

**ISH 1-4 11-07 to 14-07 2023**

**Responses by Linda Davies IP No: 20035925**

Throughout the four days of hearings, I have become increasingly disturbed by the refusal of the Applicant to comply and provide requested details of programmes or information for examination. Those facts that should have been finalised and known at this stage of the process but are not apparent. The reasoning has been that the Applicant has continued to cite the process as iterative and that the final design detail will be provided in the final Application for the Secretary of State's consideration. However, because of the poor detail already supplied this final inclusion may still be grossly lacking, creating a High-Risk situation for local residents.

The Applicant has focussed particularly on acquiring Compulsory Acquisition and / or temporary possession. The Applicant has not developed any programme of consultation with any affected person to date to explain the implications of this Right. The length of time and details are just not clear. High Risk situation for local residents.

The Applicant has also not acquired compliance from two landowners out of the 6 areas of land within the site proposed. I question whether placing the "Right" to overriding this non-compliance by CA and place it in the hands of the Developer is the moral and best decision? Whose motivation is conducive for the best for this locality and indeed the UK?

The Applicant is also trying to acquire a Statutory Authority to override easements. The worst-case scenario for all residents therefore is that this allows the Applicant to continue their construction despite any challenge, objection or deviation of the approved plans. High Risk situation for the local residents.

The Applicant is trying to include as many options as possible within their final design detail application. This allows them to choose whatever option they deem best. I ask whether the best option for the affected parties would be chosen or that which is best for the developers? High Risk situation for the local residents.

The Applicant shows blatant disregard for the monetary cost of energy not only to the local residents but also to all UK citizens. These developers will minimise their costs and maximise their profits prior to selling the proportional relative "little "energy produced by this most inefficient method for generating renewable energy to the National Grid.

Given the many reasons placed on the demands for GB land as well as the imperative important consideration for the best long-term solutions appropriate for this country to the energy crisis, the Applicant continues to show their application to be wholly a scheme where minimum cost and maximum profits for themselves and their shareholders is the only motivation to seek approval of this proposal.

I am asking the Examining Authority to recommend rejection of this proposal.