

I am a [REDACTED] and I was born, live, work and exercise in and around villages affected by all four large solar projects, but my comments are for the most part related to Cottam 1 as that is the area I have a view of from my house and covers the areas I exercise in most.

I am very concerned about many aspects of the project, battery safety, the true net carbon cost of these projects from mining finite minerals, through questionable labour manufacturing, round the globe transportation and then the current reality of their non-recyclability on decommissioning, the effect on food security, the myriad examples in the scheme of where profit is the driver over and above any purported concern about the communities, their health and wellbeing and a goal of 'clean, green energy' – but in my 10 mins today I'll focus on local people and issues.

Firstly - Repeated requests by residents, our district and county councils and other Interested Parties - for the four projects to be considered as one, to make it easier to focus our limited time and resources in objecting to them, have just been ignored.

The thousands of pages of documents to be read, overlapping deadlines for the 4 projects, difficulties in finding and cross-referencing documents.. all make it unfairly prejudicial to those whose daily lives will be affected for the next 45 years by the decisions whether to allow the projects. The Applicants' legal teams and the respective PINS Examiners are PROFESSIONALS – well versed in both the terminology and procedure of this kind of application – paid to spend all their working hours creating and trawling through documents for ONE project. Meanwhile we residents have to find time outside our working days trying to understand the procedure, work out what some of the terminology, acronyms and abbreviations mean, look for the latest versions of documents, trying to remember which of the FOUR projects we are reading about and preparing submissions on. How can that not be prejudicial? On top of that I keep having to lose income, taking time off work to come and repeat similar arguments for each enquiry!

I treat over 200 local residents and am involved in organizing many local community events, and through the people I am talking to, the effects on mental health, in addition to a feeling of hopelessness about the outcome, are becoming apparent in our communities – but the Applicant scoped out an ES specifically on health and wellbeing matters!! Instead it chose to give a few paragraphs in other ESs. Lists of GP to patient ratios, and employment figures in the county and pages & pages of other irrelevant statistics collated behind a desk are not what need to be looked at – it's on the ground research into the real impact on the physical, emotional, mental and financial health of the communities – which, personally I think deserves more than a passing mention at the end of other ESs.

Many people are very worried about how it will affect their way of life, but don't know what to do about it - they felt their concerns were just dismissed at consultation events, they don't have the capacity to engage in the complicated Examination process and they feel there is no point – it's a 'fait accompli' already.

We are assured that workers will travel to avoid 'the rush hour' – but that shows a total lack of understanding of rural traffic – where's the research into the cumulative effects of the 4 projects' increased traffic and road closures and restrictions, on school bus routes and parents trying to drop children at schools on the way to work – has the Applicant bothered to consider the pressure on home care workers that exists ALREADY to get from one client to the next early in the morning and early evening – how are they going to manage?

Green Lane - the track running between Ingham Road to the south and Coates Lane to the North was originally a proposed route for construction traffic and a route considered for taking abnormal loads through to Stone Pit Lane. The local reaction to this was one of disbelief, and many residents made their objections clear to IGP. Also 48 people signed user statements (providing evidence of use on foot, bicycle, horseback and horse drawn and motorised agricultural vehicles, uninterrupted by any obstruction or objection to passage for at least 80 years) in support of a DMMO application I made a year ago for it to be registered as a public bridleway.... and NONE of them, including some who have owned, tenanted or worked on the land either side of Green Lane, and a resident of Stow since birth some 86 years ago, have ever thought anyone owned Green Lane – they believed it to be common land. One elderly resident recalls his family cutting hay from Green Lane for their animals as no-one owned it. Old maps show the route of the track unchanged from at least 1808. A search of the land registry in support of the DMMO application revealed NO registered owner of the land over which Green Lane runs

Cottam Solar then made a great fanfare announcing that they had listened to local concerns and at page 10 of the Phase 2 consultation summary report published September 2022 they assured us that they had amended their plans to remove it as a construction access route to the site. Many local residents foolishly believed that meant that Green Lane was safe – oh no.

The draft DCO - Appendix 14.2 para 3.2 – Access 9 Green Lane Coates Lane to Ingham Road- is for operational use only. And ES 14 at 14.7.70 says that 'during the operational phase there will be 5 visits to each site per month by light van or 4x4' – so that doesn't sound too bad – but read on.

C6.4.4.3 – shows a maintenance track going off to the east of Green Lane, 400m north of Ingham Road - but not which end of Green Lane it would be accessed from.

Then Works plan sheet 10 Rev A – shows the whole of Green Lane to be subject to Works 9B – which Schedule 1 of the draft DCO shows as 'to facilitate permanent access to Works 1-7 and 10-11'. There is no need to use the full length of Green Lane to access that maintenance track – access it from the North OR the South.

The plot numbers for the length of Green Lane are 228, 229 and 232.

