

Martin Brown- Deadline 3 Submission

1. Others have commented on the inefficiency of Solar for the vast area required to deploy it. These vast schemes will deliver nothing like the headline figures quoted. When seasonal and daily variations in light levels are taken into account, the actual power delivered could be in the region of 10% of the maximum claimed output over a typical year. This power also will be predominantly produced at times when it is not actually required for use.
2. The Battery Storage systems deemed necessary for effective power supply have a limited lifespan. What is the anticipated time length of time before the batteries require replacement?
3. The BESS will almost inevitably be used for arbitrage, the buying low and selling high, of power, has this been taken into account in the projected life?
4. Can batteries utilised for this purpose be regarded as ancillary to the scheme, or should they be the subject of a separate application?
5. What guarantees are in place to dispose of unserviceable Panels and particularly Batteries safely? The current Dangerous Goods regulations mandate that importers are responsible for the safe disposal of batteries they import. [The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)
6. The provision of Emergency Water Supply for firefighting at BESS sites is essential. What is the planned capacity and anticipated duration, given that cooling may be required for days rather than hours? Does the BESS site design include containment for potentially highly toxic and hazardous runoff, and safe, sheltered from possible explosive effects positions, for First Response personnel to operate from? Bunding the site could provide a partial solution to both of these issues, while also visually screening the area.
7. Dame Maria Miller's bill [Lithium-Ion Battery Storage \(Fire Safety and Environm - Hansard - UK Parliament\)](#) seeks to rectify the current lack of regulation regarding large scale battery storage, and ensure the equipment is correctly classified and treated as the 'Dangerous Goods' it contains in large quantities.
8. The plans as presented lack clarity and are difficult to navigate and interrogate. This, together with regular changes and additions this make informed comment almost impossible for individuals.
9. While grain is priced as a global commodity, the ongoing illegal invasion of Ukraine by Putin's Russia, has made food a weapon of war. We should not be reducing our capability to produce food by industrialising productive arable land.
10. The proposed site includes fields to the North of Kexby Lane. This land presents a known flood risk and the bend in the road will present a risk of glint and glare to traffic to traffic heading towards Gainborough, particularly in the winter when the sun is at its lowest and any mitigating vegetation is leafless. Given that this is a relatively small area in the proposal, and will require a second access point from Kexby Lane, very close to that for the fields to the South of the Lane, it should be excluded from the DCO, without prejudice to my opposition to the scheme as a whole.
11. The applicant's assertion that the land was already industrialised by the fact that West Burton and Cottam Power Stations are visible is, frankly, laughable. While there is industry, it is farming, and DEFRA should be playing a far more active role in the process.