Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Meridian Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Part 3
Date:	11 November 2026

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

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

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

Created by event.video

1
00:00:00,060 --> 00:00:04,059
Good afternoon, everybody. It's 5 to 2, and we're returning to

2
00:00:05,240 --> 00:00:06,640
this issue-specific hearing three.

3
00:00:07,400 --> 00:00:10,780
Before we move on to item six, which is

4
00:00:11,640 --> 00:00:13,500
flooding and water, I just want to clarify.

5
00:00:13,540 --> 00:00:16,160
We had a discussion earlier, and

6
00:00:17,020 --> 00:00:20,360
Ms. Mayhew, who I hope is still on the line, referred

7
00:00:20,460 --> 00:00:21,100
to

8
00:00:21,980 --> 00:00:25,540
the long list and a number of solar farms that weren't included in
the long list

9
00:00:26,160 --> 00:00:28,000
that she wanted the applicant to take away.

10
00:00:28,040 --> 00:00:31,860
And we're wanting to action that point,

11
00:00:32,400 --> 00:00:33,600
and I wanted to ask

12
00:00:34,460 --> 00:00:36,160
Ms. Mayhew if she would be

13
00:00:37,060 --> 00:00:40,920
able to then pick that up to take as an action point to provide that

14
00:00:40,980 --> 00:00:41,460
list.

15
00:00:43,120 --> 00:00:46,180
Thank you, madam. Yes, Katie Mayhew here on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council.

16
00:00:46,220 --> 00:00:47,640
We can take that away, indeed.

17
00:00:48,540 --> 00:00:49,940
Thank you very much for confirming.

18
00:00:50,040 --> 00:00:52,860
So on that basis, we'll move on to item six.

19
00:00:55,300 --> 00:00:58,960
Thank you, everyone. Agenda item six, water quality and flood risk.

20
00:00:59,060 --> 00:01:02,320
I'm going to start with a couple of questions on water quality.

21
00:01:03,900 --> 00:01:06,200
The first one is to the Environment Agency.

22
00:01:07,140 --> 00:01:10,540
Ms. Locke, if you're there, I don't know if you want to call one of your colleagues

23
00:01:10,600 --> 00:01:11,200
in for this.

24
00:01:12,280 --> 00:01:15,780
At deadline three, you said that water quality monitoring commitments are still

25
00:01:15,860 --> 00:01:18,700
outstanding and further updates required

26
00:01:19,660 --> 00:01:21,740

to the CEMP and the

27
00:01:22,680 --> 00:01:26,520
Operational Environmental Management Plan to ensure that water quality monitoring

28
00:01:26,560 --> 00:01:30,220
is adequately secured. So I want to understand exactly what it is that you

29
00:01:30,260 --> 00:01:30,860
require.

30
00:01:33,280 --> 00:01:35,660
Good afternoon, madam. Yes, thank you.

31
00:01:35,820 --> 00:01:39,340
It's Liz Locke here on behalf of the Environment Agency.

32
00:01:40,120 --> 00:01:44,060
Unfortunately, our water quality specialist is attending

33
00:01:44,780 --> 00:01:46,300
a different hearing for a different

34
00:01:47,260 --> 00:01:50,880
infrastructure project this afternoon, so she's unable to attend, but I

35
00:01:50,940 --> 00:01:54,680
can outline our concerns, and if there are more

36
00:01:54,720 --> 00:01:58,540
detailed questions, I'll have to take those away and

37
00:02:00,020 --> 00:02:01,820
bring answers back in written form.

38
00:02:04,200 --> 00:02:08,120
So regarding your questions, our concerns are regarding the

39

00:02:08,180 --> 00:02:11,380
provision of an adequate water quality monitoring

40
00:02:11,580 --> 00:02:12,260
strategy.

41
00:02:13,300 --> 00:02:17,000
We do currently welcome the applicant's commitment to producing a

42
00:02:17,060 --> 00:02:20,580
post-consent detailed water management plan,

43
00:02:22,200 --> 00:02:26,120
which is committed to in the WFD assessment

44
00:02:26,360 --> 00:02:27,860
and in the outline

45
00:02:29,460 --> 00:02:31,520
Construction Environmental Management Plan.

46
00:02:32,420 --> 00:02:36,280
However, we would like to see sufficient detail at this pre-consent

47
00:02:36,480 --> 00:02:37,000
stage,

48
00:02:38,080 --> 00:02:41,960
so that we have that assurance that the post-consent

49
00:02:42,160 --> 00:02:42,880
detailed

50
00:02:44,100 --> 00:02:45,780
strategy will be adequate.

51
00:02:47,800 --> 00:02:51,660
So this outline detail could be provided in the

52
00:02:51,760 --> 00:02:55,540
outline management plans or in an outline

53
00:02:55,740 --> 00:02:56,960
water monitoring plan.

54
00:02:59,260 --> 00:02:59,600
So,

55
00:03:02,740 --> 00:03:05,740
we do acknowledge that we will be a named

56
00:03:05,860 --> 00:03:09,320
consultee on the requirement for the

57
00:03:09,820 --> 00:03:13,260
final CEMP, the Construction Environment Management Plan,

58
00:03:15,480 --> 00:03:19,140
and so we will be able to comment on the detailed

59
00:03:19,240 --> 00:03:21,420
water management plan when it's produced.

60
00:03:21,780 --> 00:03:25,320
But what we'd like to see at this pre-consent stage is

61
00:03:25,380 --> 00:03:29,260
sufficient detail so that we can have the confidence that

62
00:03:29,360 --> 00:03:29,600
our

63
00:03:30,600 --> 00:03:33,460
concerns will be covered at that detailed stage.

64
00:03:35,380 --> 00:03:39,120
And what we're specifically talking about here is the

65
00:03:39,240 --> 00:03:42,600
use of grab samples, so routine

66

00:03:44,000 --> 00:03:47,780
water quality samples where you collect the sample, and it

67
00:03:47,840 --> 00:03:48,760
goes to an

68
00:03:50,140 --> 00:03:52,520
accredited lab for analysis,

69
00:03:53,600 --> 00:03:57,000
and the use of those prior to construction, during

70
00:03:57,060 --> 00:04:00,720
construction, and for a short while after construction to provide

71
00:04:01,140 --> 00:04:02,920
a sound baseline

72
00:04:04,200 --> 00:04:08,180
of water quality, and so you can then assess any

73
00:04:08,380 --> 00:04:10,220
impacts against that.

74
00:04:11,620 --> 00:04:15,420
We do note that the applicant is proposing to use

75
00:04:16,421 --> 00:04:16,940
visual

76
00:04:19,440 --> 00:04:20,880
techniques and

77
00:04:21,820 --> 00:04:23,900
in-situ monitoring, but

78
00:04:25,500 --> 00:04:29,040
today, we've not been able to secure a commitment

79
00:04:29,140 --> 00:04:29,560
to

80
00:04:30,720 --> 00:04:32,120
routine grab sampling

81
00:04:33,000 --> 00:04:36,380
to provide that baseline against which any

82
00:04:37,140 --> 00:04:40,720
adverse water quality impacts can be noted.

83
00:04:42,620 --> 00:04:43,160
Thank you, Ms. Locke.

84
00:04:43,440 --> 00:04:43,800
Thank you.

85
00:04:43,920 --> 00:04:47,520
Is the Environment Agency concerned that, in principle, that can't
be

86
00:04:47,580 --> 00:04:50,480
achieved, or is it that you want it secured

87
00:04:51,400 --> 00:04:52,500
at this early stage?

88
00:04:54,320 --> 00:04:57,780
I think it can easily be achieved.

89
00:04:58,240 --> 00:05:00,280
Our concern is that

90
00:05:01,240 --> 00:05:05,220
we'd like to have the principles secured

91
00:05:06,880 --> 00:05:08,600
pre-consent so that

92
00:05:09,620 --> 00:05:11,620
basically, we're not arguing over the

93
00:05:12,540 --> 00:05:13,820
fundamentals when a

94
00:05:16,440 --> 00:05:19,860
detailed strategy is produced. We're confident, we have that

95
00:05:19,900 --> 00:05:23,480
confidence now that our preferred approach

96
00:05:24,400 --> 00:05:27,340
can be accommodated by the applicant.

97
00:05:28,820 --> 00:05:32,160
Thank you, Ms. Locke. That's clear. Ms. Power.

98
00:05:33,380 --> 00:05:35,880
Taylor Power for the applicant. I will pass to my colleague, Ms.

99
00:05:35,960 --> 00:05:39,560
Tischler, who will speak to this, as well as potentially Mr.

100
00:05:39,820 --> 00:05:43,420
Owen Tucker, who is joining from online and is our water quality specialist.

101
00:05:46,380 --> 00:05:48,540
Astrid Tischler on behalf of the applicant.

102
00:05:51,160 --> 00:05:55,020
I think just to set the scene, I'd like to say that the applicant

103
00:05:55,040 --> 00:05:58,160
has scheduled a meeting with the Environment Agency

104
00:05:59,260 --> 00:06:03,020
and their water quality specialist on 24th of November to

105
00:06:03,060 --> 00:06:06,640
discuss through the clarifications required to the management plans with

106
00:06:06,660 --> 00:06:10,040
regards to water quality monitoring, and we propose that we

107
00:06:10,320 --> 00:06:11,624
discuss- ... these

108
00:06:12,644 --> 00:06:16,384
updates through with the Environment Agency, and subsequently

109
00:06:16,444 --> 00:06:16,644
make

110
00:06:17,724 --> 00:06:19,964
updates as required to the management plans.

111
00:06:23,384 --> 00:06:27,324
From our perspective, the comments that we've received,

112
00:06:27,604 --> 00:06:31,004
they're clarifications to wording that are within the management plans, but they

113
00:06:31,024 --> 00:06:34,964
don't change the conclusions of the assessments that have been presented.

114
00:06:38,844 --> 00:06:40,124
Yeah, I think that's the main point.

115
00:06:40,164 --> 00:06:40,564
I don't know if

116
00:06:41,504 --> 00:06:44,524
my colleague, Mr. Owen Tucker, has got anything further to add.

117
00:06:52,504 --> 00:06:55,384
Hi, Owen Tucker, on behalf of the applicant.

118
00:06:56,124 --> 00:06:59,844
Just to reiterate what Astrid has just said, the

119
00:07:00,124 --> 00:07:02,424
applicant's committed to providing a robust and

120
00:07:03,464 --> 00:07:07,404
appropriate water quality monitoring strategy post-consent.

121
00:07:08,244 --> 00:07:12,184
We don't foresee any impediment to delivering that,

122
00:07:12,464 --> 00:07:16,463
as Liz Locke has just confirmed from the Environment Agency, and we

123
00:07:16,504 --> 00:07:20,104
look forward to meeting them on the 24th of November just to clarify a few points.

124
00:07:20,964 --> 00:07:22,944
Well, I welcome the fact that you're talking to each other,

125
00:07:24,004 --> 00:07:27,784
but there is no objection, by the sounds of it, in principle to

126
00:07:27,824 --> 00:07:30,004
providing what the Environment Agency's asking for.

127
00:07:33,704 --> 00:07:34,364
It's not an

128
00:07:35,384 --> 00:07:39,304
ongoing dispute, despite being not agreed as part of the statement

129
00:07:39,364 --> 00:07:42,184
of common ground. You're not saying that you're not going to do what they're

130
00:07:42,204 --> 00:07:42,884
requiring.

131
00:07:44,924 --> 00:07:46,844
Sorry, Owen Tucker, on behalf of the applicant.

132
00:07:47,504 --> 00:07:51,184
I think part of the contention here is the use of the word "may" in

133
00:07:51,624 --> 00:07:53,724
the text that's currently in the OSEM

134
00:07:54,204 --> 00:07:55,724
REP1061.

135
00:07:57,324 --> 00:08:01,224
That ambiguity is perhaps because it's written without the actual

136
00:08:01,284 --> 00:08:04,384
plan having been produced at a later stage, so it's perhaps a

137
00:08:06,364 --> 00:08:08,304
drafting issue that needs resolve.

138
00:08:08,884 --> 00:08:09,964
In terms of grab sampling,

139
00:08:10,924 --> 00:08:11,704
we feel that

140
00:08:12,604 --> 00:08:16,404
for the actual monitoring itself, there's perhaps more value

141
00:08:16,484 --> 00:08:20,263
in the immediate methods that we are proposing to give

142
00:08:20,584 --> 00:08:24,104
instant information to the team on site, so they can react to

143
00:08:24,424 --> 00:08:25,464
pollution incidents

144
00:08:26,384 --> 00:08:30,204
as and when required, to make sure things are being dealt with

145
00:08:30,724 --> 00:08:33,924

adequately. Obviously, grab sampling, you're taking a sample, you're sending it off

146
00:08:33,965 --> 00:08:36,845
to a laboratory. It takes a period of time for that to come back.

147
00:08:37,144 --> 00:08:40,465
Doesn't allow for that immediate response to be necessarily undertaken.

148
00:08:40,764 --> 00:08:44,704
Having said that, we agree with the agency, there are

149
00:08:44,764 --> 00:08:48,664
merits in grab sampling. It's just that they need to be proportionate and

150
00:08:48,704 --> 00:08:52,524
targeted on site, and discussions around the

151
00:08:52,544 --> 00:08:53,184
precise wording,

152
00:08:54,024 --> 00:08:56,904
we're looking to agree with them later this month.

153
00:08:58,344 --> 00:09:01,284
Thank you. I'm glad to hear that that sounds like it's resolvable then.

154
00:09:02,084 --> 00:09:06,004
Was there anything anybody else wanted to comment on in regard to the water

155
00:09:06,044 --> 00:09:06,784
quality monitoring?

156
00:09:09,344 --> 00:09:09,764
Ms. Locke.

157
00:09:13,264 --> 00:09:16,744
Hello. Thank you. Yes, Liz Locke on behalf of the Environment

Agency.

158
00:09:17,604 --> 00:09:21,504
I think the point that I want to make sure comes across is

159
00:09:21,604 --> 00:09:21,984
that

160
00:09:23,504 --> 00:09:25,844
what we're trying to achieve here is

161
00:09:27,284 --> 00:09:31,084
sampling to get a baseline. So we're not

162
00:09:31,164 --> 00:09:32,544
just talking about

163
00:09:33,744 --> 00:09:34,404
assessing

164
00:09:35,264 --> 00:09:36,204
impacts of

165
00:09:37,304 --> 00:09:39,464
pollution events as and when they occur.

166
00:09:40,264 --> 00:09:43,484
And I understand what Mr. Tucker's saying about

167
00:09:45,604 --> 00:09:48,884
the delays in taking samples and sending them to a

168
00:09:48,944 --> 00:09:52,304
laboratory, but that's not the purpose

169
00:09:53,904 --> 00:09:57,504
for these samples. The purpose of the grab samples is to

170
00:09:57,564 --> 00:09:59,684
establish that baseline,

171
00:10:00,884 --> 00:10:02,224
so that you can then

172
00:10:03,484 --> 00:10:06,404
assess any changes over a period of time.

173
00:10:09,444 --> 00:10:13,184
I accept that when you take a grab sample, it's a moment in

174
00:10:13,244 --> 00:10:14,744
time, so you're only

175
00:10:15,584 --> 00:10:18,764
monitoring what you've taken in that one water sample.

176
00:10:19,824 --> 00:10:23,664
But a program of baseline samples

177
00:10:23,944 --> 00:10:26,924
can give you a real insight into

178
00:10:28,164 --> 00:10:31,824
long-term water quality trends and

179
00:10:33,023 --> 00:10:33,644
provide that

180
00:10:34,484 --> 00:10:36,804
baseline against which you can assess change.

181
00:10:37,864 --> 00:10:38,304
Thank you.

182
00:10:38,644 --> 00:10:39,704
Thanks, Ms. Locke. Mr. Tucker?

183
00:10:42,664 --> 00:10:44,424
Owen Tucker on behalf of the applicant.

184
00:10:45,564 --> 00:10:49,304

Yes, I think just to agree with the point from Ms.

185
00:10:49,384 --> 00:10:52,764
Locke there, the anticipation would be that the baseline would require

186
00:10:52,944 --> 00:10:55,244
some grab sampling to be undertaken because,

187
00:10:56,744 --> 00:11:00,204
obviously, the visual and the in-situ monitoring only captures so many

188
00:11:00,264 --> 00:11:02,644
parameters, and it will be important for the project to

189
00:11:03,784 --> 00:11:06,784
have a robust baseline before any works are undertaken on site.

