

File Name: ISH4 26th September 2023 Part 2.mp3
File Length: 01:27:35

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:08:02 - 00:00:18:19

Okay, the time is now. 355 and it's time for hearing to continue this check with Christine. Live streaming has commenced along with the recording.

00:00:29:14 - 00:01:04:15

Thank you. Okay. So moving on to agenda item number five. In relation to water and flood risk. Specifically agenda item five A to begin with and the implications of the 60 year time limits in relation to the flood risk assessment. We've touched on some of the. No possible implications or not in the previous agenda item, but to consider the. Comments from the applicant in relation to the assessments considerations of the flood risk.

00:01:05:14 - 00:01:35:04

So in response to. On second written questions. The outlines that the 60 year time limits would take the proposed development into the 2080s epoch, which would require a 28% allowance for peat river flows in the Welland catchment area. The existing assessment, considered a 20 left 2010 uplift inflows, which was the highest central band for the 2050s and that was deemed conservative.

00:01:36:24 - 00:02:10:11

In response, the Table 37 has now been updated to require a reassessment of flood risk in 2078 if the development is likely to continue into the 2080s. Epoch to consider the climate change allowances at the time and implications for the West Glen River. And it's the first question in that context would be what are the reasons for not providing some form of assessment? Now, on the basis of that higher percentage in terms of peak river flows?

00:02:12:21 - 00:02:15:24

And this was about the applicant. I'll let Mr. Nevins answer this.

00:02:17:00 - 00:03:00:09

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Regarding the 28% climate change allowance and the confirmation of the development to be decommissioned 60 years or before means that the department would only be operating marginally within to the 2080 epoch. And. I think Mrs. Solloway is already alluded to. We don't know what the climate change allowances will be in the future. They could go up. They could go down as they have done in Scotland very recently on a recent review. So the decision to provide that mechanism to have something appropriate at the time gives a certainty that the development can be designed to ensure that there's no conveyance of flow lost or no impediment to flow at the time.

00:03:00:11 - 00:03:11:28

Using modelling software, which is probably far more advanced than what we have now. So that is a decision to put the mechanism in place for modelling two years before the 2080s.

00:03:13:20 - 00:03:58:05

And this was just just to add to this, this is an approach that came up on the bioenergy with carbon capture storage project that we myself in particular were involved in, where the same issue came up, where in that project they were looking for a obviously a very different project, a 25 year design life, but wanted an allowance to go beyond that if the design allowed for it. Environment Agency made a very similar point of that takes you into another climate change allowance period, and they accepted

wording essentially the same as this to allow for the reassessment to be done at the time when you actually know what's happening in that epoch.

00:03:58:25 - 00:04:12:08

Um, I'm conscious that the moment we haven't directly commented on this yet and we can't draw it to their attention, um, if that would help just to make sure that they are happy. But I'm conscious that that hasn't been made yet, but.

00:04:14:17 - 00:04:15:02

The.

00:04:18:14 - 00:04:20:24

I'm starting to see some feedback in the audio.

00:04:22:14 - 00:04:22:29

Apologies.

00:04:27:00 - 00:04:30:23

And but the Environment Agency did accept it on that project.

00:04:32:19 - 00:05:08:25

We'd certainly welcome further communication between the applicant and the agency on that particular point just to get their their views on the implications of it and. Because from our perspective at the moment, appreciate that there's a lot of uncertainties in the future in terms of climate change, allowances, modelling, etcetera, etcetera. Um, but as it stands, there does seem to be a slight gap in terms of our understanding towards the back end of the period. Now in terms of the assessment and it doesn't quite cover the full range of the operational lifetime.

00:05:10:03 - 00:05:18:26

Hence, the question is whether or not that should be assessed, at least in some form. Given that we have an estimate now of the 28% allowance going into that time period.

00:05:19:09 - 00:05:50:02

Again, we haven't been provided with outputs from the Environment Agency's modelling, which covers the 28% uplift. The Environment Agency model only covered a flat 20%, which again is conservative for the allowance which we were required to look at 10% for the majority of the operational lifetime. And regarding using proxies, that's something that could potentially be done so that 1 in 200 year event flows about 24% to 26% uplift. So they could be used as a proxy.

00:05:50:21 - 00:06:05:27

The 1 in 1000 would be a hugely over conservative approach. There are about a 97% uplift on the 1 in 100 year event. So we could provide clarity in writing just regarding flows and what that could look like.

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

We'd welcome that along with the interaction with the as well. Please. Thank you. Yes. Um,

00:06:14:02 - 00:06:27:29

do Rutland's County Council in terms of their responsibilities for risk, have any particular comments on on this approach? Mr. Johnson. Thank you, sir.

00:06:28:01 - 00:06:39:29

Mr. Johnson. Rutland County Council. I've got a colleague, Julie Smith, online. Don't know if she has any any points to raise, but I've just offered to bring her in at this point if she does. Thank you. Yes, please.

00:06:46:13 - 00:07:19:11

Thank you. Hello, Mrs. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council. I'm highways, but my colleague that was dealing with the local flood authority, um, matters on this. She left a couple of days ago. Rutland County Council. So I'm just trying to get caught up very quickly on the Lfi matters. Um, so I need to have a look at this particular item in more detail before I can offer further comment, I'm afraid.

00:07:21:03 - 00:07:40:02

Is that something that would be available in writing by deadline seven? Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Again, we welcome that. And then similarly, Lancashire County Council. Mr. Wilson, your hand is up. If you have any comments on the approach set up with the applicant on this particular issue, please. Yeah.

00:07:40:04 - 00:08:08:21

Thank you, sir. Mark Wallace Lancaster County Council. Just to say really mean we've touched on it already. But if the phrase assumed a 40 year operational life in the applicant's proposing a 60 year, it goes back to this question about whether the assessments reflect the time frame and think, as we've probably alluded to in comments already, we'd be pushing for that. The 40 year life should reflect the FRA if there's no information that is able to assess it beyond that lifetime at this stage.

00:08:11:29 - 00:08:13:05

Thank you, Mr. Willis.

00:08:16:19 - 00:08:17:04

Yeah.

00:08:18:08 - 00:08:57:17

Yes. Yeah. It's possible that in just two points. Firstly will look to. Include this, the elements within the kind of statement you've asked for, don't know, seven on on on all topics. And the second point I'd like to make just, um, the, the reason that we've made the commitment that we have in the is to ensure that there is no change in effects from what's been assessed. So again, the 40 years was chosen because we had to choose some date at the time. Um, the what the, the control is doing is ensuring that there is no change from what we've assessed.

00:08:58:00 - 00:09:14:24

So if we provide modelling, the modelling says actually there's a problem, we have to mitigate it. Um, and we can't, we can't do anything until we've mitigated it. So there is no change from the results of the assessment because we've put the control in, in place to ensure anything that needs to be done is done at that time.

00:09:16:12 - 00:09:36:11

Noted. Thank you. Yeah, appreciate the the safeguards are in place. It's more a case of aiding our understanding about the possible effects at this point in time given the uncertainty, clearly recognising that. But if there's more can be done to perhaps plug that gap as best we can for the time being, that'll be helpful. Thank you. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

00:09:37:10 - 00:09:39:09

Phil Britten for Parish Council.

00:09:39:18 - 00:10:08:01

Um, just in relation to a 20%, 28% or 20% increase in flow, um. Concern of Brexit, obviously, is the flooding and the capacity of the Grenfell cut to cope with that. Given the speed of or likely speed of increase in runoff due to the development. Where is that water going to go? What attenuation would be in place? It doesn't seem particularly clear from what I've read. Swales and scrapes and maybe this or maybe that. But it's it's a real concern to the residents of Retford.

00:10:09:25 - 00:10:45:28

Thank you. There are further questions on some of those matters that will come on, so perhaps you can revisit them at the time. Thank you. Okay. Sure. Move on to the next agenda item, which is B and consideration of the sequential test for flood risk and the extent to which it has been applied to the site selection process. The applicant stated previously and referred to Chapter four of the DSS, along with the existing flood risk assessment, which does provide some commentary.

