

Reference EN010141 "Thematic responses"

Throughout the Response document, including the specific points I raised in my RR and subsequently my WR, the Applicant overstates support for the scheme, overstates the contribution in Electricity generation terms and understates the impact on the Communities that would be affected should this be approved.

I raised a number of points which have either been deflected or not directly answered, which does not respect the effort we the Community are making to ensure a fair and transparent process.

Please respond truthfully and factually to my points.

2.2.1 some 1307 submissions were made by the Community objecting to the scheme. Saying that some who submitted support the development and several objected is seriously misleading. Comments from the Community supporting in general terms Solar developments in the appropriate locations such as brownfield and industrial roofs does not translate to support of this scheme on BMV land. Some 1300 objected in clear terms which is 99.5% of the submissions.

2.1.30 Stating that this development would power 108,000 homes seriously overstates the contribution this scale of solar development can make in the UK. A realistic load factor of around 10% indicates how for long periods especially in winter the development will make little if any contribution let alone support 108,000 homes. It equates to 108,000 homes exhausting the entire BESS capacity, if fully charged, after boiling a kettle 6 times excluding any other electricity consumption. Truthful and fully transparent disclosures should be made by the applicant.

Further in 2.1.30 the reference to Economic benefit is untrue. There will be a net negative economic benefit and significant cost to the Community.

2.1.33 to state that the development would have no detrimental impact on food security is a serious misrepresentation.

The loss of productive BMV land directly increases the need for higher food imports and ignores the ever increasing population / demand for food. Food security means producing sufficient food in the UK to survive potential blockades or serious import restrictions. A rush to net zero does not excuse a future food security crisis.

2.1.72 Thermal runaway thus toxic gas plumes will occur and there is no evidence that the developer has considered responsibility for evacuation procedures for Schools and Care Homes in proximity to / downwind of the BESS site. The reference to a plume study is not sufficient to absolve the developer of responsibility here.

2.1.83 There is very significant understatement / lack of detail by the developer of the true Carbon Footprint of the scheme. The inclusion of more realistic traffic / transport / construction journeys alone negates the net zero claims through the life of the scheme.

2.4.1 Again I am not getting a realistic response regarding real output and the how long 108,000 homes could actually be supplied.

2.5.4 Should the development proceed, the provisions of the Land Compensation Act 1973 and other avenues will support numerous and substantial claims for compensation / injurious affection by residents / homeowners impacted by the development. The Applicant has NOT "committed to minimising potential effects on neighbouring residents through the design of the Scheme" .