190
00:11:07,024 --> 00:11:08,204
So, we agree on that point.

191
00:11:08,924 --> 00:11:09,304
Thank you.

192
00:11:11,144 --> 00:11:15,004
If there are no other questions or comments on that, I'll move on to my second

193
00:11:15,044 --> 00:11:18,484
question, which was about the use of cesspools and the Environment Agency's

194
00:11:18,804 --> 00:11:20,224
latest response to that.

195
00:11:21,204 --> 00:11:21,984
So, Ms. Locke,

196
00:11:22,864 --> 00:11:26,224
the Environment Agency confirmed that the principle of using these across the site

197
00:11:26,284 --> 00:11:30,224
is acceptable. However, you advised that the siting of cesspits

198
00:11:30,284 --> 00:11:32,684
must avoid areas of shallow groundwater.

199
00:11:33,444 --> 00:11:37,124
So, my question is, given that the site is low-lying and largely

200
00:11:37,284 --> 00:11:40,184
flat and underlain by low permeability material,

201
00:11:41,284 --> 00:11:45,104
where does the Environment Agency expect those groundwater levels to
be?

202
00:11:48,944 --> 00:11:51,824
Good afternoon. It's Liz Locke on behalf of the Environment Agency.

203
00:11:51,944 --> 00:11:55,604
I'm afraid I can't answer that specific level of detail at this

204
00:11:55,764 --> 00:11:56,384
stage.

205
00:11:59,304 --> 00:12:00,604
I would have to take that away.

206
00:12:01,984 --> 00:12:05,004
As a general principle, obviously,

207
00:12:05,604 --> 00:12:07,444
siting cesspits in

208
00:12:08,604 --> 00:12:10,344
areas of high water table can

209
00:12:11,264 --> 00:12:13,744
risk contamination of that water table.

210
00:12:15,404 --> 00:12:18,784
But exact locations, I'd be unable to provide you with

211
00:12:19,464 --> 00:12:20,224
at this stage.

212
00:12:22,234 --> 00:12:26,214
Yes. Okay. So it's not so much asking for exact locations, because we don't have

213
00:12:26,274 --> 00:12:29,354
the water level monitoring data across the site.

214
00:12:29,554 --> 00:12:33,454
But if the site is likely to have a high groundwater level

215
00:12:33,514 --> 00:12:35,874
across the whole order limits,

216
00:12:37,494 --> 00:12:39,614
are there likely to be locations

217
00:12:40,674 --> 00:12:44,234
where you can install cesspools where they're not intercepting

218
00:12:44,294 --> 00:12:48,094
groundwater? And the reverse of that is the question that I'm

219
00:12:48,134 --> 00:12:51,954
driving at, which is, is this going to be a deliverable solution in

220
00:12:51,994 --> 00:12:55,674
principle if the Environment Agency is saying that cesspools have to be kept

221
00:12:55,734 --> 00:12:57,034
above the groundwater level?

222
00:13:00,014 --> 00:13:02,194
I understand your question. Thank you.

223
00:13:02,254 --> 00:13:06,014
Yeah, I'm afraid I can't answer that at this stage, but I can

224
00:13:06,074 --> 00:13:09,994
take that away and provide a written response for

225
00:13:10,114 --> 00:13:11,634
the next deadline.

226
00:13:12,434 --> 00:13:16,254
Okay. Thank you, Ms. Locke. Did anybody else want to comment on that?

227
00:13:16,314 --> 00:13:17,014
Ms. Taylor?

228
00:13:20,774 --> 00:13:22,494
I might pass to Ms. Tischler on this.

229
00:13:25,953 --> 00:13:27,774
Esther Tischler on behalf of the applicant.

230
00:13:27,934 --> 00:13:31,534
I think it might be best if we take it away as the applicant team as well

231
00:13:31,574 --> 00:13:34,074
and provide a response in writing.

232
00:13:35,254 --> 00:13:35,614
Thank you.

233
00:13:38,334 --> 00:13:39,874
We'll have that as an action point then,

234
00:13:40,814 --> 00:13:42,334
and that will be by D4, please.

235
00:13:45,934 --> 00:13:49,854
And an action point. Actually, applicant, if you respond

236
00:13:49,894 --> 00:13:53,774
at D4, and then there could be a written question coming out that I'll

237
00:13:53,834 --> 00:13:55,634
direct to the Environment Agency following that.

238
00:13:59,734 --> 00:14:01,134
Okay, moving on to the modeling.

239
00:14:01,974 --> 00:14:05,734
I understand that there's been some revisions to the flood risk modeling going on,

240
00:14:05,934 --> 00:14:09,794
so please could the applicant give us an update on those revisions?

241
00:14:12,234 --> 00:14:14,474
Taylor Powell for the applicant. I will pass to my colleague, Mr.

242
00:14:14,654 --> 00:14:16,794
Chris Brandon, who will speak on flood risk issues.

243
00:14:19,194 --> 00:14:21,054
Good afternoon. Chris Brandon on behalf of the applicant.

244
00:14:22,274 --> 00:14:25,974
Yes, we've had ongoing conversations with the Environment Agency through September,

245
00:14:26,014 --> 00:14:28,814
October, and even as late as last week.

246
00:14:30,294 --> 00:14:33,774
There were two points raised by the Environment Agency in the issue-specific

247
00:14:33,814 --> 00:14:36,454
hearing, one regarding the South Holland Main Drain,

248
00:14:38,074 --> 00:14:41,594

and an update to the 1D model in

249
00:14:41,814 --> 00:14:43,414
parcel D1, which is Gotts Catchment.

250
00:14:44,274 --> 00:14:46,454
They wished to understand flow conveyance

251
00:14:47,814 --> 00:14:48,934
to ensure the scheme wasn't

252
00:14:49,734 --> 00:14:51,134
impacting flow conveyance for the scheme.

253
00:14:52,854 --> 00:14:53,734
On that, we

254
00:14:54,614 --> 00:14:57,634
created a 2D spreading model, which we agreed with the EA was the
appropriate

255
00:14:57,654 --> 00:14:58,094
response,

256
00:14:59,234 --> 00:15:02,274
to model the inundation of the South Holland Main Drain across

257
00:15:03,214 --> 00:15:04,314
Gotts parcel D1.

258
00:15:06,814 --> 00:15:08,354
The results showed that

259
00:15:09,674 --> 00:15:13,634
the South Holland Main Drain doesn't start coming out of bank until
20

260
00:15:13,654 --> 00:15:14,614
hours after an event,

261
00:15:15,534 --> 00:15:16,714

and it doesn't reach the north

262
00:15:17,714 --> 00:15:21,414
end of the order limits until around about 100 hours after the initial

263
00:15:21,454 --> 00:15:25,054
event, so 80 hours over the course of the scheme land

264
00:15:25,134 --> 00:15:25,454
parcel.

265
00:15:26,314 --> 00:15:29,174
The Environment Agency have confirmed that is an

266
00:15:30,854 --> 00:15:34,274
acceptable solution and do not increase flood risk elsewhere in Gotts

267
00:15:34,334 --> 00:15:34,854
Catchment.

268
00:15:35,754 --> 00:15:39,534
I would add that the 2D model is a more representative model than

269
00:15:39,614 --> 00:15:43,094
the cautious 1D model that we've undertaken and which we've based

270
00:15:43,134 --> 00:15:43,934
mitigation on.

271
00:15:44,794 --> 00:15:48,754
The 2D model actually showed a reduction in flood depth of around 70

272
00:15:48,774 --> 00:15:49,274
millimeters,

273
00:15:50,174 --> 00:15:53,414
which was in our response to deadline three on that matter.

274
00:15:53,994 --> 00:15:54,694

But the EA, as

275
00:15:55,913 --> 00:15:57,994
I confirmed earlier, were satisfied with that update.

276
00:15:59,414 --> 00:16:03,274
The Postland pumped catchment model, the EA asked us just to test

277
00:16:03,414 --> 00:16:04,334
the sensitivity

278
00:16:05,494 --> 00:16:05,714
on

279
00:16:06,954 --> 00:16:09,154
the pump-on scenario for the 1% 100-year

280
00:16:10,114 --> 00:16:11,154
plus climate change event,

281
00:16:12,094 --> 00:16:16,014
noting that the pump-off sort of extreme worst-case scenario

282
00:16:16,194 --> 00:16:17,854
showed no increase in flood risk elsewhere.

283
00:16:19,074 --> 00:16:19,354
The

284
00:16:20,354 --> 00:16:22,394
results of that modeling were issued to the EA

285
00:16:23,214 --> 00:16:24,254
last week. We spoke to them

286
00:16:25,394 --> 00:16:28,074
last week on this. They came back to us yesterday,

287
00:16:29,834 --> 00:16:32,694
overall satisfied that there's no increase elsewhere, but they have asked us to

288
00:16:32,734 --> 00:16:35,634
clarify a very, very small parcel of

289
00:16:38,494 --> 00:16:41,014
artifact, if you will, outside the modeling, outside the order limits in land

290
00:16:41,074 --> 00:16:42,974
parcel A, which we are looking at now.

291
00:16:45,754 --> 00:16:49,194
Thank you. So is it the intention that that will all be

292
00:16:49,254 --> 00:16:51,314
submitted into the examination?

293
00:16:53,614 --> 00:16:54,794
Which, the modeling?

294
00:16:55,254 --> 00:16:55,634
Yep.

295
00:16:56,434 --> 00:16:57,374
I think we can, yes.

296
00:16:58,994 --> 00:17:01,014
We've got technical notes for the modeling.

297
00:17:01,034 --> 00:17:03,074
We've been discussing with the EA, we can submit those.

298
00:17:03,314 --> 00:17:06,114
Yeah, in the form of a technical note, we need to know what's been-

299
00:17:06,174 --> 00:17:06,234
Yes

300
00:17:06,513 --> 00:17:09,774
... going on in the background. So, can we have that by D4?

301
00:17:11,514 --> 00:17:11,734
Yes.

302
00:17:14,774 --> 00:17:17,654
And then in terms of the implications of the work you've done

303
00:17:19,075 --> 00:17:21,315
for the wider assessment of flood risk then,

304
00:17:22,374 --> 00:17:23,394
it sounds as though

305
00:17:24,254 --> 00:17:27,974
there aren't going to be really significant implications, that if

306
00:17:28,055 --> 00:17:28,634
anything,

307
00:17:29,574 --> 00:17:32,934
you're assessing the risk to have gone down in Gotts

308
00:17:32,994 --> 00:17:33,754
Catchment.

309
00:17:34,734 --> 00:17:35,034
Correct.

310
00:17:35,534 --> 00:17:36,854
And in Postland?

311
00:17:38,374 --> 00:17:40,114
Postland, there's no increase in flood risk elsewhere.

312
00:17:41,774 --> 00:17:45,734
The area that the EA have asked us just to clarify is in the region
of about 100

313
00:17:45,774 --> 00:17:48,914
square meters. It's a very, very small area, but it's just because
it's outside

314
00:17:48,954 --> 00:17:52,834
your limits, they've asked us to clarify, which we will clarify by deadline four in

315
00:17:52,834 --> 00:17:54,034
the updated technical note.

316
00:17:54,574 --> 00:17:57,814
Okay. So there's not going to be any significant changes to your assessment of risk

317
00:17:57,854 --> 00:17:59,294
based on that. Okay. Thank you.

318
00:18:01,574 --> 00:18:05,074
Does anyone else have any questions or comments on those revisions to the flood

319
00:18:05,114 --> 00:18:05,734
risk modeling?

320
00:18:13,434 --> 00:18:16,074
My next question is to the Environment Agency.

321
00:18:18,854 --> 00:18:22,214
The Environment Agency breach of defenses guidance-

322
00:18:23,069 --> 00:18:26,430
... was used to determine the parameters for breach modeling on the River Welland.

323
00:18:27,330 --> 00:18:31,010
It was decided that the breach would occur when water level reaches half the

324
00:18:31,070 --> 00:18:34,910
height of its defense, and the guidance recommends that three-quarters of the

325
00:18:34,950 --> 00:18:36,390
defense height should be used.

326
00:18:37,350 --> 00:18:40,230
So having said it's a question to the Environment Agency, actually, I'll start with

327
00:18:40,250 --> 00:18:43,710
the applicant. Can you explain to me why that decision was taken?

328
00:18:47,510 --> 00:18:49,650
Chris Brand on behalf of the applicant. We have to take that one away.

329
00:18:50,570 --> 00:18:53,770
Our modeling specialists are not on the call today to respond to that question.

330
00:18:53,810 --> 00:18:55,350
We can respond at deadline four.

331
00:18:58,010 --> 00:19:00,790
Thank you. That's another action point to return to us on that.

332
00:19:03,490 --> 00:19:06,870
And then Environment Agency, did you want to comment

333
00:19:08,270 --> 00:19:08,710
on that

334
00:19:10,510 --> 00:19:14,370
use of three-quarters defense height in the guidance

335
00:19:14,570 --> 00:19:16,810
and the applicant's use of half the defense height?

336
00:19:22,130 --> 00:19:23,230
I'll pass to

337
00:19:24,210 --> 00:19:26,290
Philip Sale, my colleague from the Environment Agency.

338
00:19:26,410 --> 00:19:28,570
I can see he's in there already. Thank

339
00:19:29,949 --> 00:19:30,550
you. Mr. Sale.

340
00:19:32,250 --> 00:19:34,630
Good afternoon. Philip Sale for the Environment Agency.

341
00:19:34,670 --> 00:19:38,070
Yeah, so in terms of the breach modeling for the River Welland,

342
00:19:39,010 --> 00:19:41,010
yeah, there is the breach of defenses guidance which

343
00:19:41,830 --> 00:19:45,770
identifies certain parameters in terms of breach width and water

344
00:19:45,810 --> 00:19:47,650
level elevation to initiate a breach.

345
00:19:48,230 --> 00:19:52,110
In the review of the Welland modeling that we undertook a few months ago, we did

346
00:19:52,190 --> 00:19:54,050
identify some slight deviations

347
00:19:54,950 --> 00:19:56,210
in terms of breach width

348
00:19:57,130 --> 00:19:58,850
and water level behind the defenses.

349
00:19:59,890 --> 00:20:02,990
But I think an important point of note is that the

350
00:20:04,390 --> 00:20:06,630
Cobit Washlands are

351
00:20:08,410 --> 00:20:11,910
a designated reservoir under the Reservoirs Act, so they're quite

352
00:20:11,990 --> 00:20:14,590
stringently managed in terms of

353
00:20:16,130 --> 00:20:18,630
resilience of the embankment. So not sort of typical

354
00:20:19,770 --> 00:20:23,610
flood defenses. They fall under the 1975 Reservoirs

355
00:20:23,690 --> 00:20:23,910
Act,

356
00:20:24,950 --> 00:20:26,490
so they're quite robust in that sense.

357
00:20:28,250 --> 00:20:32,030
We came to the conclusion really that the breach width and water

358
00:20:32,070 --> 00:20:32,389
level

359
00:20:33,230 --> 00:20:36,810
would not materially have a massive influence on model results
within the

360
00:20:36,850 --> 00:20:39,890
floodplain from the various breach scenarios that the applicant ran,

361
00:20:40,470 --> 00:20:44,170
primarily due to the nature of the floodplain being quite extensive
and flat.

362
00:20:45,230 --> 00:20:48,670
The applicant assessed a number of breach locations as well, which
we were quite

363
00:20:48,710 --> 00:20:49,370
comfortable with

364
00:20:50,450 --> 00:20:53,290
in terms of understanding that residual risk to the development.

365
00:20:53,370 --> 00:20:56,910
So yeah, whilst we do acknowledge that there were some deviations in terms of water

366
00:20:56,950 --> 00:21:00,810
level applied and breach width applied, we didn't think they would

367
00:21:00,850 --> 00:21:03,290
materially influence water level at the site.

368
00:21:04,590 --> 00:21:08,070
Additionally, sort of noting that it was a residual risk scenario and the

369
00:21:08,110 --> 00:21:10,030
classification of the

370
00:21:11,810 --> 00:21:15,530
Washlands as sort of designated reservoirs, that we didn't pursue that

371
00:21:15,610 --> 00:21:16,490
further in terms of

372
00:21:17,370 --> 00:21:20,730
asking the applicant to slightly widen the breach width and test a slightly higher

373
00:21:20,770 --> 00:21:21,030
level.

374
00:21:21,670 --> 00:21:22,750
So you're content with it?

375
00:21:23,750 --> 00:21:23,830
Yeah.

