

I would like to make the following comments to the Applicants responses to my RR by their point reference:

- 2.1 The applicant states that there is “general support for the scheme”. This is erroneous as shown in Appendix A in which 9 RR’s are detailed as being in favour whereas there are over 6 pages of people against the scheme
- 2.1.3 The statement that this proposal “which would boost the UK’s energy security by connecting up-to 500 MW of clean, green electricity to the grid, thereby helping to reduce the UK’s reliance on fossil fuels (including from overseas)assumes the maximum output from the scheme which in reality cannot be achieved
- 2.1.16 Surely the Battery Safety Management plan should be agreed before the DCO is granted rather than after?
- 2.1.30 Again the Applicant refers to the “up to 500MW” alleging the ability to power 108,000 homes. Where are these homes? They will not be local. The Legacy Fund of £6.4m over the lifetime of the project equates to £106,000 per annum – a drop in the ocean compared to the disruption and loss of lifestyle that we will all have to endure for 40 years
- 2.1.35 The Applicant has not provided sufficient detail as to how the traffic movements will be monitored and enforced. It is well known that most delivery drivers and workers use satnav’s for directions usually showing the shortest/fastest routes. Is the Applicant planning to ensure that all Satnav applications will be updated to show these temporary roads? If not what is to stop the drivers using the existing roads and bypassing the temporary roads, thereby using the roads through the villages that the Applicant maintains will not be used.
- 2.1.36 I do not think the applicant appreciates nature of the roads that will be affected. There is no doubt that the anticipated impact of the scheme will be more than “negligible” contrary to the Applicants statement.
- 2.1.58 Whilst Planning Statement (APP-031) might identify a need this scheme will not deliver the anything like the up to 500MW predicted
- 2.1.65 I cannot believe that a developers experience or credibility is not a relevant consideration
- 2.1.70 Surely detailed design of the BESS should be provided prior to consent