

Timed 5-Minute Speech for the Lime Down Open Hearing – 30th June 2026

Examining Authority, thank you. My name is [REDACTED], Chair of Hullavington Parish Council.

You have our written representations, so I will not repeat them. Instead, I will highlight the specific evidential gaps that remain because the Applicant has not engaged with the issues we raised — and illustrate those gaps with four concrete examples from our parish.

1. The central procedural point

Following our Written Representation responding to EXAM/9.1, the Applicant has provided **no further response** addressing Hullavington's concerns. There has been:

- no settlement-level assessment,
- no correction of the landscape baseline,
- no response to our evidence on construction impacts,
- no engagement with the safety issues on our rural road network, and
- no cumulative assessment at the parish scale.

As a result, the evidence we have submitted stands unchallenged.

2. Walk 8 and the railway bridge — a foreseeable, unassessed safety risk

Walk 8 is a named community route. It passes under a narrow railway bridge with **no pavement and no refuge**. It is used daily by cyclists and pedestrians accessing the only café in the parish.

The independent Railton Transport Report projects a **194% increase in HGV movements** on routes affecting Hullavington. The Applicant's answer is a management plan with GPS trackers and contractual penalties.

A contractual penalty does not physically prevent a 40-tonne vehicle from entering a narrow lane. A driver approaching from the east, facing a long detour, will be sent through Hullavington by sat-nav. At the railway bridge on Walk 8, there is nowhere to step aside.

This is not a theoretical concern. It is a **foreseeable safety hazard** on a named route. The Applicant has not assessed it.

3. Wiltshire Council’s warning of “total structural pavement failure”

Wiltshire Council — the statutory highways authority — has formally warned this examination of **“total structural pavement failure”** on the minor roads in question.

That phrase matters. It means the roads were not built to carry the loads required for this scheme. Pre-construction surveys cannot fix that. Contractual penalties cannot fix that. And the Applicant’s modelling does not account for the aggregate volumes required simply to construct the haul roads for the 400kV cable runs.

This is not just the Parish Council’s view. It is the view of the statutory authority responsible for these roads. The Applicant has not addressed it.

4. The Applicant’s own actions show their assessment was incomplete

After submitting their application, the Applicant added **fifteen new land parcels** solely to accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Loads needed to move their transformers.

Fifteen parcels is not a refinement. It is an admission that the original assessment of the landscape and transport network was incomplete. Yet no updated assessment has been provided to reflect this change.

5. The Applicant’s own concessions — and the unexplained gap

In their Responses to Relevant Representations (Part 1, p.1654), the Applicant states that Hullavington is:

- “one of the communities most likely to be affected by the Scheme,”
- with “greater sensitivity to changes in its visual surroundings,”
- and that the Scheme will change that character and “potentially the quality of life for residents and visitors,”
- with effects that are “long-term throughout the Scheme’s construction, operational and decommissioning phases.”

Those are the Applicant’s own words.

And yet they conclude that these impacts will not be “a significant adverse effect” on the wellbeing of the residents. The gap between those concessions and that conclusion has not been bridged by evidence. It rests entirely on untested consultant judgement.

6. The daily operational reality — and the unassessed impact

Every school morning, children from Hullavington travel these lanes by bus to Malmesbury and Chippenham. Elderly residents rely on the same bus routes for essential services. These are not abstractions in a transport chapter. They are the daily operational realities of a rural community.

The Applicant has not assessed the impact of construction traffic on these essential movements. The Outline CEMP and TMP remain generic and do not address the constraints of our rural road network or the safety of our residents.

7. Closing: what the Examining Authority should take from this

To summarise:

- The Applicant has not responded to our Written Representation.
- Key elements of the evidence base remain incomplete.
- The statutory highways authority has raised fundamental concerns.
- The Applicant’s own documents contain concessions that contradict their conclusions.
- And the parish-specific impacts on Hullavington have not been assessed.

We respectfully invite the Examining Authority to give weight to the fact that our evidence stands unchallenged, and to require the Applicant to provide the missing assessments so that the impacts on Hullavington can be properly examined.

Thank you.