376
00:21:24,190 --> 00:21:27,970
When you refer to the Washlands area, do you mean the bit between the Welland and

377
00:21:27,990 --> 00:21:30,270
the first defense and then the second defense?

378
00:21:32,350 --> 00:21:35,810
Yes, that's correct. I think it's called the Cap Cobit

379
00:21:35,870 --> 00:21:36,390
Washlands.

380
00:21:40,410 --> 00:21:43,950
So the applicant breached the outer embankment in their assessment.

381
00:21:45,230 --> 00:21:45,590
Thank you.

382
00:21:46,390 --> 00:21:48,750
Does anyone else have any comments or questions

383
00:21:50,190 --> 00:21:52,530
on the breach modeling of the River Welland?

384
00:21:58,410 --> 00:21:59,710
And this question is for the applicant.

385
00:21:59,990 --> 00:22:03,390
The updated figures in Annex B of the flood risk

386
00:22:03,450 --> 00:22:06,270
assessment seem to have got muddled up.

387
00:22:07,890 --> 00:22:10,470
It would be good to get that clarified by the next deadline.

388
00:22:10,570 --> 00:22:14,370
So the issues that I've noted are, there were several figures at the
end of the

389
00:22:14,410 --> 00:22:17,910
report, and it's not clear which one of the three

390

00:22:17,950 --> 00:22:21,050
reports within the larger report that they relate to.

391
00:22:21,130 --> 00:22:24,930
So figures in seven and eight, for example, appear to relate to

392
00:22:25,010 --> 00:22:27,210
the Postland catchment.

393
00:22:29,130 --> 00:22:32,410
The first and second figures in that appendix look

394
00:22:32,510 --> 00:22:36,450
identical to me, but they've got different revision numbers, and I can't see what

395
00:22:36,490 --> 00:22:39,249
I'm supposed to be looking at there. So if that could be clarified.

396
00:22:39,830 --> 00:22:43,610
The figures in appendix one, which is the peak flow estimate, which was the

397
00:22:43,730 --> 00:22:45,510
new appendix that's just been added,

398
00:22:46,570 --> 00:22:47,190
are missing.

399
00:22:48,170 --> 00:22:48,590
And

400
00:22:49,910 --> 00:22:53,210
yeah, if you can have a check through all of those figures,

401
00:22:54,930 --> 00:22:56,370
review as necessary,

402
00:22:57,790 --> 00:23:00,870
and then reissue at deadline four, that would be appreciated.

403

00:23:03,250 --> 00:23:06,130
Taylor Power for the applicant. And yes, and just confirming earlier when we were

404
00:23:06,170 --> 00:23:10,130
making the commitment to update the technical note on modeling, that would

405
00:23:10,190 --> 00:23:10,310
go

406
00:23:12,410 --> 00:23:16,250
into the flood risk appendices. So we expect we can do that all in one for deadline

407
00:23:16,310 --> 00:23:16,450
four.

408
00:23:16,790 --> 00:23:17,690
Sounds good. Thank you.

409
00:23:21,370 --> 00:23:25,270
Right, moving on to the outline flood emergency response plan.

410
00:23:25,470 --> 00:23:29,190
It would probably be useful if you could get this up on the screen, and

411
00:23:29,450 --> 00:23:32,230
I will move on to table 2-1 in a minute.

412
00:23:33,870 --> 00:23:37,630
So this emergency response plan was received at D3, and it's

413
00:23:37,690 --> 00:23:41,130
REP 2005 for anyone that's looking for it.

414
00:23:42,510 --> 00:23:45,650
My first question relates to the location of the plan

415
00:23:46,530 --> 00:23:49,790
in relation to the DCO and the phase of development.

416
00:23:50,230 --> 00:23:51,430
So at the moment,

417
00:23:52,730 --> 00:23:55,510
the emergency plan sits as an appendix

418
00:23:56,850 --> 00:23:59,210
to the construction environment management plan.

419
00:24:00,950 --> 00:24:04,890
Although it's referenced from the main CEMP text, there's

420
00:24:04,950 --> 00:24:08,170
nothing that says that any future plan has to be in accordance with the

421
00:24:08,230 --> 00:24:09,110
appendix.

422
00:24:11,630 --> 00:24:14,850
So I want to check with you whether or not you're satisfied that that is

423
00:24:15,230 --> 00:24:16,910
sufficiently secured.

424
00:24:20,190 --> 00:24:23,630
Taylor Power for the applicant. We can look at that wording and see if we can more

425
00:24:24,390 --> 00:24:27,170
strongly secure that within the wording of the CEMP to make sure that,

426
00:24:28,110 --> 00:24:30,750
like the other plans, it's in general accordance with-

427
00:24:31,070 --> 00:24:31,250
Thank you

428

00:24:31,289 --> 00:24:32,550
... substantial accordance with, rather.

429
00:24:32,590 --> 00:24:35,790
It might need to be reviewed in light of the next few questions as well.

430
00:24:35,910 --> 00:24:36,110
So

431
00:24:36,930 --> 00:24:40,370
the CEMP has to be approved under requirement 12 by the

432
00:24:40,470 --> 00:24:41,010
LPA.

433
00:24:43,360 --> 00:24:47,300
And my next question, is it appropriate to have such

434
00:24:47,360 --> 00:24:50,780
a potentially important document as an appendix?

435
00:24:51,720 --> 00:24:55,300
Is it accessible enough for the purposes of approval and enforcement?

436
00:24:56,540 --> 00:24:59,340
And I will put that question to

437
00:24:59,740 --> 00:25:00,640
Lincolnshire,

438
00:25:03,520 --> 00:25:07,420
as the body tasked with enforcing this, given that it's a flood

439
00:25:07,480 --> 00:25:08,860
risk emergency plan,

440
00:25:10,320 --> 00:25:12,620
and we're just talking about construction at the moment.

441

00:25:13,600 --> 00:25:17,060
Are you happy that it's in an appendix to a CEMP,

442
00:25:17,520 --> 00:25:18,560
in terms of it being

443
00:25:20,100 --> 00:25:23,060
transparent and easy to enforce against?

444
00:25:26,400 --> 00:25:28,040
Joel Samakula, Lincolnshire

445
00:25:29,120 --> 00:25:29,760
County Council.

446
00:25:30,700 --> 00:25:32,960
I'll refer then to Mr.

447
00:25:33,820 --> 00:25:35,700
Barton, who I think is going to take this.

448
00:25:38,040 --> 00:25:38,720
Mr. Barton.

449
00:25:39,580 --> 00:25:43,000
Thank you. Thanks, Joel. Andrew Barton, Lincolnshire County Council.

450
00:25:43,720 --> 00:25:47,519
To be fair, it's not a question we'd sort of thought about

451
00:25:47,880 --> 00:25:51,000
prior to it being raised in the hearing here today.

452
00:25:52,160 --> 00:25:55,980
I will, if I may, just sort of seek advice from the emergency

453
00:25:56,040 --> 00:25:59,780
planning team, if that's okay, and revert back in due

454
00:25:59,840 --> 00:26:00,100
course.

455
00:26:00,940 --> 00:26:04,720
I get the point, I think, in terms of it being, sitting within an appendix, perhaps

456
00:26:04,760 --> 00:26:05,560
it's not quite as

457
00:26:06,820 --> 00:26:08,040
enforceable, perhaps,

458
00:26:09,400 --> 00:26:12,220
as it could be if it was just a standalone requirement.

459
00:26:12,280 --> 00:26:14,940
So, yeah, if I could take that away and then-

460
00:26:15,020 --> 00:26:18,200
Yeah. Not just enforceable, it's the approval of it as well.

461
00:26:18,220 --> 00:26:18,340
Yeah.

462
00:26:18,380 --> 00:26:21,020
Because although the CEMP's being approved, like the point I just put to Ms.

463
00:26:21,080 --> 00:26:23,640
Taylor, I want to be clear that this is approved

464
00:26:24,780 --> 00:26:25,860
in its own right.

465
00:26:27,660 --> 00:26:30,900
But I have a related question then about enforcing it during operation and

466
00:26:30,940 --> 00:26:34,740
decommissioning, because although it's referenced at a high level in

467
00:26:34,780 --> 00:26:38,720

both those environmental management plans, it's still only attached

468
00:26:38,780 --> 00:26:42,200
to the CEMP. And again, in terms of it being

469
00:26:42,300 --> 00:26:45,980
traceable for somebody trying to enforce that, can we have a look at

470
00:26:46,520 --> 00:26:49,800
a more suitable place for that emergency plan to sit?

471
00:26:50,580 --> 00:26:54,200
And following all of those questions, the

472
00:26:54,280 --> 00:26:57,400
next question has to be, does it need to sit

473
00:26:59,260 --> 00:27:02,940
away from the CEMPs and sit by itself and be called

474
00:27:02,960 --> 00:27:06,880
directly by the DCO to make sure that it is enforceable and

475
00:27:06,980 --> 00:27:07,360
clear?

476
00:27:08,160 --> 00:27:11,760
So, I think if I could give that to both parties to have a think about,

477
00:27:12,160 --> 00:27:13,580
I'd like your advice on

478
00:27:14,400 --> 00:27:18,360
where you think it would be most safely contained and

479
00:27:18,420 --> 00:27:21,360
called upon by the DCO, Mr. Barton.

480
00:27:21,400 --> 00:27:24,440
And yeah, I'll take your thoughts into account as well, Ms. Taylor.

481
00:27:26,000 --> 00:27:27,920
Yes, thank you. Taylor Powell for the applicant.

482
00:27:29,880 --> 00:27:33,280
Yeah, we'll take that away and have a look at it and respect to how it sits within

483
00:27:33,300 --> 00:27:37,180
the plans. I know the intention with sitting it within the CEMP was to ensure

484
00:27:37,220 --> 00:27:40,520
that it's also being considered holistically and alongside the other

485
00:27:40,940 --> 00:27:44,420
construction matters, and the same again once it gets to the operational stage.

486
00:27:45,260 --> 00:27:48,740
But we can add this to the list of DCO matters that we're talking about with the

487
00:27:48,800 --> 00:27:52,480
council and consider from that enforceability perspective and come back to you.

488
00:27:52,920 --> 00:27:55,660
So, sounds good. Thank you, and apologies for calling you Ms. Taylor.

489
00:27:57,620 --> 00:28:01,000
Does anyone else have any other questions on that matter?

490
00:28:02,480 --> 00:28:06,200
In which case, turning to table 2-1 of the emergency plan, which contains the

491
00:28:06,240 --> 00:28:08,660
estimated warning times,

492
00:28:10,260 --> 00:28:11,900

if we can get that put up on the screen.

493
00:28:13,180 --> 00:28:16,400
My question for the applicant is about the

494
00:28:16,460 --> 00:28:20,080
Postland catchment, which has been given a warning time of

495
00:28:20,340 --> 00:28:24,240
1.83 hours to parcel C. Can you tell me what

496
00:28:24,280 --> 00:28:25,440
that's based on?

497
00:28:29,980 --> 00:28:31,440
Chris Brandler on behalf of the applicant.

498
00:28:32,460 --> 00:28:33,160
Yeah, so there were,

499
00:28:35,320 --> 00:28:38,080
as we discussed, this will be submitted deadline four as part of the technical

500
00:28:38,120 --> 00:28:41,860
notes, but there was a flood response duration time technical

501
00:28:41,900 --> 00:28:44,760
note prepared that we have through discussions with the Environment Agency as well.

502
00:28:46,860 --> 00:28:50,800
There's a small bank. There are seven sites, seven

503
00:28:50,840 --> 00:28:51,860
locations for the

504
00:28:52,740 --> 00:28:56,720
duration time selected across the solar development area, and one point

505

00:28:56,780 --> 00:28:58,200
on the inland parcel C,

506
00:29:00,279 --> 00:29:03,680
where the point was taken is right by the watercourse, and it

507
00:29:04,580 --> 00:29:07,720
sort of overtops on a very low point after 1.83 hours.

508
00:29:08,460 --> 00:29:09,840
So, where are they shown-

509
00:29:11,060 --> 00:29:11,200
They-

510
00:29:11,559 --> 00:29:12,320
... in the documents?

511
00:29:13,720 --> 00:29:15,180
They're not submitted yet, but there will be-

512
00:29:15,240 --> 00:29:15,340
Right

513
00:29:16,019 --> 00:29:16,880
... a deadline four with

514
00:29:17,740 --> 00:29:19,020
the EA appendices updates.

515
00:29:19,060 --> 00:29:19,420
Thank you.

516
00:29:20,960 --> 00:29:22,540
But there's a figure that shows

517
00:29:24,020 --> 00:29:24,120
the

518
00:29:25,460 --> 00:29:27,940
number where this floods out at 1.83 hours.

519
00:29:28,900 --> 00:29:32,820
In general, the Postland catchment has a 20-hour minimum response time, up to 50

520
00:29:32,880 --> 00:29:36,740
hours. This is associated with a very small portion of flood

521
00:29:36,780 --> 00:29:37,520
zone 3B,

522
00:29:38,480 --> 00:29:39,480
which correlates with the mapping,

523
00:29:40,540 --> 00:29:41,540
which can be seen on the

524
00:29:43,760 --> 00:29:47,200
flood maps that have already been generated and provided in our reports.

525
00:29:47,700 --> 00:29:51,480
So, it's literally a tiny area of flood zone 3B, so it's just a

526
00:29:51,840 --> 00:29:55,200
quirk of where it's been selected right by a watercourse, it's given 1.8 hours, but

527
00:29:55,220 --> 00:29:58,180
there's no built development in there. It's been avoided as part of the scheme.

528
00:29:58,980 --> 00:30:00,160
So, it's flood zone 3B, so there's no

529
00:30:01,060 --> 00:30:04,040
built development there. The rest of the scheme is shown to be about 20 hours

530
00:30:04,120 --> 00:30:05,560
minimum response time for the Postland.

531
00:30:07,360 --> 00:30:11,160
So again, that's being updated in the flood response plan and the

532
00:30:11,260 --> 00:30:13,260
FRA to clarify that fact at deadline four.

533
00:30:17,440 --> 00:30:17,960
Thank you.

534
00:30:20,760 --> 00:30:21,140
And

535
00:30:21,960 --> 00:30:25,740
we will have response times then for the

536
00:30:25,800 --> 00:30:27,640
South Holland main drain

537
00:30:28,520 --> 00:30:30,840
new modeling at deadline four as well?

538
00:30:32,420 --> 00:30:33,900
Chris Brandler on behalf of the applicant.

539
00:30:34,500 --> 00:30:37,800
Yeah, specifically for Gotts catchment, that's where the 2D model's been generated

540
00:30:37,880 --> 00:30:41,120
for. So, we've used the propagation times to inform the response times.

541
00:30:41,440 --> 00:30:41,700
Okay.

542
00:30:42,720 --> 00:30:44,640
Thank you. We'll have a look at those when they're submitted.

543
00:30:46,928 --> 00:30:48,808
Moving on to responsibilities

544
00:30:49,828 --> 00:30:53,548
and flood warnings. It's stated in the report that the risk from flooding will be

545
00:30:53,608 --> 00:30:56,828
managed by the site manager, including monitoring,

546
00:30:57,788 --> 00:31:01,528
and this is monitoring of heavy rainfall, the surface water flooding

547
00:31:01,608 --> 00:31:05,528
forecasts, and the EA warnings. So, we want to understand how that

548
00:31:05,568 --> 00:31:07,488
would work in reality.

549
00:31:09,248 --> 00:31:12,808
Before we move on to practicalities, can the applicant confirm if the Environment

550
00:31:12,908 --> 00:31:16,188
Agency issues warnings for the Postland and the South Holland Main Drain

551
00:31:16,288 --> 00:31:17,028
catchments?

552
00:31:20,288 --> 00:31:21,708
Chris Brand on behalf of the applicant.

553
00:31:22,628 --> 00:31:24,168
The scheme sits within

554
00:31:25,848 --> 00:31:28,708
flood alert and flood warning areas associated with the Welland and the Nene

555
00:31:28,788 --> 00:31:29,308
catchments.

556
00:31:30,428 --> 00:31:34,188

So yes, it does sit within the... So, for example, if a flood alert was issued

557
00:31:34,648 --> 00:31:35,568
in those areas,

558
00:31:36,708 --> 00:31:39,328
and we are registered to sign up for the flood warnings, we get the warnings and

559
00:31:39,348 --> 00:31:42,668
the alerts. Not specifically for the South Holland Main Drain and Postland

560
00:31:42,708 --> 00:31:46,488
catchment themselves, rip watercourses, they are linked to the River Welland and

561
00:31:46,508 --> 00:31:47,028
the River Nene,

562
00:31:48,108 --> 00:31:49,028
both of them, so they would

563
00:31:50,308 --> 00:31:52,588
reasonably fall within the flood alert, which is

564
00:31:53,488 --> 00:31:54,388
normally issued within two hours.