00:10:46:06 - 00:10:58:14

Um, the Environment Agency have fed back again response to our second read questions and again signposting those particular parts of the examination library,

00:11:00:12 - 00:11:29:23

but also acknowledging the fact that the the area search wasn't precisely defined. So first of all, we cannot comment on the the A's comment there around the area search for the sequential assessment not being precisely defined. Is there anything you can add to that particular point? I think maintaining that it's based on proximity to the royal substation, but. Is there a particular distance or. Now, how is that area of search defined precisely?

00:11:31:09 - 00:11:42:26

And it was my reference to the grid connection statement. I was going to bring in my colleague Sarah Price from who is online, sort of this.

00:11:47:01 - 00:11:47:22

Thank you.

00:11:47:24 - 00:12:19:11

Thank you, Mr. Fox. And good afternoon, everybody. So Sarah Price for the applicant. And thank you, sir, for that question. I was going to set some background to this as well, but with reference to some of the other application documentation. But just going to your question first, what the applicant did is, as you stated, partly in the question there was to take the grid connection was to to look for suitable land and willing landowners.

00:12:19:16 - 00:12:50:13

This is our set out in the site selection report, which was an appendix to the planning statement and an effectively worked from there. So there wasn't a distance from the rail substation that was set as a maximum distance of the applicant would move from. But as we have set out in other submissions to the examination, there are general benefits in keeping as close to the substation as possible, provided that suitable land can be found.

00:12:50:15 - 00:13:31:15

And those are primarily in terms of minimizing the length of grid connection, which in turn delivers both avoiding the environmental disruption from delivering that grid connection, also reducing the number of landowners that negotiation is needed with which in turn lengthens the process by which essential infrastructure is being delivered and also has cost and viability implications. And those responses, I think, are set out in other questions that we've answered elsewhere in the examination, and particularly in terms of application of the sequential test.

00:13:31:17 - 00:14:13:03

We have also submitted the early environmental review that was carried out, which is provided at appendix F of the appendices to our first written questions. And sorry, I've got the application reference which was rep to hyphen o 38 and that set out the environmental topics that the applicant considered when it was reviewing the land around the royal substation and that did include hydrology and flood risk and there were some parcels as there are now, which do fall partly within flood zone two, but they are very small parts of the site.

00:14:13:06 - 00:14:51:02

And the applicant's view was that the site as a whole, indeed the very vast majority of the site falls within flood zone one. And therefore, in terms of how the sequential test was applied, the site as a whole falls within a preferential area for location of development in terms of flood risk. And then looking at the small parcels which fall within flood zone two as set out in the flood risk assessment, those comply with the exception test on the basis of their delivering essential infrastructure.

00:14:51:12 - 00:15:25:05

But but in any case, I would emphasize the the very small proportion that we're talking about here. There is also a plan which was provided alongside those responses that I talked about previously, which which demonstrates the very small area that we're talking about. I think my colleague would be able to pull it up and if it would be helpful to the examination as well. Just to talk about we're talking about some small parts of a couple of fields.

00:15:26:05 - 00:15:36:06

It's okay. Can visualize the plan. You're referring to 2 or 3 parcels of land that are within flood zone. So I think from from memory within the site. Yes, sir.

00:15:36:08 - 00:15:38:16

And sorry, apologies.

00:15:39:22 - 00:16:11:26

Yeah. Just the question is more the consideration of the alternative sites beyond the order limits. And so, for instance, I'm not quite clear and appreciate there are perhaps other reasons why those alternative sites are considered in chapter four and the and the planning statement in terms of the site selection assessment were deemed inappropriate by the applicants. But it's not clear from that documentation, for example, what the level of footprint is on those alternative sites in comparison to your limits and the proposed development that we that we now have.

00:16:11:28 - 00:16:18:07

Can that be clarified? So, please, just to give some comparison in the relative noise alternatives that we're considered.

00:16:19:12 - 00:17:01:04

Yes, certainly, sir. Sara Price for the applicant and the so the sites think that you're talking about is the ones that we provided in the table with a general analysis of why those brownfield sites wouldn't be suitable or available for the development that we're proposing here. I think the first thing is just to draw reference to the previous responses that I gave on this. And I believe we've also done so in our our responses to questions, which is those those aren't alternative sites that were considered by the applicant at the time.

00:17:01:13 - 00:17:43:26

They were considered in responses to sites that were put forward during the consultation process. And so in terms of alternatives considered by the applicant, they are not considered alternative sites in the true sense. We could, if you would find it useful. So provide the flood risk level of those sites. But I

think that information would be provided in the context that they aren't alternatives which meet the policy requirements in the NPS in terms of delivering the same infrastructure in the same time period for the reasons that we've already given to the examination.

00:17:43:28 - 00:18:15:09

But I'm happy to go through again and think the other point, particularly with regard to flood risk, is we are talking about a site here which is almost entirely in flood zone one. And theoretically we would be able to remove small portions of panels from the areas that that you've that we're showing on the plan. But we we don't believe that would be necessary to meet the requirements of the sequential test or indeed any other planning and environmental reason.

00:18:15:11 - 00:18:51:08

And essentially those areas have been essentially left in as part of the design process because we've demonstrated through the flood risk assessment, Mr. Nevins can talk to that, but that having solar in those fields wouldn't increase the flood risk elsewhere. And so all it would do is reduce the level of renewable energy being generated by the scheme. And in terms of the application of the sequential test, I don't see that we're looking at alternative sites, large alternative sites that can.

00:18:52:13 - 00:19:02:01

Potentially deliver the same level of infrastructure at a lower flood risk level, because as said, we're talking about such very small portions of the site here.

00:19:04:18 - 00:19:27:13

Thank you. Noted. Think you'll be useful at this point in time to bring in some of the local authorities again, making reference to some of the responses we have in response to our further written questions and a note from Rutland County Council. They were not aware of a sequential assessment being carried out in terms of the site selection process. Um.

00:19:29:02 - 00:19:36:24

And it was Mrs. Smith or Mr. Johnson would like to come back in at this point. Just to elaborate on that particular response. Possible, please.

00:19:42:20 - 00:19:59:22

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council, Highways and LFA. Um, yes. Uh, we wasn't aware of any actual flood risk assessment. Sequential test being carried out. Um, so that's why we'd raise the point.

00:20:04:29 - 00:20:24:21

Thank you, Mr. Smith. Did you have any particular comments in response to Mrs. Price's feedback there in terms of the approach that has been taken and also comments back from the the Environment Agency that signpost to both the Yes and the flood risk assessment and the extent to which it's covered in those documents.

00:20:26:02 - 00:20:41:21

I think the concern sorry. Julie Smith Rutland Council highways and lead local flood authority. I think the concern was that because there's known flooding issues in the area, um,

00:20:43:06 - 00:21:00:03

it was a concern that they hadn't carried out sort of a sequential test for flood risk elsewhere. We do acknowledge that, you know, they there's only 2 or 3 areas within flood zone two. Um, so they are

00:21:01:23 - 00:21:09:15

look, when you consider the whole site, obviously they are quite small in percentage. Um.

00:21:11:10 - 00:21:21:03

But it would have been nice to see a sequential test to see whether there was other more appropriate sites in terms of flood risk. Um.

00:21:24:18 - 00:21:27:16

No, I think that's so. Yeah. Thank you.

00:21:27:28 - 00:21:41:11

Thank you. Just bring in South Kesteven who referred to the. Sequential test being applied within your limits. Is there anything you'd like to elaborate on that particular point?

00:21:44:07 - 00:21:46:24

Phil Jordan for South Steven District Council.

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

Gothic mean, that's the approach we would normally take. And it's often or it's more common where there's a

00:21:58:09 - 00:22:02:29

surface water flood risk issue on a on a large site and.

00:22:04:24 - 00:22:09:18

We we would consider surface water, flood risk, as well as

00:22:11:08 - 00:22:48:12

flood risk from sort of rivers and seas to be relevant in terms of the sequential tasks. But in terms of a large site, you'll sometimes get pockets of high risk flood areas. And in those situations, we would consider it acceptable to look at the site as a whole and then consider where the particular types of development have been placed within the within the site. So think, you know, on from the position of staff, we accept the position that's been put forward that it's a very large site and the majority of which is in the lower risk flood areas.

