, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6NY

For: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Report No. C4947/25/E/7544

Report Date: May 2025

For and on behalf of **Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd**

Steven Hale BSc FGS Geo-environmental Technician		Rob Palmer MSc FGS ACIEH Engineering Director	

Report Summary¹

Item	Comments	Section
Geology	Superficial Geology – none. Solid Geology – Mercia Mudstone Group.	4.
Strata Conditions	Nominal thickness of topsoil overlaying clay representative of the weathered Mercia Mudstone	5.
Groundwater	No water strikes noted during investigation.	5.
Suitability of Soakaways	Not recommended.	7.

¹ This summary should not be relied upon to provide a comprehensive review. All of the information contained in this document should be considered.

1. Introduction

- i. We thank you for your request to undertake percolation testing at the above-mentioned site and take pleasure in enclosing the results of this work. The investigation was undertaken on the 28th April 2025 in accordance with your instruction to proceed. The site is centred on grid reference 477350, 364723. This report describes the work undertaken, presents the data obtained and discusses the results of the tests.

2. Limitations

- ii. The recommendations made and opinions expressed in this report are based on the ground conditions revealed by the site works, together with an assessment of the site. Whilst opinions may be expressed relating to sub-soil conditions in parts of the site not investigated, for example between trial pit positions, these are for guidance only and no liability can be accepted for their accuracy.
- iii. This report has been prepared in accordance with our understanding of current best practice. However, new information or legislation, or changes to best practice may necessitate revision of the report after the date of issue.

3. Fieldworks

- iv. Three trial pits were excavated in order to undertake soakaway testing, the positions of which are shown in Appendix 1. The soakaway tests were undertaken at the base of the pit at depths rational to the construction of soakaways. The soils exposed in the trial pits were logged on site in general accordance with BS5930: 2015 +A1: 2020, and full descriptions are given on the trial pit records which are presented in Appendix 2. Photographs of the trial pits are included within Appendix 3.
- v. Once excavations were completed, the trial pits were carefully re-instated with the arisings. Whilst every care was taken during the infilling process, including compacting of the infill at regular intervals with the arm of the excavator, it should be appreciated that some mounding of the surface may have resulted. Moreover, the infilled soils may be subjected to settlement over time, such that a depression in the surface may also occur. Therefore, the locations of any pits undertaken in this investigation should be conveyed to the current site user, as the mounds or depressions associated with the pits may present a risk to current site operations. Furthermore, it must be realised that the infilled pits represent an area of disturbance within the site soils, thus the soils at the pit locations may vary characteristically compared to the undisturbed ground.

4. Geology

- vi. The available published geological data for the site has been examined and the following table presents the anticipated geology.

Table 1: Geological Data for the Site

Strata Type	Strata Name ²	Previous Name ³	Description ³
Superficial Geology	-	-	None indicated beneath the site.
Solid Geology	Mercia Mudstone Group	Red Marl	Dominantly red, less commonly green-grey, mudstones and subordinate siltstones with thick halite-bearing units in some basinal areas.

5. Strata Conditions

- vii. In accordance with the geology of the area, the succession has been shown to include the following:

Table 2: Generalised Strata Profile

Depth m below ground level to underside of layer	Strata Type	Positions Layer Revealed	Groundwater Strikes m below ground level
0.25 – 0.30	TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY)	All	None
+1.60 – +1.65	Firm, reddish brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	All	None

'+' denotes that the strata extended below the termination depth of the investigated positions, thus the extent of the deposit is only proven to the depths indicated.

6. Insitu Testing

6.1 Soakaway Test

- viii. On reaching the elected soakaway test depth, the pit was trimmed and squared as much as practicable. Water was then introduced into the pit at a controlled rate to prevent collapse of the sides and the level monitored at time intervals relative to a reference bar at ground level. The results obtained from the soakaway tests are presented at Appendix 4 and are summarised below:

² Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Map Sheets 113; Ollerton; Solid and Drift Edition, and Onshore Geoindex [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

³ Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Lexicon of Named Rock Units [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

Table 3: Soakaway Test Results

Location	Soakage Area Dimensions (average) (m)	Depths of soaked strata (m)	Soil Description (of soaked strata)	Infiltration Rate (m/s)	*Drainage Characteristics
SA01	0.30 x 1.60	1.01 to 1.60	Side – Slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA02	0.30 x 1.55	0.92 to 1.60	Side – Slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA03	0.30 x 1.55	0.99 to 1.65	Side – Slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable

- ix. During the soakaway tests the water level did not achieve a fall from 75% to 25% of the effective depth of the storage volume in all three trial pits. In all tests, the water level did not move, as such, the tests could not be completed within the scope of the method provided in BRE Digest 365 due to the poor soakage rate of the exposed soils. Due to the negligible water movement it was not possible to extrapolate the results obtained in order to obtain a soil infiltration rate.

7. Discussion

- x. The soils encountered beneath the topsoil were found to be typical of the weathered fraction of the underlying Mercia Mudstone Group. The strata conditions and subsequent drainage characteristics appear to be comparable across the site. In this instance, the infiltration testing has revealed that the soils have practically impermeable drainage characteristics. Therefore, soakaways cannot be recommended at this site and an alternative form of drainage should be adopted.

