

Written representation by Mark Vincent Judge on behalf of Grittleton Tennis Club - my comments on responses made by the Applicant to Relevant Representations submitted on behalf of the club to the Planning Inspectorate Ref 4.42 RR-1744 of their document.

Three tennis court venues were notified in the initial RR, all served from The Street, Grittleton, notably Grittleton House, Church House and the Village Hall (MUGA). The Applicants response has been written as though it is only the Village Hall and as such ignores the increased safety risk caused by large commercial vehicles when members are using The Street to walk between venues. This danger is covered in detail within the document I now refer to - Written representation by Richard ("Dick") Jeffcote - my comments on responses made by the Applicant to Relevant Representations submitted by me to the Planning Inspectorate 23.11.25

The 2nd paragraph of the Applicants response notes "...the use of The Street for HGV movements during construction..." whilst the 3rd paragraph states "...The Street is not part of the construction route..." The Street is clearly identified in the submission as the access route for the main compound next to Grittleton Village Hall and the construction of the cable route. I fail to see why, at this stage, the Applicant is so unsure of what their application proposes in terms of the use of the road network, their documents and submissions seem to contradict themselves. I strongly disagree with the Applicants desk top studies suggesting that road safety is not affected and that no significant adverse effect on accident risk are anticipated.

The Applicant refers to their own Site Selection Assessment Report (APP-185) as a way of supporting their alleged considered sequential approach to the site selection. The Issue Specific Hearing 1 meeting on Wednesday 22nd April 2026 proved that the Site Selection approach utilised by the Applicant was FLAWED. The initial assessments of sites in a 5km radius of the connection were only dealt with by way of a desk top study and were assessed to not utilise Grade 1, 2 or 3 farmland. There was no exercise undertaken at the time to consider the consolidation of those initially identified parcels. During the process of increasing the radius of search through 10, 15 and finally 20km the criteria was widened to include Grade 3 land, when this occurred is not known. This was not done sequentially by including Grade 3b first and only incorporating Grade 3a if absolutely necessary. The initial sites in the 5km radius were not reassessed on the new criteria. Consolidation of sites through the process of expanding the radius have not been considered. The final proposed scheme includes Grade 2 farmland. With such a flawed process the only realistic way to ensure the impact of any proposed scheme minimises the effect on the environment, on mental health, on safety, on the balance of renewable energy and productive farmland etc is to undertake a new site selection process from scratch. If the site identification is FLAWED then everything following is also FLAWED.

Notwithstanding the above, too many relevant surveys are still outstanding to be able to properly assess the development impacts and necessary mitigations that affect design.

The overall scheme assessment is FLAWED as it is assessed on a 60 year life but much, if not all of the scheme, would only have a 40 year life as some of the land only has a 40 year lease term.

We are all being put through a massively disruptive process by a foreign investment company who are trying to ██████████ in a dash for profit, to run rough shod over people, their health and their livelihoods, to fit a suite of supporting documents around their end goal and hide behind a premise of helping the UK deliver on its' renewable target.

Maybe we should not be surprised at this approach when we consider the involvement in this countries water industry by the ██████████ ██████████.