Table 3.1.1 of the Book of Reference has 3 sets of plot numbers in column 1 and then a whole plethora of rights required and restrictions imposed for each set of plot numbers. Why are plots 228 and 229 included in all 3 of these and plot 232 in two of them? If Green Lane is to be used for 'operation only' why are all these rights and restrictions being reserved?

My guess would be that the 5 trips a month by a light vehicle is a huge misrepresentation of the Applicant's intention for that route - as there will of course be cleaning, repair, replacement etc of the panels or any other part of the structures which would require far more trips by larger vehicles along Green Lane.

The whole point of the community action to prevent Green Lane being used by the Applicant as part of this project is that it is an ancient, rural GREEN LANE which, if covered with a permanent surface and its hedgerows altered in any other way, will lose its unique character and important role in the local community's history, health and wellbeing, as well as adversely affecting the flora and fauna which are part of its ecosystem. Can the Applicant confirm whether as part of Works 9B it intends to lay a permanent surface along the whole length of Green Lane? and detail why it is necessary to create an

'operational access' on Green Lane rather than continue to use the construction access further east or travel through other internal access routes. Surely there must be an alternative to desecrating Green Lane?

A final point - the Book of Reference at pages 303-304 and 306 purports to list the owners of plot numbers 228, 229 and 232. Despite extensive searches and notices, I was unable to find any evidence of ownership of those plots when making the DMMO application. Please can the Applicant be required to provide evidence of title of all the listed owners or reputed owners of those 3 plot numbers.

It became well known locally that a number of pre-modern era skeletons of considerable archeological and local history interest were found during excavation of the trenches dug by IGP contractors in Cottam 1 area. These are referred to in ES 13 table 13.9 inter alia AR24 – which describes 11 graves, facing E-W possibly Anglo-Saxon. At 13.37 it is acknowledged that works in that area will result in a 'large adverse residual effect'. AR 28 lists pottery finds including 2nd-4th Century and iron age fragments. There are pages of detail of other finds. Some mitigation measures are mentioned for a few of the areas which could be of great archaeological interest including using concrete footed mounting structures, which will mean that tracking panels cannot be used. But why not just leave all those areas free of solar panels? The potential for finding more skeletons, fragments, parts of the kiln, animal bone and other signs of settlements mentioned is surely considerable – is there really no other, more suitable land for solar panels within the area you claim to have researched rather than land which contains historical finds of local and probably national interest? (C.6.4.13.2 will not open)

Even more concerning is the potential for damage to the NHLE listed college and Benedictine Abbey in the graveyard of St Mary's on Normanby Road in Stow by 'direct physical impact'. ES 13 – 13.8.5 - Applicant admits that the HGVs delivering abnormal loads (that's the FIVE - 16 axle huge HGVs) will need to mount the adjacent pavement. The mitigation offered? The presence of an experienced banksman. If the vehicle cannot physically get round the 90 degree corner without damaging the wall, what will the banksman do? It's all very well modelling it on a computer screen but if in fact it will not fit – would the vehicle be reversed or would the instructions be to carry on regardless and then deal with the fallout – literally! I haven't been able to find any details of the compensation that would be in place if damage was caused – can the Applicant please confirm its position if the HGV was found NOT to fit round the bend, and where any compensation measures are detailed.

I regularly run around Fleets Lane, Thorpe Lane, PROW TLF/31/2, then Cam 31/1 and on to Coates church, then Coates Lane, either up to Normanby Top or turning down Green Lane.. I've been stopping more and more frequently to take photos – of the swans on the Till, the fantastic hip, haw, elderberry, sloe and wild apple laden hedgerows either side of the single track Thorpe Lane, the pond with its ducks and guinea fowl, the open vista looking east towards Scampton, the views from the benches in the churchyard, all the wildflowers and butterflies down Green Lane.. as the chances of the next 2 generations being able to see that for themselves seem increasingly slim. The number of hedges that have been ecosystems in themselves for longer than living memory, but are planned to be removed, is beyond depressing, and the creation of a very short 'permissive pathway' from Normanby Road to Ingham Road goes no way towards replacing the wonderful routes we currently benefit from.

I could go on for hours but I wanted to ask you, Examiner, Sir, face to face, not to allow profit-seeking investors, backed up by their own expensive experts and lawyers, quoting Net Zero 2050, - to achieve their goals unchallenged.

I've said it before and, so long as these 4 projects keep being looked at separately, I'll keep saying it to each Examiner – what I am asking you Sir, is, when you are weighing up the arguments to decide whether to recommend this project to the Secretary of State PLEASE consider why the financial, physical, mental and emotional health of thousands of local residents, and their land, and the surrounding countryside and ecosystems, should be compromised and sacrificed for the benefit of foreign investors with little compelling evidence that 10,000 acres of primarily agricultural land under solar panels is the best solution for our need for carbon fuel alternatives.