8. References

- Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365, *Soakaway Design*, September 1991.
- British Standards Institution (2015 +A1: 2020) BS 5930: *Code of practice for ground investigations*, B.S.I., London.
- Barnes, G. (2000). *Soil Mechanics Principle and Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, p.47.

Appendix 1

Site Plan



Notes:



Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd

Offices 1 & 2, Barncliffe
Business Park,
Near Bank,
Shelley,
Huddersfield,
HD8 8LU


Telephone: 0843 50 66 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk

Client:
Elements Green Trust Ltd

Job Number:
C4946/25/E/7542

Project Details:
Land off Cauntoun Road, Newark,
Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Scale:	Not to scale - reference only
---------------	-------------------------------



Appendix 2

Trial Pit Records



Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA01

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Cauntun Road

Project No.
C4946/25/E/7542Co-ords: -
Level:Date
08/04/2025

Location: Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Dimensions
(m):

1.6

Depth
1.25

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.30			TOPSOIL (Soft, brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				0.75			Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	1
				1.25 1.26			Firm, grey occasionally mottled reddish brown, very gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							Extremely weak, weathered, grey MUDSTONE recovered as gravel. [MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP] End of pit at 1.25 m	2
								3
								4
								5

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny. 2. Trial pit refused on presumed bedrock.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA02

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Caunton Road

Project No.
C4946/25/E/7542Co-ords: -
Level:Date
08/04/2025

Location: Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Dimensions
(m):

1.6

Depth
1.60

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.35			TOPSOIL (Soft, brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.60			Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.60 m	

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA03

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Caunton Road

Project No.
C4946/25/E/7542Co-ords: -
Level:Date
08/04/2025

Location: Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA

Dimensions
(m):

1.7

Depth
1.60

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.35			TOPSOIL (Soft, brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.60			Firm, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.60 m	

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable



Appendix 3

Trial Pit Photographs



Photo 1: SA01



Photo 2: SA01 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Cauntton Road

Job No:

C4946/25/E/7542

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 1: SA02



Photo 2: SA02 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Cauntton Road

Job No:

C4946/25/E/7542

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 1: SA03



Photo 2: SA03 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Cauntun Road

Job No:

C4946/25/E/7542

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk

Appendix 4


Soakaway Results

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA01	Test No:	1	Date:	08.04.2025
Length (m):	1.600	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.25	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	

Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
0	0.970	110	0.970
1	0.970	120	0.970
2	0.970	130	0.970
4	0.970	140	0.970
8	0.970	150	0.970
15	0.970		
30	0.970		
40	0.970		
50	0.970		
60	0.970		
70	0.970		
80	0.970		
90	0.970		
100	0.970		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.97		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.04	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.11		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.18	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.25		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.01

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--


Remarks	Results processed following BRE 365 (2007). Soil appears to be practically impermeable.
----------------	--

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4946/25/E/7542
Site:	Land off Cauntton Road, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA		

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA02	Test No:	1	Date:	08.04.2025
Length (m):	1.600	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.60	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	
		Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
		0	0.910	110	0.910
		1	0.910	120	0.910
		2	0.910	130	0.910
		4	0.910	140	0.910
		8	0.910	150	0.910
		15	0.910		
		30	0.910		
		40	0.910		
		50	0.910		
		60	0.910		
		70	0.910		
		80	0.910		
		90	0.910		
		100	0.910		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.91		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.08	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.26		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.43	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.60		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.77

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--


Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4946/25/E/7542
Site:	Land off Caunton Road, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA		

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA03	Test No:	1	Date:	08.04.2025
Length (m):	1.700	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.60	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	
		Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
		0	0.990	110	0.990
		1	0.990	120	0.990
		2	0.990	130	0.990
		4	0.990	140	0.990
		8	0.990	150	0.990
		15	0.990		
		30	0.990		
		40	0.990		
		50	0.990		
		60	0.990		
		70	0.990		
		80	0.990		
		90	0.990		
		100	0.990		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.99		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.14	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.30		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.45	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.60		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.71


(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4946/25/E/7542
Site:	Land off Caunton Road, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6BA		



Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Report on Soakaway Testing 3: Land at Maplebeck Road (471807, 359946)

Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists




SOAKAWAY LETTER REPORT

job number	date
site address	
written by	checked by
issued by	



Please consider the environment before printing this report.



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd
Offices 1 & 2 Barncliffe Business Park, Near Bank, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8LU
☎ 01484 604354 Company No. 5130864

<ENVIRONMENTAL> <GEOTECHNICAL>

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Limitations	2
3. Fieldworks	2
4. Geology	3
5. Strata Conditions	3
6. Insitu Testing	3
6.1 Soakaway Test	3
7. Discussion	4
8. References	4

Appendices

1. Site Plan
2. Trial Pit Records
3. Trial Pit Photographs
4. Soakaway Results



Report on Soakaway Testing

Location: **Land at Maplebeck Road**
Maplebeck, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BS

For: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Report No. C4948/25/E/7546

Report Date: May 2025

For and on behalf of **Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd**

Steven Hale BSc FGS
Geo-environmental Technician

Rob Palmer MSc FGS ACIEH
Engineering Director

Report Summary¹

Item	Comments	Section
Geology	Solid Geology – Mercia Mudstone Group.	4.
Strata Conditions	Significant thickness of cohesive and granular made ground overlying silty clay (weathered fraction of the underlying rock).	5.
Groundwater	No water strikes noted during investigation.	5.
Suitability of Soakaways	Not recommended.	7.

