



## Event Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park
<b>Event:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 4
<b>Date:</b>	4 February 2026

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

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

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

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:00 - 00:00:39:23

Okay. Shall we resume the the hearing? Uh, so we, um, are just at .4.8 of the agenda. Um, which relates to the drafting of the DCO requirement. 11 in relation to and archaeology. So just, just just to set the context for this, um, uh, question 2.1. 21 sought to clarify the drafting of that requirement.

00:00:39:25 - 00:00:49:04

And in response to that, um, uh, Nottinghamshire County Council provided some specific wording.

00:00:51:10 - 00:01:24:02

Uh, some fairly fairly a fairly lengthy response there. And I note that this requirement was updated at deadline two to include elements of Nottinghamshire's suggestion include the requirement for an investigation for each phase, and though generally the Nottinghamshire wording is far more detailed than the revision is actually made. But I do note that in the statement of common ground, it suggests that this this matter is is agreed.

00:01:24:09 - 00:01:28:27

Um, Mr. Lawrence, can you. Can you help with that particular point?

00:01:29:06 - 00:02:00:02

Well, Lawrence, Nottinghamshire County Council, yes I can. Um, I think perhaps it's in the statement of common ground as being agreed in principle, subject to that draft DCO being updated. Um, I think the issue is, is it been updated by the applicant and submitted the deadline to, which is the same time as we submitted our own recommended wording. So you've got two versions of the truth in front of you. We're still of the view, having reviewed what was submitted at deadline two, that the wording we provided in response to the essay Questions is the correct form of words.

00:02:00:04 - 00:02:31:09

It's a form of words that's been used on other consent orders. And it's really to ensure that that, um, iterative process of performing the evaluation, uh, or getting approval for the evaluation, performing the evaluation, updating the mitigation strategy, and then implementing the updated mitigation strategies followed through. Um, it is a complex process because of the amount of post, uh, consent evaluation work that there will be. So, so that's really to get around that and make sure it works as intended. And I think the wording put forward is is helpful.

00:02:31:11 - 00:02:34:24

But it's it's still a little too simplistic for what we're trying to achieve here.

00:02:36:00 - 00:02:54:10

Thank you. So um, yeah, I understand how that, um, that situation may or may have arisen. So over to the, the applicant. And is it is it Mr. Turner or Mr. Sharpe? Um. That will. So, no. So noting the, um, the more detailed, uh, suggestion that NCC put forward would what is your response to that?

00:02:54:23 - 00:03:30:23

Um, uh, Matthew Sharp on behalf of the applicant. So I suppose going back a couple of steps. So it's, it's in the statement of common ground as an agreed sort of point, simply because at the time of submission of the the D2, um, statement of common ground, we'd understood the wording previously had been agreed. Um, and so the wording put forward by the county, we didn't see that before D2. So, um, you know, the version that we've included at D2 was our attempt at dealing with the point that you had raised.

00:03:31:03 - 00:04:05:15

Um, we have subsequently had a conversation with the county's, um, um, archaeologist about this suggestion. Um, and I think essentially there's sort of, you know, our requirement is, you know, principally based on the precedent set out at Stone Street Green. Um, and so that's that's where the additional wording has been sourced. Um, when we spoke with the county in relation to their, um, suggestion, we've asked for just sort of clarity as to which DCO that relates to.

00:04:05:17 - 00:04:50:15

Just so we can understand a little better in terms of what it's trying to achieve. I think in terms of, you know, what set out in our version, what sets out in the county's version. Um, I'm confident that we can reach a sensible compromise. Um, I think the sort of the principle points that we've left as a, um, points for the county to come back to us on relate to, um, whether things like the qualifications of those undertaking the works would be better covered within the AMS itself, just because, you know, certainly from a delivery perspective, um, making sure that the AMS reads as a comprehensive document rather than having to go back and forth between requirement drafting and the document.

00:04:50:17 - 00:05:21:29

So, you know, that's essentially a this smallish point from our perspective. And I think also their suggested paragraph five seems like a sensible addition to what we've suggested, but we're keen to have a conversation with them just to actually come to a position where the two suggestions can be sort of put together in, in, into an agreed form. But as soon as the county is ready to have that conversation, we're keen to get that buttoned up as quickly as possible. Thank you.

00:05:22:09 - 00:05:40:01

Thank you. So just just to pick up on the particular point that Mr. Lawrence made about the the need to secure an iterative process, which I think is what is included under paragraph one of that requirement is, is that something that you would accept in principle is is is reasonable to have in such a requirement?

00:05:41:24 - 00:06:16:29

Um, Matthew Sharp, on behalf of the applicant and certainly the intention of what's, you know, the strategy that sets out within the outline archaeological mitigation strategy is that it is iterative. Um, and so, you know, drafting of requirement 11, um, what we're trying to do is to sort of be clear in terms of there is a, um, a written scheme of investigation for each, you know, phase of the development. And that then includes, um, a program of archaeological investigation required for that phase.

00:06:17:01 - 00:06:36:11

And then that set out sort of, you know, to demonstrate how that's in accordance with the outline archaeological mitigation strategy. So in that sense it will be iterative. So agree with the principle. Um, and so yeah, I think that there doesn't seem to be a difference between us on that point.

00:06:36:27 - 00:06:57:22

All right. Thank you. And Mr. Sharpe, so, um, so yes, I'll leave it with the two parties to go away and discuss. Um, were there any further modifications to requirement at 11 can be accommodated to, to to to deal with the points that um Nottinghamshire feel that need to be perhaps enhanced in that, in that requirement.

00:07:00:01 - 00:07:31:07

Okay. Um, I'm now going to move on to item 4.9, which is the effects of development on the former Ossington airfield. Um, and just just as a starting point. Um, we have noted the, the extent of local interest in the site. That's that's very evident in the representations that we've and we've received particularly and including rep one hyphen 135 from the Ossington Solar Concerns Group.

00:07:31:20 - 00:08:01:22

Um, and I note in um the Nottinghamshire County Council local impact report, they set out that the um Ossington RAF World War two battle headquarters haven't been had been given sufficient consideration by the applicant, and they note that they're in the process of enhancing their records of the site and as a result of recently discovered information. And I assume this is something that Mr.. Mr. Morden can help us on. I'll come to that in a moment.

00:08:01:25 - 00:08:36:15

Um, the applicant has indicated in response that they'll engage with the county council with a view to agree an appropriate course of action. Um, uh, I'm also aware that there's disagreement between the parties on whether or not there's any significance associated with the setting of of RAF Ossington. Um, uh, NCC and response to question one point. Sorry, 8.1.2 points out that Rossington and the associated built remains and would be impacted, um, both directly and as a consequence of changes to their setting.

00:08:37:22 - 00:09:16:15

Um, I also note, I just by way of context, that this area has not been subject to stage one archaeological investigation and the figure we had earlier on, which set out those areas that hadn't been included as part of that investigation, does include the field as having not been been subject to that investigation. And so so that's that's my my context to my understanding of of the situation. So I'd like to start by going to, uh, Mister Morden and hearing about um, Nottinghamshire's position regarding um, the, the any heritage significance associated with this, this area.

00:09:19:15 - 00:09:53:29

At Jason Morden, Nottinghamshire County Council? Uh, yes we are. We've only really recently uh, this has come on our radar in the sense that we've been out and examined. Um, I've undertaken our own site examinations, um, and discovered quite extensive remains from the World War two, um, airfield, a lot more than we were previously aware of? Uh, there has been a record on our historic environment record? Um, which was, of course, picked up during the early stages.