565
00:31:54,428 --> 00:31:57,848
The flood alert normally gets issued once the EA has reviewed various items like

566
00:31:57,888 --> 00:32:01,208
river gauging, river models, rainfall, radar, that kind of thing.

567
00:32:02,728 --> 00:32:06,648
And the more prominent settlements of Spalding and Wisbech downstream

568
00:32:06,688 --> 00:32:07,888

of both watercourses

569
00:32:08,948 --> 00:32:09,628
would generally be

570
00:32:10,728 --> 00:32:14,468
anticipated to be alerted first, but we would get the alerts at the same time

571
00:32:15,008 --> 00:32:18,928
on our scheme, which are, as the submitted notes, the deadline

572
00:32:18,968 --> 00:32:22,888
for will show the response times are between 10 hours and 50 hours up to 100

573
00:32:22,948 --> 00:32:26,448
hours for the watercourses. So, the flood alert being two hours

574
00:32:27,148 --> 00:32:31,008
also being issued, we think it's a reasonable timeframe for the

575
00:32:31,048 --> 00:32:32,468
flood alert to cover our scheme.

576
00:32:33,728 --> 00:32:37,708
So, for something like Gotts Catchment, which isn't, I don't think, in the

577
00:32:37,768 --> 00:32:38,448
fluvial

578
00:32:41,008 --> 00:32:44,788
risk zone that the Environment Agency is monitoring,

579
00:32:44,888 --> 00:32:48,868
would that be part of the alerts that come to you, or is that

580
00:32:49,168 --> 00:32:51,468
entirely separate because it's just

581

00:32:52,308 --> 00:32:55,888
the local drainage and it's not covered by the Environment Agency

582
00:32:56,148 --> 00:32:56,848
flood alerts?

583
00:32:57,768 --> 00:32:58,768
So, the flood alert is a

584
00:32:59,768 --> 00:33:03,468
sort of area-wide alert. So, it's being prepared for

585
00:33:03,508 --> 00:33:07,328
flooding. It doesn't specifically relate to that portion of the
Gotts

586
00:33:07,388 --> 00:33:09,088
Catchment in South Holland Main Drain,

587
00:33:09,908 --> 00:33:13,668
which is why we said, and we will clarify in our updated flood
response

588
00:33:13,728 --> 00:33:16,008
plan on these points about the site manager being responsible, that

589
00:33:17,448 --> 00:33:21,348
there is an element of visual and planning involved in rainfall

590
00:33:21,388 --> 00:33:23,248
events, but the South Holland Main Drain

591
00:33:24,968 --> 00:33:28,048
doesn't start flooding out for 20 hours.

592
00:33:29,308 --> 00:33:30,548
And our plan is to

593
00:33:31,468 --> 00:33:31,768
have the

594

00:33:32,808 --> 00:33:35,508
site begin evacuation procedures on a flood alert.

595
00:33:36,388 --> 00:33:39,908
So, we'd expect the site operatives and the site manager to

596
00:33:40,228 --> 00:33:40,908
consider that,

597
00:33:42,068 --> 00:33:45,768
especially in relation to the Gotts, where there is sensitivity in flood zone 3B,

598
00:33:45,848 --> 00:33:46,408
for example.

599
00:33:49,108 --> 00:33:49,468
Okay.

600
00:33:53,188 --> 00:33:56,468
And then this concept that the site manager

601
00:33:56,688 --> 00:34:00,668
will react if there's heavy rainfall, and I'll move on

602
00:34:00,748 --> 00:34:03,888
to that means there won't be so many people on the site.

603
00:34:05,208 --> 00:34:05,488
Is that

604
00:34:06,408 --> 00:34:10,248
considered to be a key part of the mitigation for the flood risk on the

605
00:34:10,308 --> 00:34:13,188
site? And what I'm driving at is the

606
00:34:15,448 --> 00:34:17,308
principle of it and

607

00:34:18,129 --> 00:34:20,748
how heavy rainfall is identified

608
00:34:22,109 --> 00:34:25,968
and defined if it's something that is going to be relied upon

609
00:34:26,028 --> 00:34:26,968
as part of the

610
00:34:27,848 --> 00:34:29,028
emergency plan.

611
00:34:30,388 --> 00:34:33,109
I think there are some points that we'll have to take away and sort of form

612
00:34:33,928 --> 00:34:36,688
proper response to in terms of how that's, those questions.

613
00:34:36,768 --> 00:34:36,928
But

614
00:34:39,328 --> 00:34:41,868
in terms of defining what a rainfall event is,

615
00:34:41,928 --> 00:34:45,048
it's not uncommon for

616
00:34:46,149 --> 00:34:47,988
construction sites I currently work on,

617
00:34:49,708 --> 00:34:53,069
where we have site meetings canceled because there's a heavy rain forecast from the

618
00:34:53,109 --> 00:34:57,089
Met Office, or there's still standing water on site from previous

619
00:34:57,129 --> 00:34:59,128
events, and the site operatives do not come in.

620

00:34:59,688 --> 00:35:03,488
So, there's a reasonable approach that we kind of want to apply to that

621
00:35:04,208 --> 00:35:06,887
regard, that they'll know there's flooding, rainfall coming.

622
00:35:07,408 --> 00:35:08,567
It doesn't necessarily mean it's going to be a

623
00:35:09,528 --> 00:35:10,988
severe worst-case storm event.

624
00:35:11,848 --> 00:35:14,488
The 20-hour flood response is a 100-year

625
00:35:15,428 --> 00:35:17,828
plus climate change event. Flood zone 3B,

626
00:35:19,388 --> 00:35:21,548
sorry, in Gotts Catchment, it's a 33-year.

627
00:35:22,168 --> 00:35:25,628
But that's not going to happen every time, and it's very hard to know whether

628
00:35:25,648 --> 00:35:28,968
that's going to be a 33-year event, one in 30-year event, excuse me,

629
00:35:29,688 --> 00:35:32,648
when it starts raining. The weather forecasts don't predict that

630
00:35:33,508 --> 00:35:37,208
in that kind of detail. It's normally post-event they kind of

631
00:35:37,268 --> 00:35:40,608
determine what the return period was for that event.

632
00:35:41,928 --> 00:35:45,688
So, I think the flood alert system we've got and the response times that we've

633
00:35:46,128 --> 00:35:47,088
modeled for the

634
00:35:47,928 --> 00:35:50,368
Postland Main Catchment and the South Holland Main Drain

635
00:35:51,248 --> 00:35:51,888
and the River Welland,

636
00:35:53,068 --> 00:35:56,568
we feel are reasonable timeframes to act on a flood alert,

637
00:35:57,188 --> 00:36:00,848
as well as monitoring on site. But there is going to be an element of the site

638
00:36:00,888 --> 00:36:03,848
manager taking action when there's rainfall on site.

639
00:36:12,188 --> 00:36:15,588
Thank you. Ms. Locke, was there anything the Environment Agency wanted to comment

640
00:36:15,668 --> 00:36:15,868
on

641
00:36:17,048 --> 00:36:19,808
in regard to the flood warnings and the responsibility

642
00:36:21,368 --> 00:36:22,608
for staying up to date with those?

643
00:36:28,348 --> 00:36:30,828
Good afternoon. It's Liz Locke from the Environment Agency.

644
00:36:31,008 --> 00:36:34,148
No, I don't think there is anything more we want to say on this matter at this

645
00:36:34,208 --> 00:36:34,988
stage. Thank you.

646
00:36:37,688 --> 00:36:40,108
And was there anybody else who wanted to

647
00:36:41,148 --> 00:36:42,028
comment on anything

648
00:36:43,388 --> 00:36:44,788
in that item?

649
00:36:59,678 --> 00:37:02,038
I think while I've got you here, Mr.

650
00:37:02,218 --> 00:37:05,418
Brandon, and you said that you have experience of working on sites where

651
00:37:06,498 --> 00:37:10,338
heavy rainfall is a factor in terms of what's going on, I will

652
00:37:11,078 --> 00:37:13,558
ask this question because I'm interested to hear what you

653
00:37:14,398 --> 00:37:18,358
think about it. So, during heavy times of rainfall, it's stated that

654
00:37:18,378 --> 00:37:21,578
there will be a reduced number of staff working on site, and it's expected that

655
00:37:21,638 --> 00:37:25,558
staff would not be carrying out visits on site during times of heavy rainfall.

656
00:37:26,098 --> 00:37:30,078
So, can you talk us through how that works in terms of timing and numbers,

657
00:37:30,138 --> 00:37:33,838
and if it's precise and enforceable, so it's something that we can

658

00:37:33,878 --> 00:37:34,838
rely upon?

659
00:37:36,738 --> 00:37:37,418
In terms of my

660
00:37:38,498 --> 00:37:41,958
current site project, I'm not a contractor, but the contractor has

661
00:37:42,158 --> 00:37:46,118
processes in place, and there are lots of developers on the site at the same time,

662
00:37:46,178 --> 00:37:49,338
so they're not always talking to one another, looking after their own sites.

663
00:37:50,598 --> 00:37:54,518
They have plans in place to monitor rainfall, and they've all signed

664
00:37:54,558 --> 00:37:58,378
up to the flood alert system along the main river that runs around the

665
00:37:58,418 --> 00:37:59,198
perimeter of the site.

666
00:38:00,378 --> 00:38:01,118
And when the

667
00:38:02,658 --> 00:38:03,718
main river doesn't flood out,

668
00:38:05,018 --> 00:38:08,958
generally at all, the flood alert gets issued, and they also look at the

669
00:38:08,998 --> 00:38:10,638
rainfall forecast, and they decide

670
00:38:12,598 --> 00:38:16,298
to either just have management staff on site in cabins, and

671
00:38:17,038 --> 00:38:20,558
not call staff to site. So, for example, site visits I plan to

672
00:38:20,598 --> 00:38:21,718
undertake get canceled

673
00:38:22,638 --> 00:38:24,938
because there's no one on site to go around and take me around the site and see.

674
00:38:24,958 --> 00:38:28,038
And we also, there's potential flooding, so we don't go to site.

675
00:38:28,638 --> 00:38:29,698
So, it's managed by the

676
00:38:30,498 --> 00:38:31,798
site manager for each development

677
00:38:33,958 --> 00:38:34,498
contractor.

678
00:38:37,158 --> 00:38:41,058
The reason this is important is because we'll move on to refuges and capacity of

679
00:38:41,118 --> 00:38:45,018
those, but if you've got 855 people at the

680
00:38:45,058 --> 00:38:46,938
point of construction on the site,

681
00:38:48,178 --> 00:38:51,118
you've got far fewer spaces, obviously, in the refuges.

682
00:38:51,198 --> 00:38:55,078
So, in terms of a site manager telling people not to

683
00:38:55,118 --> 00:38:57,118
come to work that day because of the weather,

684
00:38:58,158 --> 00:39:02,138
those are some quite big figures in terms of how many people are on site and how

685
00:39:02,178 --> 00:39:03,778
many people wouldn't be able to come on site.

686
00:39:03,838 --> 00:39:03,958
So,

687
00:39:05,097 --> 00:39:08,518
how realistic is it that you're going to not have

688
00:39:08,858 --> 00:39:12,638
500 workers there in terms of how much weight we can

689
00:39:12,678 --> 00:39:14,358
give that as mitigation?

690
00:39:17,558 --> 00:39:18,918
I think that's difficult to answer

691
00:39:19,898 --> 00:39:22,878
acutely now. I think I'd take that away and respond properly, but,

692
00:39:23,918 --> 00:39:24,218
if I may.

693
00:39:39,998 --> 00:39:40,098
Ms.

694
00:39:41,498 --> 00:39:42,878
Power, was there anything you wanted to add to that?

695
00:39:43,258 --> 00:39:44,558
No, Taylor Power for the applicant.

696
00:39:45,038 --> 00:39:48,558
No, I think we can provide more details on that and those updates to the

697
00:39:48,718 --> 00:39:52,358
plan, in terms of providing you more certainty in the drafting as to

698
00:39:52,718 --> 00:39:54,578
how those decisions would be made and

699
00:39:55,718 --> 00:39:59,578
how then you can have comfort that enough people won't come to site on

700
00:39:59,638 --> 00:40:00,738
the days of most risk.

701
00:40:01,778 --> 00:40:02,058
Thank you.

702
00:40:04,098 --> 00:40:05,258
Any other comments on that?

703
00:40:07,158 --> 00:40:09,438
Okay, then let's have a look at the refuges.

704
00:40:10,018 --> 00:40:13,718
So, it's been proposed that safe refuge is provided in

705
00:40:13,818 --> 00:40:17,058
areas that flood. We're looking at probably 11 compounds,

706
00:40:17,118 --> 00:40:21,078
indicatively, by locating a welfare cabin either

707
00:40:21,158 --> 00:40:24,538
raised on a platform or stacked on top of a ground floor

708
00:40:24,678 --> 00:40:25,238
unit,

709
00:40:26,458 --> 00:40:28,998
and that will be accessed by steps or a ramp.

710
00:40:30,838 --> 00:40:34,578
So, my first question is, has the structural integrity of that solution been

711
00:40:34,638 --> 00:40:37,358
assessed as recommended in the guidance?

712
00:40:39,898 --> 00:40:42,698
Chris Brandon, I'm part of the applicant. Not at this stage.

713
00:40:42,738 --> 00:40:45,778
We haven't assessed the structural capability in this detail.

714
00:40:46,638 --> 00:40:46,938
However,

715
00:40:48,798 --> 00:40:50,978
cabins are designed to be stacked upon one another,

716
00:40:51,938 --> 00:40:52,078
and

717
00:40:53,118 --> 00:40:56,638
raised platforms are designed to be structurally sound.

718
00:40:56,718 --> 00:41:00,358
So, we haven't assessed it in detail, but there's no reason to suggest

719
00:41:00,698 --> 00:41:02,638
you can't stack cabins on one another.

720
00:41:02,738 --> 00:41:04,958
It's quite frequent on the sites we visit and work on.

721
00:41:05,198 --> 00:41:06,818
Oh, I'm sure you can stack them on top of one another.

722
00:41:06,878 --> 00:41:10,518
It's whether or not they'll withstand a couple of meters of water

723
00:41:10,898 --> 00:41:13,038
pushing against them that I'm asking about.

724
00:41:17,278 --> 00:41:19,298
No, we haven't assessed the velocities of the

725
00:41:20,698 --> 00:41:24,018
catchments are low, unless there's a residual risk of a breach.

726
00:41:25,998 --> 00:41:29,718
So, in terms of water pressure under normal operating in the compounds,

727
00:41:31,278 --> 00:41:32,598
the compounds can, the

728
00:41:33,498 --> 00:41:34,518
cabin at the bottom can flood

729
00:41:35,838 --> 00:41:37,338
with minimal pressure on the structure itself.

730
00:41:39,118 --> 00:41:40,918
I've never come across a situation where

731
00:41:41,838 --> 00:41:44,438
they have failed, if they've been flooded.

732
00:41:44,698 --> 00:41:46,318
But it's something we can take away and

733
00:41:47,278 --> 00:41:50,538
provide further clarity on in the updated plan, deadline four.

734
00:41:51,358 --> 00:41:52,958
Yeah, we don't necessarily need

735
00:41:53,898 --> 00:41:57,818
lots of decimal places of structural engineering

736

00:41:57,898 --> 00:42:01,718
calculations, but I think we do need to have some reassurance that

737
00:42:01,758 --> 00:42:02,658
in principle-

738
00:42:03,058 --> 00:42:03,178
Yeah

739
00:42:03,337 --> 00:42:03,998
... they'd remain

740
00:42:05,338 --> 00:42:06,018
resilient.

741
00:42:07,458 --> 00:42:09,458
Yes, Taylor Power for the applicant. Just to add to what Mr.

742
00:42:09,658 --> 00:42:12,818
Brandon said, I think we're probably not at the stage that we're

743
00:42:13,538 --> 00:42:17,518
doing detailed design of these sorts of structures, but I think what we could

744
00:42:17,558 --> 00:42:21,158
provide is just comfort that there is standard industry

745
00:42:21,218 --> 00:42:24,718
design that can perform in these sorts of conditions.

