

Good evening,

My name is Catherine Booth and I am a resident of [REDACTED] along with my parents Mr Stephen and Mrs Clare Booth, who have resided here for 30 years.

Following on from the concerns raised by myself and my neighbours at the previous open floor hearing, I am thankful that the Applicant has requested a change to the cable route, which they propose now run south of West Farm, away from our properties and the single-track access route to these properties.

We have received communication from the Applicant that the construction compound, represented in the area of interest 14-298, would no longer be required in this original location, if the request to relocate the cable route is approved. Would it be possible to obtain some clarification or confirmation of this change to the location of the compound, as this change is not detailed in the letter sent by the Applicant to Mr Raywood on the 21st of November? Following on from my remarks at the previous open floor hearing in September, if the compound were to remain in this original proposed location, I would have major reservations about the noise and visual pollution this would cause for those living in the properties surrounding the compound. Additionally, as the photos submitted by Mr S and Mrs C Booth with the submission ID 23817 show, this single-track access route has poor visibility onto the main road, which has a 60-mph speed limit. The access route is close to the blind bend, where multiple accidents have occurred in the past 2 years that have required emergency service attendance. We are concerned that, if vehicles need to wait on the road for construction traffic to exit the compound, this increases the risk of collision due to the blind bend. Resultantly, I believe that having the construction compound in the area of interest marked 14-298 would not be the safest or most practical location, particularly if the application to have the cable corridor moved to the south of West Farm is approved.

Further to this, considering the document detailing the statement of common ground between Cottam Solar Project and other solar projects in the area, I would like to draw attention to Figure 17.8 230314 on the Tillbridge Solar Webpage ([https://tillbridgesolar.com/wp-content/uploads/peir/Volume III/figure 17-8\\_230314\\_CumulativeFigures\\_TransportandAccessNew.pdf](https://tillbridgesolar.com/wp-content/uploads/peir/Volume%20III/figure%2017-8_230314_CumulativeFigures_TransportandAccessNew.pdf) ). This document shows that Cottam Solar Project and Tillbridge Solar Project share a cable route corridor search area and cable route boundary in Normanby by Stow. Is there an opportunity for the Tillbridge Solar Project and its Planning Inspector to be made aware of the proposed change to the cable corridor made by the Cottam Solar Applicant? We fear that, if the proposed changes to the cable route are not conveyed to this other project, a separate cable corridor would be made by the Tillbridge Solar Project following the old, proposed route down our single-track access, despite the fact that it is not the optimum or safest route.

Thank you.