00:09:54:07 - 00:10:07:16

Um, but we feel it probably merited more looking at than it's been given up till now. It's very late in the day, but it's still worthy of some consideration. We think above and beyond that that it's been given.

00:10:10:17 - 00:10:20:22

Okay. So can I ask what what is it this particular project that that's kind of spurred this, this interest and and then can you can you explain a little bit more about what what has been found.

00:10:21:11 - 00:10:51:16

Yes. So yes, it's it's almost a direct response to this. Although we have got other projects running in the Ossington area at the moment. Um, for instance, we're looking at the design landscape which is covered, um, which is a non designated heritage asset, uh, working alongside the Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust for instance. But this, this particular the airfield is not an area, for instance, that I'm particularly specialist in. So it's been a pretty steep learning curve for me as well.

00:10:51:24 - 00:11:27:09

Uh, and my colleagues, uh, uh, the HR manager and the other person who does Bill heritage work in the county council. We all visited the site on um and was shown around by the tenant farmer. Uh, and we discovered quite substantial sets of remains that relate to various different functions that went on associated with the airfield. So there's barrack sites, there's a WAF site, there's, there's, uh, fire, um, uh, sites, there's there's communal components, all of which have some form of built remains above ground.

00:11:27:15 - 00:12:00:29

Um, there are also potential archaeological implications as well below ground. Um, in particular in the area that's been proposed for the panelling and most of the panelling is outside of the it doesn't impact on the buildings. Um, it's really just the airfield itself and the areas that were the original runways. Um, which will be impacted directly. Um, but then, you know, it's a big area. So the setting is obviously also a consideration here.

00:12:02:16 - 00:12:21:21

Okay. Thank you. And, um, so, so what would you say the implications of this work? How how would you, um, progress this the interest that's been found in terms of, um, whether or not this is this should formally be recognized. This area should be formally recognized as a heritage asset. It's either designated or or non designated.

00:12:23:01 - 00:12:55:16

Jason Morgan, Knox county Council. So, um, it's difficult really. We don't have any designated, um, uh, airfields in the county. Uh, as I said, this is a steep learning curve for some of us within the authority as well. I'm not World War II, but but the I would suggest by what we have on our historic environment record, that this site is is probably the best example of an undesignated heritage asset of World War II of airfields. Um, I don't know the answer to your question.

00:12:55:18 - 00:13:28:02

I think there has to be some more communication. Really. There's clearly a direct impact on an undesignated heritage asset if you put PVS on it. Um, but there's also this archaeological issue, which is probably one that could be picked up through the archaeological mitigation strategy. So I'm less concerned about, um, that, but setting is uh, yeah. Is something for a non designated heritage asset. Usually, you know we'll end up in a lesson significant impacts situation.

00:13:28:04 - 00:13:58:25

But so I think the, the real crux is the direct impact. Um I would just say that we've, you know, as we've done our Um, uh, reconnaissance and also looked into it. We've discovered that there's a great deal of communal value. As you've pointed out already, these things have been raised, and some of that we should maybe have picked up earlier. Um, but there have been regular events and so on at gatherings, uh, associated with the World War Two activity on the site.

00:13:58:27 - 00:14:20:10

And we're aware that people come from quite some distances to come and visit the site. Um, Canada in particular, because the Canadians were based on site, but also prisoner of war. There's Italian connections and so on. So it we feel it's, you know, we need to be wary of the sensitive sensitivity of a site like this. Really.

00:14:23:04 - 00:14:23:19

One second.

00:14:25:06 - 00:14:40:12

I'm not sure that there's actually public access to the to that area at the moment is so, so in terms of how those activities are accommodated, I suppose, I don't I don't expect you to be able to answer at that point, but that's my understanding. It is not publicly accessible. Is that is that your understanding?

00:14:40:25 - 00:15:11:02

Joseph Morden, Notts County Council. Parts of it are. The road runs along part of the original runway. You can get right through the middle of the site. In essence, Ossington Village was almost in the core of it. There were parts of of the airfield, in particular barracks and, and some of the outlying um areas that are the other side of the village, so stretches right across overlaps with the design, landscape, park and garden, um, of which there are public right of way. So you can drive through it.

00:15:11:10 - 00:15:24:21

You can certainly walk through parts of it. But yes, that's true that certainly some of the bigger buildings, the really quite impressive bits are not, um, immediately visible and are not accessible on public rights of way at the moment.

00:15:25:10 - 00:15:30:26

That's really helpful. Thank you. Yes. Mr. Northcott, what did you want to say? Obviously come to the applicant after we've heard from you.

00:15:31:13 - 00:15:34:20

Thank you, Anthony Northcote, for jpeg. Um.

00:15:35:00 - 00:16:07:09

To give you some sort of local knowledge, really, about Ossington Airfield. So it was first put on to the historic environment record in 1966. So it has been there a long time, and there are two entries on the historic environmental record, one for the airfield itself and one for the battle headquarters. So it's on, on there in two different forms. And when the airfield was built, um, it was a classic, um type, eh, airfield. World War two had three runways when it was put there.

00:16:07:11 - 00:16:38:20

Um, it blocked up the public road completely so you could no longer get across. Um, when the airfield closed, the public road was then given a new alignment, taking the alignment of two of the runways, which is why it was a funny sort of s shape across. Um, in the last few years, the community has been very active in terms of improving the visitor experience, as you might say, of the if the airfield. So there are visitor interpretation boards. So the community is paid for and put up.

00:16:39:04 - 00:17:22:06

Um, and a couple of years ago, after a very long um, fight, there is at long last, um, a natural memorial, um, on the center of the airfield. It's just off the public road, uh, just on the northern side. And as Mr. Morden has alluded to, um, you do get visitors from Canada in particular, now the landowner. Um, so the airfield, as I understand it, is in two broad ownerships. Now, whilst there isn't strictly public access onto the airfield, the northern part of the airfield in particular um, is used almost every day by people walking along the former runways.

00:17:22:08 - 00:18:02:28

And the landowner has never restricted access in, in any way and therefore actually outside of this process, probably if somebody wanted to make a claim for, you know, a footpath rights over 20 years that would undoubtedly probably be successful. And whilst in strict terms there are some public footpaths and public road goes through the middle. There has in effect been de facto acceptance that the public do wander, you know, right across the northern part of the airfield. And it is that northern part where the panels are proposed, is where the majority of the former structures are sort of located from, from my memory.

00:18:03:05 - 00:18:39:17

And so from, from our perspective, we would say that it is worthy and it should be considered to be a non designated heritage asset, um, for which there is a direct impact, um, being undertaken. And whilst I would fully accept that the, you know, panels are not going to be sited on when any of the former structures would be what you would lose from the panels being located. There was the current open vista that allows you to understand where everything sits in relation to each other.

00:18:39:21 - 00:19:18:15

So in terms of the significance of how that would impact directly on the experience of the airfield, if you go and put a whole load of um, elements in the middle panels, that mean you'd go along could get those clear views across, then you've lost in effect, the in our view, you'd be losing. What is the primary significance of the airfield, which is you can still see today the full outline sort of uninterrupted. If you look on an aerial photograph, you can see that that outline that was put down in the 1940s as a bomber war base remains.