¹ This summary should not be relied upon to provide a comprehensive review. All of the information contained in this document should be considered.

1. Introduction

- i. We thank you for your request to undertake percolation testing at the above-mentioned site and take pleasure in enclosing the results of this work. The investigation was undertaken on the 26th March 2025 in accordance with your instruction to proceed. The site is centred on grid reference 471807, 359946. This report describes the work undertaken, presents the data obtained and discusses the results of the tests.

2. Limitations

- ii. The recommendations made and opinions expressed in this report are based on the ground conditions revealed by the site works, together with an assessment of the site. Whilst opinions may be expressed relating to sub-soil conditions in parts of the site not investigated, for example between trial pit positions, these are for guidance only and no liability can be accepted for their accuracy.
- iii. This report has been prepared in accordance with our understanding of current best practice. However, new information or legislation, or changes to best practice may necessitate revision of the report after the date of issue.

3. Fieldworks

- iv. Three trial pits were excavated in order to undertake soakaway testing, the positions of which are shown in Appendix 1. The soakaway tests were undertaken at the base of the pit at depths rational to the construction of soakaways. The soils exposed in the trial pits were logged on site in general accordance with BS5930: 2015 +A1: 2020, and full descriptions are given on the trial pit records which are presented in Appendix 2. Photographs of the trial pits are included within Appendix 3.
- v. Once excavations were completed, the trial pits were carefully re-instated with the arisings. Whilst every care was taken during the infilling process, including compacting of the infill at regular intervals with the arm of the excavator, it should be appreciated that some mounding of the surface may have resulted. Moreover, the infilled soils may be subjected to settlement over time, such that a depression in the surface may also occur. Therefore, the locations of any pits undertaken in this investigation should be conveyed to the current site user, as the mounds or depressions associated with the pits may present a risk to current site operations. Furthermore, it must be realised that the infilled pits represent an area of disturbance within the site soils, thus the soils at the pit locations may vary characteristically compared to the undisturbed ground.

4. Geology

- vi. The available published geological data for the site has been examined and the following table presents the anticipated geology.

Table 1: Geological Data for the Site

Strata Type	Strata Name ²	Previous Name ³	Description ³
Superficial Geology	-	-	None indicated beneath the site.
Solid Geology	Mercia Mudstone Group	Red Marl	Dominantly red, less commonly green-grey, mudstones and subordinate siltstones with thick halite-bearing units in some basinal areas.

5. Strata Conditions

- vii. In accordance with the geology of the area, the succession has been shown to include the following:

Table 2: Generalised Strata Profile

Depth m below ground level to underside of layer	Strata Type	Positions Layer Revealed	Groundwater Strikes m below ground level
0.25 – 0.30	TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY)	All	None
+1.50	Firm, reddish brown mottled greenish, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	SA01	None
0.70	Firm, greenish grey mottled reddish brown, gravelly, silty CLAY [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	SA02	None
+1.30 – +1.40	Firm to stiff, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	SA02 & SA03	None

¹ '+' denotes that the strata extended below the termination depth of the investigated positions, thus the extent of the deposit is only proven to the depths indicated.

6. Insitu Testing

6.1 Soakaway Test

- viii. On reaching the elected soakaway test depth, the pit was trimmed and squared as much as practicable. Water was then introduced into the pit at a controlled rate to prevent collapse of the sides and the level monitored at time intervals relative to a

² Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Map Sheets 113; Ollerton; Solid and Drift Edition, and Onshore Geoindex [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

³ Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Lexicon of Named Rock Units [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

reference bar at ground level. The results obtained from the soakaway tests are presented at Appendix 4 and are summarised below:

Table 3: Soakaway Test Results					
Location	Soakage Area Dimensions (average) (m)	Depths of soaked strata (m)	Soil Description (of soaked strata)	Infiltration Rate (m/sec)	*Drainage Characteristics
SA01	0.30 x 1.30	0.94 to 1.50	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA02	0.30 x 1.00	0.86 to 1.30	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA03	0.30 x 1.20	0.94 to 1.40	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable

*Based on the most onerous results for each test.

- ix. During the soakaway tests the water level did not achieve a fall from 75% to 25% of the effective depth of the storage volume in all three trial pits. In all tests, the water level either did not move or moved at a negligible rate. It is considered that the initial movement was observed as water filled any gaps and fissures within the ground at the sides of the pits. On this basis, the tests could not be completed within the scope of the method provided in BRE Digest 365 due to the poor soakage rate of the exposed soils. Due to the negligible water movement it was not possible to extrapolate the results obtained in order to obtain a soil infiltration rate.

7. Discussion

- x. The soils encountered beneath the topsoil were found to be typical of the weathered fraction of the underlying Mercia Mudstone Group. The strata conditions and subsequent drainage characteristics appear to be comparable across the site. In this instance, the infiltration testing has revealed that the soils have practically impermeable drainage characteristics. Therefore, soakaways cannot be recommended at this site and an alternative form of drainage should be adopted.

8. References

- Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365, *Soakaway Design*, September 1991.
- British Standards Institution (2015 +A1: 2020) BS 5930: *Code of practice for ground investigations*, B.S.I., London.
- Barnes, G. (2000). *Soil Mechanics Principle and Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, p.47.

