

CSP ExAs 2nd Qs. Additional information.

This is an additional submission to the Examining Authority's 2nd Questions. **2.5.4** which I replied to recently.

Please see below the recent email thread between IGP and us. (The Planning Inspectorate was included in the email, but a copy may not have reached the Examining Authority)

Dear Eve,

Having seen the notes attached to REP3-036, It appears that you are not willing to improve mitigation on our property as indicated at the CAH1.

I hope this is not the case and these notes are just a summary of the previous position.

As stated in my own submissions and during our chat, moving the panels back behind our trees the same as the adjacent field would make a significant difference to the visual blight on our home and our wellbeing.

This would be a more acceptable buffer distance and would bring parity with other isolated properties. A small compromise that would be much appreciated.

Please let us know your intentions.

Kind regards,

Simon and Kate Skelton.

Hi Simon and Kate,

I hope you are well. As you have seen in the notes, our landscape team undertook another review of the layouts and proposed screening and this did not change their opinion on the offset distances and mitigation proposed. However, in order to enable the screening to become established at as early a stage as possible, we will add into the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan a commitment to plant the landscape mitigation already proposed around North Farm at the outset of work on the project, i.e. at the beginning of the construction period.

We will add this into the documentation to be submitted for the deadline tomorrow.

To Eve Browning and for the attention of Mr. Rory Cridland,

Thank you, Eve, for at least getting back to us.

We were afraid this would be your reply. This shows total disregard for affected properties and people's lifestyles and mental wellbeing.

It is quite sad that you have continued to show the true colours of this corporate project, lacking compassion and understanding and with the inability to admit error and provide any compromise.

How dare you sit in your office discussing our future and whether or not you can accommodate us, as if this was already a done deal!

The minimum we asked for was a tiny fraction of land as a buffer to prevent the ruination of our home and to bring parity with other properties.

I hope you never find yourself in a similar position.

With the many harms of this and the other 5 schemes in this vicinity, we think giving local residents some respect is a minimum requirement and would only help in showing the Secretary of State, that you have worked with communities and not terrorised them.

15,000 acres of solar in one area is a big ask, and your scheme is all take and no give.

We realise now, that from day one we have been too civil and accommodating towards IGP and your solar encirclement. We now find ourselves being walked all over.

You and your firm will destroy our home and our lives for nothing but corporate greed. [REDACTED]

Simon and Kate Skelton.

I apologise Sir, if you have seen the above thread, but I need you to be fully in the picture.

I understand your position of impartiality in this process, but my wife and I are extremely upset and feel totally helpless with a Developer who seems to act like this is signed, sealed, and delivered and the land is already theirs.

When the Applicant's landscape staff imply that moving this industrial eyesore further away from our property will not improve matters, alarm bells start to ring. Their professional opinions are being clearly paid for. I am sure they would argue black is white. Moving the solar panels back as discussed, many times before, would without doubt lessen the impact and make this solar scheme just about bearable to live with, if a DCO was granted. The current proposal would be overbearing, and as shown, the buffer distance is far less at North Farm than other isolated country properties on the scheme and certainly less than other privately owned homes.

Our research has shown that due to the elevated position of our home, the infrastructure proposed and the surrounding nature of the fragmented Cottam proposal, our home would be the most blighted property by solar development in the UK and probably in the world! With this enormous 3,000-acre site and a simple solution in sight, why is no one listening?

We need fair protection. Early planting of a new hedge is an insult not a solution. An early planting regime should be standard practice already, I am sure you would agree. Meaningful and acceptable mitigation would be the siting of panels away from our home and squaring off the solar land parcel to the North as originally intended, with the falling land profile reducing impact further. Please see my [REDACTED] WR.

At the moment we are emerging from this soul-destroying process with nothing but the prospect of the destruction of our much loved surroundings and significant financial loss. We just do not understand this Developer's attitude towards fellow human beings.

We cannot and will not leave this injustice here.

Please, for all our sakes let us come to a fair and civilized solution.

Thank you,

Simon and Kate Skelton.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