00:19:18:17 - 00:19:42:09

And that is very unusual for the airfields, you know, in, in and around the county. Um, so the community, you know, that they're sort of gravely concerned, really, about the sort of the experience that people have of that today would be completely eradicated and lost through through the proposal. Thank you.

00:19:43:07 - 00:20:01:07

Thank you. So I'd like to ask the applicant to respond to the concerns raised about the, um, potential direct and indirect effects on what's potentially a non designated heritage asset. I don't know who's going to respond to that.

00:20:01:18 - 00:20:03:08

Uh, Mark Turner for the applicant.

00:20:03:10 - 00:20:04:01

Thank you.

00:20:04:19 - 00:20:22:07

Uh, so we did pick up the the high points, um, early on. And they are referred to in our desk based assessment. And we gave some consideration. I think we want a matter of clarification. I believe that we did undertake some geophysical survey.

00:20:24:25 - 00:20:58:00

Uh, on the northern part of the airfield. so we might need to issue a correction there. Uh, the results of that, uh, indicated suggested that strong positive anomalies are recorded, and these likely represent made ground and the debris of infrastructure removed from the former RAF airfield. So from an archaeological perspective, we considered that there was relatively low risk of significant remains surviving in those areas where panels were proposed.

00:20:58:09 - 00:21:28:23

We accept that the battle headquarters exist within the belt of woodland to the north and northwest. They will not be directly impacted, and most of the other structures, I think, are in the more wooded areas to the north of the, uh, open part of the airfield, uh, and or outside the ward limits, so far as we're aware, we recognize that there is an emerging interest in this.

00:21:29:14 - 00:22:12:26

Uh, and what we would seek to do is to work more closely with Nottinghamshire to understand, uh, the airfield a bit better. We think we can accommodate some survey work, some type of topographical survey work in those areas within the limits, so within our control to provide a better record of these things. And we can accommodate that within the stage. One works proposed as part of the AMS process. Uh, we will work more closely with the team at Nottinghamshire to understand their concerns and to actually agree which specific structures survive above ground and whether or whether or not they are within the order limits.

00:22:12:28 - 00:22:39:27

So we will have an ongoing dialogue with that. We think there are things that can be done to better explain and understand the airfield, given its interest. Uh, and we will propose appropriate mitigation following a stage one survey and share those results with Nottingham accordingly. And we work with them to understand that better. And it may be that we can agree some specific mitigations in relation to that. I think that there are emerging conversations to be had on this.

00:22:42:28 - 00:23:13:24

Obviously it's been acknowledged that this this and I'll come to you in a moment. Mrs. Hopkins, it's been acknowledged that the the potential significance of the airfield has been picked up relatively late in the day and we, as an XAT, would be very keen for you to continue to have those conversations as you indicated. And if we could have a sort of a clear approach agreed by deadline three, that would be that would be very helpful. And I could just come to Mrs. Hopkins now before trying to take route to conclusion on this point.

00:23:13:27 - 00:23:15:08

Elizabeth Hopkins.

00:23:15:16 - 00:23:44:03

Carlton on Trent Parish Council, uh it is the Ossington airfield is the only access, and historically there was access also to other farmsteads, namely, and Copthorne and Copthorne used it but rarely, and there was a tower in the middle of the open space, which was obviously the remains of which will be there somewhere under the ground. Thank you.

00:23:45:21 - 00:23:46:15

Thank you.

00:23:48:08 - 00:24:15:13

So just just to return to Mr.. Mr. Morden for a moment, in terms of what you've heard from Mr. Turner about an approach to, um, uh, taking the potential significance of, of the airfield, um, into accounting and in terms of both the potential direct and indirect and effects of the development. Are you, um, are you confident that an approach can be agreed, given the timescales that we're now working with?

00:24:17:11 - 00:24:49:28

Jason morden, Notts County Council. Um, I'm confident they can carry out the level one survey. And that's, um, we're grateful for that. Uh, and that will, that will certainly inform the HR and will further inform our position on the significance of the site. But I think it acknowledging what we've established so far and the facts on that, we've ground truth. I think what we're looking at, a significant site, albeit I don't think it would be registered or scheduled, which are the two kind of ways you would protect it.

00:24:50:00 - 00:25:09:09

Um, it shouldn't be looked at as a bunch of individual assets. It does need to be considered as it's in its whole and it's entirety. And that's very much, uh, what we've heard about it's communal value. That's really where that strength lies. Um, so I'm, I'm not 100% confident, though, that we could come to a to an agreement.

00:25:09:24 - 00:25:17:29

Understood. Thank you. Um, so in terms of that, that, that that survey work that you've referred to, Mr. Turner, what sort of timescales are we talking about for that?

00:25:19:00 - 00:25:27:17

An alternate for the applicant. We were considering this as a more detailed survey as part of the stage one works under the AMS process. So so.

00:25:28:02 - 00:25:28:19

Consent.

00:25:28:21 - 00:26:02:00

I would like to point out that large amounts of the hard infrastructure of the airfield no longer exist. It was returned to agriculture pretty comprehensively whilst part of the roads still exists and there are some tracks and perimeter tracks. Most of the runways in the northern part that we're interested in have actually been taken out. So we, I agreed it's probably not going to meet nationally important criteria. And in our assessments we've considered it on that basis.

00:26:02:25 - 00:26:21:23

Um, so yeah, we wouldn't we wouldn't want to overstate or underplay the amount of significance and communal interest that it has. I think we need to come to a better understanding with NCC as to what remains and what they consider the significance to be in those remains. Thank you.

00:26:22:29 - 00:26:54:02

All right. So I understand now. So. So that conversation is around just articulating what it is that that's there in terms of what knowledge there is there at the present, at the present time. Um, and, and then any further work on, on progressing that would, would be as part of the stage one work post, post consent. So if I can encourage the parties to work together on, on that um, uh, initial phase looking what's, what's known and, and articulating that clearly so that, that and the implications of the scheme for that can be understood.

00:26:54:04 - 00:26:57:11

That's I suppose that's all we can we can agree at this point.

00:26:59:11 - 00:27:30:28

Mark Turner for the applicant. Yeah, I think that's an appropriate way forward. We'd like to engage with, with NCC during that process so we can come to a more common position, uh, if possible, for the next deadline. But we may be disagreeing the way forward. Beyond that point, I suspect, given the timescales we've got, but we will work with with the team to understand what it is that we've got in front of us and what we consider to be an appropriate way forward, and whether we can agree a form of works and a future direction from that.

00:27:31:00 - 00:27:39:18

And we will try and get that position to you for deadline three if we can. Uh, we'll try and have some conversations next week if possible. Yeah.

00:27:41:09 - 00:28:13:10

Jason Morden, Notts County Council completely. We're happy to have those conversations. I would just say that, you know, in my walk around I found a lot more physical remains than, than you're indicating yourselves in. And that includes remains of runways and other elements which are relatively which we think are very rare. So there are some things that you may not be aware of, and that you will maybe want to go out and and ground truth for yourselves as well. So we are working to tight timescales, but I'm sure we can cooperate.

00:28:14:23 - 00:28:43:22

I can only encourage that that work to continue. Given the timescales that we're we're dealing with for the examination and the importance for us to have that, that information. All right. Thank you. Um, I'm going to, uh, well, we're drawing to an end of, um, this this topic, um, heritage in archaeological matters. Um, before we do move on to the next item, does anyone have any final final points to raise under under this item?