Appendix 1

Site Plan

Notes:



Rogers **Geotechnical** Services Ltd

Offices 1 & 2, Barncliffe
Business Park,
Near Bank,
Shelley,
Huddersfield,
HD8 8LU

Telephone: 0843 50 66 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk

Client:
Elements Green Trent Ltd

Job Number:
C4948/25/E/7545

Project Details:
Land at Maplebeck Road, Newark

Scale:	Not to scale - reference only
---------------	-------------------------------



Appendix 2

Trial Pit Records



Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA01

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land at Maplebeck Road

Project No.
C4948/25/E/7545Co-ords: -
Level:Date
26/03/2025

Location: Maplebeck Road, Maplebeck, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BS

Dimensions
(m):



1.3

Depth
1.50

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.25			TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to sub-rounded and fine to coarse mudstone and siltstone).	
				1.50			Firm, reddish brown mottled greenish grey, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is sub-angular and fine to medium mudstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.50 m	

Remarks: 1. Position cleared of services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA02

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land at Maplebeck Road

Project No.
C4948/25/E/7545

Co-ords: -

Level:

Date

26/03/2025

Location: Maplebeck Road, Maplebeck, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BS

Dimensions
(m):

1

Depth
1.30

0.3



Scale

1:25

Logged

SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.30			TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to sub-rounded and fine to coarse mudstone and siltstone).	
				0.70			Firm, greenish grey mottled reddish brown, gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is sub-angular and fine to coarse mudstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
				1.30			Stiff, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is sub-angular and fine to medium of mudstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.30 m	

Remarks: 1. Position cleared of services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA03

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land at Maplebeck Road

Project No.
C4948/25/E/7545Co-ords: -
Level:Date
26/03/2025

Location: Maplebeck Road, Maplebeck, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BS

Dimensions
(m):



1.2

Depth
1.40

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.30			TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is sub-angular to sub-rounded and fine to coarse mudstone and siltstone).	
							Stiff, reddish brown, slightly gravelly, silty CLAY. Gravel is sub-angular and fine to medium of mudstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	1
				1.40			End of pit at 1.40 m	2
								3
								4
								5

Remarks: 1. Position cleared of services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable



Appendix 3

Trial Pit Photographs



Photo 1: SA01



Photo 2: SA01 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land at Maplebeck Road

Job No:

C4948/25/E/7545

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 3: SA02



Photo 4: SA02 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land at Maplebeck Road

Job No:

C4948/25/E/7545

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 5: SA03



Photo 6: SA03 backfilled



Site Name:

Land at Maplebeck Road

Job No:

C4948/25/E/7545

t. 0843 50 666 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk

Appendix 4


Soakaway Results

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA01	Test No:	1	Date:	26.03.2025
Length (m):	1.300	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.50	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	

Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
0	0.940	110	0.960
1	0.940	120	0.960
2	0.940	130	0.960
4	0.940	140	0.960
8	0.940	150	0.960
15	0.940		
30	0.950		
40	0.950		
50	0.950		
60	0.950		
70	0.950		
80	0.950		
90	0.960		
100	0.960		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.94		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.08	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.22		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.36	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.50		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.29

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd
Site: Land at Maplebeck Road


Job No: C4948/25/E/7545

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA02	Test No:	1	Date:	26.03.2025
Length (m):	1.000	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.30	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	

Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
0	0.860	110	0.880
1	0.860	120	0.880
2	0.860		
4	0.860		
8	0.860		
15	0.860		
30	0.870		
40	0.870		
50	0.870		
60	0.870		
70	0.880		
80	0.880		
90	0.880		
100	0.880		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.86		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	0.97	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.08		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.19	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.30		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 0.87

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--


Remarks	Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
----------------	---

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4948/25/E/7545
Site:	Land at Maplebeck Road		

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA01	Test No:	1	Date:	26.03.2025
Length (m):	1.200	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.40	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	
	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	
	0	0.940	110	0.940	
	1	0.940	120	0.940	
	2	0.940			
	4	0.940			
	8	0.940			
	15	0.940			
	30	0.940			
	40	0.940			
	50	0.940			
	60	0.940			
	70	0.940			
	80	0.940			
	90	0.940			
	100	0.940			



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.94		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.06	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.17		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.29	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.40		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.05

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)


Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd
Site: Land at Maplebeck Road

Job No: C4948/25/E/7545



Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Report on Soakaway Testing 4: Land off Mill Lane (472200, 362150)

Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists




SOAKAWAY LETTER REPORT

job number	date
site address	
written by	checked by
issued by	



Please consider the environment before printing this report.



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd
Offices 1 & 2 Barncliffe Business Park, Near Bank, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8LU
☎ 01484 604354 Company No. 5130864

<ENVIRONMENTAL> <GEOTECHNICAL>

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Limitations	2
3. Fieldworks	2
4. Geology	3
5. Strata Conditions	3
6. Insitu Testing	3
6.1 Soakaway Test	3
7. Discussion	4
8. References	4

Appendices

1. Site Plan
2. Trial Pit Records
3. Trial Pit Photographs
4. Soakaway Results



Report on Soakaway Testing

Location: **Land off Mill Lane**
Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH

For: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Report No. C4949/25/E/7546

Report Date: May 2025

For and on behalf of **Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd**

Steven Hale BSc FGS
Geo-environmental Technician

Scott Alexander BSc FGS
Senior Geo-environmental Engineer

Report Summary¹

Item	Comments	Section
Geology	Superficial Geology – none. Solid Geology – Mercia Mudstone Group.	4.
Strata Conditions	Nominal thickness of topsoil overlaying clay representative	5.
Groundwater	No water strikes noted during investigation.	5.
Suitability of Soakaways	Not recommended.	7.