00:22:48:27 - 00:23:04:23

And therefore the the sighting of the development and the proposed mitigation has been carried out within the site. And that's what the reference to our sort of approach or acceptance of the site specific approaches.

00:23:06:12 - 00:23:20:04

Thank you for that clarification. Mr. Willis on behalf of Lincolnshire Towns Council. There anything you'd like to add? Time for the chance to come back to the point raised.

00:23:20:19 - 00:23:40:19

Thank you, sir. Mark Wallace So, no think echo what Mr. Jordan said. Really don't think we've raised any specific concern, would recognize the strategy and approach being taken. And, you know, on the basis of what we can see, there's a there's very small parts in flood zone. So, um, but don't think we've got any in principle issue with the approach has been taken.

00:23:42:25 - 00:23:49:01

Thank you. Mr. Willis. That's helpful. Is there anything that the applicant would like to respond to on those points?

00:23:49:08 - 00:24:06:28

Um, and then just going to add that if the starting point of the project is we had a connection agreement substation, if you look at the figure 11.4, it's essentially not possible to connect in some real substation without crossing some area of flood to due to proximity of rail and.

00:24:09:02 - 00:24:10:09

I'm going to say this wrong.

00:24:12:07 - 00:24:35:13

Um. So essentially that's your starting point in the sequential test talks about available sites. Development is essentially the starting points for connecting into the grid. Um, at that substation. And then otherwise think we've set out on our written submissions about what the race is about, sequential approach to design within the limits.

00:24:38:08 - 00:24:40:12

And we got the design guidance as well. Of course.

00:24:42:18 - 00:24:45:15

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Miss Holloway.

00:24:47:08 - 00:24:48:03

This is all the way for.

00:24:48:05 - 00:25:25:11

My price action group. Um, in all of this, we hear about the time is talking about the the impacts on site. I'm just wondering what is an acceptable process within the site selection to actually look at the potential implications of on site activity to off site. If you take for example, Stratford, it is half a mile from the order limits from the edge of the hold limits. And if there is even 1% difference in the speed of runoff, there is going to be an impact on grandfathered.

00:25:25:20 - 00:25:58:18

Now, the applicant has already said that it's 256% faster, although they believe that the grass sward will take water. Um, but if that doesn't happen and if there is any degree of compaction during the construction process, there is no way that the land is going to be able to cope with accommodating the water and at some point in time it will reach full capacity days. And there are natural runoffs, slopes, topography on the land.

00:25:58:20 - 00:26:39:21

And a typical one is running down Colby Road all the way down to Bradford. And we have shown in our representations many of the pictures of flooding into the Rapid area, some of it from the river, but some of it also from surface water. So we are particularly concerned for the residents of Bradford and there are other areas around um ban as well where no your mitigate. So the applicant would be mitigating the impact on the solar panels around there, but that doesn't necessarily mitigate the impacts for runoff for everyone else either through the river or off down the land.

00:26:40:06 - 00:27:24:27

So we would we would ask for some kind of acceptance or acknowledgement of appropriate mitigation measures, particularly in respect of we've now got a 60 year period that we've got to consider. And we know that the effects of climate change aren't just going to happen in 2080s when the remodeling might take place. There is going to be a linear effect between now and that period of time where it's going to get worse and there doesn't seem to be any measures being put in place up front, particularly for runoff from the solar areas tracks Substation Yes, we can see where the mitigations being put in place, but not really a clear modeling of where the surface water currently runs off.

00:27:26:01 - 00:27:47:29

Thank you. Thank you, Miss Holloway. That does. Begin to introduce some of the next line of question we've got on the next agenda item items. I don't know whether I would like to come back on that point specifically now, perhaps in relation to the sequential approach and how it applies to that in particular, and perhaps we leave some of the wider points to the following agenda items. That's okay. Yes.

00:27:48:02 - 00:28:05:21

I think all I was going to say and I'm going to bring this in evidence. I think perhaps I should wait was just that, you know, the starting point in policy terms is that you can't cause an increase in flood risk elsewhere, which is informed. The design of our scheme. And the conclusion of is that we don't. And the Environment Agency has accepted that.

00:28:09:21 - 00:28:11:02

Thank you. Okay.

00:28:12:19 - 00:28:49:06

Casino further hand. So I'll move on to item C, which is the consideration of surface water and drainage during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases and reference to the various management plans. They cover that, several of which have been updated. Recently as well. And the. Violent and disabled. Three seven. It refers to the regular inspection of training systems and servicing audits during the operational phase.

00:28:50:29 - 00:29:23:15

Of running around that what would happen? Perhaps I could talk us through a scenario whereby there is an extreme weather events, um, during the operational phase. What would happen if. I appreciate there would be mitigation measures you think would be put in place to to manage that. But. Since the onset management of a particular extreme weather event. How would that be managed within the limits and beyond the order limits?

00:29:29:12 - 00:29:30:09

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

00:29:30:14 - 00:30:07:18

Liam Nevins on behalf of the applicant regarding an extreme weather event, you can expect the measures that have been in place for the construction phase to function to a point. Anything beyond what they've been designed to fail essentially. So culverts, for instance, would be overwhelmed and essentially act to be blocked. That would essentially hold water back behind the culvert until there was an overtopping of that particular structure and then that would then pass downstream. So regarding what would happen downstream, that we know worse than what it would be without the development, without the development, there's no suds in place.

00:30:07:20 - 00:30:34:08

It runs off the land, the lands tilled, for instance. Then there'd be faster runoff than if there was crops on there, for instance. And then the receiving environment downstream would receive water at a quicker rate. So to answer your question, what would happen during an extreme event? The measure should function to a point to hold water back, so transferring it downstream until the point that would become overwhelmed, but essentially acting as a beneficial mechanism to slow water.

00:30:36:17 - 00:30:55:25

It seems that the active management during the construction phase as a contractor would be overseeing any particular issues in terms of surface water that may arise. The operational phase, is

there still such a active management of that? Should should there be an event that does begin to raise concerns.

00:30:56:24 - 00:31:21:03

On behalf of the applicant? There should be a dedicated environmental manager that goes around and essentially checks the functionality of any infrastructure that's left in place regarding drainage to ensure that it's functioning adequately for the lifetime of the development. And that should be a regular check and any remedial measures required will be undertaken quickly to ensure that should there be an extreme weather event, then the staff have the best possible chance of functioning.

00:31:22:00 - 00:31:52:25

Can I just add that? Sorry about that. There is reference to that in the so the outlined surface water drainage strategy which talks about drainage measures serving impermeable areas, will be checked on a regular basis if the require dredging or unblocking that will happen. There's reference to what the regular maintenance would look like. And of course all of this will need to be approved in the detailed versions plan afterwards. So think it's the point is that the two have to be read together.

00:31:53:09 - 00:32:15:17

Yeah. No. Appreciate the points in the drainage strategy, which seems to be proactive in terms of trying to block any drains, address culverts, manage it in that sense. I guess I'm thinking more in terms of reacting to a. An unforeseen problem that may or may not arise during the operational lifetime. And how that would be. Managed by who?

00:32:18:09 - 00:32:22:01

Lynn Nevins, on behalf of Declan, can you clarify what you mean by an unforeseen event or.

00:32:23:06 - 00:32:27:19

Have you done for a rain that overwhelms the mitigation measures that are in place.

00:32:28:29 - 00:33:04:08

On behalf of the applicant? Think I've previously mentioned that should the structures be overwhelmed, the water would pass over the top and over spilling function and then be passed downstream. The measure should be designed to accommodate extreme rainfall. So up to the 1 in 100 year event, anything beyond that would be considered incredibly extreme and again, it should still function up to that point. So in terms of reacting to weather event on site, I don't think it would be safe to do so for any personnel to be on site during that particular rainfall event.

00:33:04:20 - 00:33:19:02

And again, with the measures in place, they should still function to a point at that point to become overwhelmed and water passes downstream. So again, without measures in place that water is going to pass downstream. Incredible. Anyway.

00:33:21:11 - 00:33:28:06

We'll just note in table 312 of the we have to put in place an emergency response plan.

