

There have been many documents to track and I have tried to keep up. Nevertheless, at this stage of the proceedings I still see fundamental issues with the application:

-Loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. This keeps coming up, and I have seen no reason to justify the loss of such a volume of BMV land and countryside. Not finding an alternative in the locality is not a good reason. Given that there are many options to reach net zero and given known government preference to avoid BMV land then it is hard to justify the application. Is this really what we want as a country – to wipe our swathes of countryside and high quality farmland to achieve a small impact on our journey towards net zero?

-The energy provides will be a small percentage of the “head-line rate”. It will do nothing at night and little trough winter when electricity is needed. This is all well documented. Once again, does this warrant such a negative impact on the countryside and communities?

-Lifetime Net Carbon Benefit. From what I can gather there is a possibility that over 40 years this project could be Carbon positive. If this is the case, it would seem to heavily undermine the application.

-Absence of a robust and ring-fenced decommissioning bond. From a community point of view, this seems imperative, yet the applicant chooses not to ensure this.

-The above, and the trivial amount of money being given to the legacy fund clearly suggests that the applicant has little or no interest in the people and communities of the area.

-Construction traffic. The management of this seems to be questionable. And even if it is managed, that does not divert from the major impact it will have on the roads and communities. It will simply “manage” it within the framework the applicant decides. The applicant also stated in response to my concern that there would be no traffic impact in the area of Wood End Lane, Pertenhall. I do not think they can guarantee this. Construction traffic will take the route that is quickest for them. The whole construction effort will impact traffic and the routes people take.

-I note that the many videos presented are produced using a fish-eye lens, dramatically distorting the view, making objects in the distance look much smaller. Could I ask why this kind of lens/camera was chosen?

Overall, the application seems weak given the impact it will have on communities, the farmland, and countryside. I have seen practically no comments in favour throughout the entire process. And the questions and concerns of the many people who have taken time to respond to the application are real.

In summary, I hope that the inspectorate will reject this application.