746
00:42:24,778 --> 00:42:26,898
Is that what the examining authority is looking for?

747
00:42:27,158 --> 00:42:30,878
Yes, and back to Mr. Brandon's point about the levels and the

748
00:42:30,938 --> 00:42:31,738
velocities

749
00:42:33,218 --> 00:42:36,138

and the onset durations, that's all

750
00:42:36,938 --> 00:42:40,778
at a high level, very helpful background to give us the reassurance

751
00:42:40,818 --> 00:42:41,498
that those will

752
00:42:42,478 --> 00:42:44,338
stay in the right place.

753
00:42:47,698 --> 00:42:51,538
Can you put up Annex D of the drainage plan, which

754
00:42:51,638 --> 00:42:54,878
is APP 231? It's quite

755
00:42:55,998 --> 00:42:58,718
big, so it might take a while to get up on the screen.

756
00:43:01,342 --> 00:43:04,942
But while that's going up, my question then is about the location of the

757
00:43:04,982 --> 00:43:08,862
refuges. So it's stated that where reasonably practicable,

758
00:43:09,442 --> 00:43:13,402
temporary construction compounds will be located outside of flood zone two

759
00:43:13,422 --> 00:43:13,922
and three,

760
00:43:15,162 --> 00:43:17,842
and that's in table 3.7 of the CEMP.

761
00:43:18,602 --> 00:43:22,122
So we want to discuss how that's secured, given that this is such a

762
00:43:22,182 --> 00:43:23,602

high-level statement,

763
00:43:24,902 --> 00:43:28,542
and given that it's such an important matter potentially for the safety of

764
00:43:28,582 --> 00:43:32,222
workers. Can there be a greater commitment than where

765
00:43:32,282 --> 00:43:33,902
reasonably practicable?

766
00:43:37,482 --> 00:43:38,942
Chris Brands on behalf of the applicants.

767
00:43:40,442 --> 00:43:41,282
Can I take this to mean

768
00:43:42,102 --> 00:43:45,762
the potential compounds that have been proposed in the

769
00:43:46,082 --> 00:43:47,942
land parcel D1 specifically?

770
00:43:48,102 --> 00:43:50,462
It's all the construction compounds and...

771
00:43:51,482 --> 00:43:51,602
So,

772
00:43:52,802 --> 00:43:56,342
apart from the two compounds which you can, well, I can't come on to now, but the

773
00:43:56,662 --> 00:43:59,562
applicants reviewing those locations to be removed from the Cots catchment.

774
00:43:59,722 --> 00:44:00,282
But for the other

775

00:44:01,862 --> 00:44:02,842
construction compounds,

776
00:44:05,082 --> 00:44:08,342
outside of residual breach event, they're outside

777
00:44:09,362 --> 00:44:11,762
or undefended modeled flood extents.

778
00:44:14,342 --> 00:44:17,882
So they have been located outside flood extents from undefended scenarios.

779
00:44:18,062 --> 00:44:21,362
It's the residual risk of the breach of the Welland where some are

780
00:44:22,622 --> 00:44:23,242
requiring defend

781
00:44:24,662 --> 00:44:27,662
bonding for the compounds for the substation commerce, which would act as safe

782
00:44:27,702 --> 00:44:28,082
refuge.

783
00:44:29,362 --> 00:44:29,962
Okay. So,

784
00:44:31,722 --> 00:44:32,142
let me see. If

785
00:44:37,022 --> 00:44:39,702
we've got that plan up, I just saw it.

786
00:44:39,802 --> 00:44:40,022
So

787
00:44:40,882 --> 00:44:43,462
as an example, if you can go

788

00:44:45,782 --> 00:44:46,042
to

789
00:44:47,022 --> 00:44:48,682
sheet one of five.

790
00:44:56,302 --> 00:44:59,942
So we've got the substation to the east of parcel A

791
00:45:00,022 --> 00:45:00,402
there.

792
00:45:01,522 --> 00:45:05,462
And for people that aren't familiar with this plan, the pink is the

793
00:45:06,742 --> 00:45:08,902
Postland flood zone.

794
00:45:10,282 --> 00:45:10,302
Yeah.

795
00:45:10,362 --> 00:45:14,042
So my question then, I appreciate that the light blue would be the

796
00:45:14,102 --> 00:45:16,902
Welland extent, but given that you're saying that that's

797
00:45:17,562 --> 00:45:21,102
unlikely, especially during construction, let's focus on the
Postland

798
00:45:21,182 --> 00:45:21,762
flooding.

799
00:45:23,522 --> 00:45:27,362
And you're saying that wherever possible, compounds will be placed
in

800
00:45:27,482 --> 00:45:30,582
lower flood risk areas. Why is that substation

801

00:45:31,462 --> 00:45:35,422
in the flood zone associated with Postland catchment rather than just

802
00:45:35,482 --> 00:45:37,702
to the west in the area that doesn't flood,

803
00:45:38,862 --> 00:45:40,322
apart from a Welland breach?

804
00:45:53,542 --> 00:45:54,762
Ms. Burns for the applicant.

805
00:45:55,922 --> 00:45:59,642
I might need to take that away just to confirm the exact design decisions between

806
00:46:00,122 --> 00:46:04,042
moving that substation

807
00:46:04,122 --> 00:46:04,962
in particular.

808
00:46:07,462 --> 00:46:08,742
Okay. There might be others as well.

809
00:46:08,822 --> 00:46:09,002
I think-

810
00:46:09,082 --> 00:46:09,203
Okay. Yeah

811
00:46:09,321 --> 00:46:11,022
... I just wanted to put that up as an example.

812
00:46:11,442 --> 00:46:15,342
I think there are other parts and other bits of infrastructure

813
00:46:15,402 --> 00:46:18,942
that it's been stated that the flood zone has been avoided where

814

00:46:19,022 --> 00:46:22,782
possible, or following a sequential approach, it's at least been moved down the

815
00:46:22,822 --> 00:46:23,642
risk zones.

816
00:46:24,442 --> 00:46:28,402
And it's not clear from the plans that I've got that that's been

817
00:46:28,462 --> 00:46:32,402
done. So, I think because this is a matter of safety, if we could at

818
00:46:32,442 --> 00:46:36,382
least look at the compounds and you can work your way

819
00:46:36,442 --> 00:46:39,382
through these, and I'd like to see for each one

820
00:46:40,002 --> 00:46:43,522
why it's not been put in a lower flood zone when there's one

821
00:46:43,562 --> 00:46:44,122
nearby.

822
00:46:45,222 --> 00:46:47,802
If I could have that by D4 as well, that would be great. Thank you.

823
00:46:47,802 --> 00:46:51,082
Understood. I just want to clarify, is this in terms of the operational

824
00:46:51,122 --> 00:46:54,022
infrastructure or the construction infrastructure, or both?

825
00:46:54,102 --> 00:46:54,562
It's both.

826
00:46:54,582 --> 00:46:54,842
Yeah.

827

00:46:54,901 --> 00:46:58,882
Okay. I mean, construction, there's obviously a lot more, but the risk may be lower,

828
00:46:58,922 --> 00:47:01,722
but there's more of them, so we need to look at it in that context.

829
00:47:01,762 --> 00:47:05,482
But operation, obviously, the risk of them getting flooded goes up, so we do need

830
00:47:05,562 --> 00:47:07,942
to look at them in both contexts.

831
00:47:07,982 --> 00:47:08,642
Yes. Understood.

832
00:47:11,862 --> 00:47:13,302
Were there any questions from

833
00:47:14,202 --> 00:47:15,462
anybody else on that,

834
00:47:16,402 --> 00:47:18,502
on the application of the sequential approach?

835
00:47:22,862 --> 00:47:26,482
Okay, so evacuation routes and points,

836
00:47:26,782 --> 00:47:30,462
these are shown in Appendix A of the emergency plan.

837
00:47:31,682 --> 00:47:34,002
It would probably be helpful to put that up.

838
00:47:35,902 --> 00:47:39,702
The reference for the emergency response plan is

839
00:47:40,142 --> 00:47:42,262
REP 2005.

840

00:47:55,982 --> 00:47:59,922
And my first question is to the applicant, and that's

841
00:48:00,022 --> 00:48:03,722
if you could talk us through this plan. It's the one in Appendix A.

842
00:48:03,782 --> 00:48:06,762
It'll turn up in a minute. I'm sure you know it well anyway.

843
00:48:07,662 --> 00:48:11,462
It's very small, and it's quite hard to follow, so I thought I'd give you the

844
00:48:11,522 --> 00:48:12,922
opportunity to talk

845
00:48:13,782 --> 00:48:15,542
through it with us. It's both of them.

846
00:48:15,582 --> 00:48:19,102
It's the grid one and the one for the solar development area

847
00:48:19,262 --> 00:48:19,882
underneath.

848
00:48:20,922 --> 00:48:24,682
So for people that can't see it very well, on these two plans, there are

849
00:48:24,742 --> 00:48:27,982
some orange lines and arrows which are supposed to be the

850
00:48:28,022 --> 00:48:29,422
evacuation routes.

851
00:48:31,062 --> 00:48:34,662
So if you could talk us through it, and if you could tell us how these were

852
00:48:35,382 --> 00:48:37,042
chosen, that would be helpful.

853
00:48:39,662 --> 00:48:41,022
Chris Brands on behalf of the applicants.

854
00:48:41,722 --> 00:48:42,002
Yes,

855
00:48:44,042 --> 00:48:45,222
the routes have been chosen where

856
00:48:47,342 --> 00:48:51,262
they're part of the access routes for the scheme, and also they're also roads

857
00:48:51,282 --> 00:48:52,602
that can be driven by vehicles,

858
00:48:53,842 --> 00:48:56,642
and then the nearest roads that are available to use for safe escape and access.

859
00:48:57,042 --> 00:48:58,522
And so we looked at

860
00:49:00,022 --> 00:49:03,622
online mapping site photographs to rule out access tracks

861
00:49:04,022 --> 00:49:06,262
that weren't suitable or routes that weren't suitable, and-

862
00:49:08,233 --> 00:49:09,354
... came up with these orange routes,

863
00:49:10,494 --> 00:49:10,854
which

864
00:49:12,133 --> 00:49:15,574
use the existing access or the proposed access routes into and out of the scheme.

865
00:49:16,134 --> 00:49:19,174
And so there are no new access points and internal roads

866
00:49:20,514 --> 00:49:23,474
that can be driven by emergency service vehicles and escape vehicles.

867
00:49:23,994 --> 00:49:27,714
So that's why they've been derived in those routes specifically,

868
00:49:27,934 --> 00:49:28,634
to rule out any

869
00:49:30,814 --> 00:49:33,334
tracks or dead ends that they might meet.

870
00:49:33,414 --> 00:49:37,074
So we did a thorough review of online mapping and photographs and

871
00:49:37,114 --> 00:49:38,674
topography to make sure we can get the routes.

872
00:49:39,614 --> 00:49:39,954
Okay.

873
00:49:40,994 --> 00:49:44,214
I think it would be helpful if these maps could be reissued in a

874
00:49:44,834 --> 00:49:48,814
bigger format and in a way that we can see the arrows clearly and where

875
00:49:48,854 --> 00:49:51,474
the evacuation points are, because at the moment, it's not clear.

876
00:49:51,974 --> 00:49:55,914
In the text, they're named as a place, and then they're

877
00:49:55,934 --> 00:49:59,734
given a grid reference, and we haven't got either of those on the map, so you can't

878
00:49:59,814 --> 00:50:03,474

tally the two. So I think given that this is potentially quite important, it would

879
00:50:03,514 --> 00:50:06,494
be useful to revise that. So can we have that as an action point for

880
00:50:07,194 --> 00:50:08,834
D4 as well, please?

881
00:50:10,854 --> 00:50:11,394
And I think

882
00:50:12,274 --> 00:50:16,074
the explanation you've given is very useful, and we could do with that context.

883
00:50:16,134 --> 00:50:19,114
We need to understand how these routes have been chosen.

884
00:50:21,274 --> 00:50:21,954
Yes. Sorry, yes.

885
00:50:21,974 --> 00:50:23,754
If you could include that as well.

886
00:50:23,954 --> 00:50:24,154
Yes.

887
00:50:28,514 --> 00:50:31,774
If you can go down to the next plan, though, then, so the one after the grid

888
00:50:31,834 --> 00:50:35,274
connection route, move down to the one that's got the solar development area on it.

889
00:50:43,834 --> 00:50:47,694
So in paragraph 3.1.7 of the

890
00:50:47,734 --> 00:50:51,594
emergency plan, you state that a separate evacuation point will be

891
00:50:51,614 --> 00:50:54,754
provided for staff working within the GOTS catchment,

892
00:50:55,694 --> 00:50:59,414
which is to avoid the need to cross over the South Holland Main Drain in the

893
00:50:59,454 --> 00:51:00,434
event of flooding.

894
00:51:03,494 --> 00:51:06,594
But then it says, "If staff are unable to access the

895
00:51:06,634 --> 00:51:10,214
designated evacuation point, they will be directed to the

896
00:51:10,234 --> 00:51:13,774
construction compounds that are located on site instead."

897
00:51:14,414 --> 00:51:17,814
And there are similar statements made elsewhere, so we're not clear what that

898
00:51:17,874 --> 00:51:21,134
means. And on the face of it, it looks as though you're trying to

899
00:51:21,834 --> 00:51:24,834
stop people from crossing the drain, but if they can't get north, then they've got

900
00:51:24,854 --> 00:51:28,714
to go south across the drain. So could you explain what's going on there?

901
00:51:29,714 --> 00:51:31,174
Yes. Chris Brand, on behalf of the applicant.

902
00:51:31,754 --> 00:51:34,674
Yeah, we've noted the clarifications that need to be updated in the response plan,

903

00:51:34,694 --> 00:51:37,434
and we're going to make those changes for time forward to clarify on that.

904
00:51:40,014 --> 00:51:43,254
So will there be a safe escape route from that catchment?

905
00:51:44,694 --> 00:51:47,654
There will be a safe escape route, as shown on the plan at the moment.

906
00:51:48,554 --> 00:51:52,014
We're reviewing removing the temporary construction compounds from

907
00:51:53,374 --> 00:51:57,294
the GOTS catchment, which would remove the safe refuge in high-risk

908
00:51:57,334 --> 00:51:58,014
flood areas.

909
00:51:59,214 --> 00:52:01,554
So we are reviewing both the isolated

910
00:52:02,674 --> 00:52:03,754
evacuation route from

911
00:52:04,994 --> 00:52:06,514
GOTS at the moment as part of that update.

912
00:52:08,514 --> 00:52:08,954
Thank you.

913
00:52:15,614 --> 00:52:15,874
And then,

914
00:52:17,034 --> 00:52:20,174
could we get up the flood risk assessment, which is

915
00:52:20,254 --> 00:52:22,434
REP1050,

916

00:52:23,474 --> 00:52:25,634
and put up plate 52?

917
00:53:01,454 --> 00:53:02,414
That's great. Thank you.

918
00:53:04,234 --> 00:53:07,774
So in the emergency plan at 319, it stated that the

919
00:53:07,794 --> 00:53:11,594
construction compounds within the overhead inter-array corridor between

920
00:53:11,754 --> 00:53:15,174
C and D are located outside of the area of fluvial

921
00:53:15,294 --> 00:53:19,274
flood risk and can therefore be used as a safe gathering point for staff working

922
00:53:19,314 --> 00:53:23,134
in C and D, as well as for the storage of critical equipment and emergency

923
00:53:23,174 --> 00:53:25,254
supplies, as it's safe from flood risk.

924
00:53:25,394 --> 00:53:25,734
But

925
00:53:27,593 --> 00:53:29,774
does that area that you're saying doesn't

926
00:53:31,734 --> 00:53:34,934
flood coincide with the bit between the two models

927
00:53:35,714 --> 00:53:37,694
that you can see on this plate?

928
00:53:42,494 --> 00:53:44,494
Chris Brand Chris Brand, on behalf of the applicant.

929
00:53:48,714 --> 00:53:50,994
When we agreed the modeling approach with the EA, the

930
00:53:52,034 --> 00:53:55,574
derived river flow catchments that contribute to these watercourses were,

931
00:53:56,034 --> 00:53:57,194
which is what's shown on these maps.

932
00:53:58,214 --> 00:53:59,334
I'll clarify,

933
00:54:00,734 --> 00:54:03,554
I don't have the information to hand, and our specialist, the modeling specialist

934
00:54:03,594 --> 00:54:05,774
isn't here, but I can clarify that area

935
00:54:08,414 --> 00:54:10,254
as part of the catchment for the South Holland Main Drain.