00:33:32:16 - 00:33:33:28

Two. 312.

00:33:35:26 - 00:33:37:13

Major accidents and disasters.

00:33:42:01 - 00:33:42:28

That's helpful.

00:33:49:13 - 00:34:08:18

And think so Just. Just think that's what we're talking about here. Think we're talking about. We designed our scheme to deal with flood events, including incorporating climate change. But if you're talking something politic, um, then that would be an emergency. Think where it's a whole other variety of things that would need to be dealt with. That's what the emergency response plan would deal with.

00:34:09:26 - 00:34:10:11

Thank you.

00:34:12:15 - 00:34:18:20

Do Rutland County Council have any comments on this particular point? Mrs. Smith.

00:34:26:24 - 00:34:33:15

And thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways and lead local flood authority
And.

00:34:35:09 - 00:35:14:22

I think our main concern is about during construction. Um, but in terms of, um, as I said earlier, I haven't had a chance to go back and review the Environment agency's, um, comments and the applicants details on that. So I just need to review that. Um, so hopefully once the flood risk assessments been done and it's been done to the approach of applying the appropriate climate change percentage, um, then that should address, um, future concerns.

00:35:14:27 - 00:35:40:11

But I had noted that there was the, the emergency response plan. Um. But as I say, we were concerned about, um, villages outside of the Rutland area, to be honest, um, with, um. A flash, floods, etcetera, as we know that there's been issues in the past. Thank you.

00:35:41:20 - 00:36:14:27

Sir. Can I come in? Just. Yes. Justin Johnson, Rutland County Council. Just on that point. It may be that a further point can be added to the, um, in terms of some form of, um, review and assessment as to why, why the flooding occurred, why the defence measures were overcome and if possible, additional mitigation put in place that may be appropriate.

00:36:16:27 - 00:36:20:21

And the applicant. Yes, that's. Think we can do that?

00:36:21:29 - 00:36:23:29

Thank you. That's helpful. And.

00:36:25:18 - 00:37:03:23

Mrs. Smith and Mr. Johnson was going to raise it later on. But Mrs. Smith mentioned the need to go back and review some of the more recent documentation. Um, just conscious. There have been updates and deadline five, particularly in relation to the surface water drainage strategy. The outline water management plan, the and the damp as well which cover some of the issues discussed, think it will be particularly helpful if you are able to review those latest versions of the documents just to see if they address some of the outstanding concerns that you may have.

00:37:03:28 - 00:37:13:11

That may be a conversation in going in the background in relation to the common ground, I'm not sure, but we'd certainly welcome an update position in terms of your views on those documents.

00:37:13:27 - 00:37:28:21

So just in general and Rockland County Council and believe as part of the discussion on the statement of Common Ground, we've already set up meeting possibly next week to try and have discussions on on that very point. Thank you.

00:37:29:05 - 00:37:32:16

Thank you. Yeah, that'd be good. Okay.

00:37:36:07 - 00:37:37:22

Um, Mrs. Holloway.

00:37:38:21 - 00:38:09:03

But Mrs. Holloway from Past Action Group taken on board, that the applicant has accepted to do a review and assessment of situations in the. Could we also add in to that review a review of the climate change every 5 or 10 years? So obviously certain baseline assumptions have been. Used to to model the flood risk that actually it was then reviewed against actually the actual situation. So every 5 or 10 years.

00:38:09:18 - 00:38:28:25

So that then more preparedness could be put in place to provide further mitigation if it was deemed that things were moving a lot faster and out of control and climate change than everybody thought, it could work the other way, of course, in which case nothing would need to be done, but it would least

00:38:30:11 - 00:38:37:19

allow for some planning and rectification in advance of a problem occurring. Thank you.

00:38:38:05 - 00:39:13:08

And the applicant say, just to clarify what was what was agreeing to there was to a if there's been an emergency and emergency events and that we would respond to that. And would you think um what think you're asking which is a pre-emptive review before we put the measures in place, um, and then onwards, don't, don't think we would be agreeing to that because that's not something there's no agreed to. It's kind of a position is made when a consent is granted. What I would say is that the detail of our operational mitigation and construction mitigation has to be approved at the relevant time.

00:39:13:10 - 00:39:20:21

And so that question could be asked then if that was not necessary, I don't believe that is the usual approach and I don't think we'd be agreeing to that. Yeah.

00:39:23:16 - 00:39:45:04

Mr. Holloway. Mrs. Holloway from Pulse Action Group would say that 60 years isn't the usual approach in the context of the solar farm. So maybe if we've got extraordinary circumstances in terms of the duration of this development, but actually we have to consider different measures to safeguard and in this case, protect the residents in the residential areas. Thank you.

00:39:47:00 - 00:39:54:27

Sorry about that. Think I was making. That's not really an approach taken in any form of development. Consents. Not just solar.

00:39:56:18 - 00:40:08:04

Noted. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Would either Lancashire County Council or even County Council like to comment on this particular point before we move on to the next item on the agenda? Mr. Willis.

00:40:10:16 - 00:40:27:12

Sir Mike Wallace, Lancashire County Council. Just to say, do note that there's been, I think, some updated documents, a deadline six as well. So we will go away and just review those to see what those changes are. And I think as Mr. just Mr. Johnson said, we could seek to clarify that the statement of common ground.

00:40:29:24 - 00:40:30:27

Thank you. Mr. Wallace.

00:40:31:22 - 00:40:32:08

And.

00:40:32:27 - 00:40:40:25

Stephen, appreciate your acts as the lead local flood authority for your area. But is there anything you have to add on this before we move on?

00:40:42:25 - 00:40:56:12

Cultural Industry Council. No, no specific comments. So we would defer to Lincolnshire County Council and other relevant drainage bodies on this. Thank you. Okay. Um. Yes. Apologies.

00:40:57:13 - 00:41:27:24

Phil Britten Parish Council. Just a comment on the maintenance of culverts and drains and that that goes on at the moment. Any good farmer will maintain culverts, drains, field drainage. All that will serve to do is deliver the water quicker from the solar area into the rivers or the drainage system, which will then arrive in Retford quicker, speedy, more volume, bigger volumes potentially, which is our concern over this development. Run hot water back on the land.

00:41:27:26 - 00:41:32:27

It'll maintain drains and culverts, etc. will just speed the water downhill and into the river.

00:41:33:16 - 00:41:36:15

Okay. The applicant like to respond to that point, please.

00:41:37:14 - 00:42:12:17

Mr. Nevins, on behalf of the applicant, there are several measures that are proposed throughout several documents. The water management plan outline water management plan which seek to slow down water through check dams, through soils and so on and so forth. And the functionality of culverts is separate to that particular point. So it's a slightly separate issue. The measures are there to slow water down, getting off site vegetation, planting procedures to ensure that water is conveyed at a slower rate through friction increases in terms of culverts and blocking.

00:42:12:19 - 00:42:22:14

That's good practice that should occur. Culverts should not be blocked to allow the functionality of the drainage system downstream of that culvert. Thank you.

00:42:23:18 - 00:42:28:26

Thank you. Hand at the back. The gentleman from the parish council. Apologies. I've forgotten your name.

00:42:30:23 - 00:42:32:07

That's a roving microphone.

00:42:34:20 - 00:42:35:10

Absolutely.

00:42:35:20 - 00:42:37:14

Please do. Please do.

00:42:55:16 - 00:42:58:07

Tony Barker, the parish council.

00:43:00:23 - 00:43:02:03

I've looked very.

00:43:02:05 - 00:43:03:00

Carefully.

00:43:03:02 - 00:43:04:08

Particularly at.

00:43:06:00 - 00:43:10:10

Five zero 53, which is the.

00:43:12:06 - 00:43:18:15

Outline. Surface water drainage strategy. Amended by the applicant.

00:43:20:04 - 00:43:56:05

By their own calculation. Using the assumption that the arrays are surface mounted, covering four point 6,000,000m² in imperial terms, but over 1000 acres in a six hour storm that would generate an extra 14,000l per second, being a 256% increase on baseline. Extrapolating that out. That's 305,000,000l of water extra in a six hour period.

