

Response to the "late response from the Applicant to the request for further information ("RFI") letter dated 14 April 2026 (re-issued 20 April and 28 April).

Dear Secretary of State,

I am not going to use this request for further information as a vehicle to reinstate my points of concern regarding the PVDP proposal, as my original concerns, all of which still stand, are already a matter of public record and therefore do not need to be reiterated. What I will do is take the opportunity to present you with a series of questions, which I would be grateful if you asked them of yourself as you consider your final decision. I feel this important, as most of my questions surround the unfair nature of the plan-decision making process surrounding this NSIP.

Question 1. Why have you allowed the applicants to submit late documents when this decision goes explicitly against the original decision of your predecessor? I take the opportunity here to remind you of Mr Milibands statement that *"Agreeing to an extension of the duration sought, and at a late stage within the RFI response period, could create an undesirable precedent and risk undermining confidence in, and the integrity of, the planning process. It may also give rise to concerns of fairness, as other respondents are working to the existing timetable and would not have benefited from an equivalent extension."*

Question 2. Who is controlling the plan-decision making process, those tasked with its oversight or those who benefit from its outcome?

Question 3. Do you consider that the post-examination submissions provided by the applicant to be so extensive that they effectively amount to a new development for your consideration?

Question 4. Given the high levels of concern surrounding negative biodiversity impacts, do you consider that the proposal will result in "nature safe energy generation"?

In conclusion, I regard the decision to allow the applicants to submit additional documentation as undemocratic, giving rise to my view that there is one set of rules for us and one for them. Clearly the applicants request that you reconsider the decision to allow them to submit documentation beyond the deadline to which we all adhered is an obvious ploy on their behalf to further obfuscate an already poorly evidenced proposal. Perhaps cynically, I firmly believe that the applicant's approach is underpinned by an element of orchestrating "objection fatigue" as they seek approval for their proposal. Currently we clearly have a lack of an appropriate planning mechanism for the provision of solar power, in terms of its environmental and societal damage, its spatial distribution and its generation in terms of appropriate infrastructure support.

Yours sincerely

Professor Stewart Thompson.