***The BESS group have been asked to provide some ideas for your letters to the SLC etc and whilst we cannot tell you what to write I am copying some of the most recent questions that the BESS working with the JTCC have asked South Lanarkshire Council (SLC).***

Most of our letters have been headed in the following style

**Formal Objection to Proposed Long-Duration Energy Storage (LDES) Facility at Meikle Dripps**

**Date:** xx July 2025

**To:** South Lanarkshire Council Planning Department planning@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

**Dear Sir/Madam,** I am writing to register a **formal objection** to the proposed Busby Long-Duration Energy Storage (LDES) facility located at Meikle Dripps for the following reasons.

***You may wish to use these to gather your thoughts and ideas for your letter to them. Please do not copy the exact wording or phrasing. We have changed some of the wording to make it more personalised for you.***

* Why has such an important decision for the Community not been ratified by the SLC Board and why did SLC not communicate this decision to the residents of Busby and Thorntonhall and the JTCC prior to advising the ECU?
* In the 2024 EIA screening request response SLC included this requirement " a report demonstrating that the site accords with policy NPF8 Green belts of NPF4, including providing reasons as to why a green belt location is considered essential for the proposals, and why it cannot be located on an alternative site out with the green belt."  Why in the 2025 response, for the much larger LDESS, have SLC decided that this is no longer a requirement?
* Does this proposed industrial development in a designated green belt site comply with LDP2?
* Why has there been no public participation in the determination of your decision?
* Why have you not considered the human health impacts of this potential development?
* I wish to make a formal complaint about SLC changing the decision date as this has denied myself and our community the opportunity to comment on the proposed plan?
* Is the author of the checklist really saying that the presence of pylons in the countryside is enough reason to justify an industrial appearance development the size of 56 football pitches?
* Are the applicants AHA seriously saying that they will only build on 0.5 hectares of this 34.9 hectare site to avoid the threshold for an EIA, The EIA regulations, schedule 2 seem to differ?
* May I bring it to your attention that the proposed site size is over half of adjacent Thorntonhall village and, unlike the authors assumption of course, is out of scale and character with our surrounding communities
* Given the size and of the proposed site and the communities and schools that it will I impact upon what noise impact assessment has been undertaken?
* Last year, SLC's screening opinion for the BESS (P/24/0179) took 3 months, while this year, the screening for the 86-acre site LDESS (P/25/0765) was undertaken in just a few weeks.