00:43:57:11 - 00:44:00:01

That is going to end up in the West River Glen.

00:44:01:22 - 00:44:06:13

It's something like 300,000 tons of water. It's got to go somewhere.

00:44:08:03 - 00:44:25:03

So again, the applicant makes the point that that's not the calculation because they're going to put mitigation measures in place. So I'd like just to run through those, oh, reference to pages 13 to 21 of that document.

00:44:26:25 - 00:44:37:21

Plate seven shows the developer is intending to lead gaps between the panels rather than a single drip line at the lowest end of each section.

00:44:39:29 - 00:45:14:13

And. Their reasoning in terms of mitigation. They rely on a study by Cooke and McEwan. Which I've looked at. And that in some states and they they put this into the document outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runaway volumes or peak flows. However. Where the ground beneath panels is bare, they may be an increase in peak discharge.

00:45:15:05 - 00:45:39:18

I wonder if they've read the conclusion to that report because in in there it confirms that in certain circumstances with ground is bare below the array's arrays that surface water runoff could increase by 100%. Seems to be conveniently forgotten or ignored.

00:45:41:20 - 00:45:46:16

There's also a lot of reliance upon. Grasping.

00:45:48:21 - 00:46:31:08

Grass growing, having matured under the PV arrays and along drip lines. And notice again, they refer to natural England in their technical information note which says the key to avoiding increased runoff and soil into watercourses is to maintain soil permeability. And vegetative cover. Permeable land surfaces underneath and between panels should be able to absorb rainfall as long as they are not compacted and there is vegetation to bind soil surfaces.

00:46:33:23 - 00:46:59:20

Cannot see that the developer is planning. To have grassland established before construction. In fact, in the final paragraph on page 616, they say as such, the area under the drip line should be seeded with the suitable grass mix as shown in plate nine to prevent riling and an increase in surface surface water runoff.

00:47:00:15 - 00:47:02:17

So what are they proposing?

00:47:02:28 - 00:47:19:10

Are they saying post installation of the arrays when the ground will be compacted? It'll look like the Battle of the Somme. And they got to spread a bit of grass seed around and hopefully the thing matures up. Sounds very unlikely to me.

00:47:21:17 - 00:47:28:17

Was also interested to know there's a suggestion that the panels are located on flat topography.

00:47:30:04 - 00:47:46:18

Well, I've not noticed that. And I've walked the site many times. It's a sloping site. Many of the panels will be on slope areas where there are slopes, all of course, ending up in the West River Glen.

00:47:49:15 - 00:47:57:14

The other thing that I found quite strange, there's a they refer to a, um.

00:48:00:14 - 00:48:01:25

And what have they called it?

00:48:13:16 - 00:48:15:02

The model study area.

00:48:16:22 - 00:48:32:02

So this is a study to inform them what depth of buffer they need adjacent the watercourses to slow down and create friction to stop the water running into the to the watercourse.

00:48:33:02 - 00:48:34:09

It's interesting.

00:48:34:11 - 00:48:58:06

That study is a very small area of land. It's on the south side of the River Glen. It's about ten acres, so it's less than 1% of the total. The area is pretty flat. So I'm really not sure that that demonstrates. What should be done. In terms of mitigation and that buffer zone.

00:49:00:13 - 00:49:31:04

So the whole side really kind of understand and think this is sort of partly alluded to as why they've not prepared a full modelling of the scheme itself and what the impact will be on discharge into the River Glen and its impact on other areas. Probably they don't want to let us know that. There's a mitigation measure which came in.

00:49:34:17 - 00:49:51:20

The SMP was the introduction of smiles and scrapes. And the photograph shows some fairly low scraped ditches and all that seems to be at the discretion of the developer as to what is appropriate.

00:49:53:14 - 00:50:24:29

So I think it really is of concern that if it was you go we go back to their analysis that there'd be this huge amount of water going in if the whole thing was hard surface over a thousand acres from a 256% increase down to 0% by the mitigation they've suggested it doesn't feel right.

00:50:26:00 - 00:50:33:24

And I was very interested to note that Rutland County Council in their submission

00:50:37:09 - 00:50:50:09

to zero 48, they consider the proposals would have a negative impact on surface water drainage across the vicinity of the site and the development could pose a flood risk.

00:50:53:14 - 00:51:25:02

So really, I'm very concerned that the applicant has not considered flood risk outside of the site in any detail whatsoever. The mitigation measures are minimal and goodness only knows if we get a lot of ground compaction. During construction. It will just make the whole situation worse and it'll be local residents who pick up the the problems of this.

00:51:27:29 - 00:51:28:14

Thank you.

00:51:28:16 - 00:51:48:24

Thank you, Mr. Barker. Um, you have touched on a number of points. Later on in terms of my questioning, but thought it'd be useful just to get your perspective on that as a whole. Um. With applicant. Let's come back to any of those points. Briefly. I think it's probably some headlines you can touch upon.

00:51:49:20 - 00:52:28:19

And I'll briefly just introduce this one to come back on a couple of points. And to just in terms of the the grassland and the commitment to install it is both in our limp and our soil management plans. So that grassland is going to be installed because it's a core part of our mitigation proposals, not just in relation to flooding and the the water management plan, which is the construction phase document was amended at nine six to deal with if there is a short period where the grassland isn't in place fully, the measures will be put in place.

00:52:28:21 - 00:52:55:17

So just wanted to reemphasize the fact that that grassland is definitely happening because it has to because various documents require us to do it. The question is about the timing and how that works and and obviously the vagaries of grass actually growing physically, practically. And what happens if

that doesn't happen? And that's what that commitment is. It was put into the wmp during that construction phase. But that will be the issue has been put.

00:52:57:09 - 00:53:02:13

So then, Mr. Nevins, just to come back on some of the points about principle, about assessment and.

00:53:03:10 - 00:53:34:06

I just. Thank you, Mr. Evans. On behalf of the applicant. There's quite a few points raised by Mr. Barker. I'll try and use comprehensive as possible regarding the hard surface panels on the ground. That's obviously not a realistic scenario. The panels have raised above the ground, so there is still vegetation and soil available for infiltration to occur. So there's no physical footprint of the panels. So the increase from that in terms of taking away permeable ground is zero.

00:53:34:18 - 00:54:18:28

In terms of slope, 90% of the array areas of slope of less than 2%, which would generate slow runoff. 7.5 is between 2 and 6, which would generate moderate runoff and less than 2.5 between above 6%. So generally the site is flat. It does have undulations. There is no getting away from that. That's that's absolutely true. But 90% of the area is of less than 2% slope. Regarding the model itself, to demonstrate the effectiveness of mitigating surface water runoff through vegetation model works by using three basic principles topography, roughness and rainfall applied to that ground.

00:54:19:18 - 00:54:57:06

That ground is relatively representative of the topography within the arrays. 19% of less than 2% slope is representative of that particular modelled area. So it can be extrapolated out and applied to the wider area in terms of increasing roughness, regardless of where we did that on site, if you increase the roughness of a surface, the friction acts to slow down water. That principle is applicable throughout. So with the commitment to having a vegetated surface wherever possible, that increases the friction and therefore slows surface water down across the area.

00:54:58:18 - 00:55:24:28

Regarding the scrapes and swales. There is a commitment for these to be designed prior to the construction phase and signed off by the lead local flood authority and relevant other organisations before construction starts. So they have to be designed properly and the construction contractor will be responsible for undertaking that design process once a detailed design for the development is in place. Thank you.

00:55:27:15 - 00:55:28:08

Thank you for that.

00:55:28:10 - 00:55:28:25

Mr.

00:55:29:24 - 00:55:48:07

Barker. I'm conscious of the time, although we are keen to make sure we run through the agenda. I think initially said that we need to finish for 5:00. Um, if everybody's agreeable, I think we're keen to continue to allow the agenda item to be concluded. So if we can.

00:55:48:18 - 00:55:49:03

Okay.

00:55:49:05 - 00:55:50:22

So keep that in mind though, please.

00:55:51:18 - 00:56:00:28

Coming back on some of the points made. So how long will the grass vegetation be established before construction? Will it be mature?

