

The Applicant's responses have failed to address the points I raised in my earlier submission with very little new detail and continued unsubstantiated opinions.

#### Loss of Best and Most Versatile Land

The Applicant's response is to repeat government policy and to justify its actions through arbitrary criteria that are not explained and with no detail of the search and selection process for assessing lower grade land: 2.8.10 – 2.8.16.

#### Disproportionate Scale

The applicant's response dismisses such concerns with claims that some reductions were made in certain areas, omitting that increases were made elsewhere to compensate any reductions. They claim "efficient use of agricultural land" to produce the headline 400MW when all existing statistics indicate an expected output of 40MW. 2.8.19.

#### Detrimental Visual Impact on Countryside

The applicant's response states that the proposed mitigation measures will eliminate visual impact and there will be no industrialisation of this 6 mile tract of open countryside. This very subjective view is contrary to the experience of other large scale sites and has no further details to substantiate their claim. 2.8.30

#### Inadequate Consultation

The Applicant's response has been to repeat what consultation processes took place without commenting on the level of engagement they reached or the attention they gave to genuine concerns raised. This continues with many instances of their responses stating that details of many important factors will not be given until after project acceptance and so unavailable to stakeholder review. 2.2

#### Impact on the Local Communities

Applicant recognises that such a development will have a "inevitable adverse effect" on human health and wellbeing, but dismisses these as, in their opinion, "not significant".

The applicant does not answer criticisms of its claim of ecological net gain and merely refers back to its original documents based on inadequate survey detail.

#### Reduction in Biodiversity

The Applicant reiterates their original statements which were the cause of the initial concerns as they are based on surveys that were inadequate and lacking in sufficient detail. 2.10.6, 2.10.7.

#### Battery Storage Issues

The Applicant has not described adequate mitigation of BESS risks. For instance, air quality mentions plume modelling for "reasonably worst case" - 2.4.10, and toxic fume dispersion assessment for "anticipated short term" fires - 2,4,18, despite the known difficulties in stopping thermal runaway fires and the potential spread of fumes over several kilometres.

#### Soil Degradation

Applicant has referred to previous documents with no new input.

#### Increased Flood Risks

Applicant has referred to previous documents with no new input.

#### Transport Disruption

My concerns raised about severe traffic congestion on B and C road are dismissed as "negligible" by the Applicants as defined by their "expectations", "instructions" and "forecasts" with no detailed analysis available to substantiate their assertions which have been found to be completely contradicted by the experiences of other large solar installations.

2.12.11. Total reliance is placed on the use of the internal site roads, when the reality is that drivers will rely on their GPS systems to choose their route. There is no method of monitoring traffic movements and no enforcement procedures defined. 2.8.39. There is emphasis on minimising disruption during construction site working hours, but makes no mention of any early morning HGV movements expected outside these hours. 2.12.6.

#### Construction Disruption

Concerns about noise from piling activities are referred back the original document still with no monitoring and enforcement over excessive noise from piling - 2.15.2. The work replacing solar panels throughout the operational life of the site is acknowledged but its impact is stated as "no significant effect" without any quantification of HGV movements, workforce involved and expected duration per year. 2.23.9.