

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent
Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape Effects

Reg Identity Number [REDACTED]

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able to see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent

Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape Effects

Reg Identity Number [REDACTED]

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and

respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able to see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent

Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape Effects

Reg Identity Number SD6614921

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able to see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing

them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent

Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape Effects

Reg Identity Number [REDACTED]

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able to see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent

Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape

Effects

Reg Identity Number [REDACTED]

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able to see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent

Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape Effects

Reg Identity Number [REDACTED]

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.

East Park Energy (EN010141) Application for an Order Granting Development Consent

Comments on Site Inspections, Virtual Site Survey Material and the Assessment of Public Rights of Way and Landscape Effects

Reg Identity Number [REDACTED]

Susan Sheard

The following comments should be read alongside my previous submissions concerning procedural fairness, site inspections and the adequacy of interested parties to participate effectively in the examination process.

I remain deeply concerned about the exceptionally short interval between Deadline 4, 5 and Deadline 6, which was further reduced by the delay in the Planning Inspectorate publishing the full set of Deadline 5 submissions. In practice, this left only three or four working days for both the Applicant and Interested Parties to review, evaluate and respond to a substantial volume of complex technical evidence. Such a limited period is simply inadequate for the proper examination of the issues before the Examining Authority. The concerns raised are wide-ranging, highly technical and often interrelated, requiring careful analysis rather than rushed responses. Significantly, concerns about the compressed timetable have been raised not only by Interested Parties and the local community group Stop East Park Energy (SEPE), but also by the Applicant. When both sides of the examination are expressing concern that there is insufficient time between examination stages, this strongly suggests that the timetable is not allowing for the level of scrutiny that the Planning Act examination process is intended to provide. Unless sufficient time is allowed for all parties to consider and respond to the evidence properly, there is a real risk of procedural prejudice and an imbalance in the examination process. In my view, this undermines the principles of fairness, transparency and effective scrutiny that are fundamental to the integrity of the examination.

In my last submission I raised concerns regarding the Site Inspection including:

- the absence of any clear explanation as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) was not being undertaken. By comparison the examinations of Sunnica and Mallard Pass involved substantially more extensive site visits both accompanied and unaccompanied
- the practical difficulties experienced by Interested Parties in locating and accessing the VSI material
- the quality and adequacy of the material provided

These concerns remain unanswered and unresolved.

The video footage consists largely of short, ground-level recordings taken while travelling along tracks. It provides little contextual or panoramic information to help to understand the landscape, topography, visual relationships or the true scale of the proposed development. It is therefore not an adequate substitute for an Accompanied Site Inspection. Furthermore, the difficulties in accessing the material have persisted throughout the examination. The video files have been difficult to locate and navigate. I also note that additional Virtual Site Visit videos have been published today, without any accompanying email or notification to Interested Parties advising that new examination material had been added to the project page. These videos do not open directly from the examination document page preventing Interested Parties from viewing them. I would be grateful if the Examining Authority would confirm that he has been able see the video material in the form submitted by the Applicant. The late publication of additional examination material and the difficulty in accessing them further reduces the already limited time available for review and comment, adding to the cumulative disadvantage faced by Interested Parties during the closing stages of the examination.

To date no explanation has been provided as to why an Accompanied Site Inspection was not considered appropriate, despite the acknowledged scale and complexity of this NSIP. Taken together, these matters have limited the ability of

Interested Parties to engage effectively with the site evidence and have reduced the transparency and robustness of the examination process. These shortcomings are particularly relevant to the assessment of Public Rights of Way and landscape effects. The limited site inspections and inadequate virtual material have not enabled the impact on these routes to be fully appreciated.

Given the scale of the proposed development, affecting approximately 2,000 acres across a large rural landscape, I remain of the view that the combination of limited physical site inspections and inadequate virtual material has not enabled either the Examining Authority or Interested Parties to fully appreciate the likely effects of the proposal. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives careful consideration to the cumulative effect of the compressed examination timetable, the delayed publication of submissions, and the deferral of substantive responses to the final deadline. Taken together, these procedural issues have materially reduced the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny and informed participation by Interested Parties. The examination should not simply be fair in principle; it must also be fair in practice. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully taken into account when assessing the weight to be given to the evidence submitted during the closing stages of the examination and, ultimately, when reaching a recommendation.