

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2026 11:26
To: planninginfo
Subject: Objection to DM/26/1671

[REDACTED]

FORMAL REPRESENTATION -OBJECTION
Application DM/26/1671
Non-material amendment to DM/ 21/2276
Land east of Wineham Lane- Battery Energy Storage Facility

Dear Planning Officer,

We would like to object to the amendment to DM/21/2276.

Little explanation has been submitted to the list of changes submitted by Elements green Ltd.

Why do we need an acoustic fence when in the original application we were assured that there would be no noise from the development. The original plan was to shield the development from view with planting creating a natural green boundary. A fence is not in keeping with the wild aspect of the local countryside. Clearly something has changed, or the original application was not telling the truth.

The proximity of the secondary exit is too close to the main entrance and both are opposite the highly occupied lodge park. How would the residents be evacuated if a fire occurred?

With the decrease in battery units but still retaining the same output how is that possible? Is there a greater fire risk? Who makes them? Are they as safe? We have been left completely uninformed about what is being installed close to our home.

If these revisions are considered non material then what else can be changed without consultation with the local community?

The section 96A procedure has no general consultation requirement and cannot be used to change the development without a full public consultation.

We feel the only possible course of action is to deny this application without a full public consultation.

Best wishes