¹ This summary should not be relied upon to provide a comprehensive review. All of the information contained in this document should be considered.

1. Introduction

- i. We thank you for your request to undertake percolation testing at the above-mentioned site and take pleasure in enclosing the results of this work. The investigation was undertaken on the 7th April 2025 in accordance with your instruction to proceed. The site is centred on grid reference 472200, 362150. This report describes the work undertaken, presents the data obtained and discusses the results of the tests

2. Limitations

- ii. The recommendations made and opinions expressed in this report are based on the ground conditions revealed by the site works, together with an assessment of the site. Whilst opinions may be expressed relating to sub-soil conditions in parts of the site not investigated, for example between trial pit positions, these are for guidance only and no liability can be accepted for their accuracy.
- iii. This report has been prepared in accordance with our understanding of current best practice. However, new information or legislation, or changes to best practice may necessitate revision of the report after the date of issue.

3. Fieldworks

- iv. Three trial pits were excavated in order to undertake soakaway testing, the positions of which are shown in Appendix 1. The soakaway tests were undertaken at the base of the pit at depths rational to the construction of soakaways. The soils exposed in the trial pits were logged on site in general accordance with BS5930: 2015 +A1: 2020, and full descriptions are given on the trial pit records which are presented in Appendix 2. Photographs of the trial pits are included within Appendix 3.
- v. Once excavations were completed, the trial pits were carefully re-instated with the arisings. Whilst every care was taken during the infilling process, including compacting of the infill at regular intervals with the arm of the excavator, it should be appreciated that some mounding of the surface may have resulted. Moreover, the infilled soils may be subjected to settlement over time, such that a depression in the surface may also occur. Therefore, the locations of any pits undertaken in this investigation should be conveyed to the current site user, as the mounds or depressions associated with the pits may present a risk to current site operations. Furthermore, it must be realised that the infilled pits represent an area of disturbance within the site soils, thus the soils at the pit locations may vary characteristically compared to the undisturbed ground.

4. Geology

- vi. The available published geological data for the site has been examined and the following table presents the anticipated geology.

Table 1: Geological Data for the Site			
Strata Type	Strata Name ²	Previous Name ³	Description ³
Superficial Geology	-	-	None indicated beneath the site.
Solid Geology	Mercia Mudstone Group	Red Marl	Dominantly red, less commonly green-grey, mudstones and subordinate siltstones with thick halite-bearing units in some basinal areas.

5. Strata Conditions

- vii. In accordance with the geology of the area, the succession has been shown to include the following:

Table 2: Generalised Strata Profile			
Depth m below ground level to underside of layer	Strata Type	Positions Layer Revealed	Groundwater Strikes m below ground level
0.20	TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT)	All	None
+1.45 – +1.50	Firm, reddish brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly becoming gravelly, silty CLAY [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	All	None

'+' denotes that the strata extended below the termination depth of the investigated positions, thus the extent of the deposit is only proven to the depths indicated.

6. Insitu Testing

6.1 Soakaway Test

- viii. On reaching the elected soakaway test depth, the pit was trimmed and squared as much as practicable. Water was then introduced into the pit at a controlled rate to prevent collapse of the sides and the level monitored at time intervals relative to a reference bar at ground level. The results obtained from the soakaway tests are presented at Appendix 4 and are summarised below:

² Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Map Sheets 113; Ollerton; Solid and Drift Edition, and Onshore Geoindex [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

³ Sources: British Geological Survey (NERC) Lexicon of Named Rock Units [online resource from www.bgs.ac.uk]

Table 3: Soakaway Test Results

Location	Soakage Area Dimensions (average) (m)	Depths of soaked strata (m)	Soil Description (of soaked strata)	Infiltration Rate (m/sec)	*Drainage Characteristics
SA01	0.30 x 1.70	0.93 to 1.45	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA02	0.30 x 1.50	0.95 to 1.50	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable
SA03	0.30 x 1.70	1.05 to 1.50	Side – Slightly gravelly, silty CLAY Base – As above	-	Practically impermeable

*Based on the most onerous results for each test.

- ix. During the soakaway tests the water level did not achieve a fall from 75% to 25% of the effective depth of the storage volume in all three trial pits. In all tests, the water level did not move, as such, the tests could not be completed within the scope of the method provided in BRE Digest 365 due to the poor soakage rate of the exposed soils. Due to the negligible water movement it was not possible to extrapolate the results obtained in order to obtain a soil infiltration rate.

7. Discussion

- x. The soils encountered beneath the topsoil were found to be typical of the weathered fraction of the underlying Mercia Mudstone Group. The strata conditions and subsequent drainage characteristics appear to be comparable across the site. In this instance, the infiltration testing has revealed that the soils have practically impermeable drainage characteristics. Therefore, soakaways cannot be recommended at this site and an alternative form of drainage should be adopted.

8. References

- Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365, *Soakaway Design*, September 1991.
- British Standards Institution (2015 +A1: 2020) BS 5930: *Code of practice for ground investigations*, B.S.I., London.
- Barnes, G. (2000). *Soil Mechanics Principle and Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, p.47.

