

I have grave concerns about the four NSIP Projects referred to in my Relevant Representation, ie Low Carbon Gate Burton Solar Project, Tillbridge Solar, Cottam Solar Project Limited and West Burton Solar Project Limited and the relationships and collaboration that has developed and is continuing to develop between these companies including their shared legal team. I raised this at the Planning Inspectorate's Examination (Session 2), held in Lincoln on 4th July, 2023. It was confirmed to me by the Examining Authority's Inspector at that meeting that legally these four projects are all independent of each other and will be examined independently not as one. I thank Mr Stone for clarifying this point. I have to point out this is despite the very close proximity of each one to the other covering 10,000 acres of Lincolnshire farmland.

However, it should be noted that:-

At the above meeting on 4th July [REDACTED], Senior Associate, Pinsent Masons LLP did state these four projects are collaborating with each other. It has been noted they are using the same firm of solicitors, Pinsent Masons, to represent them. This firm of solicitors is also representing the company Mallard Pass Solar Project Limited in respect of the 2,105 acre NSIP proposed solar farm also in Lincolnshire.

One has to question the ethics of this as these companies have aligned themselves to one another to look after each other's interests. This is further confirmed in the following Relevant Representations contained on the Gate Burton Energy Project Planning Inspectorate's website wherein the companies of these four proposed solar projects propose to include reciprocal protective provisions for the benefit of each other within their Development Consent Orders:-

RR-273 Tillbridge Solar Limited

RR-043 Cottam Solar Project Limited

RR-287 West Burton Solar Project Limited

This demonstrates how these four companies are working together and in essence how the schemes are joined in many ways and as such should be examined as one.

Working together in this way can surely only be argued as an attempt by the companies to secure all four projects have a successful outcome... and are 'getting all their ducks in a row' ! One questions if a precedent could be set here enabling the provision of a challenge from the other companies involved if, for example, only one of these solar projects was to receive approval from the Secretary of State but we are all hopeful and trusting that none do ?

I continue to object to this (these) solar projects.