



Submission by Mallard Pass Action Group (MPAG)

– unique ID ref. 20036230

## **Deadline 4:**

# **CAH1 – Compulsory Acquisition Hearing**

## **Written Summary of Oral case**

**MPAG representatives: Mrs Sue Holloway; Mrs Helen Woolley.**

1. MPAG's role is to help residents grappling with the complexities of the whole subject of compulsory acquisition rights; to help unpick what it all means for them; to have someone to talk to; to understand their issues and concerns and provide some holistic support and representation for them, albeit not in any legal capacity.

Further to Mr Williams point, MPAG are querying whether the CA rights should apply across the whole of the order limits, is it proportionate? Other solar NSIPs still have similar requirements for setback and mitigation, yet the scale of their order limits seems more contained relative to the power output they will generate is far lower.

The extent of the CA rights could affect many residents, not just the landowners who are entering into the scheme. It should be identified before the Examination is completed whether all of those rights are required as currently detailed in the Book of Reference. It provides no reassurance to residents that this will only be determined post consent when the detailed design is provided, and the extent of the CA will remain in the DCO even if certain rights are not required down track.

## **2. Article 30 temporary Use of Land for maintaining the authorised development.**

MPAG are concerned given the time unlimited nature of the application, it leaves this open-ended for potentially a very long undefined period of time.

The Applicant referred to sub para 11 which defines a period of 5 years other than for landscaping and ecology elements. The cable maintenance, were it to go through Essendine, would be dealt with through the Street works provisions in Schedule 9

## **3. Cabling choice**

Depending on the final decision about where to route the cables back to the substation, MPAG asked whether there could be some provision within the DCO to remove affected persons and text in relation to acquisition rights which would no longer be required. The Applicant said it would not be possible and it could only be applied at the point of implementation, they needed to keep their options open in case network rail renege. Surely at the point Network Rail are satisfied there are no engineering issues, the applicant would sign a contract to ensure the cabling through the culvert took place. This should take place before the Examination is complete, otherwise how can the impacts of the CA rights be effectively assessed other than on a worst case scenario.

Leaving this open-ended until post consent will add to the stress and anxiety of residents.

## **4. Additional cabling concern**

Irrespective of which cable route is chosen for cables needing to cross the main railway line, there is still cabling planned to come into Essendine from Pickworth Road and onto the A6121. There has been no apparent assessment of this proposal in any of the documents and is worthy of consideration to look at alternative options e.g. running cross-country along the field margins of the solar areas from the NW part of the site across to Uffington Lane.

## **5. General submission**

There appears to be no assessment of the impacts of the different cabling options in any of the documents which should also be a consideration.

5.1 There are 2 bus stops in Essendine but no zebra crossing. This is a particular concern for school children (and adults) if the cabling is run through Essendine. The Applicant says there was no need for assessing traffic impacts as they will be approved if acceptable by the local council, surely that does not negate the need to review these issues beforehand in the same way other traffic measures have been reviewed.

5.2 The blanket approach for CA rights affecting both sides of the road in Essendine seems unnecessary when one side of the road or the other could have been identified as being most suitable.

5.3 The CA consultation has been confusing and very much under the radar for residents. At no stage were the words 'compulsory acquisition' ever used in documents, just a few words about having 'an interest in land' hidden amongst more detailed information all about the consultation. This has been very disconcerting for residents and created much anxiety for residents.

5.4 Category 3 parties. The category 3 letters were sent out in June 22 during Stage 2 consultation. The consultation report (APP-029 P335 onwards) subsequently shows 17 redacted names which the Applicant says is down to red line boundary changes between Stage 2 consultation and the final application. MPAG would dispute these RLB changes and feel there are likely to be parties that should still be classed as having a Category 3 interest. It was only on prompting the Applicant that Mrs Woolley actually became a Category 3 interest.