Appendix 1

Site Plan



Notes:



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Rogers Geotechnical Services Ltd

Offices 1 & 2, Barncliffe
Business Park,
Near Bank,
Shelley,
Huddersfield,
HD8 8LU

Telephone: 0843 50 66 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk

Client:
Elements Green Trent Ltd

Job Number:
C4949/25/E/7546

Project Details:
Land off Mill Lane, Kersall, Newark,
Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH

Scale:	Not to scale - reference only
---------------	-------------------------------



... delivered using our own drilling rigs / crews / soils lab / engineers



Appendix 2

Trial Pit Records



Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA01

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Mill Lane

Project No.
C4949/25/E/7546Co-ords: -
Level:Date
07/04/2025

Location: Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH

Dimensions
(m):



1.7

Depth
1.45

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.20			TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.45			Firm, reddish brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly becoming gravelly, silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.45 m	

1

2

3

4

5

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA02

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Mill Lane

Project No.
C4949/25/E/7546Co-ords: -
Level:Date
07/04/2025

Location: Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH

Dimensions
(m):



1.5

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Depth
1.50

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.20			TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.50			Firm, reddish brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly becoming gravelly, silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.50 m	

1

2

3

4

5

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable





Trial Pit Log

Trialpit No

SA03

Sheet 1 of 1

Project Name: Land off Mill Lane

Project No.
C4949/25/E/7546Co-ords: -
Level:Date
07/04/2025

Location: Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH

Dimensions
(m):



1.7

Depth
1.50

0.3

Scale
1:25Logged
SH

Client: Elements Green Trent Ltd

Water Strike	Samples and In Situ Testing			Depth (m)	Level (m)	Legend	Stratum Description	
	Depth	Type	Results					
				0.20			TOPSOIL (Soft, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly, clayey SILT. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular to rounded and fine to coarse of various lithologies).	
				1.50			Firm, reddish brown, slightly sandy, slightly gravelly becoming gravelly, silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is tabular, sub-angular and fine to coarse of mudstone and siltstone. [WEATHERED MERCIA MUDSTONE GROUP]	
							End of pit at 1.50 m	

1

2

3

4

5

Remarks: 1. Position scanned for services using CAT and Genny.

Stability: Stable



Appendix 3

Trial Pit Photographs



Photo 1: SA01



Photo 2: SA01 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Mill Lane

Job No:

C4949/25/E/7546

t. 0843 50 666 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 1: SA02



Photo 2: SA02 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Mill Lane

Job No:

C4949/25/E/7546

t. 0843 50 666 87

www.rogersgeotech.co.uk



Photo 1: SA03



Photo 2: SA03 backfilled



Environmental
Geotechnical
Specialists

Site Name:

Land off Mill Lane

Job No:

C4949/25/E/7546

t. 0843 50 666 87
www.rogersgeotech.co.uk


Appendix 4

Soakaway Results

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA01	Test No:	1	Date:	07.04.2025
Length (m):	1.700	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.45	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	
		Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
		0	0.930	110	0.930
		1	0.930	120	0.930
		2	0.930	130	0.930
		4	0.930	140	0.930
		8	0.930	150	0.930
		15	0.930		
		30	0.930		
		40	0.930		
		50	0.930		
		60	0.930		
		70	0.930		
		80	0.930		
		90	0.930		
		100	0.930		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.93		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.06	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.19		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.32	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.45		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.55

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--


Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	C4949/25/E/7546
Site:	Land off Mill Lane, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH		

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA02	Test No:	1	Date:	07.04.2025
Length (m):	1.500	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.50	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	
		Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
		0	0.950	110	0.950
		1	0.950	120	0.950
		2	0.950	130	0.950
		4	0.950	140	0.950
		8	0.950	150	0.950
		15	0.950		
		30	0.950		
		40	0.950		
		50	0.950		
		60	0.950		
		70	0.950		
		80	0.950		
		90	0.950		
		100	0.950		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	0.95		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.09	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.23		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.36	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.50		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.42

(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.


Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	
Site:	Land off Mill Lane, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH		C4949/25/E/7546

Rogers Geotechnical Services L

Soakaway Test

Trial Pit No:	SA03	Test No:	1	Date:	07.04.2025
Length (m):	1.700	Datum Height:			0.00 m agl
Width (m):	0.30	Granular infill:	None		
Depth (m):	1.50	Porosity of infill:	1	(assumed)	

Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)	Elapsed time (minutes)	Water Depth (m below datum)
0	1.050	110	1.050
1	1.050	120	1.050
2	1.050	130	1.050
4	1.050	140	1.050
8	1.050	150	1.050
15	1.050		
30	1.050		
40	1.050		
50	1.050		
60	1.050		
70	1.050		
80	1.050		
90	1.050		
100	1.050		



Start water depth for analysis (mbgl):	1.05		
75% effective depth (mbgl):	1.16	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
50% effective depth (mbgl):	1.28		
25% effective depth (mbgl):	1.39	Elapsed time (mins):	#N/A
Base of soakage zone (mbgl):	1.50		

Volume outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (m³):

Mean surface area of outflow (m²): 1.39


(side area at 50% effective depth + base area)

Time for outflow between 75% and 25% effective depth (mins):

Soil infiltration rate (m/s):	Test incomplete as 25% effective depth not achieved. Unable to reliably determine soil infiltration rate.
--------------------------------------	--

Remarks Results processed following BRE 365 (2007).
Soil appears to be practically impermeable.