936
00:54:11,614 --> 00:54:12,454
Okay, thank you.

937
00:54:13,954 --> 00:54:16,754
That's probably another separate action point then, isn't it, for D4?

938
00:54:18,114 --> 00:54:18,634
Thank you.

939
00:54:33,354 --> 00:54:37,074
And then if we go back to the emergency plan and table 34

940
00:54:39,494 --> 00:54:42,414
and 35, this shows the evacuation times,

941
00:54:45,474 --> 00:54:49,454
which are very short, the drive time of evacuation route

942
00:54:49,574 --> 00:54:50,554
using roads.

943
00:54:51,574 --> 00:54:55,014
And we wanted to understand a bit more about how those numbers have been

944
00:54:55,074 --> 00:54:56,114
calculated.

945
00:54:58,314 --> 00:55:02,254
So, for example, land parcel B, and bearing in mind that we can't

946
00:55:02,334 --> 00:55:03,574
see the plan very well,

947
00:55:04,674 --> 00:55:06,094
but it's suggesting

948
00:55:07,074 --> 00:55:10,954
that it'll take three minutes to drive from land parcel B to the

949
00:55:10,994 --> 00:55:14,194
evacuation point, which seems very low.

950
00:55:14,294 --> 00:55:18,126
So I wanted to- ... find out how those numbers have been calculated.

951
00:55:20,346 --> 00:55:21,506
Chris Brandon on behalf of the applicant.

952
00:55:21,906 --> 00:55:22,906
They were derived using

953
00:55:24,646 --> 00:55:28,186
Google Maps for destination to and from with a vehicle.

954
00:55:30,146 --> 00:55:33,866
So it's based on the road speed that Google Maps identifies,

955
00:55:35,246 --> 00:55:37,346
and the response time, and the travel time for a car.

956
00:55:40,226 --> 00:55:43,546
And does it take any account of the fact that people are dispersed across the site

957
00:55:43,586 --> 00:55:47,166
and that they're not all in the ideal location as the flooding happens?

958
00:55:48,426 --> 00:55:50,406
Not that travel time, no. That's just the

959
00:55:51,266 --> 00:55:52,166
vehicle travel time.

960
00:55:56,306 --> 00:56:00,146
And in terms of people working on the site, is there an expectation that they're

961
00:56:00,166 --> 00:56:03,266
all going to have a vehicle to hand, or will a lot of them be on foot?

962
00:56:05,466 --> 00:56:09,026
We've been updating the emergency response plan for deadline four in response to

963
00:56:09,066 --> 00:56:11,266
the EXQ1 questions, and

964
00:56:12,526 --> 00:56:16,026
in light of the recent Lincolnshire County Council responses

965
00:56:16,726 --> 00:56:17,346
from last week.

966
00:56:19,366 --> 00:56:23,186
Yeah, but we're updating the plan based on, to confirm that there'll be

967
00:56:23,366 --> 00:56:25,866
vehicles for staff to evacuate from,

968
00:56:26,706 --> 00:56:28,846
and the staff will ensure they have enough vehicles to get into.

969
00:56:30,666 --> 00:56:33,466
But we haven't gone into the granular detail of

970
00:56:34,346 --> 00:56:35,666
the workers getting to the vehicles.

971
00:56:35,886 --> 00:56:39,326
But we have clarified the plan for deadline four with more detail on
that

972
00:56:40,466 --> 00:56:40,906
discussion.

973
00:56:41,946 --> 00:56:45,206
When you say, "In response to the local authority,"

974
00:56:45,906 --> 00:56:49,706
are those the comments that the local authority have sent into this
examination, or

975
00:56:49,726 --> 00:56:52,706
have you been having separate conversations with them about this
plan?

976
00:56:53,146 --> 00:56:56,666
No, these are the comments we've sent in via examination, the

977
00:56:56,886 --> 00:56:58,206
deadline three responses.

978
00:57:00,586 --> 00:57:01,786
So, Mr. Brandon,

979
00:57:03,066 --> 00:57:05,806
the safety of the people on the site is the responsibility

980
00:57:07,126 --> 00:57:10,946
of the local authority, which isn't exactly what your last submission said.

981
00:57:11,106 --> 00:57:15,066
So I do want to get your thoughts on a lot of the questions I've

982
00:57:15,126 --> 00:57:19,106
just asked and understand where the local authority are at the moment in terms

983
00:57:19,166 --> 00:57:21,426
of reviewing this plan and your opinion of it.

984
00:57:23,226 --> 00:57:25,966
Thank you, madam. Andrew Barton, Lincolnshire County Council.

985
00:57:27,326 --> 00:57:31,006
Unfortunately, we've not got anyone from our emergency planning team with us

986
00:57:31,246 --> 00:57:31,966
today, so

987
00:57:32,766 --> 00:57:36,186
the scope of which I'll be able to answer those questions in any detail is probably

988
00:57:36,246 --> 00:57:38,026
limited, so I apologize for that.

989
00:57:39,326 --> 00:57:43,166
I think we've obviously, as just been mentioned by the applicant, we made

990
00:57:43,746 --> 00:57:47,026
a late submission into DL3, which is reference

991
00:57:47,106 --> 00:57:49,586
AS-033.

992
00:57:50,786 --> 00:57:51,206
Those were

993
00:57:52,486 --> 00:57:56,446
comments from the emergency planning team, which I think a lot of which

994
00:57:56,486 --> 00:57:58,486
have been covered by yourself, madam,

995
00:57:59,306 --> 00:58:02,866
this afternoon. But obviously, we'll give the applicant

996
00:58:02,925 --> 00:58:06,346
the opportunity to review those comments and provide feedback on those

997
00:58:06,986 --> 00:58:10,146
queries, which are largely around sort of personnel numbers and

998
00:58:13,886 --> 00:58:17,766
yeah, I think just some clarification, I think, on some of the finer detail of

999
00:58:17,826 --> 00:58:18,566
the plan.

1000
00:58:20,766 --> 00:58:22,286
I think the other point that we'd raised in our

1001
00:58:23,406 --> 00:58:27,266
submission was to do with the, it was sort of a nuanced point really, but to

1002
00:58:27,306 --> 00:58:29,406
do with the role of the LLFA,

1003
00:58:31,486 --> 00:58:32,466
which is predominantly

1004
00:58:33,706 --> 00:58:37,486

leading on sort of technical responses in terms of surface and flood water risk,

1005
00:58:37,946 --> 00:58:40,886
as opposed to fluvial coastal flooding.

1006
00:58:40,966 --> 00:58:43,366
So, and thank you, in respect of the second question,

1007
00:58:44,846 --> 00:58:48,786
which was 19.018 at

1008
00:58:48,846 --> 00:58:52,406
the first examiner's questions, the safety of workers in construction

1009
00:58:52,466 --> 00:58:56,026
compounds. We made the point that, perhaps the Environment Agency might have been

1010
00:58:56,066 --> 00:58:59,246
better placed to deal with some of those queries,

1011
00:59:00,386 --> 00:59:01,366
given the sort of

1012
00:59:02,426 --> 00:59:06,326
the role of Lincolnshire County Council in its LLFA capacity,

1013
00:59:06,426 --> 00:59:06,566
so.

1014
00:59:08,846 --> 00:59:10,286
Thank you for that clarification.

1015
00:59:11,246 --> 00:59:15,106
But I'll certainly take these points away and speak with the

1016
00:59:15,726 --> 00:59:16,566
emergency planning team.

1017

00:59:16,906 --> 00:59:20,707
And it sounds as though there's a revised emergency plan coming in at D4, so I'll- Yes

1018
00:59:21,185 --> 00:59:22,886
... await your comments on that with interest.

1019
00:59:23,086 --> 00:59:23,806
Yeah, certainly. Yeah.

1020
00:59:25,506 --> 00:59:28,966
The timing of construction. It stated that the construction compounds will only be

1021
00:59:29,026 --> 00:59:32,965
there for a maximum of two years, and given the risk of flooding, I just wanted

1022
00:59:32,986 --> 00:59:35,785
to check that you consider that to be the worst-case scenario.

1023
00:59:37,186 --> 00:59:38,126
That's to the applicant.

1024
00:59:40,706 --> 00:59:44,646
Taylor Power for the applicant. I suppose just to clarify in respect of two

1025
00:59:44,706 --> 00:59:45,026
years,

1026
00:59:46,006 --> 00:59:46,946
it probably reflect,

1027
00:59:47,966 --> 00:59:51,386
and I'll pass this to Brandon in respect of his understanding in terms of the flood

1028
00:59:51,486 --> 00:59:55,406
elements, but in terms of how they're scheduled within the site, that

1029

00:59:55,446 --> 00:59:59,026
reflects the fact that the entirety of the site isn't going to be

1030
00:59:59,426 --> 01:00:03,146
worked under construction all at once for the entire period of

1031
01:00:04,566 --> 01:00:07,766
the construction period. So I think the intention would be that as areas are

1032
01:00:07,826 --> 01:00:11,546
constructed, then you would remove construction compounds from that

1033
01:00:11,646 --> 01:00:15,226
area. And so any particular area of the site wouldn't require more than two years

1034
01:00:15,766 --> 01:00:19,606
to be constructed. But that might not have been your question in respect of that

1035
01:00:19,666 --> 01:00:20,186
timeframe.

1036
01:00:20,386 --> 01:00:24,226
You might be right. My reading of it was that the risk is

1037
01:00:24,306 --> 01:00:28,026
low because construction compounds would only be there for two

1038
01:00:28,086 --> 01:00:30,206
years, because the construction would only last two years.

1039
01:00:30,266 --> 01:00:32,426
But have I misunderstood that, Mr. Brandon?

1040
01:00:34,306 --> 01:00:37,426
Chris Brandon on behalf of the applicant. No, your understanding is correct.

1041
01:00:38,266 --> 01:00:39,046
That's the response.

1042
01:00:39,686 --> 01:00:42,606
And that's being used to give us some

1043
01:00:42,666 --> 01:00:46,646
reassurance that the risk is low because they won't be there for very

1044
01:00:46,686 --> 01:00:49,706
long, and where the risk is from the Welland, for example, where it's going to be

1045
01:00:50,586 --> 01:00:52,206
hopefully well defended, then

1046
01:00:53,526 --> 01:00:56,586
that means that the risk is low. But if the construction time's longer than that,

1047
01:00:56,626 --> 01:01:00,366
then the risk will go up. So my question is, in terms of it being worst

1048
01:01:00,446 --> 01:01:04,006
case for us to assess, is two years realistic?

1049
01:01:08,346 --> 01:01:11,146
Mr. Brandon, I think that question's probably for you in respect of,

1050
01:01:13,046 --> 01:01:16,606
have the approach that you have taken to assessing the worst case,

1051
01:01:17,426 --> 01:01:18,646
has it taken-

1052
01:01:19,730 --> 01:01:23,410
It's taken into account the two-year timeframe, and I think what

1053
01:01:23,810 --> 01:01:25,510
the examining authority is asking is if

1054

01:01:26,330 --> 01:01:30,030
construction actually took three years, does that materially change the

1055
01:01:30,070 --> 01:01:32,170
assumption you've made there in terms of risk?

1056
01:01:33,630 --> 01:01:35,210
Thanks for clarifying. No, it doesn't.

1057
01:01:35,549 --> 01:01:36,930
The worst-case scenario

1058
01:01:38,190 --> 01:01:40,670
applied to mitigation includes a

1059
01:01:41,930 --> 01:01:42,330
1,000-year

1060
01:01:43,490 --> 01:01:45,790
flood event plus climate change. So, in

1061
01:01:46,930 --> 01:01:50,910
the scenario of construction compounds could be there, so for such short

1062
01:01:50,950 --> 01:01:52,170
duration in

1063
01:01:54,090 --> 01:01:55,730
relation to the scheme, climate change

1064
01:01:56,590 --> 01:02:00,110
wouldn't normally apply to a baseline risk assessment, which you

1065
01:02:00,490 --> 01:02:03,330
could apply to the construction compound, but we've applied a climate change

1066
01:02:03,390 --> 01:02:04,970
allowance for that for safe refuge.

1067
01:02:05,030 --> 01:02:07,470
So yes, it does take into account

1068
01:02:08,950 --> 01:02:11,550
future scenarios, if you will, not just the two-year scenario.

1069
01:02:12,890 --> 01:02:16,770
The local catchments, though, you have modeled to the 1 in 100 design flood

1070
01:02:16,810 --> 01:02:20,290
event, and the same principle applies, doesn't it?

1071
01:02:21,630 --> 01:02:25,210
Because I think we've agreed that that statement is they're only there for two

1072
01:02:25,290 --> 01:02:29,170
years, so that means that the risk is lower than it would be if

1073
01:02:29,190 --> 01:02:30,910
they were there for a longer period.

1074
01:02:30,990 --> 01:02:34,850
So my question, I think, is just, are you confident that they will only be

1075
01:02:34,890 --> 01:02:38,170
there for two years, or is there a chance that the construction is going to go on

1076
01:02:38,250 --> 01:02:40,510
for significantly longer than that,

1077
01:02:41,510 --> 01:02:42,570
to the extent that we need to

1078
01:02:43,750 --> 01:02:44,710
take that into account?

1079
01:02:46,670 --> 01:02:50,410

Taylor Power for the applicant. I think this probably goes to Mr.

1080
01:02:50,610 --> 01:02:54,350
Brandon in terms of confirming at what point in time it would have materially

1081
01:02:54,390 --> 01:02:58,110
changed the risk assessment, because I imagine there's, and

1082
01:02:58,270 --> 01:03:00,370
I'll pass also to Ms. Tischler, and

1083
01:03:01,530 --> 01:03:03,750
in respect of the construction assumptions,

1084
01:03:04,730 --> 01:03:06,010
that while it might be

1085
01:03:06,830 --> 01:03:10,210
possible that construction could take three years or four years at a

1086
01:03:10,830 --> 01:03:13,450
slower period of time, even though that's not the intention,

1087
01:03:14,670 --> 01:03:18,070
the likelihood that it would take 10 or 15 years is probably very

1088
01:03:18,130 --> 01:03:20,990
unlikely. And so I suppose it's at which point, to Mr.

1089
01:03:21,210 --> 01:03:25,150
Brandon's risk assessment, would those assumptions in terms of a

1090
01:03:25,270 --> 01:03:28,249
1 in 100-year event or 1 in 1,000-year event change

1091
01:03:30,189 --> 01:03:33,990
if you consider a two-year period to not present a significant

1092
01:03:34,050 --> 01:03:36,750
risk, but would a three-year, would a five-year?

1093
01:03:37,250 --> 01:03:38,250
Does that make sense?

1094
01:03:38,310 --> 01:03:40,310
No, I completely understand. I get the maths.

1095
01:03:40,390 --> 01:03:43,410
It's whether or not that statement is anything we could put weight on, and it

1096
01:03:43,470 --> 01:03:45,690
sounds like it probably doesn't make much difference.

1097
01:03:45,770 --> 01:03:49,570
The fact that the line is in there that says it's only two years, so that helps

1098
01:03:49,610 --> 01:03:52,970
reduce the risk, is probably not something we can put a great deal of weight on.

1099
01:03:53,310 --> 01:03:56,370
That's fine. Okay, I want to move on to freeboard.

1100
01:03:58,330 --> 01:04:01,670
At least 0.3 meters freeboard will be provided for the

1101
01:04:01,710 --> 01:04:04,850
refuges, which coincides with the minimum in the guidance.

1102
01:04:05,350 --> 01:04:05,630
I'll come

1103
01:04:06,570 --> 01:04:07,730
back to you in a minute if that's...

1104
01:04:07,890 --> 01:04:11,810
Were you going to have a question about the last thing we were just talking about,

1105

01:04:11,850 --> 01:04:12,710
Mr. Raines?

1106
01:04:13,970 --> 01:04:15,870
Yes. David Raines, local resident.

1107
01:04:16,370 --> 01:04:20,030
Regarding the escape routes that I couldn't really see in

1108
01:04:20,110 --> 01:04:21,010
orange on the maps,

1109
01:04:22,230 --> 01:04:25,690
I think you need to take into account that a lot of the local roads are in very

1110
01:04:25,750 --> 01:04:29,710
poor condition. There's a lot of subsidence, a lot of cracks, a lot of

1111
01:04:29,770 --> 01:04:33,710
potholes. They're dangerous to drive in the dry and good

1112
01:04:33,790 --> 01:04:34,250
light.

