

1) Since my previous submissions to the Planning Inspectorate I have become aware of the experience and knowledge of local residents who have observed the regular patterns of flooding over many years. I am very concerned that known flood risk points such as Norton would be far more frequently affected by more severe flooding as a result of the increased runoff from panels and infrastructure sites. Existing flooding often renders local roads impassable for residents and the local services on which we all rely, including the emergency services.

2) Regarding traffic and the condition of roads within the proposed site area, answers given by IGP during the ISH on 22/04/26 confirmed that 'Highway Improvements' were intended only to facilitate their HGV traffic during the construction phase. This calls into question the condition of the roads and lanes in the site area for normal traffic including agricultural and light commercial vehicles, buses, cars, cycles, horses and pedestrians. Our local roads are fragile and potholed already without the additional wear and tear of heavy construction vehicles. I object that there is apparently no provision in the application to repair and restore local roads to their proper condition when construction is completed. I also object that many of the proposed 'Highway Improvements' will undoubtedly affect views and landscape with the removal of ancient hedgerows.

3) As a volunteer coordinator for the charity Malmesbury and District LINK, I am increasingly concerned about the charity's ability to transport often frail and elderly patients to medical appointments across the proposed site during the construction phase, which it appears may be considerably longer than the proposed 2 years, noting:

a) That a contributor to the OFH on 21/04/26 with experience of working on Solar development projects expressed significant doubts about the length of the 2 year construction period, citing smaller projects which had exceeded similar timescales.

b) That discussion during the ISH on 22/04/26 appeared to highlight uncertainties regarding the commencement of construction of different sectors of the proposed development.

4) I am increasingly concerned about the risks associated with large BESS installations and the likely outcome of fires. It seems that BESS fires cannot be extinguished but only left to burn out while attempts are made to prevent the spread to neighbouring units. This, I understand, is highly likely to result in very significant levels of both airborne toxins and toxic groundwater. The latter could, I understand, risk contamination of the underlying aquifer from which drinking water is extracted.

I question whether a) sufficient water supply would be available for cooling and b) containment of contaminated water would be adequate, particularly in the possible event of fire spread to multiple BESS modules.

I also object strongly to the possibility of significant quantities of airborne toxins being released in close proximity to homes and the villages and towns in this area. The 40th anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear accident should be a reminder of the unpredictable spread of contamination, on any scale.

I object that I have not seen anything in the proposal which provides any reassurance, warning or support for affected residents in the event of an incident.

5) I am increasingly concerned that the issue of agricultural land use, particularly BMV land, has not apparently been properly assessed in identifying the proposed site for solar generation, as discussed during the ISH on 22/04/26. I strongly object to the loss of productive agricultural land at a time when our national food supply is already over reliant on imports, global markets and uncertain supply chains.

6) Further to my previous comments on noise and HGV traffic I was appalled to hear a resident who spoke at the OFH meeting on 21/04/26 reporting how representatives of IGP suggested that they should move out of their property if they would be inconvenienced by noise or construction traffic. This obviously raises serious questions about the attitude of the applicants to local residents and also provision of compensation for displaced residents if relocation became necessary. It also became apparent at the OFH that some residential property within the proposed scheme had not even been identified by IGP, which in my opinion is a disgraceful omission.