Client:	Elements Green Trent Ltd	Job No:	
Site:	Land off Mill Lane, Kersall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG22 0BH		C4949/25/E/7546



Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Environmental Statement

Flood Risk Assessment Appendix C

Sequential Test Report

Revision number 1

June 2025 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)



Contents

1.1	Overview	2
1.2	Sequential Test.....	3
1.3	Exception Test.....	5
1.4	Conclusions.....	6



1.1 OVERVIEW

- 1 This document applies the Sequential and Exception tests of the National Policy Statements (NPS) & National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for the entire site boundary. The NPS and NPPF requires the Local Authority to apply the Sequential and Exception Test in consideration of new development.
- 2 The Development would be located to the northwest of Newark, in the Newark and Sherwood district, Nottinghamshire, East Midlands. The Development would be within an area bound by the Order Limits. The Order Limits are to the west of the A1, north of the A617, east of Eakring, and south of Egmanton, to the north and north-west of Staythorpe. The Development essentially consists of discrete land parcels proposed to be occupied by solar PV panels and connected by cable route areas. The eastern side of the Development runs from the north of North Muskham to Egmanton in the north. The western side of the Development runs north-west from Staythorpe Power Station and then splits at Maplebeck, with spurs running to Eakring in the north-west and Kneesall to the north-northeast, then connecting with the eastern side of the Development.
- 3 Further details on the Development can be found in Chapter 5 'Development Description' of the Environmental Statement [EN010162/APP/6.2.5].
- 4 This document should be read in conjunction with the Technical Appendix A9.1 'Flood Risk Assessment' of the Environmental Statement [EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1].

Sequential Test

- 5 Paragraph 5.8.9 of NPS EN-1 states that *"If, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), for the project to be located in areas of lower flood risk the Exception Test can be applied ... The test provides a method of allowing necessary development to go ahead in situations where suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available"*.
- 6 The NPPF requires the Local Authority to demonstrate a sequential, risk-based approach is applied to steer new development to the lowest areas of flood risk. Where it is not possible to locate development in low-risk areas of the site it is required to compare reasonably available sites in the wider area. The aim of the test is to steer new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding.
- 7 Paragraphs 172 of the NPPF state that developments known to be in areas of flood risk should apply a risk based sequential test in order to steer proposed development towards areas classed as having a lower probability of flooding. (i.e. in Flood Zone 1). Paragraph 177 of the NPPF does, however, acknowledge that under certain circumstances it may not be possible to locate development on land identified as having a lower risk of flooding and certain infrastructure can be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, subject to passing the Exception Test.
- 8 According to Appendix 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification of the NPPF, the Development is classified as 'Essential infrastructure' and as such is



acceptable within Flood Zones 1 and 2. The exception test is required if development is proposed within Flood Zone 3.


Exception Test

- 9 Paragraph 5.8.10 of NPS EN-1 outlines the Exception Test:
- “is only appropriate for use where the Sequential Test alone cannot deliver an acceptable site. It would only be appropriate to move onto the Exception Test when the Sequential Test has identified reasonably available, lower risk sites appropriate for the proposed development where, accounting for wider sustainable development objectives, application of relevant policies would provide a clear reason for refusing development in any alternative locations identified. Examples could include alternative site(s) that are subject to national designations such as landscape, heritage and nature conservation designations, for example Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and World Heritage Sites (WHS) which would not usually be considered appropriate.”*
- 10 As previously stated, the Development is considered ‘essential infrastructure’, meaning this is acceptable in Flood Zones 1 and 2. However, application of the exception test is required for Development within Flood Zone 3.
- 11 The PPG advises that essential infrastructure development can be considered appropriate in Flood Zone 3a and 3b, following satisfactory application of the Exception Test. The Exception Test aims to ensure that more vulnerable property types are not allocated to areas at high risk of flooding.

1.2 SEQUENTIAL TEST

- 12 The work areas are defined as follows:
- Work Area 1: Solar PV;
 - Work Area 2: Cable Route;
 - Work Area 3: Mitigation/enhancement;
 - Work Area 4: Intermediate substations;
 - Work Area 5a: BESS;
 - Work Area 5b: 400kV Substation;
 - Work Area 6: National Grid Staythorpe Substation and connection point;
 - Work Area 7: Consented Staythorpe BESS and Connection; and
 - Work Area 8: Access Works.
- 13 The EA Flood Map for Planning shows that the Development is mostly located in Flood Zone 1 (89.99%), whilst 10.01% lies in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Flood Zones 2025



- 14 The electrical infrastructure within Work Area 1, and Work Areas. 4, 5a & 5b are located outside Flood Zone 2, Flood Zone 3 and the future floodplain.
- 15 As established within Environmental Statement Chapter 4: Alternatives [EN010162/APP/6.2.4], the Development was directed to this area owing to it being the most favourable location considering all factors in the selection process. Section 4.3 of the Alternatives Chapter shows that the Development has been sited taking account of multiple planning and environmental considerations, and discounting less favourable alternatives. Flood Zones 2 and 3 have been a key consideration. Figure 4.1a Environmental and Planning Designations [EN010162/APP/6.3.4.1.1] and 4.7 Hydrology, Ecology and Geology Considerations show that Flood Zones 2 and 3 have been avoided [EN010162/APP/6.3.4.7] as much as possible on balance with other considerations as set out in section 4.3 of the Alternatives Chapter.
- 16 Throughout the design evolution, it is evident that Flood Zones 2 and 3 have been further avoided as set out in Section 4.4 Design Evolution in the Alternatives Chapter. Post Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) publication, two new datasets relating to the impact of climate change on flooding from the Environment Agency became available (Trent and Tributaries 100-year plus Climate Change event, and the Flood Map for Planning Present Day Extents), which show a 1 in 100 chance flood extent for rivers. Using this and existing flooding data, all proposals for solar PV were removed from flood zones 2 and 3. The design evolution between PEIR and ES is shown on Figure 4.9. Design Evolution Changes from Preliminary Environmental Information Report to Environmental Statement



