

Further clarification required on the response to deadline 3 submission from Sara Jane Knightley by The Applicant

Q1.1.8 The applicant is still referring to “outline drainage principles and storage calculations” surely at this stage of the application more definitive data should be made available – the applicant reply does not give an assurance that any firewater will not contaminate the surround land.

Q1.1.9 The applicant replies that “It requires the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) guidance to be followed to ensure minimum separation distances and emergency access arrangements are established” but this response does not give any assurance that 400m separation distance is sufficient. Will the BESS be re-sited if the NFCC guidance recommends more than 400m?

Q1.1.10 Just because the offices of Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Police and Crime Commissioners did not respond to the statutory and non-statutory consultations does not mean that the Applicant should not engage with the Police and Designing out Crime Officer

Q1.1.11 It is incomprehensible that the Applicant has not included any CHG emissions associated with the cyclical pre-planned maintenance operations. I find it staggering that at this stage they do not have sufficient information to support a reasonable and accurate calculation. This fact alone must surely make the ExA challenge the validity of the Applicants carbon emissions calculations and whether or not there is in fact a carbon cost to this scheme?

Q1.1.15 The Applicant has stated that it does not propose use of the Little Paxton junction with the A1 for construction traffic. Can the applicant therefore confirm which route from the site they propose to use for construction traffic needing to go southbound down the A1?

Q1.1.16 The Applicant states that there are currently no contracts with tenant farmers to graze and manage the use of sheep on the grassland. What measures has the Applicant in place to maintain the grassland should these potential tenant farmers remove their expressions of interest?

Q1.1.17 In response to my question the Applicant has simply referred back to ES Vol 1 Chapter 16 (APP-052). The Applicant has taken no regard of the significant number of residents affected by this application who have specifically sited that it will have a detrimental effect on their health and well-being.

Q1.3.3 The Applicant has responded that small mammal gates (max dimensions of 0.3m x 0.25m) will be provided at the base of the fence. What are the larger mammals supposed to do? There are plenty of deer, badgers and foxes that will not be able to access their known “travel” routes.

Q1.12.5 The Applicant refers to the greenhouse gas assessment for water used in construction and operational phases, but has not confirmed that they will have an adequate, suitable and sustainable water supply for not only construction and operational phases but also any fire fighting requirements. Local water companies have currently reduced water pressure to households and imposed hosepipe bans due to depleted water supplies. The Applicant must be required to identify where the water required will be obtained and ensure that as a result the supply to local residents/businesses is not affected.