00:28:45:28 - 00:28:54:17

Nope. Can't see any hands physically or virtually. So, um, I'm going to hand over to Mr. Hobbins to deal with item five.

00:28:56:12 - 00:28:57:05

Thank you.

00:29:01:28 - 00:29:32:16

Okay. Just before we do that, I'm just going to, um, just go back to the question about about timings that are raised before the break. So we are moving on to the the final substantive item and water and flooding in the water environment. Um, first of all, does anybody have any concerns about, um, carrying on with this discussion until, say, as a, as a, as a, let's say 6:00 at the latest? Are there any concerns anybody in the room or virtually about that suggestion.

00:29:33:21 - 00:29:35:03

I'll look for any hands.

00:29:38:14 - 00:29:55:09

Okay. Well, I don't think we anticipate, um, taking, taking that long, but but and we will conclude discussions by 6:00 at the ladies this evening. And if we've not completed water in the flooding environment, then obviously we will return out tomorrow morning. All right. So I hand over again to Mr. Hopkins.

00:29:55:11 - 00:29:56:00

Thank you.

00:29:56:04 - 00:30:17:21

Thank you. Um, so I now deal with item five, which is flooding in the water environment. Um, the issues today will be those related to points raised in written submissions that we've received at deadline one and two, as well as in relevant reps. Um, can I just check first that we have the Environment Agency here? And would it be Mr. Smitherman. Smitherman that I'd be talking to?

00:30:19:03 - 00:30:24:27

Oh, yes. Mr. Smitherman from the Environment Agency. We've got a number of specialists on the call as well.

00:30:25:01 - 00:30:35:03

Okay. And we'll bring them in obviously as appropriate. Yeah. Thank you. Okay, great. Thank you. Um, and Nottinghamshire County Council, is it yourself, Mr. Lawrence?

00:30:35:05 - 00:30:46:11

Mr. Lawrence county council? Yes, myself. And on the call, I also have, uh, Mr. Ross Marshall, who's a principal officer for flood risk management and may chip in if necessary.

00:30:46:13 - 00:30:47:11

Okay. Thank you.

00:30:54:10 - 00:31:18:13

Okay. So I'll first come to some questions for the Environment Agency. Um, and these, uh, regard your response to our first written questions. And this is in particular where you consider we've stated that the proposed development does not pass the exception test due to the applicant not having considered the risk of flooding from ordinary water courses.

00:31:20:01 - 00:32:03:03

So I'd just like to explore this further and ensure that I have the correct understanding of your position in relation to the exception test. And just to understand specifically why you believe it hasn't been met and what you think would need to be done in order to meet it. So, um, can I just clarify first? Do you consider this assessment does not meet the exception test due to not considering ordinary water courses as part of the fluvial elements of the assessments? Or is it that proposed development doesn't consider the increased risk of flooding on ordinary water courses as a result of loss of floodplain storage? Apologies if there's a bit jumbled there or misunderstood, but I'd just like to understand that further.

00:32:03:05 - 00:32:05:02

Really. In essence, please. Thank you.

00:32:05:18 - 00:32:11:07

Hiya. I'm going to bring in my colleague Sean Holland, flood risk specialist.

00:32:11:09 - 00:32:11:24

Okay.

00:32:11:26 - 00:32:13:07

That's fine. Thank you. Thank you.

00:32:14:03 - 00:32:46:07

Hi, sir. Um, Sean Holland, flood risk specialist in the Environment Agency's national infrastructure team. Um, this comment specifically looks at the area surrounding the Beze. Um, so this is where there are ordinary watercourses within the vicinity. Um, within the application, the um applicant states that they will not be placing above ground infrastructure in areas with flooding greater than 0.4m, except for a very small area in works area five, eh? However, we do have concerns that if there are going to be raised things, there will be a loss of floodplain associated with this.

00:32:46:11 - 00:33:15:14

Additionally, although there are areas where it steps below that 0.4m, obviously that will still remove floodplain. So we're kind of looking to have a better understanding of how much floodplain is going to be lost, what kind of impacts this will have. And that's where our kind of specific concerns lie. Um, we do not think this is going to be something that is of extreme risk. It's just understanding what risk that could be. Um, but we do think this can be resolved within the time limit of the examination.

00:33:15:21 - 00:33:28:18

Okay. So you're essentially looking for sort of further information from the applicants in that regard. Um, and then you would consider that you'd be able to the assessment would essentially pass the exception test set out. Okay. Thank you.

00:33:29:07 - 00:33:42:26

Just quickly, just depending on the results of that assessment, there may be some more mitigation implemented. But we think that that mitigation can be implemented. And we think it will be kind of small changes, not big site wide changes at all.

00:33:43:00 - 00:34:01:25

Okay. Thank you. I think it would be quite helpful if I could just ask if you could perhaps, um, set that out a little bit. Um, something that I couldn't quite sort of understand myself through the, the, um, statements of common ground as well. So perhaps you could set that out a little bit more clearly or explicitly, um, at the next deadline. That would be quite helpful. Thank you.

00:34:01:27 - 00:34:12:28

Um, just quickly on that. We have received some additional information from the applicant since we made those comments, and we are currently reviewing that. So once we've reviewed that, we will give full comment, hopefully giving some clarity on the whole situation.

00:34:13:00 - 00:34:19:17

Okay. And you say that you do think this will be resolved before the end of the examination? Okay. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

00:34:23:10 - 00:34:31:15

So I'll just come to the applicant there and ask you for your any comments there please. Thank you. Liam Evans, on.

00:34:31:17 - 00:35:10:13

Behalf of the applicant. And regarding work area five, the bears, the 0.4m flooding relates to pluvial flooding, and that's derived from 2D flood modeling that was undertaken as part of the, um, flood risk

assessment. Work area five will be served by a sustainable drainage system designed to the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change allowance, as agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council at an early stage in the process. So as such, during that extreme rainfall event, that system should accommodate that rainfall event comfortably and release at greenfield rates, and as such, there should be no loss of floodplain storage.

00:35:10:24 - 00:35:43:09

I know that the Environment Agency had mentioned ordinary watercourses as part of the 1d 2d Pengelly Dyke flood modelling. We did look at ordinary watercourses connected to that particular watercourse, and note that the 1 in 100 plus 39% climate change outline does not encroach in the bears area. There are linear drainage ditches around the bears which convey a certain amount of water. However, the conveyance capacity far exceeds the hydrograph coming into those, and we can clarify that before deadline three in an updated submission.

00:35:43:11 - 00:35:45:09

Okay, that'd be helpful. Thank you.

00:35:57:12 - 00:36:28:19

So I'll just pick up back with the Environment Agency Um, with regards to the modelling undertaken, um, and picking up points that you've raised in your submissions concerning the use of the some of the data set modelling for the assessment of ordinary water courses. So I think this is um, issue, uh EA zero 28. Um, and it's the 1% EDP plus 23% data set. Um, again, I'd just like to make sure that I'm clear on the concerns that you raised on this and the implications therein.

00:36:29:10 - 00:36:44:10

Um, so where are your concerns that this allowance wasn't wouldn't be suitable for the use of assessment of this central infrastructure, which the proposed development has been defined as? Is that am I correct in my understanding, or is that they.