[EN010162/APP/6.3.4.9.2] with areas to along the easter extent of the Development removed.

- 17 The Applicant has secured a Grid Connection at Staythorpe National Grid Substation (NGET), which is located within Flood Zone 2 and adjoined by Flood Zone 3 on the western side. With the connection point, which is the western bay at NGET substation, the optimal technical design for the cables are to cross Flood Zone 3 to establish connection with the rest of the Development's infrastructure.
- 18 Two alternative options are proposed to connect the Development's infrastructure via a 400 kV cable to the National Grid Staythorpe Substation:
 - Connect via the substation associated with a consented grid support BESS on land immediately to the west of the existing National Grid Staythorpe Substation. This grid support BESS has been granted planning consent (Newark and Sherwood District Council, planning reference 22/01840/FULM) (Work Area 7); or
 - Connect the 400 kV cable to connect directly to the National Grid Staythorpe Substation (Work Area 6).
- 19 Both of these options associated with Work Areas 6 and 7 are located within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b. Whilst the site selection and design evolution have sought to avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3, both options for points of connections are located within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Therefore it is not possible for the Development to completely avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3, and there are no other more suitable alternatives.
- 20 The Development is classed as Essential Infrastructure, as per Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification: of the NPPF, which is appropriate in the Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, in terms of flood risk vulnerability.
- 21 For these reasons, the Development meets the requirements set out in Table 3 of the Planning Practice Guidance and meets the requirements of the Sequential Test of the NPPF and NPS.
- 22 Paragraph 5.8.10 of NPS EN-1 outlines the Exception Test *"is only appropriate for use where the Sequential Test alone cannot deliver an acceptable site. It would only be appropriate to move onto the Exception Test when the Sequential Test has identified reasonably available, lower risk sites appropriate for the proposed development where, accounting for wider sustainable development objectives, application of relevant policies would provide a clear reason for refusing development in any alternative locations identified. Examples could include alternative site(s) that are subject to national designations such as landscape, heritage and nature conservation designations, for example Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and World Heritage Sites (WHS) which would not usually be considered appropriate"*.

1.3 EXCEPTION TEST

- 23 Paragraph 5.8.11 of NPS EN-1 confirms both elements of the Exception Test need to be satisfied for development to be consented. In line with Paragraph 5.8.29 of NPS EN-1, the two criteria set out in the Exception Test should be applied to developments are:



- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
- b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.
- 24 Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9] and Technical Appendix A9.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1] demonstrates that the Development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and will reduce flood risk overall given the reduction in surface water runoff following redevelopment.
- 25 Fundamentally, the Development will contribute to the decarbonisation of energy supply infrastructure, therefore contributing to wider sustainability aims, including Net Zero.
- 26 The Development is located primarily within Flood Zone 1, with a small footprint of the Work Area 3 located within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Work Area 3 will comprise grassland, scrub and scattered trees, which compatible with the EA's "Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk 2024" Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) research report.
- 27 Work Area 2 will be located entirely below ground and in waterproof ducting, ensuring no loss of floodplain storage or conveyance.
- 28 Work Area 6 is located primarily in Flood Zone 2 and, despite modelling showing shallow depth inundation for the 1 % AEP + 30 % Climate Change and 39 % CC (i.e. less than 0.1 m depth), is unlikely to flood due to the presence of private flood defences which serve the operational substation with an elevation of 13.10 m AOD.
- 29 Work Area 7 has incorporated flood resilient design, and the connection point is likely to be in an area modelled to be outside the 1 % AEP + 39% Climate Change.
- 30 The Development will incorporate planting and land management measures (RSuDS) which will reduce the potential for an increase in surface water runoff rates;
- 31 Hardstanding areas will be served by surface water drainage infrastructure (SuDS) to limit surface water runoff to greenfield (baseline) rate up to the 1 % AEP + 40 % Climate Change event.
- 32 The Development is classed as Essential Infrastructure, as per Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification: of the NPPF, which is appropriate in the Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, in terms of flood risk vulnerability.
- 33 As such, the Sequential and Exception tests are passed i.e. the Development is located appropriately (Essential Infrastructure in Flood Zone 3 and 2), as per EA Flood Risk and Coastal Change Guidance.

1.4 CONCLUSIONS

- 34 Overall, the Development is in accordance with the purpose and requirements of the Sequential Test, taking account of the flood risk vulnerability classification.



- 35 Regarding the Exception Test, Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Water Resources [EN010162/APP/6.2.9] and Technical Appendix A9.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1] demonstrates that the Development will be safe for its lifetime, taking into account the vulnerability, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Therefore, the Development is considered to be in compliance with the Exception Test.