00:56:03:11 - 00:56:32:25

Secondly, we accept that the example given of the all hard covering on the land. It's in your proposal. But we accept that in reality the arrays are going to be mounted on frames. But if the ground below the arrays doesn't have substantial vegetation below it. The water's going to run off.

00:56:34:22 - 00:56:48:12

Fourthly, still sorry. Thirdly, I still can't get why there wasn't a proper modelling and modelling for the scheme as a whole. Don't buy that. That small area is representative of the whole.

00:56:50:25 - 00:56:52:16

So let's come back on those points.

00:56:54:01 - 00:56:54:27

Thank you, Mr. Barker.

00:56:56:29 - 00:57:07:22

Is there anything you'd like to come back on? Briefly. I'm keen to move on with a question. That's okay. I mean, some of it may come up in the questions, but any urgent points please do feel to respond to that.

00:57:08:09 - 00:57:18:09

And no mean would just add a spokesman for the applicant that obviously the the Environment Agency hasn't raised concerns with what the work we've done.

00:57:19:25 - 00:57:28:23

So we just leave it at that. We've had an expert producing it and the expert statutory body saying that our approach is acceptable.

00:57:29:27 - 00:57:31:10

Thank you. Sorry, could just.

00:57:32:12 - 00:57:39:00

Counter that environment agency don't consider surface water runoff soot in that brief.

00:57:41:11 - 00:58:03:29

So don't see how they could have commented on. On this in their response to you, because we've discussed this through the local flood warning method and the deputy flood warden and. Basically, the Environment Agency have said it's not their brief to consider surface water runoff.

00:58:07:18 - 00:58:11:00

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Preston. Did you have your hand up at the back?

00:58:13:06 - 00:58:17:27

Yes. Please feel free to take a seat. If that would be. That'd be helpful.

00:58:21:08 - 00:58:42:08

I just like Phil Britain Parish Council just like to come back on the establishment of the grass ward, which is fundamental to controlling water and infiltration or improving infiltration on the land.

Believe in the documents, it says at Mallard pastor's discretion. But they're committed to establish grassland prior to.

00:58:46:15 - 00:58:47:13

Prior to.

00:58:49:01 - 00:59:11:08

Construction. It's how long before construction to establish a really good grass sward is when it's going to be drilled. Fertilized. What management's in place? That's a key consideration I feel for this development. And the word at our discretion is doesn't fill me with a lot of hope that will be corrected or where appropriate. Sorry.

00:59:13:23 - 00:59:17:24

Okay. Will come back to grass wards in the questions.

00:59:19:15 - 00:59:30:14

Okay. Lights and move on by unconscious. That's Mr. Bradley has had his hand up online perhaps for some time if Mr. Bradley would like to. Make his point, please.

00:59:32:03 - 01:00:12:27

Thank you. Um. I'll put my hand down. Geoffrey Radley, retired, conservation professional and local resident. I'm not in the flood risk zone. Um, the two points, really. First of all, this question of, um, soil permeability. There is an interaction here with the management of the site subsequent to construction. Um, permeability depends on compaction is adversely affected by compaction and, um, that can be affected by the management regime, either the mowing regime or the grazing regime.

01:00:12:29 - 01:00:51:24

Indeed, heavily grazed soils are more prone to compaction and more prone to runoff. There was an experiment in a trial in Wales that showed very dramatic effects of heavy sheep grazing on. So a runoff. So I would ask that the applicant consider that in their management plan for the management of the areas under the panels. If they haven't and the other areas within the site if they haven't already done so. Secondly, um, it's already been said by a number of people that parts of Bradford have long suffered periods of flooding during times of peak flow.

01:00:51:27 - 01:01:22:19

Um, and despite what's in the surface water drainage strategy. Rep 553 I would suggest that there's a case for adopting a bit of a precautionary approach. Um, especially in the light of the increased protected life to 60 years of the development. Um, and there are some well-established techniques for increasing not only slowing the flow, but increasing flood storage in previously canonised river catchments such as the West Glen.

01:01:23:08 - 01:01:54:25

And these also have a benefit for biodiversity, which is my main interest. Um, channel diversification is one of them. Creation of Watsons is another. And I note that in the statement of common ground between the applicant and natural England, it's agreed that there will be no net gain from the in relation to biodiversity of the Westland River from current proposals. And I also note the Environment Agency does have plans to undertake catchment management works in this area but with no timescale.

01:01:55:05 - 01:02:13:19

And I think it would not be unreasonable that the developers should be asked to contribute to these works, both to ensure biodiversity net gain and to increase flood storage and so ensure a precautionary approach to tackling the risk of increased flooding in Retford. Thank you.

01:02:15:22 - 01:02:36:21

Thanks, Mr. Radley. We are going to be releasing biodiversity tomorrow. It will be now, along with with soil management. So I think perhaps the interests of time will hold those sorts of timing, if that's okay. I'd just like to revisit the modelling point, though, and.

01:02:39:04 - 01:02:43:23

In terms of the extent to which that has been applied.

01:02:46:07 - 01:03:18:22

In response to our further written questions, it was stated that a grid resolution of four metres has been applied to to the modelling which wouldn't. And especially if resolution to pick up some of the finer channeling Baker from the runoff from from the panels. And it was just a question of whether or not there's any more detail, more fine grained modeling that could be applied using a different method perhaps that could consider that issue in more detail, given the apparent limitations of the modeling that's been applied so far with the resolution.

01:03:20:11 - 01:03:52:19

Evans On behalf of the applicant. The modeling was intended to demonstrate the effectiveness of establishing grassland and vegetation management. It wasn't intended to demonstrate the effectiveness of Swales, which are yet to be designed, and other measures such as scrapes. So that's why it's not been undertaken at this point. We don't know the fine detail, what that will look like, and it's up to the construction contractor to undertake the design of those measures prior to the construction phase in agreement with the lead local authority. So that's why it's not being incorporated into the modeling.

01:03:54:12 - 01:03:57:10

Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

01:03:59:14 - 01:03:59:29

Um.

01:04:04:02 - 01:04:13:11

Just look at our next question. Think. We've sort of been coveting extents in the previous discussion around the provision of. Grasslands.

01:04:16:00 - 01:04:21:10

In advance of construction. If we perhaps just revisit that, though, um.

01:04:23:13 - 01:04:35:20

I'm still not quite clear as to when and where that will be provided. Is that still to be determined at a later date with the detail management? Is that is that the stand there?

01:04:37:14 - 01:05:15:04

Yes. What I would draw attention to is paragraph 4.7 of the outline source management plan, which talks about the fact that where it can be achieved. Advance. Sowing the grass is advantageous for construction purposes. However, in some areas that will not provide the best outcome and a better score may be better achieved by tailoring, sewing, following intonation, and where trenching is completed. So we need to be a kind of a local decision depending on the soil and piece of land in question, which is the the that then dovetails with the water management plan, which now allows for the fact that it could be the case that it's not able to be put in place for soil reasons.

01:05:15:13 - 01:05:16:09

So therefore,

01:05:18:05 - 01:05:39:19

the the outcome measures, which will then need to be part of the detailed water management plan. And that's the point I was trying to make earlier, is that it can't be seen in isolation. The soils management and the water management and landscape management are all interconnected aspects which will talk to each other as they're all discharged.

01:05:41:06 - 01:06:01:03

And note that requirement six requires the detailed design of the operational scheme to demonstrate how it needs to be consistent with the surface water drainage strategy that has been approved pursuant to Requirement nine. So therefore, we've got one.

01:06:02:19 - 01:06:11:05

You've got the design, the soil management measures, the. Thought management measures and the landscape management measures all talking to each other.

01:06:12:20 - 01:06:21:21

So the lead local authorities would have sign off on the extent of advance selling and any mitigation puts in place where that wasn't possible.

01:06:22:29 - 01:06:24:23

Glass. Yes. Yeah. Yeah.

01:06:26:15 - 01:06:27:00

Thank you.

01:06:29:03 - 01:06:29:18

Um.

01:06:32:02 - 01:06:36:03

Next question. Just revisiting this year round. Um.

