

Date of PM and Dates of Hearings – 27th and 28th July – immediately following the PM

- 1) The timing is at the start of the summer holidays – when many in the community will not be available to attend/participate.
- 2) The notice period for announcement of these dates was far too short to allow for people to even attempt to re-arrange their plans.
- 3) It is extremely unfair to expect people to re-arrange their plans, given for a large proportion of people, Summer 2022 will be the first time in 3 years a family holiday will be possible.
- 4) Very few people will be able to attend/participate and lose either 3 consecutive days of their working week or pre-planned holiday.
- 5) It is unfair and unrealistic to expect anyone to be able or to need to do so.
- 6) It is unfair to expect anyone (if they are able to attend/participate the PM on 26th), to consider, digest and prepare comment for the Hearings on 27th and 28th. These dates should be spread over the course of 3 or 4 weeks and not during significant holiday periods – Summer, Christmas or Easter.
- 7) I would like to attend – either as an observer or participant – all of the meetings open to the public or interested parties but will be unable to do so if the suggested timetable is adopted.
- 8) The timing of the PM is before Sunnica have confirmed which of the 3 (and counting) Options for connection to the National Grid they have chosen. How can interested parties and the community comment and take a view on, a plan that has not yet been finalised and they have not yet had the opportunity to consider? It is extremely unreasonable and unfair.
- 9) The timing is approximately 4 weeks after the ExA suggested a ‘Public Consultation’ was held by Sunnica, which consisted of a Public Exhibition (which itself was arranged a very short notice and was not widely publicised) and at which details of proposed changes were inadequate – NO new details, viewpoints, or any impacts or assessments were included. NO details of the technology in respect of the proposed Sub-station or change to cabling were demonstrated and NO further assessments had been undertaken.
- 10) Parties who made comments to Sunnica following the above and requested further information - requested by 6 July – (I am one) have yet to receive any reply from Sunnica; the timing of the PM therefore does not give sufficient time to respond and comment with materially important information still not having been made available to them.

Written submissions date – suggested deadline 30th August

- 1) The deadline date is unfair and unreasonable for the following reasons:
- 2) Again this falls within the Summer holiday period and at a very busy time for families with children about to return to school.
- 3) It gives no opportunity to the large majority of the community who will be away on holiday to prepare and comment within the timescale suggested.
- 4) I would like to submit my comments but will be unable to if the suggested timetable is adopted.
- 5) I would suggest the timetable be changed to allow for the community to be more fully represented.

Meeting methodology

- 1) The PM is described as a 'blended event', whilst this may prove useful for some it is already acknowledged that the technology employed is likely to fail and cause fatigue amongst participants; this is extremely unsatisfactory.
- 2) It is also unreasonable and unfair to expect those affected who can't physically be present due to long held prior commitments (and who could have attended had more notice been given), to attempt to join the meeting virtually, from somewhere (possibly abroad) via a technology that may or may not work, should they even have the equipment to attempt this.

Topics to be discussed at Issue Specific Hearings

- 1) Technology to be employed – and can this be decided after a DCO has been granted?
- 2) Safety – given significant failures in the UK and elsewhere to date – how can this be guaranteed?
- 3) BESS sites – Safety of sites, visual and other impacts
- 4) Loss of Agricultural land/food security
- 5) Impacts on Ecology, Environment, Wildlife
- 6) Loss of Rural environment
- 7) Impacts on local communities, physical and mental health
- 8) Access issues – permanent and temporary
- 9) West site A – proposed Sub Station
- 10) Noise and light pollution

Suggested locations for ExA to visit on site tour and specifics to view

- 1) West site B**
Proximity to protected and ecologically sensitive areas; SSSI, AONB, NNR, rivers, brooks, ponds and other natural environments
Total inappropriateness of location for any development
Sunnica's proposed access to site through Snailwell village
- 2) West site A**
View of, and views towards, proposed site and proposed location of Substation (proposed Option 3) - Safety of site, visual and all other impacts
- 3) All BESS sites** – Safety of sites, visual and all other impacts
- 4) All proposed Solar array sites** – Safety of sites, visual and all other impacts
- 5) All currently productive agricultural land**
View the high quality and high yield land that Sunnica has incorrectly identified as 'low' grade.

Finally I would comment that the Planning Inspectorate process seems unwieldy, overly complex and heavily weighted in favour of the applicant (developer) rather than the affected community; without professional (and expensive) advice it is extremely difficult for any individual with concerns to make their views known.

Further, I cannot believe that it is acceptable that:

- a) Material elements of the scheme – ie the location of strategic, impactful developments – the substation, technology to be employed etc can be decided after a DCO has been granted.
- b) The ExA can request that the applicant hold a Public Consultation, but not direct that the applicant to forward such comments to the ExA.

I would like to know:

- a) Did Sunnica pass on the comments following the Public Exhibition on 22 and 23 June?
- b) If yes, has the ExA had sufficient time to consider them?

For information and for the avoidance of any doubt, I have reviewed the latest Consultation document and attended the exhibition event at Chippenham on 23 June.

The details of the proposed changes presented were restricted only to the original maps highlighted with 'areas of change': NO new details, viewpoints, or any impacts or assessments were included.

NO details of the technology in respect of the proposed Sub-station or change to cabling were demonstrated.

I had a lengthy discussion with two members of the Sunnica project team, and whilst they attempted to answer my questions, it became apparently clear that NO further assessments had been undertaken, and that they were relying on various 'scenarios' rather than actual, fully assessed options and project outcomes.

I consider the information supplied inadequate, and was not in any way reassured that the proposed changes had been thoroughly considered.

After three years, the suggested timetable would allow for the Sunnica scheme – which is far from finalised and clearly not at a stage to be Examined – to be considered in the middle of the local communities summer holidays when the fewest people will be able to attend, participate or comment either in person or virtually.