

Stephen Reid Keepers Lodge NG12 5QS. Author 3 BOOKS
In other words can we yet sway the inspectors judgement? Yes or No?

Context is everything! THIS IS ABOUT A GREEN REVOLUTION.

BALANCE

The Benefits/policy BALANCE argument is no longer as weighted as it was
Exagen cite multiple cases where this now defunct "trump card" was played
Because the NESO gate process shows all slots are **NOW** full to 2035.
Therefore **harms can NOW outweigh 'benefits'** as alternative locations are possible

1 There isn't a clear Gate 2 grid connection for 24/00161

The entries are irrational.
A FOI to NESO is outstanding. FOI/25/301 (00113986)

There has been conflation/ obfuscation of two Exagen schemes,
in **two counties**, miles apart.
The BESS connection 2033 is Gate 2 listed as
"Old Wood and Wymeswold 85Mw BESS"

There is duplication of one solar connection one 2028 one 2033

The solar connection is insufficient at **40Mw vs 49.9Mw** applied for

How did Exagen secure a 2028 Gate date FOR ONLY A SPLIT PART of the project
when the shoe of 24/00161 had been rejected at planning?
The second part, the BESS is conflated as Nottinghamshire AND Leicestershire

Can we defer this hearing until after 24th March - the latest date for a NESO response?
Pegasus say a connection request will **have to be re submitted to NESO after the appeal**
No connection = No project if it includes a BESS
as the whole district, and the whole country **was as of Nov 2025 FULL to 2035**

2 TRUST / SAFETY /Desk Work

Many of us do not trust this operator or its agents

A lot of our objections are based on EXAGEN use of '**desk data**'
1 in 30 or 1 in 100 year **flood data** cannot be relied on now
There were several in the last 10 years on Kingston Brook
The last one UNRECORDED by sensors Last week
Flood data is wrong, see videos **Glenys will show**

The traffic passing places on Bradmore Rd
Coming towards Wysall are placed after a bend
and the single track road in the wood is on an incline
And lies within a deep 'trench'
There are therefore **blind spots** AND it's 60mph!

We don't trust Exagen because they only sought
fire service advice AFTER rejection
Contrary to NFCC guidelines

Related to this issue

3 FIRE FIGHTER SAFETY

Both parts of this site are not safe
The two sites have **not been designed with an emergency in mind**
Contrary to NFRS advice, if Exagen had sought it. PRIOR to DETAILED PLANNING.
Also see page 22 (link broken) [http s:// assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/661feca73771f5b3ee757fac/grid-scale-storage-health-safety-guidance.pdf](http://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/661feca73771f5b3ee757fac/grid-scale-storage-health-safety-guidance.pdf) says **2 access points**

Fire service guidelines to their own staff is

DO NOT REVERSE A FIRE APPLIANCE MORE THAN 20m in most situations

As incorporated in Gov Planning Regs for buildings and **non residential buildings**

AND recently into the 2025 NFCC guidelines.

Most site roads are **single track** and SIGNIFICANTLY LONGER than 20M

You may well argue that "Building Regs" only apply to Buildings

And that these containers are not buildings

YET

The fire appliance reversing clauses in Building regs Both volumes

was added **for the HEALTH SAFETY**

and realistic preservation of fire fighters

Are you Exagen, saying that by dismissing this

Very specific safety provision as non statutory

that **you do not care for the safety of fire fighters?**

There are NO **passing places, no loops** no hammerhead turning places

There is only **ONE site access** from the main road, contrary to NFCC

Roads within the BESS compound are

too dangerous to use being **highly confined between fences and BESS**

Multiple vehicles on site will not be able to safely escape

a poison vapour cloud or explosion along 1 track roads

The ARC reversing suggestion is risible as it applies in one location for one vehicle.

Tankering off /and recycling excess firewater already disproved by PINs

NFCC guidance says a 5 inch water main/fire hydrant is needed.

The southern parcel has one such

The larger Northern parcel only has a 1 inch domestic main. (Inadequate)

Firewater run off volumes/penstock:

Exagen got that wrong too- based on time.

Millions of gallons required over days, not 2 hrs.

No clarity on how excess contaminated firewater will be safely managed

The penstock is situated in the floodplain (see video) is not lined and will over top

4 LVIA

Removing long established Skylark habitats

- removes a very important **trace ingredient** that makes **THE LIVED EXPERIENCE** of a natural walk enjoyable.
- The **mitigation site is OUTSIDE the application zone**, why not use Scotland or Wales?

See **nosiz.info** for videos of **distant walkers**.

Significant harm is done by turning a **health giving**

natural walk into a steel fenced prison yard walk.

The balance is out of line with a

much wider public need for **HEALTHY PUBLIC GREEN SPACE**

What is the point of A GREEN REVOLUTION

That destroys a valued GREEN SPACE.

Basically this is a very risky OCTOPUS venture

for which EXAGEN

has paid little regard for people and place