00:36:44:22 - 00:37:16:03

Um, I will say this has come from my modelling specialist, so I'm kind of taking his comments from this one. Um, specifically this we think this is a reporting error more than a material error. Um, so we think there has been some kind of misreporting in the Fra, which needs clarification. Um, and that's we think. Is that simple as that. Um, we do not think this is going to be materially cause any differences and actually have any felt impact on site. We feel like this is just a mis assessment in Phrae that's kind of reported.

00:37:16:06 - 00:37:42:19

What needs fixing and reporting. Um, it's that specifically looking at that climate change epochs, it's using that central allowance where there is they should be using the higher allowances for, um, essential infrastructure. This is in in reference to any of the River Trent modeling, though we feel that that has been done completely as it should be done, and they have used the correct allowances for all of that modeling. This is just looking at um.

00:37:45:10 - 00:37:51:19

The Lower Trent and the Erewash management catchment area.

00:37:52:18 - 00:38:05:13

Okay. And I'll take that slightly wider then and say that, you know, can I centrally can can I be satisfied then? The impacts of climate change in the modelling have been considered appropriately and appropriately, and of an appropriate time frame.

00:38:11:11 - 00:38:35:24

Yes. So the comments I have from my modelling specialist basically say that the Fra should be updated to correct refer to the right climate change databases, but in accordance to looking at the fluvial flood risk, we feel that these have been accurately represented and no additional mitigation or anything like that needs to be put in place. This is just a reporting clarification and a reporting error that needs to be resolved.

00:38:36:02 - 00:38:40:23

Okay. Thank you. Another applicant if you'd like to comment on that please. Thank you.

00:38:41:08 - 00:39:12:21

Liam Evans, on behalf of the applicant. We welcome the comments from the Environment Agency. Just regarding the clarification in the Fra. Um, it should be noted that the CCP one climate change allowance data set was used purely as a validation tool, not as an assessment tool. Work area one was designed to be outside flood zone two, i.e. the 1 in 1000 year event, and as such the conclusions of the Fra are reflected based on that. So it is a simple case of clarifying 1 or 2 points to reflect the Environment Agency's comments.

00:39:12:23 - 00:39:17:23

Okay, yeah that's fine, thank you. If you think those will be my deadline three okay. Thank you.

00:39:31:04 - 00:39:35:24

So I'll now move on to the conclusions of the flood risk assessment. Um,

00:39:37:11 - 00:39:40:21

and I'll come back to the Environment Agency again. Um.

00:39:43:00 - 00:40:19:26

So I think it comes really to to what? I've sort of asked you about the flood risk assessments. Um, just in, perhaps in another, in other terms so I can be satisfied. Um, you know, the development Meets, um, policy. Um, and it's about, obviously the conclusions of the flood risk assessment. Um, and I just wondered if you could comment. Um, you know, in terms of the increase in overall flood risk in the core study area, would that be something that, you know, is that you satisfied that there would wouldn't be an increase in overall, an overall flood risk, um, in the study area or what? Yeah.

00:40:19:28 - 00:40:21:00

You could just comment, please. Yeah.

00:40:21:29 - 00:41:04:17

Shaun Holland, the Environment Agency um, we are satisfied that the applicant has placed all infrastructure outside of the design flood event, which means there should be no loss of fluvial floodplain. Um, meaning that no additional mitigation needs to be implemented. Additionally, this should cause no increase in flood risk on site and or off site. Um, the outstanding issues that we have. So we've got those ones surrounding the beds where it sounds like it just needs to be a bit of clarification, the reporting areas that need clarification. And then the other two outstanding issues are to do with placement of um construction compounds and stockpiling during the construction phase, which we think can be resolved fairly easily and mitigation can be implemented if needed.

00:41:04:19 - 00:41:34:08

However, it might just be about placement for those ones. Um, and then the only other point we have is about the, um, biodiversity mitigation areas and ensuring that any implementation of planting, so new tree planting and things like that do not block off access to rivers for, um, essential kind of incident management and emergency access and things like that, which again, I think is something that can be resolved very easily. And it may be as simple as just having a map that shows a key route into that area.

00:41:34:12 - 00:41:42:23

Okay. Thank you. So those are subject to obviously to ongoing discussions which we can see, see through the statements of common ground as they come through. Thank you.

00:41:42:29 - 00:41:43:20

Thank you.

00:41:47:20 - 00:42:21:23

Um, and could I just, um, perhaps raise a slightly more general, wider point here as well. About the conclusion. I think that I'd just like to bring in a few of the, um, the submissions that we've had from from IPS and especially in the local area, and it just considers the the impact of surface water runoff on the development. So I know this is something that has been dealt with. But again, coming to the to the Environment Agency, I would just like you to comment on what you might think. The risk of the surface water runoff from the panels could be.

00:42:21:25 - 00:42:25:11

And if that's something that you think has been appropriately or adequately addressed.

00:42:25:26 - 00:43:00:15

This. So sorry, Charlotte, from the Environment Agency. Um, looking at that kind of surface water runoff, it doesn't really sit within the remit of the Environment Agency. Um, we normally take the understanding of the assessment that that is something that the local authority will assess and ensure that the appropriate mitigation is implemented so that that surface runoff does not increase. Um, doesn't have any impact on a fluvial event. So the correct Suds drainage kind of systems have been put in place to ensure that it doesn't. It overall has that net zero kind of increase of risk.

00:43:00:21 - 00:43:10:23

Um, so yeah, we we assess it as if it hasn't had an increase and we kind of leave it to the remit of the local authority to ensure that that occurs.

00:43:11:06 - 00:43:17:05

So yeah. Okay. You're sort of more concerned with the assessment element of that, um, where that's brought in, but not necessarily.

00:43:17:12 - 00:43:39:04

Um, we only really assess the fluvial arena. We don't look at that surface water remit. We try and leave that to the local full authority. Um, we only look at it kind of in the context of if they are using surface water mapping as a proxy for ordinary watercourse flooding. Um, and that element of things, we don't look at surface runoff from panels or anything like that.

00:43:39:11 - 00:43:42:10

Okay. Thank you for. Yeah. Thanks for clarifying it. Thank you.

00:43:54:02 - 00:44:07:25

And does the applicant, would you like to perhaps address some of those concerns around surface water runoff? Um, you know, where we've had some local people who've essentially submitted photos and things that have their own concerns.

00:44:08:17 - 00:44:54:11

Lane Evans, on behalf of the applicant. Um, we have engaged with several members of the public, and lots of useful information has been gleaned to inform our assessment and indeed the placement of infrastructure within the development. And I think I'll specifically point to, um, field E7, where at pier, uh, there was a larger extent of solar panels within that particular area, and that has now been stripped back to account for a surface water flow pathway. And instead of panels, that area is now earmarked for grassland and mitigation, which again, um, is a form of natural flood management, which is encouraged by MPs in one as a way to to control surface water from solar developments.

00:44:56:14 - 00:45:14:22

Again. I'd also point to the Environment Agency's response to the x ray question. 13 .1.1, where they've specifically asked on the appropriateness of grassland under the PV arrays for mitigating increases for surface water, and there's agreement on that particular point. Thank you.

00:45:15:20 - 00:45:16:21

Mr. Northcote.

00:45:18:00 - 00:45:56:13

Thank you, Sir Anthony Northcote, on behalf of JPEG. And you've moved on to the the issue about surface water runoff, sir. And that, of course, relates to your question, 13 .1.6 of the first set of examining authority's questions. And I do note that in the applicant's response to that, they provided, you know, information in relation to work area eight. The creation of the new access is within your question. You specifically ask them about, um, you know, your or you cited examples of work, work, work six, seven and eight.