01:06:38:00 - 01:07:16:17

Possibility of beareth and the applicant refers to that being unlikely to contribute to runoff at grade levels. And the baseline agricultural situation and the Malachi section group did line six of queried that assumption on the basis that it's not necessarily equivalence if you compare land that may be currently used for agriculture in terms of the the rich structures that may be in place that may retain water more than Bear River, that may be in place if the ground's been cleared for the construction of a area.

01:07:16:19 - 01:07:19:21

We can comment on that particular point, please.

01:07:20:17 - 01:07:50:22

Mr. Evans, on behalf of the applicant and any agricultural workings on that land will ultimately introduce compaction through agricultural movements. So stand by that position that. During the baseline, there will be periods where runoff will occur on the agricultural land through compaction and through tilling and possibility of small patches of earth being present during the construction phase is absolutely real.

01:07:50:24 - 01:08:13:19

And therefore we have measures committed to that where a particular risk is identified. Certain measures, drainage measures can be put in place to ameliorate that. In terms of compaction and runoff

for baseline. It's analogous to what would be considered to be a better Earth scenario during the operational phase.

01:08:15:25 - 01:08:16:14

Mr. Brittain.

01:08:17:25 - 01:08:20:15

I'm sorry would disagree with the

01:08:22:03 - 01:08:55:24

the point that compaction following construction was similar to agricultural levels of compaction. Yes, compaction does occur in agriculture, but great measures are taken to avoid it. Um, low ground pressure tires, um, track laying sorry, tractors with tracks. Um, also only working when the soils are dry. Um. Yeah, there's lots and also controlled traffic wheeling where tractors only run in tramlines or up and down certain set and wider machines to cause other issues.

01:08:56:22 - 01:09:08:02

And so if you're going to run all over the field, building a solar array, that's completely different to driving up and down in a tractor with a wide machine on controlled traffic, weanlings with low ground pressure tyres.

01:09:11:20 - 01:09:38:00

And half that would just add that our soil management plan has extremely wide array of measures to avoid compaction and ameliorate it where it does happen. So what we are talking about here is isolated areas where grass may not have been able to have grown but would be highly unlikely to have compacted in any event because of the measures in the SNP to avoid it during construction phase.

01:09:41:17 - 01:09:42:15

Mr. Fox.

01:09:44:23 - 01:09:49:27

Moving on and just to touch on some of the issues around.

01:09:51:18 - 01:09:59:14

Topography in the orientation of panels and possible indications for runoff. Again.

01:10:03:06 - 01:10:35:00

The gradient vector analysis of the topography and response back of the limits. They say that it shows the surface water flow direction is very rarely orientated north, south, east, west for more than 50m, meaning the alignment is unlikely to concentrate flows downhill, especially taking the shallow slopes on which the majority of rays are located. And with Mr. Barker around some of these points.

01:10:36:01 - 01:10:37:17

I'm just wondering how that statements

01:10:39:15 - 01:11:13:01

related to the previous comments in the outline surface water drainage strategy, which does acknowledge the intensification of the runoff of panels along the drip line in small channels or rivulets could be exacerbated where they are not positioned in alignment with topography. So it's just a question as to whether or not the alignment of panels at the detailed design stage will take account of runoff implications at that point in time. Is that going to be a factor in the detailed design? The point in time.

01:11:15:14 - 01:11:41:15

Mr. Evans, on behalf of the applicant, think I'll refer back to that vector analysis that there is no particular direction in any land parcel that remains in a particular slope for any period of time. And so therefore the orientation of panels is not necessarily going to concentrate flows in a particular direction. It will dissipate as per natural topography. So to answer your question, no, it won't account for orientation of panels.

01:11:42:26 - 01:11:55:28

So the the statements in the outline, there was more of a general comment that could be could be an issue in theory. But your view is that having regard to the topic on this site, it isn't. Is that correct? Is that correct?

01:11:56:00 - 01:12:12:29

Summary Mr. Evans, on behalf of the applicant, yes, that is a general statement. If you have a particular slope that is in one direction for a substantial degree, then yes, there is a potential for rivulets to occur and along a concentrated pole. But that's not the case in this particular application.

01:12:16:15 - 01:12:27:18

And we just come back to the point about our data design approval requirement six has to be consistent with the mitigation measures that are approved pursuant to the drainage requirement.

01:12:32:16 - 01:12:33:27

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

01:12:35:05 - 01:12:35:20

And.

01:12:37:09 - 01:12:39:15

Similar points. Um,

01:12:41:13 - 01:12:53:00

just touching on the type of panels that could be provided. So the comparison between trapped tracker panels or fixed our phasing panels. Um.

01:12:55:05 - 01:13:11:03

Respond to further written questions for .0.1. Think it was a little too that south facing fixed panels could be beneficial in terms of reduced runoff rates in comparison to tracker panels. Is that.

01:13:12:02 - 01:13:12:25

Is that correct?

01:13:15:06 - 01:13:29:12

Snap ends on behalf of the applicant, not necessarily with track panels. We see you have the ability to tilt and retain water on a surface for a particular period longer, so a steeper incline, it's going to run off a quicker rate. So that's not necessarily the case now.

01:13:29:23 - 01:13:59:05

Okay. I'm just referring to the response to question 4.0.1, which did imply that there could be a benefit in terms of water runoff from the fixed panels as a comparison between the benefits of to the two different technologies with track panels being more efficient in the generation. Um, so I was going to ask whether or not there be some consideration again at the detailed design stage of runoff when determining the type panels that are applied across different parts of the of the sites?

01:13:59:07 - 01:14:29:27

Absolutely. Mr.. On behalf of the applicant, I think there is a commitment in the outline water management plan where a specific risk area is identified, then specific measures will be implemented at that case. So once we know the detail of the particular panel orientation and whether it be tracker or South facing, then at that point measures can be targeted in areas that are of steeper slope. For instance, those 2.5% of a gray that's 6% and above would be an.

01:14:29:29 - 01:14:30:16

Obvious.

01:14:30:25 - 01:14:31:24

Area to focus on.

01:14:33:14 - 01:14:34:17

Thank you. That's helpful.

01:14:44:10 - 01:14:51:24

Just review my questions again. I think some of them have already been covered to. To a large extent.

01:14:53:23 - 01:14:54:08

Um.

01:14:56:05 - 01:14:58:06

Even going into one. I don't think we've touched on.

01:14:59:18 - 01:15:00:03

Neglected.

01:15:00:12 - 01:15:05:29

Great delegates are safe and the applicants response to Question 12 .0.6. Um.

01:15:08:26 - 01:15:19:06

Seconds back on some of Rutland County Council's concerns about the stripping back of land and potentially reduced infiltration rates.

01:15:21:27 - 01:15:38:18

It was just again think it's probably wrapped up in Rockland County Counsel's office to review some of the more recent submissions, but be keen to understand whether they felt the applicant's response backfired. To address that point. Perhaps that's one for deadline seven in writing. Perhaps, unless you wanted to, to raise anything now, Mr. Smith.

01:15:46:18 - 01:15:52:23

Thank you, sir. Um. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council, Highways. And. Um.

01:15:54:11 - 01:16:24:13

Yes, I do need to still go through the documents and can obviously submit, um, full comments for the next stage. Uh, our concern regarding construction, um, lies very much in some recent issues in the middle of summer. It had been dry for a while. We had flood flash flooding. Um, a considerable sized site had been stripped. Nowhere near as big as this site.

01:16:24:22 - 01:16:48:05

Um, it was a fraction of the size of this site. Um, and it caused considerable flooding, um, to the highways. Um, but what was more concerning was residential properties. So, um, that's why we need to kind of be sure that there's going to be no issues with flooding. It's very difficult at this stage to, um.

01:16:50:18 - 01:16:57:10

Put a hand on heart and say this development would be acceptable without seeing any modeling and any design. Um.

01:16:59:06 - 01:17:03:22

Uh, hence the reason why we've been raising concerns about this. Thank you.