1113
01:04:35,730 --> 01:04:39,410
In adverse conditions, they will be even worse than that when there are a lot of

1114
01:04:39,470 --> 01:04:41,890
people trying to leave the site in their cars.

1115
01:04:42,090 --> 01:04:46,050
I think that needs to be taken into consideration, and it's not something which

1116
01:04:46,090 --> 01:04:47,950
should be assessed by Google Maps.

1117
01:04:50,810 --> 01:04:51,810
Thank you, Mr. Raines.

1118
01:04:55,690 --> 01:04:56,350
Freeboard.

1119
01:04:57,530 --> 01:05:01,190
So the 0.3 meters coincides with the minimum in the guidance,

1120
01:05:01,950 --> 01:05:05,210
and my first question is a point of principle, which is, is it

1121
01:05:05,250 --> 01:05:08,530
appropriate, given the vulnerability of the users and the

1122
01:05:08,890 --> 01:05:10,910
inevitable uncertainty in the modeling,

1123
01:05:11,810 --> 01:05:15,170
that we are using 0.3 meters freeboard for the

1124
01:05:15,210 --> 01:05:16,070
refuges?

1125
01:05:17,270 --> 01:05:20,550
And Ms. Locke, I don't know if the Environment Agency want to
comment on that

1126
01:05:20,630 --> 01:05:21,190
first.

1127
01:05:32,090 --> 01:05:35,569
I'll pass to my colleague, Sasha Levers, who will

1128
01:05:35,949 --> 01:05:36,650
comment on that one.

1129
01:05:37,030 --> 01:05:38,190
Thank you. Ms. Levers.

1130
01:05:39,110 --> 01:05:42,450
Hi. Yeah, Sasha Levers, Flood Risk Advisor at the Environment

1131
01:05:42,570 --> 01:05:45,610
Agency. Can I just clarify, are we talking about the

1132
01:05:46,310 --> 01:05:50,110
construction refuge or just generally during the operation of the

1133
01:05:50,450 --> 01:05:51,410
site or both?

1134
01:05:52,150 --> 01:05:55,870
The refuges at this point, but if you've got a wider point, then I'm very happy to

1135
01:05:55,910 --> 01:05:56,470
hear it.

1136
01:05:58,170 --> 01:06:02,150
I suppose the main point we have, it's not so much the

1137
01:06:02,210 --> 01:06:05,590
freeboard, although the 300 millimeter freeboard is the

1138
01:06:05,690 --> 01:06:06,350
standard.

1139
01:06:07,670 --> 01:06:11,610
I suppose it's difficult to assess the refuge points in isolation

1140
01:06:11,670 --> 01:06:12,270
because,

1141
01:06:13,470 --> 01:06:14,230
within the

1142
01:06:15,570 --> 01:06:19,290
flood emergency response plan, there was limited information on the particular

1143
01:06:19,350 --> 01:06:20,230
flood hazard,

1144
01:06:21,250 --> 01:06:25,210
on evacuation points, and actually at the refuge points themselves, which makes it

1145
01:06:25,250 --> 01:06:26,730
difficult to assess

1146
01:06:27,970 --> 01:06:30,110
the safety of the site users at those points.

1147
01:06:31,310 --> 01:06:35,010
So really, without that flood hazard assessment within

1148
01:06:35,090 --> 01:06:38,690
the flood emergency response plan, which includes the flood depth and

1149
01:06:38,730 --> 01:06:39,310
velocity,

1150
01:06:40,270 --> 01:06:44,250
it's difficult to properly give an opinion on that and then

1151
01:06:44,310 --> 01:06:47,510
subsequently give an opinion on whether that freeboard is appropriate or not.

1152
01:06:48,210 --> 01:06:49,770
I don't know if that helps your question at all.

1153
01:06:52,170 --> 01:06:55,610
It does. Thank you. Are you saying that the Environment Agency's position is that

1154
01:06:55,650 --> 01:06:58,330
you want more information then in that emergency plan?

1155
01:06:59,670 --> 01:07:03,130
Yes, that's right. I think although information was given on the

1156
01:07:03,190 --> 01:07:04,570

evacuation routes,

1157
01:07:06,270 --> 01:07:09,370
there isn't that assessment of the risk to people

1158
01:07:10,250 --> 01:07:12,850
on those routes when they're in use and also the refuge points.

1159
01:07:12,930 --> 01:07:16,690
So, the emergency response plan didn't really go into much

1160
01:07:16,730 --> 01:07:20,470
detail on the flood depth, velocity, and rate and onset and duration
of

1161
01:07:20,530 --> 01:07:21,030
flooding.

1162
01:07:21,970 --> 01:07:25,350
We would recommend the applicant refer to the government

1163
01:07:25,410 --> 01:07:28,450
guidance FD 2320 and FD

1164
01:07:28,730 --> 01:07:32,350
2321, particularly the methodology for identifying flood hazards,

1165
01:07:33,150 --> 01:07:37,006
which would demonstrate- ... to what extent those areas are

1166
01:07:37,086 --> 01:07:40,246
safe for particular site users of different vulnerabilities.

1167
01:07:40,286 --> 01:07:44,026
And I think only once we've got that information could an

1168
01:07:44,066 --> 01:07:44,886
opinion be given.

1169
01:07:46,226 --> 01:07:49,266
Without, I don't want to step on the toes of Lincolnshire because

they're the

1170
01:07:49,986 --> 01:07:51,386
authority who'd make a decision on it.

1171
01:07:51,446 --> 01:07:54,946
But in terms of being able to make the assessment, we don't feel like it would be

1172
01:07:54,986 --> 01:07:58,726
possible to give an opinion on that without the flood hazard rating being provided.

1173
01:07:59,826 --> 01:08:01,966
That's helpful. Thank you, Ms. Labus. Mr.

1174
01:08:02,186 --> 01:08:04,666
Barton, was there anything from the council's point of view to add to that?

1175
01:08:07,086 --> 01:08:10,506
No, we've not got anything further to add at this moment in time, madam.

1176
01:08:12,366 --> 01:08:16,106
But I will take that point away, and again, I'll wrap it up with

1177
01:08:16,186 --> 01:08:19,927
the other comments that have been directed at us, if that's

1178
01:08:19,986 --> 01:08:20,226
okay.

1179
01:08:21,146 --> 01:08:21,626
Ms. Power.

1180
01:08:22,626 --> 01:08:24,146
Taylor Power for the applicant. Mr.

1181
01:08:24,326 --> 01:08:28,087
Brandon, did you have any comments on those amendments suggested by the

1182
01:08:28,166 --> 01:08:28,826
EA to the plan?

1183
01:08:30,326 --> 01:08:31,626
Chris Brandon on behalf of the applicant.

1184
01:08:32,666 --> 01:08:36,226
Yes, we've taken those points on board, and we're updating the flood plan to

1185
01:08:36,266 --> 01:08:38,646
include hazard assessment from the modeling,

1186
01:08:39,507 --> 01:08:41,507
which is, we'll be updated deadline four.

1187
01:08:42,366 --> 01:08:43,746
In terms of free boards,

1188
01:08:45,126 --> 01:08:48,646
the minimum free board we've provided is 380 millimeters, so it's above

1189
01:08:49,087 --> 01:08:52,686
the minimum standard, and the rest are 800 millimeters or over one meter

1190
01:08:53,026 --> 01:08:56,786
free board. But we'll clarify the flood plan with the hazard

1191
01:08:56,826 --> 01:08:57,366
mapping, which

1192
01:08:59,206 --> 01:09:01,286
Ms. Labus mentioned on the call just there.

1193
01:09:01,986 --> 01:09:04,866
Yeah, so I had a question on the 38-centimeter free board.

1194
01:09:04,906 --> 01:09:05,467

That's for the

1195
01:09:06,387 --> 01:09:08,706
refuge in parcel A, I think.

1196
01:09:09,566 --> 01:09:10,087
So it is

1197
01:09:10,967 --> 01:09:11,927
just above

1198
01:09:12,846 --> 01:09:14,146
the minimum free board.

1199
01:09:14,986 --> 01:09:18,507
And is that within the error of the model?

1200
01:09:21,366 --> 01:09:23,326
In terms of errors in models,

1201
01:09:26,406 --> 01:09:30,346
historically, a model tolerance has been within 10 millimeters for a

1202
01:09:30,387 --> 01:09:31,666
detailed hydraulic model.

1203
01:09:33,666 --> 01:09:35,967
In circumstances nowadays, that's

1204
01:09:37,547 --> 01:09:39,626
because it used to be kind of relied on that there was a tolerance
of plus or minus

1205
01:09:39,646 --> 01:09:43,587
10 millimeters, but modeling's got more advanced, so the 10-
millimeter default

1206
01:09:43,646 --> 01:09:45,866
is no longer normally an argument.

1207
01:09:45,946 --> 01:09:48,266

You have to demonstrate potentially less than that.

1208
01:09:48,846 --> 01:09:52,686
So in terms of a 38-centimeter free board, yes, I would suggest that

1209
01:09:52,726 --> 01:09:56,086
the model tolerance is well within that for a predicted flood level.

1210
01:09:57,986 --> 01:10:01,066
And what about the fact that an average water level's been used to calculate the

1211
01:10:01,126 --> 01:10:01,786
free board?

1212
01:10:02,586 --> 01:10:03,686
What are the implications of that?

1213
01:10:07,066 --> 01:10:09,446
We've assessed the worst-case depth across

1214
01:10:11,426 --> 01:10:12,906
land parcel A and all the other parcels.

1215
01:10:13,006 --> 01:10:13,206
So,

1216
01:10:14,646 --> 01:10:17,866
if you select the deepest point, which we have done in these cases,

1217
01:10:18,946 --> 01:10:22,786
to develop the mitigation for the bund height or wall height for the actual

1218
01:10:23,026 --> 01:10:26,866
infrastructure, and the free board is 38 centimeters, that's in the worst,

1219
01:10:27,006 --> 01:10:28,906
the deepest part of land parcel A. So,

1220

01:10:29,826 --> 01:10:32,646
if you locate it on other parts of the site, it'll be even more free board than

1221
01:10:32,686 --> 01:10:36,306
that. So that's the worst-case approach example of 38

1222
01:10:36,366 --> 01:10:37,946
centimeters. It won't be any less than that.

1223
01:10:39,665 --> 01:10:43,266
Okay. Thank you. And then the last point about the cabins is that,

1224
01:10:43,846 --> 01:10:47,346
and this might be more of a DCO point, is that

1225
01:10:48,426 --> 01:10:51,086
the assessment's based on a typical cabin height,

1226
01:10:53,026 --> 01:10:56,606
and that's not secured anywhere. And if different cabins were used, for

1227
01:10:56,646 --> 01:10:59,466
example, we might end up without any free board.

1228
01:10:59,886 --> 01:11:03,486
So my question is, should we be specifying a minimum height

1229
01:11:04,466 --> 01:11:07,546
rather than saying, "Using cabins"?

1230
01:11:08,186 --> 01:11:10,746
Is that something that you could go away and consider?

1231
01:11:11,726 --> 01:11:13,526
Yes. Taylor Power for the applicant.

1232
01:11:13,806 --> 01:11:16,606
We could consider that and whether that could be captured in something like the

1233
01:11:16,646 --> 01:11:17,506
design parameters.

1234
01:11:18,246 --> 01:11:18,706
Thank you.

1235
01:11:19,646 --> 01:11:20,966
I think that's a separate action.

1236
01:11:34,286 --> 01:11:37,626
You may have already covered this in your revisions that are going to be submitted

1237
01:11:37,686 --> 01:11:41,566
at D4, but another one for your list is

1238
01:11:41,646 --> 01:11:41,886
that

1239
01:11:43,466 --> 01:11:47,046
in parts of the report, the emergency report,

1240
01:11:48,146 --> 01:11:51,825
it said that safe refuge has been provided in the event that the safe

1241
01:11:51,866 --> 01:11:55,846
escape can't be achieved, and elsewhere, it's the other

1242
01:11:55,906 --> 01:11:59,706
way around. It's saying that if safe evacuation isn't possible,

1243
01:12:00,406 --> 01:12:03,686
then people can go to the cabins. So it's quite

1244
01:12:03,746 --> 01:12:07,686
confused when you read it, and I think we'd appreciate clarity on that.

1245
01:12:08,426 --> 01:12:11,486
I suspect it's something you've already picked up as part of your

revisions.

1246
01:12:13,826 --> 01:12:15,706
Chris Brandon on behalf of the applicant. Yes, correct.

1247
01:12:15,866 --> 01:12:16,546
We've picked it up, and it was

1248
01:12:17,446 --> 01:12:20,846
a point made by Lincolnshire County Council within terms of how we're applying

1249
01:12:20,886 --> 01:12:22,166
refuge and keeping people on site.

1250
01:12:22,206 --> 01:12:25,686
So we'll respond to that, and we're updating the plan with that clarification.

1251
01:12:25,866 --> 01:12:28,006
Okay. We'll have a look at that when it comes in then. Thank you.

1252
01:12:35,166 --> 01:12:37,726
Okay, that's most of my questions on the emergency plan.

1253
01:12:37,786 --> 01:12:40,246
Just turning to the development in flood zone 3B.

1254
01:12:42,586 --> 01:12:44,506
It's not in dispute. Oh,

1255
01:12:45,966 --> 01:12:46,666
Mr. Malkin.

1256
01:12:47,206 --> 01:12:50,406
Yeah. Sorry, just a quick question on the evacuation routes.

1257
01:12:51,366 --> 01:12:55,066
There are already official signed evacuation

1258
01:12:55,166 --> 01:12:55,546

routes

1259
01:12:56,906 --> 01:13:00,686
for the occasion of flood in that area, so it'd be useful to know

1260
01:13:01,246 --> 01:13:04,926
how the minor roads that are indicated by the applicants

1261
01:13:06,546 --> 01:13:08,946
meet those official evacuation routes.

1262
01:13:09,546 --> 01:13:13,306
And as Mr. Raines was saying, lots of these

1263
01:13:13,366 --> 01:13:14,766
minor roads are

1264
01:13:15,846 --> 01:13:19,746
narrow. Lots of them have deep ditches on either sides, and in

1265
01:13:19,766 --> 01:13:22,406
the case of a flood, they fill first.

1266
01:13:23,426 --> 01:13:27,366
So it would also be useful to know how many vehicles would be evacuating,

1267
01:13:27,906 --> 01:13:31,346
what sorts of vehicles they are. Would these just be normal

1268
01:13:32,166 --> 01:13:36,086
passenger transport, or would there be an occasion where perhaps

1269
01:13:36,126 --> 01:13:39,926
expensive heavy machinery needs to be off-site to save it from

1270
01:13:39,986 --> 01:13:43,946
flood damage, and over what time period that's going to occur?

1271
01:13:44,386 --> 01:13:48,326
Because if these small roads are heavily congested and they

1272
01:13:48,366 --> 01:13:51,946
possibly meet traffic coming in the opposite direction, I think it'll be fairly

1273
01:13:51,986 --> 01:13:52,526
chaotic.

1274
01:13:56,116 --> 01:13:58,696
Thank you. Did you want to respond to that?

1275
01:14:00,876 --> 01:14:03,176
Taylor Powell for the applicant. I suppose only if Mr.

1276
01:14:03,376 --> 01:14:06,656
Brandon had any comments on the way in which existing

1277
01:14:07,316 --> 01:14:08,676
escape routes have been considered.

1278
01:14:09,696 --> 01:14:11,956
But if not, we can come back to that in writing.

1279
01:14:14,376 --> 01:14:15,476
Chris Brandon on behalf of the applicant.

1280
01:14:15,896 --> 01:14:19,676
Yeah, we haven't got any more detail other than we just discussed earlier on how

1281
01:14:19,716 --> 01:14:19,896
we've

1282
01:14:21,116 --> 01:14:23,236
approached the evacuation routes, but we'll consider that.

1283
01:14:25,836 --> 01:14:28,936
Mr. Malcolm, it does sound as though there's going to be more detail in the revised

1284
01:14:28,976 --> 01:14:32,596

plan, so have a good look at that when it arrives at D4 and then provide your

1285
01:14:32,636 --> 01:14:33,156
comments.

1286
01:14:39,116 --> 01:14:42,676
So, Gotes catchment, don't think it's in dispute that it's in flood zone 3B,

1287
01:14:43,816 --> 01:14:47,696
and the national policy statement says that development should not occur in

1288
01:14:47,736 --> 01:14:51,076
flood zone 3B except under exceptional circumstances.