00:45:56:15 - 00:46:30:23

And in their response, they've only addressed areas six and seven. Um, in our response to the first set of questions from the examining Authority, and we've provided details, um, of a whole list of proposed access points that are proposed to be created. And we've given the references for those where they appear to be located in areas of high or medium risk of pluvial, i.e. surface water flooding. And some of those also correlate to the example that you've had in a representation.

00:46:30:25 - 00:47:19:16

RR 169 from Mrs. Gladwin, Pamela Gladwin of how the surface water came out through one of those accesses and then into into their land. So I think there still remains an unanswered question. In response to what you posed, in particular the accesses and how drainage and surface water runoff from existing accesses are being proved, or new ones to be created are not going to exacerbate or lead to additional surface water runoff flooding, because at the moment, in essence, they just seem to be going to create new, hard standing in areas that are already at risk and have pathways of surface water flooding, which nobody seems to be proposing to do anything in response to.

00:47:19:28 - 00:47:24:12

Okay. Thank you. Is that something perhaps the applicant can can come back on or.

00:47:25:17 - 00:47:54:07

Claim Nevins on behalf of the applicant? I can confirm that the Osmp submitted um, contains provisions for storm events from hard standings, which includes access, tracks and access. And these measures can include track side drainage, check dams to slow flow, and once flow enters that particular structure, to allow water to to settle out. And that is the mechanism by which surface water is controlled for. For the points that Mr. Northcote is raising. Okay. Thank you.

00:47:57:00 - 00:48:03:14

Are there any further comments on Nottinghamshire? Do you have any comments in relation to surface water runoff or.

00:48:04:29 - 00:48:26:25

Well, Lawrence nothing you can't cancel. Yeah I mean we are the flood authority clearly. And, um, this is our remit. Um, my understanding is broadly that, you know, what's been submitted is satisfactory for this stage in the process, but I'm just going to defer to, uh, Ross Marshall on the screen in case he wants to just add anything more on that point.

00:48:28:14 - 00:48:28:29

Thank you.

00:48:29:01 - 00:48:55:18

Russ Marshall Nottinghamshire County Council uh, as lead local authority, uh, we are absolutely happy with the principles that have been put forward by the applicant for the management of surface water to date. We're engaging with them to to discuss moving forward with the detailed design. Um, and have no concerns on the ability to to adequately manage surface water from the site, subject to detailed design. Thank you.

00:48:55:20 - 00:48:56:21

Okay. Thank you.

00:49:02:29 - 00:49:06:16

Okay. Are there any further comments from anybody in the room or online?

00:49:08:01 - 00:49:15:16

Um, okay. Okay. In that case, um, unless the applicant wants to come back on anything there.

00:49:15:18 - 00:49:16:07

And then

00:49:17:27 - 00:49:23:28

on behalf of the applicant, there's no further specific points. I just want to thank the local authority for their engagement to date.

00:49:24:00 - 00:49:55:08

Yeah. Thank you. Okay. So now I'll now move on to, uh, five point item 5.4, which is water quality groundwater and contaminated land. Um, and again, I think these questions are slightly less detailed, essentially asking for, um, where different parties are on this, which I think there's a number of different issues that have, um, you know, I think they're in discussion at the moment. Um, and this also includes the contaminated water from the best as well, in the event of a fire. So I've just come back to the Environment Agency.

00:49:55:20 - 00:50:04:07

Um, you had a number of concerns related to water quality, groundwater contaminated land, uh, and the events of a fire in the best. Um.

00:50:06:08 - 00:50:19:12

Are, I think, just ask if there are any at the moment that are of particular concern that you would like to highlight. Um, and if you envisage that you'll be able to come to an agreement on these before the end of the examination.

00:50:22:03 - 00:50:46:13

Hi. Ryan Smitherman from the Environment Agency. Um, as we noted earlier, there's a number of concerns or concerns that are currently being addressed within the long term. There's a couple of other, uh, issues that we've raised That is still requiring further discussion. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to bring in, um, a ground and water and contaminated land specialist, uh, Susie Bates and.

00:50:49:12 - 00:51:22:21

Thank you. Susie Bates and groundwater contaminated land specialist in the national infrastructure team at the Environment Agency. Um, we've got a few minor issues which I think can be addressed quite easily. Um, they just relate to some amendments of chapter nine. Um, but I'll go on to the, uh, the ones that relate to the drainage at the base and or substation. Um, there are three issues which are all linked in there EA 008009 and EA zero ten.

00:51:23:03 - 00:52:00:01

Um, so I'll just kind of summarize where we are with them. Um, we're pleased to see that an automatic penstock with backup power system and regular testing Schedule has been included in the scheme to manage the fire water drainage, and we did, however, also request that this information was added into chapter nine of the environmental statement. Just to kind of tie everything off and that hasn't been completed yet. Um, we requested a commitment to maintaining the Suds drainage system, but that action is outstanding.

00:52:00:19 - 00:52:41:17

Um, and this should be added into the outline fire safety management plan. Um, following on from this, we also requested clarification on how any fire water would be handled and noted that anchoring off site for to a suitably permitted disposal site was our preferred option. Um, so we requested updates, uh, relating to this to be put into the outline fire safety management plan. Um, the flood risk assessment and outline drainage strategy and the Outline Operational Environment Management Plan, but these haven't been finalized yet.

00:52:41:19 - 00:53:13:29

And then the last point, uh, is that's linked to the monitoring fire water was a concern about the lack of post-fire pollution prevention controls regarding the firewater basin and such system. Um, and we requested that chapter nine of the environmental statement was updated to clarify that any containment system for fire water would be cleaned following a fire and before drainage resumes.

00:53:14:12 - 00:53:25:23

Um, and would need that to be updated in the outline fire safety management plan, up uh, flood risk assessment and outline drainage strategy as well.

00:53:27:09 - 00:53:30:27

So I think that's that's all of our points summarized.

00:53:31:03 - 00:53:43:00

Okay. Thank you. Um, and just turning to the applicant, is there anything that you'd like to come back on and perhaps update where, where you are and some of those discussions, or if there's anything that's, um, preventing that. Thank you.

00:53:43:09 - 00:54:20:08

Um, yes. Uh, Matthew Sharp, on behalf of the applicant. Um, just very briefly, um, this follows on a conversation that we had yesterday. So, um, we had a meeting with Mr. Harrington from the Environment Agency last week, which we reported on yesterday. Um, we've got a track of all of the outstanding matters, and we went through in detail all of the outstanding matters and have agreed what needs to be done for D3. So the matters that we've just sort of heard about are points that we talked about and agreed the action last, last week.

00:54:20:10 - 00:54:32:16

So, um, all of those changes will be included as part of the D3 submission, um, with the updated tracker. Um, provided. Just so you're clear in terms of where we're at, but very close to agreement.

00:54:32:21 - 00:54:36:04

So you should see. Yeah. A lot more green on that tracker then. Essentially. Yeah okay.

00:54:36:06 - 00:54:38:17

Again it's getting getting more and more green.

00:54:39:01 - 00:54:39:27

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:43:03 - 00:55:10:13

Okay. And then likewise I just come to Nottinghamshire I think you had. Um, again I think for the analysis it was undertaken for your local impact report. There were a number of recommendations that were included therein as well. Um, and I think your position is that you would, um, you know, essentially obviously you would want to see those, um, put in places. Are you able to, um, sort of update on where you are discussions on those or sort of anything that's outstanding or a particular concern?

