

I would like to make the following comments in response to the ExA's questions:

Q1.1.3 the revised guidance from NFCC to BESS has been published and includes the need for a comprehensive risk management process leading to a robust battery safety management plan and emergency response plan. It also includes specific explosion control guidance. It is imperative that the Applicant has read and included this in their submission.

Q1.1.8 it is imperative that the Applicant has included adequate bunds in the scheme to ensure that any firewater does not contaminate the surrounding land.

Q1.1.9 400 meters separation from properties is not a considerable distance when the impact of an explosion is considered.

Q1.1.10 surely the Applicant should be required to engage with the Police and Designing out Crime Officer? The risks from this type of develop leading to increased crime are well known and measures to reduce/prevent should be written into the Scheme.

Q1.1.11 The ExA has questioned how often the cyclical preplanned maintenance operations will take place. Surely the Applicant also needs to confirm that these extra traffic movements have been included in their calculations both for the impact on the roads and the resulting increased carbon emissions.

Q1.1.16 The applicant proposes to use sheep to graze the grassland at certain times of the year. Where is the applicant proposing to get these sheep from and what will happen to them when they are not grazing the grassland? As the site is so enormous a lot of sheep will be required to keep the grass levels under control!

Sheep cannot just be put out and left alone to graze - what measures has the Applicant got in place to monitor the sheep from a welfare point of view.

Q1.1.17 There is absolutely no doubt that human health will be adversely affected by this development. The applicant did not give this sufficient consideration during the consultation phase but must be required to consider and justify the considerable amount of harm that will be caused to residents well-being. NPS EN-1 recognises that energy infrastructure has the potential to impact on the health and well-being of the population. Applicants must assess the effects of each element of the project and identify any potential adverse health impacts and any measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for these impacts. NPPF promotes the preservation of healthy and safe communities and observes that access to a network of high quality open spaces is important for health and well-being of communities, Taking these away from residents over such a vast area must be considered.

Q1.1.21 Surely consent for this project cannot even be considered until the outcome of NESO's Connection Reforms process has been published.

Q1.3.1 AS the Applicant currently has no funding secured for decommissioning how can substantial hedgerow planting (over 17km) be guaranteed?

Q1.3.3 The Applicant mentions mammal gates but does not give details of size or spacing. Mammals have specific routes they use to cross land it is imperative that the gates are placed across all of these routes – unfortunately mammals are not able to follow signs indicating the provision of mammal access routes!!!

Q1.7.2 The Applicant suggests that the proposed development count theoretically supply almost half all electricity that BCC and HDC collectively consume but source from non renewable generation. Surely if this is the case the supply from this development should be sold to BCC and HDC thereby at least giving some benefit to the communities that will suffer from this development?

Q1.7.4 Not only should the applicant be required to justify the size of the proposed development but why it has been proposed to go over four sites thereby increasing the overall spread of the development.

Q1.11.3 The applicant suggests that construction staff would be encouraged to consider ways of travelling to site other than by individual private car. Encouraged is very different to required. Have the carbon emission calculations and traffic movement calculations assumed that shared transport would be used? If so then additional calculations should be shown assuming individual journeys are there appears to be no requirement to insist on shared/sustainable travel.

Q1.1.15 not only should the impact on the A1/B645 junction be considered but also the impact on the northbound exit and southbound entrance to the A1 at Little Paxton

Q.1.12.5 Not only should the Applicant be required to prove that they have an adequate suitable and sustainable water supply in place not only for the construction but for any fire fighting needs, but they should also ensure that the cost in emissions and additional transport requirement have been included in their calculations