

I am submitting this Written Representation for Deadline 1 to oppose several assertions made by the applicant during the Issue Specific Hearings. The current proposals fail to protect local communities, severely underestimate long-term impacts, and exaggerate benefits.

#### 1. Flawed Traffic and Routing Strategy

The applicant claims construction traffic will bypass local villages but refuses to accept strict enforcement measures, dismissing a "three strikes" HGV policy as "harsh." Without an enforceable mechanism written into the DCO, the volume of HGVs will inevitably cause major problems on nearby roads. Furthermore, their traffic modelling relies on a highly unrealistic car-sharing ratio of 2.0 workers per vehicle, hiding hundreds of daily car movements. A value closer to 1.5 is more realistic.

#### 2. Failure to Assess Cumulative Impacts

The applicant has deliberately excluded major regional developments, such as Universal Studios and Tempsford New Town, I believe by restricting their "Zone of Influence" to a 10km radius. I understand that the build of these developments may be on a different time scale, but there is still a significant cumulative impact on this part of Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire. Additionally, there are other industrial Solar Farms being planned. I would also request the Inspectorate to look closely at the totality.

#### 3. Inadequate Decommissioning Security

The applicant refuses to commit to a secure financial bond for decommissioning, relying instead on the threat of a "criminal offense" in 40 years. Shell companies frequently dissolve, ownership changes hands, so this threat appears meaningless. Future owners will never be held accountable. To prevent local taxpayers from inheriting the cost of clearing toxic panels and batteries, the DCO must mandate a ring-fenced financial bond with the value of full clean up: panels, batteries, cables, repairs to the roads, and land, i.e. everything.

Furthermore, the applicant's suggestion during the hearings that local landowners will somehow guarantee the cleanup because they "want their land back" is absurd. Farmers do not have the multi-million-pound capital required to dismantle a 1,900 acre industrial site. Additionally, no one can realistically predict what landowners, or their corporate successors, will actually want in 40 years' time. As a minimum, The Examining Authority must follow the precedent set by the Cleve Hill Solar DCO and legally guarantee these funds upfront (and in their entirety) before a single solar panel is installed.

#### 4. Exaggerated Energy Generation

The project's 400MW capacity claim is clearly misleading. Given the UK's ~10% solar load factor, actual average output will be closer to 40MW. Destroying 1,900 acres of prime agricultural land for such inefficient yield is disproportionate and threatens domestic food security. May I request that the EastParkEnergy website makes it abundantly clear what the real energy generation will be and that this is also clearly presented to the Inspectorate for full consideration?

I respectfully request that the Examining Authority scrutinise each of these points in the context of the application.