00:55:11:06 - 00:55:45:25

Well, Lawrence, Nottinghamshire County Council, I think the issues that were raised and the recommendations, uh, put forward in our local impact report have largely been, um, reviewed and taken into account by the applicant and that they're updated Fra and outlined drainage strategies is, uh, it basically, you know, resolves those issues. Um, so at this point in time, uh, unless, uh, my colleague on the call has anything further to add on this, I don't think we're we're highlighting any particular issues that need further work at this point.

00:55:45:27 - 00:55:49:25

And clearly, we'll we'll update you through the statement of common Ground at the next deadline.

00:55:49:27 - 00:55:51:24

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

00:55:55:13 - 00:56:05:22

Okay. Well, I have no further detailed questions. Um, I'll just open it to the room. Is there anybody else who has any comments or anything I'd like to raise at this point?

00:56:08:22 - 00:56:10:06

Yes. Yeah. Mr..

00:56:12:12 - 00:56:44:09

Williams from the solar farm steering group. Um, are you asking the question about five 4 or 5 five? Um, I'm at five foot four, five, five. I've taken those together since. I'm finished with five. Four? Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Okay. So, um, do you have any general questions that you'd like to raise or. What do you think? Well, that's Paul Williams. They're also the farm steering group. Mine particularly two, five, five, I think.

00:56:44:11 - 00:57:09:03

Yeah. Please, please go ahead. Yeah. Okay. And some of them actually possibly been answered by, um, the last input from the Environment Agency. Um, I've got two issues, but I'll leave the second one, which is water related, but perhaps could have been mentioned earlier on to the very end and address that principally by writing as opposed to wasting time here now. Yeah. That's fine. Yeah. Um, the, uh.

00:57:11:07 - 00:57:50:08

I've got questions, really. And, uh, I don't know if the examining authority also share those questions. Um, I've noted that in rep 1065, which is looking at the issue regarding the thermal runaway, Bess. Um, though of course not a statutory consultation. Uh, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service have been approached for comment, information, etc. and if there has been any published risk response from Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service in the examination library, I've not seen it.

00:57:50:19 - 00:58:29:05

Um, so perhaps some clarification as to whether where we're at with the, uh, with the Nottinghamshire Fire Rescue Service would be useful to know because clearly, although they're not statutory consultation, they have a statutory responsibility to acquaint themselves with fire risk within the county. Um, the question that I think has been answered a little bit now is that, um, in the outline fs MP, it talks about the intention that following the grant of the DCO and the preferred make and model of batteries has been decided.

00:58:29:15 - 00:59:03:15

Uh, then there'll be a phrase used refinement of the outline FSM p into a final FSM. The implication seemed to be from that, that all the examining authority were going to get on. The nature of design and problems, potentially with the best is what we have now in terms of an SNP. And in fact, that's all the Secretary of State would have. And thereafter, once or if the DCO is granted, then some of the gaps will be filled in.

00:59:04:03 - 00:59:04:24

Um.

00:59:07:09 - 00:59:19:05

So I couldn't accept that things like siting of where the hydrants are, siting of where the two tanks are, that can be dealt with later by an agreement with the new Consumer District Council. Um,

00:59:20:21 - 01:00:00:23

they are quite specific about how much water should be stored within the tanks. Um, and they to the credit they have followed. The applicant has followed the guidelines published by Nottinghamshire, Nottinghamshire National Fire Chiefs Council's um guidelines on what should be stored on site and what should be available and how that should be available. And that includes, of course, the discharge rate from the on site water. Um, we're looking in some respects or perhaps examining authority is looking in some respects because the applicant is already building a base just down the road.

01:00:00:27 - 01:00:29:09

And I mean, how often does that happen? Now, in that best original outline for MP, it was planned that there should be a impermeable membrane, put 300 mil below the ground just in case of in the

event of a fire, and this would prevent any contaminant water from sinking down towards the water table.

01:00:32:27 - 01:00:59:21

Quite a few of the bits of that outline FSM have just been copy pasted into this one. I have no problem with that. If it was good, then it's good. Now that the three. The impermeable membrane as far as I can see, hasn't been copy pasted in and I'm now getting reports from residents down there, but actually that has been abandoned. And there's just permeable material now underneath where the cells are going to be,

01:01:01:14 - 01:01:04:05

which is of some concern.

01:01:06:00 - 01:01:38:11

The SNP does stipulate the size of the drainage, lagoon, stroke, pond or whatever you want to call it, uh, and that appears to be designed to accommodate The contents of one of the um tanks. Um, on site tanks are about 220 zero zero zero litres of water. Um, the implication that I'm getting from that, and I may be totally mistaken, is that there seems to be an assumption that we'll have to, which is that's two hours.

01:01:38:13 - 01:02:09:10

Firefighting, according to the National Fascist Council's guidelines, is that we should have a pond which could cope with two hours firefighting. Um, now that's either based on the optimistic premise that the tanker will arrive within two hours, or that the fire brigade are able to put the fire out in two hours. I think either assumption might be optimistic. Um, to give you some examples. Um, January last year.

01:02:10:05 - 01:02:46:02

Um, we're now quite famous. Moss landing. Best fire in California. Uh, the US Environmental Protection Agency responders reported they had to remove 586,300 gallons of contaminated fire water from the site. That's 2.6 million liters. And if that's how the graphic up, um, has previously arranged the corporation. The applicant? Yes. Um, that is the equivalent to the size of the Olympic sized swimming pool.

01:02:47:12 - 01:03:20:23

Uh, now, that is far different from the 228,000 liter capacity. But the most landing site was slightly strange because it was indoors. It was, um, and of course, it was an American. Um, 15th of September, 2020. Best fire an explosion in Liverpool. Uh, it was later confirmed that Water was. Once water was deployed, the runoff contained hydrofluoric acid.

01:03:21:04 - 01:03:51:09

Um. Fire fighting continued for 58 hours there. Uh, there's no exact calculation as to how much contaminated firewater there was, but several reports put it over 5,000,000l. Um, 19th of February last year, certainly a year ago. Now, this is probably the most worrying, um, the best fire at the best in Essex during the construction phase, as opposed to the operation phase.

01:03:51:26 - 01:04:42:05

Uh, that also had contaminated fire water in it. And because they had so many problems ranging a waste carrier to take it away, reportedly. But contaminated fire water was still on site four months later. The reason I mentioned the stay thought best is that in light of the fact that this error happened during the construction phase. And of course, Stanthorpe is now in the construction phase. Um, possibly the applicants are thought, well, perhaps ought to learn from the mistakes down in Essex and have appointed, um a contractor to be to respond to, if need be, any contaminant, um, firewater resulting from an unfortunate explosion or fire during the construction phase.

01:04:42:07 - 01:04:58:11

I don't know if that's happened, if that is in place already or about to become in place, then that gives us greater confidence. You know, that could deal with a fire at the very, very large, uh, best at Arem.

01:05:00:18 - 01:05:05:11

I don't know if that's the case, and I don't know if there's any interest in that answer or not.

01:05:07:21 - 01:05:26:05

In terms of contaminants. Um, I'm not going to go through the contaminants. uh, you know, I'm sure had them all before, but of course, one of them, one of them, uh, the hydrogen fluoride, which has the capacity to become hydrogen floating. Was it hydrofluoric acid? Um.

