

1. The Gate Burton Energy Park (GBEP) is one of four Solar NSIP proposals in the District of West Lindsey. The number, scale and impact of all four proposed projects in the local area are overwhelming for the people and local communities. 2. All four proposals, (Gate Burton Energy Park, West Burton Solar Project, Cottam Solar Project and Tillbridge Solar Project) are within a 6 mile (10km) radius and would cover 10,000 acres (4,000 ha) of farmland and countryside. 3. All the proposed solar schemes have a wider impact zone than the boundary limits of the sites and as such have a combined reach of over 100 square miles of countryside. This combined size and reach equates to being the largest solar complex in Europe. 4. The Draft Development Consent Order links all the proposed schemes together. The developers are pooling resources and physical infrastructure. An example of this is the joining of cable corridors for the schemes. Therefore, the four projects are interdependent on one another but are being submitted to The Planning Inspectorate on an individual basis. 5. By submitting separate applications, the companies involved are separating the collective mass of these projects into four schemes and as such are in effect "salami slicing" one Mega solar farm into four sections. 6. At present, there are 11,000 acres of current and proposed solar farms within a catchment of 30+ villages. This translates to losing 15% of farmland to solar usage in the region. The UK solar industry quotes a maximum 0.5% land-use for solar. This statistic highlights the disproportionate impact these schemes will have on the 30+ parishes. 7. Due to the scale of the potential impact of all four proposals, the proposed and potential schemes must be considered as one. The real impact on communities, wildlife, livelihoods, landscape, tourism, business, heritage, flooding, farming and culture cannot be appreciated otherwise. 8. All these proposals in this area are being developed at the same time and backed by multimillion pound businesses. It is an unsurmountable task for individuals such as myself and other local residents to feel they have a real chance of defeating this number and type of proposals in our locality. 9. The concentration of four schemes in a local area is unprecedented. 10. It appears that the NSIP system was not designed to cater for mass development on this scale. 11. The statutory

consultation has been inadequate and misleading. Low carbon has shown a lack of due care for the views of residents. 12. Mental health implications have not been addressed sufficiently. Access and enjoyment of green spaces for general, mental and physical health are a major concern. 13. Some residents are already suffering mental health consequences directly related to these proposals. 14. The landscape and visual impact of the GBEP will be devastating with an incredible 1690 acre (684ha) footprint. 15. The GBEP will dominate the neighbouring rural villages. 16. The construction of this scheme will last for a significant time and consist of vast numbers of abnormal loads. The impact on residents in this regard will be untenable. The subsequent damage to the local road network and interruption to daily life for many years to come is not acceptable. 17. Soil compaction and damage is a long term negative impact and will harm the viability of the land and ecology of the landscape in the future. 18. Flood risk and surface run off are major concerns. 19. The economy of the region will be severally impacted. 20. Land contamination and pollution are major issues. 21. The use of the ex-power station site for solar arrays and the Battery Energy Storage System, with an adjacent 400kv Grid connection, along with the site's mature screening, would appear to be a far more appropriate site selection than the proposed scheme. 22. All of the 10,000 acres of land proposed for all the solar schemes are entirely on farmland. 23. With 250,000 hectares of commercial roof space available in the UK, along with thousands of acres of decommissioned power station sites, ex-airfields and airports in the area and the country, it is clear that current and daft Planning Policy has not been followed. 24. The GBEP will remove approximately 1690 acres of farming land from production. Due to heightened global uncertainties, loss of such land does not allow for future uncertainties. 25. Low Carbon state that the GBEP would replace approximately 25% of the former generation capacity of the coal fired Cottam power station, this is not correct and has misled the public. 26. When the average output of only 11% of the peak design capacity is taken into consideration, the GBEP would replace only 2.75% of Cottam Power Station's generation capacity and therefore only around one tenth of the figure claimed by Low Carbon. 27. Due to the area of land mass

proposed for the development and the thousands of 3.5m high solar arrays, the potential visual impact on the open Lincolnshire landscape will be catastrophic. 28. The visual impact in this area of Lincolnshire would be overwhelming, allowing the solar arrays to become the dominating feature in the landscape, occupying 15% of the local farmland. 29. Mitigation in relation to this scheme is extremely poor. 30. The limited proposals of new hedge planting will have little effect on the screening. During winter months, such screening will be inadequate. 31. The landscape character of the area will be lost. 32. Fields of solar arrays and associated equipment will physically dominate the open countryside. 33. Rural heritage and ways of life will be detrimentally affected. 34. I am concerned regarding the regulation, control and enforcement of the planting and maintenance proposals and mitigation measures in the short and long term of the project. 35. The change of land use from agricultural to industrial on this scale is unparalleled and would transform the area into a bleak and depressing place for local residents. 36. Views from public rights of ways and highways, such as the Lincoln Cliff road B1398 would be radically changed by all four proposals. Much loved views and viewpoints will be lost. People's enjoyment of the landscape will be severely impaired. 37. There will be acres of tracking solar panels with reflective glass surfaces visible for miles around. Glint and glare is a major concern. Drivers using the B1398 may be dazzled by the reflection from the panels. Other road users and footpath users may also suffer consequences of glint and glare occurrences. 38. Due to radical changes in soil analysis results, the ALC findings are questionable. 39. An independent soil analysis needs to be carried out. 40. The farmland on and around the proposed GBEP is fertile and productive arable land. 41. Solar farm biodiversity claims are unproven in the UK especially on this monumental scale. 42. The area is rich with wildlife including birds of prey and scarce farmland species. 43. Deer and brown hare are in abundance and their movements would be curtailed and channelled around the vast perimeter fences leading to damaging localised browsing. Wildlife habitats will be adversely affected. 44. The fields of solar panels will change air flow and movement. This will have a negative impact on

insects, wildlife and ecosystems. 45. The open, wide landscape will be covered in glass, steel, concrete and miles of obtrusive wildlife unfriendly security fencing. 46. Security lighting will also affect wildlife behaviour. Light pollution will also be an issue. 47. Increased and organised crime and theft may occur in this rural area with the attraction of valuable infrastructure materials. 48. Ground works for cabling would cause unnecessary and extensive environmental damage. 49. In reality, the colossal Battery Energy Storage System would do very little for UK energy security. 50. This battery infrastructure could be a significant risk to human life from fire or toxic fume. 51. Emergency services may have difficulty accessing and operating in these sites. 52. The carbon footprint of the proposal is under calculated as the panels and batteries would have to be replaced 2 to 4 times over the scheme's 60 year life time. 53. This area of the UK already contributes significantly to energy generation. 54. The need for renewable or low carbon energy does not automatically override environmental protections. The harm caused to landscape character and visual amenity and the environment as a whole is significant. 55. I consider that 60 years is a very significant period in my lifetime during. Furthermore, on-going works and decommissioning periods mean that the time frame will be extended by many years. 56. I believe the harm caused by this proposed development to the land and all its occupants and users clearly outweighs any perceived benefits. The premise of renewable energy is to save the environment and not to destroy it.