

My principal interest regarding the application on behalf of the group is that there is insufficient analysis and proposals in relation to the provision of permissive walking routes.

Focusing on the procedure for the examination only, I have two areas where I would ask for the Inspector's consideration:

1. The subjects for identified for consideration at Annex C Socio-economic 41 PRowS and Traffic, Transport and Highway

Safety 50 Effects on PRow network do not ostensibly appear to cover proposals for mitigation and potential community benefits as such. I would request consideration be given to this being a sub heading or separate subject heading.

2. I would welcome the opportunity, if it is within the Inspector's gift, to attend one or more accompanied site visits to look at the opportunities to improve connectivity of local walking routes by the creation of more permissive paths.

By way of an example, it would be beneficial to visit private land at the location $52^{\circ}18.295'N$, $0^{\circ}28.274'E$, where Sunnica's cable route would pass under the River Kennett. At the same time, to visit nearby locations on public bridleway $52^{\circ}18.177'N$, $0^{\circ}28.589'E$ and public footpath $52^{\circ}18.147'N$, $0^{\circ}28.520'E$. These three locations are very close together and at the moment, there is no way for pedestrians to cross the river without a long detour. Plans can be provided to demonstrate this at evidence stage. The point of the site inspection would be to evaluate the pedestrian problem and scope any opportunity for the cabling to be over the water at this point combined with a permissive pedestrian bridge.

Whilst I have submitted this as a written statement, I would be available to attend the meeting on 26th July, either in person or the online facility, if asked to do so.

There are many other suggestions for permissive routes of which I will provide written evidence on behalf of the group at a later stage.