

1. The Cottam Solar Project (CSP) is one of four Solar NSIP proposals in West Lindsey.
2. The number, scale and impact of all proposed projects in the local area are overwhelming.
3. All four proposals, (Cottam Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park, West Burton Solar Project and Tillbridge Solar Project) fall within a 6 mile (10km) radius and would cover 10,000 acres (4,000 ha) of farmland.
4. The 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.
5. The DCO 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.
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 excessive and disproportionate impact these schemes will have on the 30+ neighbouring parishes.
7. It is my belief, that due to the scale and magnitude of the potential impact of all four proposals, they must be considered and examined as one. The real impact on communities, wildlife, livelihoods, landscape, tourism, business, heritage, flooding, farming and culture cannot be fully appreciated otherwise.
8. All these proposals in this area are being developed at the same time and backed by big business. It is an unsurmountable task for people 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 a unique and unprecedented situation. I am not aware of this occurring elsewhere in the Country.
10. IGP has shown a lack of due care and consideration for the views and opinions of residents. The statutory consultation has been inadequate and misleading.
11. Mental health implications have not been addressed sufficiently. Access and enjoyment of green spaces for general, mental and physical health are a major concern.
12. Some residents are already suffering mental health consequences directly related to these proposals. Due to restricted and dwindling access to mental health services in rural areas these problems will be exasperated.
13. The landscape and visual impact of the CSP will be devastating with an incredible 3000 acre (1200ha) footprint.
14. The construction for the CSP covers a large area of the countryside and is spread over many separate parcels of land. These are often serviced by only single track lanes and as such were not designed to cater for the number, size and weight of the abnormal loads needed to build the proposed schemes.
15. 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.
16. Land contamination and pollution are major issues. Solar panels contain toxic materials.
17. The land selected for development has been chosen on the basis of availability.

18. The use of the ex-power station site for solar arrays and the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), with an adjacent 400kv Grid connection, along with the site's mature screening, would appear to be a far more appropriate site selection.
19. All of the 10,000 acres of land proposed for solar panels are entirely on farmland.
20. With 250,000 hectares of commercial roof space available in the UK, along with many thousands of acres of decommissioned power station sites, ex airfields and airports in the area and the wider country, it is clear that current and daft Planning Policy has not been followed.
21. The Cottam Solar Project will remove approximately 3000 acres of farming land from production.
22. IGP state that the CSP would replace 30% of the former generation capacity of the coal fired Cottam power station, this is also not correct and has misled the public.
23. When the average output of only 11% of the peak design capacity is taken into consideration, the CSP would replace only 3.5% of Cottam Power Station's generation capacity and therefore only around one tenth of the figure claimed by IGP.
24. Due to the random configuration of the ten separate parcels of land that form the CSP development and the thousands of 4.5m high solar arrays, the potential visual impact on the open Lincolnshire landscape in this area will be catastrophic.
25. The scheme is disaggregated and incohesive. It divides the rural agricultural landscape and countryside.
26. The visual impact in this area of Lincolnshire would be overwhelming, allowing the solar arrays to become the dominating feature in the landscape.
27. Mitigation on this proposal is extremely poor with the potential for **all** trees and hedgerows to be removed.
28. The limited proposals of new hedge planting will have little effect on the screening of 4.5 metre high solar arrays. During winter months, such screening will be inadequate.
29. The landscape character of the area will be lost due to the dominant visual impact of many fields of solar panels and associated equipment.
30. Historic views to iconic landmarks will be impaired and harmed.
31. Rural heritage and ways of life will be detrimentally affected.
32. The topography of the landscape in this area has not been considered in mitigation.
33. 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.
34. The change of land use from agricultural to industrial on this scale is unparalleled.
35. Views from public rights of ways and highways, such as the Lincoln Cliff road B1398 (Middle Street) would be radically changed by these proposals. Much loved views and viewpoints will be lost.
36. There will be acres of tracking solar panels with reflective glass surfaces visible for miles around. Glint and glare is a major concern.
37. The ALC findings by IGP, show BMV land will be built upon.

38. The farmland on and around the proposed CSP is fertile and productive arable land. The area is known as the "Breadbasket of the Nation".
39. Solar farm biodiversity claims are unproven in the UK.
40. The area is rich with wildlife including birds of prey and scarce farmland species.
41. 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.
42. The fields of solar panels will change air flow and movement. This will have a negative impact on insects and wildlife.
43. The open, wide landscape will be covered in glass, steel, concrete and miles of obtrusive wildlife unfriendly security fencing.
44. Security lighting will also affect wildlife behavior. Light pollution will also be an issue.
45. Increased crime and theft may occur in this rural area with the attraction of valuable infrastructure materials.
46. Ground works for cabling over this extended distance would cause unnecessary and extensive environmental damage.
47. In reality, the colossal Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) of 600MW would do very little for UK energy security.
48. This battery infrastructure could be a significant risk to human life from fire or toxic fume.
49. Emergency services may have difficulty accessing these sites in these isolated areas and may also not have access to necessary equipment or services to attempt fire-fighting activities.
50. The CSP is located in the catchment area of the River Till. If thousands of acres of solar arrays are installed in the catchment area, the rate of surface water run-off would exceed any attempts at amelioration by IGP.
51. The carbon footprint of the proposal is massively under calculated due to the fact that the panels and batteries would have to be replaced 2 and 4 times respectively over the scheme's 40 year life time.
52. This area of the UK already contributes significantly to energy generation. There is a long history of coal fired power stations plus current CCGTs and the Nuclear Fusion development sites.
52. 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 immense.
54. I consider that 40+ years is a significant period in my lifetime during which the development would seriously detract from the landscape character and visual amenity. Furthermore, on-going works and decommissioning periods mean that the time frame will be extended by years.
55. 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.