01:05:29:10 - 01:06:14:17

We'll be contained within the smoke plume. And I've not seen any modeling for smoke plume. Uh, in the outline, FSM p um, or, um, stuff about the wind direction. If the if there is an event of fire, uh, and the weather conditions are rain, snow, fog, mist. What are the implications in terms of contamination beyond the site? Um, but it may well be that that has been thought of, and I've missed it, but so far it doesn't appear to be an outline FSM b uh, I'm not going to go on any further because I'm sure people want to go home.

01:06:14:19 - 01:06:52:13

There aren't many things I would mention, but we can do that by technical, um, writing in as well. Yes. Yeah. The second issue is very, very briefly. Uh, it's regarding a field near, say, west of Nora Woodhouse. The group act on behalf of um, represent one of the resident occupiers up there who's fed by spring. Natural spring. That's coming from a field that's often called W7 on most of the maps. And it feeds a pond, which is pond 116, and there's a natural spring there which originates in the field that's going to be paneled.

01:06:52:25 - 01:07:12:02

And there's just fear that the pile driving could actually pierce the piping that was picked up. Mr. Turner's gone there, isn't he? Um, we think picked up by GFS, but not identified as a pipe. But I'll put that in writing and not wasting all time anyhow. Okay. Okay. Thank you for that. Um, well.

01:07:12:04 - 01:07:20:08

Come to Mrs. Hopkins. I've just come to the applicant first. If you'd like to respond to the kind of two main points there, and then I'll come back.

01:07:21:04 - 01:08:03:00

Um, yes. Uh, Matthew Sharp, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I suppose the sort of the high level points. Um, we've reached out to Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service following your request for a statement of common ground to be entered into. We've yet to receive a response from them. Um, they've not provided any representations to the examination. They're not registered as an interested party. So at the moment, they've not raised any objection. Um, as we've talked about before, the the outline fire safety management plan is based on the established, um, version used at Thorpe Bears, which they agreed with.

01:08:03:02 - 01:08:19:07

And so those principles have flowed through, which I think, um, was recognized by the interested party there. Um, and so happy to provide responses on the other matters that sort of go beyond the sort of the water scope. Um, um, once we see those in writing.

01:08:20:18 - 01:08:28:19

Yes. Okay. I can come back and writing. I think that'd be appropriate. Thank you. Okay. No problem. Um. Mrs. Hopkins. Yeah.

01:08:30:14 - 01:09:03:13

Thank you. Elizabeth Hopkins, council on Trent parish council. Um, as previously explained, we are the end of the line. So the water that is, um, gets into the watercourse ends up coming to Carlton. The suds and the mitigation that's put in place. Um, it's how that is maintained. We've been trying to get a meeting with the applicant. Um, we've got something hopefully sorted this weekend to discuss this.

01:09:03:15 - 01:09:50:21

We want something that's specific to Carleton, we echo the concerns of the Environment Agency regarding the maintenance of any structures that have put in place, whether it's draining channels or scrapes or suds. You can't have a pond if you like. That's to capture overflow full of water before the water. You know, we have the downpour, so the management of water upstream, logically, is going to be different to the management of water downstream and how that maintenance and the maintenance is, is policed, if you like, or maintained throughout the operational period.

01:09:51:00 - 01:10:11:13

Um, from my own experience, I know that if you have, um, a sock away, I call it drainage channels. I think you call them. Um, they, they fill up with silt and are less effective as time goes on. And of course, being the end of the line. We're going to get that salt, and likewise we're going to get the contaminated water over time.

01:10:13:27 - 01:10:17:27

Okay. Thank you. Um, yeah. Yes. Yeah.

01:10:19:14 - 01:10:52:22

Uh, it's just in response to, um, to this clerk. Mr. clerk, isn't it sharp? Sorry. I do apologize. Um, there are a number of other issues regarding the best, which aren't, strictly speaking, water related. And I'm thinking of cutting, saving some time and quickening things up a bit. If in the written follow up to this, I was able to look at some design issues regarding the best and pass that to the applicant so they

could address them now, as opposed to it coming up in a month's time, what have you, even though they're not water related but.

01:10:54:28 - 01:10:56:24

Yep yep yep yep.

01:10:56:27 - 01:10:57:16

Obliged.

01:10:58:26 - 01:11:03:27

Thank you. Um, and back to the applicants. If you could respond to Missus Hopkins said. Thank you.

01:11:04:29 - 01:11:36:16

Evans, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. We are engaging with Miss Hopkins and Carlton on Trent Parish Council to discuss the issues that they experience in terms of downstream flooding. Um, in terms of the issue that was raised in terms of maintenance of particular structures and grassland that is covered in the Olymp, and that's a commitment to to managing those particular structures, ensuring that they are functional and and doing the job that they're supposed to be doing. So there is accountability there and a mechanism whereby the continued maintenance occurs.

01:11:36:27 - 01:11:41:19

And those discussions with Mrs. Hopkins, would you be able to update us as well on, on.

01:11:43:04 - 01:11:47:03

On behalf of the applicant? Yes, absolutely. Um, I'll update you hopefully at deadline three.

01:11:47:05 - 01:11:48:04

Um, yes.

01:11:48:06 - 01:11:52:04

Pending the outcome of Saturday's discussions. Thank you. Thank you.

01:11:59:28 - 01:12:03:08

Um, does anybody else have any further points they would like to make?

01:12:05:01 - 01:12:19:04

Okay. I don't see any other hands or any hands on line. So in that case, um, I'll just say thank you to everybody who's contributed to these discussions. And I will now hand over to doctor McGinn for, uh, any other business.

01:12:25:01 - 01:12:52:01

Thank you, Mr. Hobbins. So we are reaching the the end of our, um, agenda today. And I'd just like to take this opportunity to ask, um, if there are any interested parties that would like to raise any points that haven't been covered in the agenda, um, for today's discussion, that any points that anyone would wish to to raise, either in the room or online.

01:12:56:03 - 01:13:33:15

Okay, well, I can't see any hands, either physical or virtual. So, um, uh, in terms of where we're up to, um, we do have a, um, a list of actions which I don't propose to, to, to run through now because we are we are on to 30. Um, and they are they are evolving before my eyes. So I'll save everybody a little bit of time and not run through through those. But, um, we will be able to, um, to issue those, uh, pretty swiftly. Um, and, and so hopefully they will coincide with what everyone else has noted as the actual points arising from a pretty wide ranging discussion today.

01:13:33:28 - 01:14:09:00

Um, and so just just to note, at this stage, unless otherwise indicated, we, um, we would we would like your responses by by deadline three. That's Wednesday, the 18th of February. Um, and also, if there are any other, uh, submissions the party wishes to make in response to or setting up their the, the points that they've made at, um, at this hearing, then we would welcome those also. so in, uh, drawing this, um, this issue specific labeling to a close, I'd like to thank everybody for their very helpful and constructive contributions.

01:14:09:09 - 01:14:48:04

Today we found it really, really very useful indeed. Um, and and also to want to remind you that both, um, notes and the digital recording of uh, proceedings and yesterday and today will be made available. Um, on the at the project page of the national infrastructure website as soon as soon as practicable. Um, I've also reminded you about post hearing submissions, including your written summaries of any oral submissions. I have reminded you about that. Um, so it just remains for me to close this issue specific hearing three for the Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park.

01:14:48:06 - 01:14:49:18

Thank you very much, everyone.