1289
01:14:51,196 --> 01:14:53,076
So we've already asked about this

1290
01:14:54,416 --> 01:14:55,276
previously

1291
01:14:56,096 --> 01:15:00,016
in the context of the viability of the scheme, and you clarified, and this is

1292
01:15:00,056 --> 01:15:00,956
to the applicant,

1293
01:15:02,136 --> 01:15:05,456
that removal of the parcel would lead to a lower generating capacity but wouldn't

1294
01:15:05,496 --> 01:15:09,236
render the scheme unviable. So given this, how

1295
01:15:09,276 --> 01:15:12,656
does development in 3B meet the definition of exceptional

1296
01:15:12,836 --> 01:15:13,796
circumstances?

1297
01:15:17,236 --> 01:15:18,436
Ms. Burns for the applicant.

1298
01:15:20,036 --> 01:15:23,796
It's our view that it would meet those exceptional circumstances in light of the

1299
01:15:23,856 --> 01:15:27,796
generating capacity and maximizing that grid connection that

1300
01:15:27,836 --> 01:15:31,756
we've spoken about, in this case, the 750

1301
01:15:32,536 --> 01:15:36,036
megawatts, which is one of the core objectives of the

1302
01:15:36,136 --> 01:15:36,536
scheme.

1303
01:15:37,596 --> 01:15:41,236
So that land parcel, which is parcel D1, generates approximately

1304
01:15:41,496 --> 01:15:45,236
32.2 megawatts AC capacity, and that's

1305
01:15:45,276 --> 01:15:48,756
equivalent to 4.3% of the scheme's total capacity.

1306
01:15:49,396 --> 01:15:51,256
And in light of the urgent need

1307
01:15:52,096 --> 01:15:54,596
for low-carbon renewable infrastructure,

1308
01:15:55,836 --> 01:15:59,716
removal of that would reduce the scheme's contribution

1309
01:15:59,776 --> 01:16:00,536
towards meeting

1310
01:16:01,916 --> 01:16:05,255
or fulfilling that maximization of the generating

1311
01:16:05,296 --> 01:16:05,956
capacity.

1312
01:16:16,516 --> 01:16:19,976
Okay. And then we note the applicant said that there are no alternative

1313
01:16:20,036 --> 01:16:24,016
locations identified to the development in 3B and

1314
01:16:24,056 --> 01:16:26,936
that more land would have to be sought to replace it.

1315
01:16:27,016 --> 01:16:30,876
So, can you provide us with a bit more information about that process?

1316
01:16:31,936 --> 01:16:33,476
Ms. Burns for the applicant. So,

1317
01:16:34,456 --> 01:16:38,236
an alternative could be to reprovide the array and solar

1318
01:16:39,436 --> 01:16:41,516
stations elsewhere within the order limits.

1319
01:16:41,976 --> 01:16:45,676
As you've expressed, that land's already utilized for other infrastructure,

1320
01:16:45,736 --> 01:16:47,216
including substations, array,

1321
01:16:48,696 --> 01:16:50,576
mitigation, set-backs, et cetera.

1322
01:16:50,616 --> 01:16:51,956
We would need to therefore

1323
01:16:53,876 --> 01:16:55,916
acquire or reach agreement with other

1324
01:16:56,716 --> 01:16:58,756
landowners to accommodate that elsewhere.

1325
01:17:03,236 --> 01:17:04,116
Does that answer your question?

1326
01:17:06,116 --> 01:17:08,956
Yes. It does answer at a high level.

1327
01:17:09,516 --> 01:17:09,976
I would

1328
01:17:11,656 --> 01:17:15,616
have liked maybe a bit more information about the exercises that's
been undertaken

1329
01:17:15,676 --> 01:17:19,136
to look for those alternatives rather than saying that there's no
more within the

1330
01:17:19,176 --> 01:17:22,116
order limits. But if that's as far as you can go, then

1331
01:17:23,396 --> 01:17:27,016
that's as far as you can go. Did anyone else have any questions on
this

1332
01:17:27,056 --> 01:17:30,236
development in flood zone 3B and whether or not it meets exceptional

1333
01:17:30,336 --> 01:17:33,396
circumstances and whether or not alternatives should have been
sought?

1334
01:17:34,956 --> 01:17:35,536
Lincolnshire?

1335

01:17:40,016 --> 01:17:40,136
Oh,

1336
01:17:41,476 --> 01:17:42,216
Mr. Semakula?

1337
01:17:43,716 --> 01:17:44,936
Joel Semakula, Lincolnshire

1338
01:17:45,836 --> 01:17:49,576
County Council. Madam, our starting point is that when we have a

1339
01:17:49,596 --> 01:17:53,236
national planning policy test of exceptional circumstances, the applicant can't

1340
01:17:53,276 --> 01:17:57,236
simply rely on a national need for this type of development as justifying

1341
01:17:58,156 --> 01:18:00,616
having met that test. We'd expect to see something more.

1342
01:18:00,816 --> 01:18:00,896
So,

1343
01:18:02,176 --> 01:18:04,136
I think we'd also expect to see even

1344
01:18:05,216 --> 01:18:08,836
greater clarity than what's been provided here today.

1345
01:18:09,136 --> 01:18:12,656
And as to the flood zone 3B case and alternatives,

1346
01:18:13,295 --> 01:18:17,276
we really fall in here behind the Environment Agency and largely

1347
01:18:17,316 --> 01:18:20,816
defer to it. I mean, we dealt with this partly under item four,

1348

01:18:22,376 --> 01:18:25,616
and I don't want to repeat the points that are addressed in the strategic site

1349
01:18:25,656 --> 01:18:26,936
selection note and

1350
01:18:27,916 --> 01:18:28,636
relating to the

1351
01:18:29,776 --> 01:18:31,836
land availability and the grid connection.

1352
01:18:32,236 --> 01:18:36,156
But we simply continue to wonder why infrastructure has

1353
01:18:36,176 --> 01:18:39,376
to be located in flood zone 3B at all.

1354
01:18:41,516 --> 01:18:45,336
And in our view, we see greater clarity around

1355
01:18:45,376 --> 01:18:49,056
why solar stations proposed within this particular flood zone area and

1356
01:18:49,236 --> 01:18:52,776
within the Gotes catchment could not be relocated to land at lower risk

1357
01:18:53,036 --> 01:18:53,876
within the order

1358
01:18:54,816 --> 01:18:55,336
limits.

1359
01:18:56,736 --> 01:18:58,536
There's one additional point that we raise

1360
01:18:59,416 --> 01:19:02,736
here that came out of our local impact report as well.

1361
01:19:02,916 --> 01:19:06,696
We remain concerned at the extent of bunding required

1362
01:19:06,756 --> 01:19:10,576
around infrastructure in the floodplain, and we share the EA's concerns

1363
01:19:10,636 --> 01:19:13,956
about cumulative effects on floodplain storage, flows,

1364
01:19:14,576 --> 01:19:15,476
and maintenance.

1365
01:19:16,876 --> 01:19:19,716
In terms of the additional detail here, we defer again here to the Environment

1366
01:19:19,976 --> 01:19:20,496
Agency.

1367
01:19:25,976 --> 01:19:26,976
Thank you, Mr. Semakula.

1368
01:19:28,756 --> 01:19:31,276
Ms. Leavers for the Environment Agency.

1369
01:19:33,576 --> 01:19:36,616
Yes, hi. Sasha Leavers, Flood Risk Advisor at the Environment Agency.

1370
01:19:38,196 --> 01:19:41,636
As been discussed, there's some uncertainty as to why the development needs to be

1371
01:19:41,676 --> 01:19:45,136
located in flood zone 3B, but I can comment on-

1372
01:19:46,987 --> 01:19:50,868
... the assessment the applicant's done to demonstrate what impact that could

1373

01:19:50,908 --> 01:19:54,328
have on flood risk. So whilst the solar panel legs and the solar

1374
01:19:54,408 --> 01:19:58,268
stations within the functional flood plain will result in a loss of flood storage,

1375
01:19:58,908 --> 01:20:02,708
the applicant has provided within their flood risk assessment some volumetric

1376
01:20:02,768 --> 01:20:06,428
calculations which demonstrated that the result on flood risk would be

1377
01:20:07,048 --> 01:20:10,768
negligible as a result of this. We did previously raise

1378
01:20:10,808 --> 01:20:14,648
concerns regarding the impact of this development

1379
01:20:14,708 --> 01:20:18,328
on the flood flow routes within the functional flood plain, which then

1380
01:20:18,368 --> 01:20:22,048
prompted the applicant's additional modeling for the Guts

1381
01:20:22,108 --> 01:20:25,308
catchment, which Mr. Brandon referred to earlier.

1382
01:20:25,468 --> 01:20:29,228
And from this, we were satisfied that what was being

1383
01:20:29,268 --> 01:20:31,828
proposed within flood zone 3B wasn't going to have

1384
01:20:32,828 --> 01:20:34,728
an adverse impact on flood flow routes.

1385
01:20:34,768 --> 01:20:36,428
So in terms of the

1386
01:20:37,528 --> 01:20:40,568
actual impact on flood risk that we're seeing, we consider this negligible.

1387
01:20:41,268 --> 01:20:43,748
So I suppose it just remains the policy decision as to

1388
01:20:44,928 --> 01:20:46,648
whether it actually needs to be there or not.

1389
01:20:48,568 --> 01:20:51,307
Thank you, Ms. Leavers. Before you go, we have one question for you.

1390
01:20:51,428 --> 01:20:54,888
You referred to some guidance earlier, and just for our action point, could you

1391
01:20:54,948 --> 01:20:57,828
just remind us what the guidance was that you referred to?

1392
01:20:58,428 --> 01:21:00,568
Yeah, it was government guidance.

1393
01:21:00,648 --> 01:21:03,568
It's a research produced by the Environment Agency.

1394
01:21:03,608 --> 01:21:06,708
It was FD 2320 and FD

1395
01:21:06,908 --> 01:21:10,808
2321, which I think is the flood risk guidance for new development and

1396
01:21:10,828 --> 01:21:12,388
the flood risk to people.

1397
01:21:13,308 --> 01:21:13,688
Thank you.

1398
01:21:20,168 --> 01:21:23,508

Ms. Burns for the applicant. I just wanted to follow up with a question just around

1399
01:21:23,508 --> 01:21:27,408
that exceptional test and just the specific reference, just because my

1400
01:21:27,428 --> 01:21:31,108
read on EN1 is a bit different around when exceptional

1401
01:21:31,188 --> 01:21:32,648
circumstances are required.

1402
01:21:34,508 --> 01:21:37,848
And that's when there would be an increase in flood risk elsewhere that cannot be

1403
01:21:37,888 --> 01:21:41,508
avoided or wholly mitigated. And in this case, the applicant's been able to

1404
01:21:41,548 --> 01:21:45,448
demonstrate that there would be no increase in

1405
01:21:45,488 --> 01:21:47,188
flood risk. So I'm just wondering how that

1406
01:21:48,908 --> 01:21:50,028
test is to be applied.

1407
01:21:51,128 --> 01:21:52,248
And just, I just want to confirm.

1408
01:21:53,908 --> 01:21:55,427
Well, we're interested in your opinion on that.

1409
01:21:55,487 --> 01:21:55,688
Yes.

1410
01:21:57,368 --> 01:22:01,268
Yes. I mean, I turn to paragraph 5.8.41 of EN1,

1411
01:22:01,328 --> 01:22:05,148
which talks about energy projects and being sited in

1412
01:22:05,188 --> 01:22:06,268
flood zone 3B,

1413
01:22:09,028 --> 01:22:12,308
and where essential energy infrastructure is to be located in such areas for

1414
01:22:12,368 --> 01:22:15,868
operational reasons. We've discussed maximizing

1415
01:22:16,328 --> 01:22:16,908
capacity

1416
01:22:18,228 --> 01:22:22,028
and the lack of availability elsewhere within the order limits to host that.

1417
01:22:22,088 --> 01:22:25,928
It should only be consented if the development would not result in a loss of

1418
01:22:25,968 --> 01:22:28,968
floodplain storage and would not impede water flows.

1419
01:22:29,988 --> 01:22:30,268
And

1420
01:22:31,108 --> 01:22:34,648
for the reasons Mr. Brandon's expressed today, that is the case.

1421
01:22:35,168 --> 01:22:38,148
And therefore, the tests under 5.8.42 around

1422
01:22:38,748 --> 01:22:41,248
exceptionally where there would be flood risk elsewhere,

1423
01:22:43,208 --> 01:22:46,488
the Secretary of State needs to be satisfied that that risk wouldn't

come into...

1424
01:22:47,028 --> 01:22:47,808
wouldn't be engaged.

1425
01:22:49,948 --> 01:22:52,428
Thank you. Was there anything else, Ms.

1426
01:22:52,508 --> 01:22:55,268
Powers, from the applicant's point of view before I finish?

1427
01:22:56,168 --> 01:22:56,688
No, thank you.

1428
01:22:59,048 --> 01:22:59,648
Mr. Atkins.

1429
01:23:00,968 --> 01:23:01,828
Just for clarity,

1430
01:23:02,808 --> 01:23:04,548
are the applicants saying that

1431
01:23:05,868 --> 01:23:09,608
if they can't develop on flood zone 3B, the project

1432
01:23:09,708 --> 01:23:12,208
is not viable or the project is viable?

1433
01:23:12,328 --> 01:23:15,228
Because I thought I'd read previously at question

1434
01:23:15,268 --> 01:23:19,188
19.0.11 that the inspectorate put out

1435
01:23:19,668 --> 01:23:23,348
that the case was that if they couldn't develop that land, the
project wouldn't be

1436
01:23:23,408 --> 01:23:23,848
viable.

1437
01:23:24,728 --> 01:23:28,448
Yeah, it was a misspeak in the flood risk assessment where they

1438
01:23:28,488 --> 01:23:31,908
suggested that it was a question of viability, but they confirmed their

1439
01:23:31,948 --> 01:23:35,628
response to the question you've just read out that it isn't a question of viability

1440
01:23:35,688 --> 01:23:38,968
any longer. Ms. Powers, I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

1441
01:23:39,548 --> 01:23:41,068
No, that's correct. So yes, the

1442
01:23:42,308 --> 01:23:46,188
term viability was used, but was just more generally meant to refer

1443
01:23:46,268 --> 01:23:49,808
to generating capacity, but didn't actually refer to overall

1444
01:23:49,848 --> 01:23:53,168
viability of the scheme. So we corrected that in response to the written questions.

1445
01:23:54,708 --> 01:23:57,808
That's the end of my questions on water quality and flooding.

1446
01:23:58,228 --> 01:24:01,608
Before we move on, was there anything anybody else wanted to raise?

1447
01:24:01,688 --> 01:24:05,528
And I'm looking here towards South Holland Internal Drainage

1448
01:24:05,608 --> 01:24:08,187
Board, who have sat very patiently through all of this.

1449

01:24:08,288 --> 01:24:12,148
Was there anything that you wanted to say before I move

1450
01:24:12,208 --> 01:24:12,948
on from flooding?

1451
01:24:15,208 --> 01:24:19,048
Thank you. Judith Stout for South Holland Internal Drainage Board.

1452
01:24:20,188 --> 01:24:23,988
No, we would defer to the Environment Agency and the lead local

1453
01:24:24,048 --> 01:24:27,848
flood authority, as in Lincolnshire County Council, on these flood risk

1454
01:24:27,888 --> 01:24:31,768
matters. Thank you. But may I just check with my colleague, Carl

1455
01:24:31,808 --> 01:24:35,428
Vines, in case there was anything that he wished to raise?

1456
01:24:38,188 --> 01:24:39,868
Carl Vines, South Holland Drainage Board.

1457
01:24:40,408 --> 01:24:43,068
No, I don't think I've got anything extra to add to that.

1458
01:24:43,208 --> 01:24:47,068
I think we've covered plenty of responses on the original

1459
01:24:47,108 --> 01:24:47,888
responses, so.

1460
01:24:48,768 --> 01:24:50,068
Okay. Well, thank you for attending.

1461
01:24:51,808 --> 01:24:54,068
Okay. I think that's the end of that agenda item.

1462
01:25:01,628 --> 01:25:05,288

Okay. We're going to take a break now before the next

1463
01:25:05,348 --> 01:25:06,368
agenda item.

1464
01:25:08,068 --> 01:25:11,788
It's 20 minutes past 3:00. We're going to break for 15 minutes, so

1465
01:25:12,008 --> 01:25:13,728
we will resume at

1466
01:25:13,768 --> 01:26:29,848
15:35.