

Submission ID: 17834

I consider it unfair that the meeting is held at an hotel in Lincoln instead of a suitable venue near to where the solar project is proposed.

It is unfair to ask people to travel into the city, where parking is both expensive and difficult to find.

Public transport is available, but is not a regular service and can be costly.

The timing of the examination meetings also precludes those at work, those that have children etc.

in some cases may clash with holiday periods.

Concerns about the claims made by Low Carbon on the following items need clarification:-

1. Flood Risk particularly near residences, as a great deal of the area falls within an area designated at having a high risk of surface water flooding. Low Carbon have not answered any of the questions on how they will control the excessive runoff of rainwater from panels, when concentrated on compacted heavy clay soil. Residents have sought assurances from Low Carbon, that if passed, this rainwater runoff would not be directed into the adjacent River running parallel and adjacent to residences. This river swells quickly in heavy rain and has at times been close to the top of the bank, the house attached to mine has flooded on several occasions, whilst other residences have been flooded externally. When asked about who would indemnify residents against flood due to the increased risk of panel runoff at one of the consultation meetings we were informed by a Low Carbon representative that we would have to take them to court, which I considered a sinister response.

Likewise with BSS and the concerns of fire/explosion from batteries, toxic fumes and carcinogenic fall out. When asked if the local fire department had the manpower, equipment, training etc, the same representative informed that as the site would pay business rates, it was the fire departments job. which I considered alarming.

I have doubts about the how they propose to manage sensitivity the wildlife in the area.

The rural roads, noise levels and promised output need more investigation.