

Dear Sir,

This is my Written response to the ISH1 regarding the draft DCO.

**Item 4.**

The interrelationship between Cottam (CSP), Gate Burton, West Burton, Tillbridge, Heckington Fen and Mallard Pass is an incomplete picture and dilutes the impact caused by the unparalleled quantity of solar NSIP applications for Lincolnshire.

The other 4 that we know of, Beacon Fen, Springwell, Fosse Green and Temple Oaks are now on the NIP website with applications expected next year.

Three of these are also closer to the CSP than both Mallard Pass and Heckington Fen.

Another solar NSIP proposal, the eleventh which crosses the West Lindsey border has just been made public knowledge, One Earth Solar.

Therefore all 11 must be considered in any decisions by the ExAs.

*“Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that “When considering cumulative effects, the ES should provide information on how the effects of the applicant’s proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence)”. For the purposes of this Advice Note, ‘other existing development and/or approved development’ **is taken to include existing developments and existing plans and projects that are ‘reasonably foreseeable’.**”*

**Item 5 e)**

The applicant has thousands of acres of land at their disposal, yet they still ask for the use of public rights of way for construction and maintenance. This is seeking unnecessary permission that would be dangerous and inconvenient to the public.

**Article 23(2) (c) Private Rights. m)**

I was shocked to find out in public that I am classed as an “Affected Person” I have no recollection of being informed of this in the past and have still not received any recent written confirmation from IGP.

The single unmetalled track that provides sole access to our property and the farmland beyond, would become extremely dangerous. Heavy construction traffic would destroy the surface and make it very difficult to enter or leave our own home. Traffic would increase from practically zero to an unconscionable amount. This track is gated and locked for security and has provided us with peace of mind for over 20 years. This would all be lost with solar employees having access and freely roaming the site adjacent to our isolated farmhouse at all hours during construction and operation.

The Draft DCO also seeks “carte blanche” permissions to remove miles upon miles of hedgerow including my own boundary hedges that are biodiverse and offer the only screening to this high impact proposal. (Important hedgerows H154 and H155)

I believe the dDCO literally lists every hedge in and around the CSP sites and states their entire individual lengths. This again is asking for unnecessary freedom to cause harm with potentially unlimited and damaging powers.

Lastly, I must comment on the lifespan and decommissioning of this proposal.

I was under the impression the life was 40 years, but the Applicant suggests this could be unlimited due to a maintenance regime which would in essence make the CSP forever fit for use.

The CSP must have a definitive lifetime, along the lines of the serviceable life of the original generating and storage apparatus and not its continual replacement, as suggested.

The current proposal with a rolling commissioning/decommissioning scenario is an unacceptable burden to be endured by the same communities.

The final decommissioning protocol seems even more worrying with no triggering mechanism. This would gift any subsequent operator the ability to avoid decommissioning.

Thank you.