01:17:07:17 - 01:17:36:26

Thank you, Mr. Smith. So, yeah, think again. As I said before, there are a number of updates to the various management plans. I think your point around the concrete shoes as well and possible implications for and off the applicant have made an update to again the surface water drainage strategy to discuss the possibility of providing berms or embankments up slopes of arrays where they would be provided. So there are some changes have been made. Think in response to your comments that we particularly useful to get some feedback on if if possible please by the line seven. We welcome.

01:17:36:28 - 01:17:37:13

That.

01:17:39:14 - 01:17:55:19

Some half of that think suppose one point I'm just would say in reading that is that at this point in time we're not going to be able to really to provide any more level of design information now. So if there are concerns about what might be

01:17:57:15 - 01:18:17:16

through experience, for example, then I think we need to be focusing on what kind of in-principle measures we need to be putting in the plan to be able to deal with. Then we will deal with that. I don't think we're going to be able to provide X at this point, and it's not because it's not enough time in examination. We don't have that information at this point in design

01:18:19:22 - 01:18:20:07

development.

01:18:21:26 - 01:18:50:21

And again, Mrs. Smith and the other local authorities as well. Thank. Would encourage you to consider the point just made there in terms of the level of detail that should be provided at the outline management plan stage and whether or not that is sufficient and recognizing that there will ultimately be sign off for those plans at the detailed design stage on the requirements. So again, perhaps reflect on that point and feedback on that basis that would be useful as well, please.

01:18:53:24 - 01:18:54:09

I.

01:18:56:24 - 01:19:04:16

Do you have any further points? On water and flood risk. Before we move on.

01:19:08:07 - 01:19:08:27

Mr. Burton.

01:19:10:03 - 01:19:27:01

Just a question around the management of the grassland. I noticed in the recent reply or answers to questions that the applicant referred to managing the grassland as organic or organically, which seems to be a new new development not mentioned before.

01:19:29:15 - 01:19:32:00

That organically or organic?

01:19:34:22 - 01:19:45:07

But which has implications for how the grassland is managed under the panels established in. Is it going to be certified as organic land or just not? What does it mean?

01:19:45:10 - 01:19:57:17

That's perhaps the question for tomorrow when we discuss land use and soils. But appreciate there is the interaction between the two. Perhaps if you can pick that up tomorrow, given that we now are of course classified. That's okay. Mr. Mr. Brittain Thank you.

01:19:59:04 - 01:20:00:12

Okay. Um.

01:20:05:15 - 01:20:22:29

Moving on then with the agenda. Think it'd be good at this point in time to review the action points arising from the specific hearing for as it's taking place so far? Afternoon, Mr. Clifford.

01:20:24:19 - 01:20:27:16

You're able to. Room for the draft, please.

01:20:31:10 - 01:20:37:28

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. So we've got the updated updates on statements of common ground we.

01:20:38:00 - 01:20:38:22

Discussed.

01:20:39:12 - 01:20:41:11

Earlier and.

01:20:47:21 - 01:20:52:02

And potential complete line. Seven.

01:20:59:29 - 01:21:02:11

Including the points mentioned in relation.

01:21:02:13 - 01:21:03:24

To my action group.

01:21:10:06 - 01:21:19:12

And then in terms of the scope of the development item, details of implications for the and other documents, including planning statement updates, climate.

01:21:19:14 - 01:21:20:14

Change, carbon effects.

01:21:20:16 - 01:21:34:08

Average annual power output, approximate number of homes supported etcetera, arising from the 60 year time limit. That's the general document document update that we discussed earlier on following the 60 year change.

01:21:35:27 - 01:21:39:18

And thirdly. Again, this is for the applicant.

01:21:44:02 - 01:21:45:09

To provide a response.

01:21:47:02 - 01:21:58:15

Because the further to what's been said already on nets. A deadline. Five Comments regarding the capacity for the rifle substation and surrounding network.

01:22:00:11 - 01:22:11:22

Yeah, I think. Yes. Although don't they will just reflect what I said earlier. I think we will try and speak to that. Encourage them.

01:22:12:03 - 01:22:26:14

Any further discussions with an update on those? As I said earlier on, I think we may find it brilliant that we asked them further questions ourselves as well given the lack of appearance today. Erm.

01:22:28:03 - 01:22:29:21

Fortunately for the applicant.

01:22:34:01 - 01:22:35:22

Clarify if carbon effects.

01:22:39:12 - 01:22:40:03

What is this one?

01:22:42:27 - 01:22:43:24

Yeah, it was.

01:22:43:26 - 01:22:58:21

It was a query, um, in relation to whether or not the body carbon of any works arising from potential upgrades to the substation or surrounding network have been assessed with climate change effects.

01:22:59:00 - 01:22:59:21

Oh yes. Yeah.

01:22:59:29 - 01:23:00:18

At that point.

01:23:01:06 - 01:23:20:15

Yeah. Okay. Those are the ones for the scope of the development. And then for water and flood risk for the applicant. And on the sixth for the gain in relation to the six year operational time limit. Clarification on flows and results of any further interaction with the Environment Agency.

01:23:22:03 - 01:23:30:20

Next one for Rutland County Council Update on position, including regarding implications of the proposed 60 year operational time limit for the FRA.

01:23:31:22 - 01:23:58:00

So just on the previous one for the applicant, um, just think we might submit that entity because I think the first one is um, that within that uh, the paper we're going to do on assessment of the implications of security as we talk through, um, if we can provide modeling and what that might show. And then a separate item on encouraging the Environment Agency to look at the, the wording on. Yeah.

01:23:58:09 - 01:24:06:11

I'd agree. So actually the first one can be the first point can be incorporated into the earlier. Yep. Point. Um, yeah.

01:24:08:18 - 01:24:09:26

Yeah, that's fine.

01:24:11:21 - 01:24:14:28

Okay. We've had a Rutland County Council one and then

01:24:16:21 - 01:24:27:27

next one for the applicant. And this is an addition to the think regarding additional emergency event mitigation following the suggestion from Rutland County Council.

01:24:28:16 - 01:24:46:18

Yes, I think had that as adding wording to say that if an emergency happens requiring us to do a review of what that well what happened in flood risk terms and provide the results of that review to them in terms of any additional mitigation measures required. So it's kind of a post post event reviews.

01:24:59:12 - 01:25:29:03

Okay. Then the only other one from water and flood risk is for Rutland County Council and Lancashire County Council is provide update position on relevant management plans regarding water and flood risk matters, including updated deadline six documents, and also to include comments on whether or not the level of detail provided in the outline plans is sufficient. South Kesteven Council want to be included in that one as well or not?

01:25:32:00 - 01:25:34:07

By filtering himself in district council.

01:25:34:13 - 01:25:39:00

I'm happy on those particular plans to have comments.

01:25:39:02 - 01:25:45:02

Provided by Lancashire County Council. Okay, we'll keep action point for the two county councils.

01:25:45:13 - 01:25:58:06

And just the applicant. I would just say that if it became the focus to be on suggestions for additional wording to those management plans which we can then consider.

01:25:58:25 - 01:26:00:29

Um, and there's no reason why.

01:26:01:19 - 01:26:02:10

Beforehand those.

01:26:02:12 - 01:26:31:11

Can't be provided beforehand. You don't need to wait for a deadline in order to communicate with the applicant directly and you know, and then set the results out at the following deadline for us to consider. But yeah, absolutely. As we've said before, continuing liaison on these points, particularly on things like management plans, requirements, etcetera, that can just take place outside of the examination and the results just presented to the examination. Because what don't want these sessions is to become drafting sessions which could be held off offline.

01:26:33:15 - 01:26:38:22

Those are the action points. Yeah. Okay. For today or for this afternoon?

01:26:40:25 - 01:27:12:26

It's drawing to a close for today. Then reminder, if you've spoken today, it would assist us. If you please provide a written summary of your submissions by deadline seven again, which is on the 10th of October. Hearing of the recording of the hearing today will be published in the website as soon as possible after the hearing has concluded. Just to say thank you everyone for your participation contributions, which will help us in drafting our recommendations to Secretary States in due course.

01:27:12:28 - 01:27:21:07

And a reminder that issue specific for continues tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. with agenda item number six.

01:27:23:04 - 01:27:29:13

Times now 522 and this issue specific hearing number four is adjourned until tomorrow. Thank you.