



GMAG Response to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations

GMAG has reviewed the Applicant's responses and notes that many of the original concerns have not been resolved but are instead deferred to post-consent stages.

The Applicant's responses repeatedly rely upon:

- future ground investigations;
- future generic and detailed quantitative risk assessments;
- future hydrogeological assessments;
- future drainage design;
- future BESS consequence modelling;
- future emergency response planning;
- future archaeological trenching;
- future detailed design information

GMAG submits that this is the central issue before the Examination.

The Applicant repeatedly asks the Examining Authority to conclude that impacts will be acceptable before the investigations and assessments required to understand those impacts have been completed.

Groundwater and Contamination

The Applicant confirms that further ground investigations, hydrogeological assessment and quantitative risk assessment work will be undertaken after consent and following detailed design.

GMAG submits that significant uncertainty therefore remains regarding groundwater behaviour, pollution pathways and aquifer protection within this sensitive chalk groundwater environment.

BESS Safety

The Applicant acknowledges that final consequence modelling, emergency response planning, spacing calculations and detailed risk assessments depend upon the final BESS design and will be completed at a later stage.

GMAG submits that the Examination is therefore being asked to accept conclusions regarding safety before the underlying evidence base has been finalised.

Night-Time Lighting

GMAG remains concerned that operational lighting effects have not been properly assessed.

The Applicant confirms that operational lighting will be required while also confirming that the LVIA does not assess lighting effects

No detailed assessment of night-time visual effects, skyglow, cumulative lighting impacts or human health implications arising from operational lighting has been provided

Human Health

The Applicant relies upon a Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment. However, those conclusions depend heavily upon underlying environmental assessments

Where important technical work remains outstanding, including groundwater investigations, BESS safety assessments and lighting assessment, GMAG submits that corresponding conclusions regarding human health and wellbeing cannot be regarded as fully robust.

This issue carries particular weight given that Human Health has been brought back into scope during the Examination.

Conclusion

GMAG submits that the Applicant's responses reveal a continuing reliance on post-consent assessment, future design work, future investigations and future management plans across multiple topics.

The issue is not whether future mitigation may eventually be developed.

The issue is whether the Examining Authority currently possesses sufficient evidence to understand the likely significant effects of the proposed development.

GMAG notes that a number of these matters are now the subject of specific questions raised by the Examining Authority, including reliance on future site investigations, future drainage design, future risk assessments, future management plans, human health assessment pathways, and fire safety and emergency response arrangements.

GMAG respectfully submits that significant uncertainty remains regarding the National Grid connection arrangements, groundwater, contamination, BESS safety, night-time lighting, archaeology and human health, and that this uncertainty should attract substantial weight in the planning balance.

Submitted by Great Moulton Action Group

A village working group committed to protecting our countryside, while enabling progress for our nation



Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Declaration

In accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in casework evidence, GMAG confirms that AI-assisted tools, have been used in the preparation of GMAG submissions made during the East Pye Solar examination.

AI has been used to assist with:

- reviewing and summarising examination documents;
- analysing application and examination material;
- drafting, editing and restructuring text;
- improving clarity, grammar and presentation.

AI **has not** been used as an independent source of evidence.

All evidence, factual information, document references, opinions, conclusions and planning judgments contained within GMAG submissions are based on examination documents and source material published by the Planning Inspectorate, the Applicant, statutory consultees and other examination participants.

All AI-assisted content has been reviewed, checked and approved by GMAG before submission. GMAG accepts full responsibility for the accuracy, completeness and content of its representations.

This declaration applies to all GMAG submissions unless otherwise stated.

Submitted by Great Moulton Action Group

A village working group committed to protecting our countryside, while enabling progress for our nation