

Dated 26th May 2026

For the attention of the Examining Authority:

Dear Sir

I would like to raise a number of points with you regarding the East Park Energy Scheme EN010141.

1/. Ambiguities in language

There are many statements within the draft DOC which end with phrases such as:- "as far as practical", "where possible", and "where viable" etc or words to this effect. I suggest these phrases are included to gain future flexibility beyond the granting of the DOC or and indicates that those points where these comments appear have not been firmly resolved as yet.

I hope the inspector will require tightening of such points within the final DOC where possible to bring clarity to what might be granted, particularly with respect to traffic routing. If developers and constructors are allowed scope, I fear they could further seek to adjust their stated position at a later date, detrimental to the spirit of any granted permissions to the detriment of the landscape and the interests of local people affected by the scheme. For example: it is particularly important that detail plans for the BESS, traffic movements, routes to site, and timing of deliveries are tied down, firm and are totally unambiguous.

2/. Traffic rules variance - I read that large construction projects are able to seek variance of traffic weight limits and access limits for roads for the duration of a project if required. If so, does this mean variance could be sought for any traffic plan submitted by the applicant after the DOC is granted to include more local roads in the overall traffic access plan from that proposed now (which still has unresolved issues – eg route of South bound traffic leaving the site).

3/. Policing - I am very concerned that once granted the DOC will be insufficiently policed to be effective. I am unsure which body will have the resources and policing duties to oversee such a large project as East Park Energy over the 30 - 36mths of the initial construction and at the 20 year major renewal and the 40 year decommissioning stage. This should be firmly resolved in the DOC. The local authority have no budget or staff to do this at the level required for proper policing. Oversight should be thorough and independent.

4/. Unmonitored traffic movements - Once construction starts, I believe irrespective of any traffic plan, vehicles will be travelling in every direction on every local road using which is the easiest and shortest for them to access the site in order to save time and cost. It would be possible for workers who are likely to be billeted radially from the site, to use many unsuitable roads before accessing the main entrance.

5/. Applicant responses to interested parties - Is it correct that in the NSIPs process that the applicant has no obligation to directly answer all questions fielded by residents, only questions asked by the inspectorate? I am unhappy that my last submissions were not fully answered, only points which I believe the developer felt were weak or could be defended. Surely the developer must respond to all rational sensible questions in WR's from all at the examination stage of the project, particularly those living closest to it whose properties are named in the application.

6/. lack of response to details in WR - In my previous WR I offered clear information relating to traffic volumes which in turn would affect greenhouse gas and carbon calculations. Over the life of the plant I calculated the number of traffic movements to be in excess of 700,000. This is a considerable figure if then included correctly within carbon calculations. The applicant states 12,146 movements for the 'construction' stage but it is vague as to the figures for stages beyond that.

7/. Lack of breakdown for Diesel usage - There appears to be no breakdown of how the diesel figure quoted in the greenhouse gas calculations had been arrived at: For example which vehicles and generators are to be used on site, what fuel consumption is used and how many days each vehicle is projected to work. I request more detailed information on this aspect, or direction as to where it is in the application if I have missed it.

8/. Potentially understated GHG calcs - My overarching concern is that greenhouse gas calculations are understated for the whole life of the plant. When compared to energy created by gas how much saving does this solar scheme truly save? We believe the savings versus the carbon cost of building are potentially worse than using gas. Whilst probably all solar plants fall into this calculation it's important that we have accurate figures to judge the green credentials of this scheme. I request the applicant provide a more thorough cradle-to-grave carbon calculation which is fully transparent for comparison with our own calculations which are ongoing.

9/. Site visit - My penultimate point is regarding your site visit. As of today, we have no notification of the date and time of the visit, as I very much want to accompany you, but I do understand individuals are unable to talk directly or influence you on that walk (and can only follow). It worries me that the applicant now seems to be suggesting offering the inspector a head height drone and 3d photography 'fly over' some of the siting points. Why? Is this so you don't have to walk them, or to make sure you are not subject to the full experience of being in the landscape where solar is proposed? It seems an odd thing for them to do... I would seek clarification as to why they wish to do this now, and hope it is not in lieu of your visit in person.

I think it is essential that you visit the site again, and particularly observe how this site will look when also driving around the area on our various roads, and not just from static points or from short walks at key points. Please also note the landscape is now at its maximum leaf coverage, which is not the case in winter when foliage is thin, and the site is much more visible.

I would be very grateful if you would take this into account when you visit. I can supply many images showing different vantage points around the site in winter (where much more is visible) if you require them.

10/. Temporary Status - My final point is that like all the other NSIP's solar schemes that they have only 'Temporary' status and by definition, the landscape will return back to how it is now, after 40 years of solar.

But the applicant suggests an enormous amount of screening and planting is required, which is required trying to mask clearly unsuitable placement of many solar arrays. This is particularly evident around footpaths and rights of way where fences and screening are proposed across crop fields on a vast scale.

My point is that if the site is to be returned to its pre-scheme state as defined by the 'Temporary' status of the planning, all the planting, fencing and hedging will need to be removed which will be damaging to wildlife, but if not removed after 40 years will have totally changed the nature of the current open rolling landscape. It can't on this basis be regarded as 'Temporary'. I would like clarification that all hedges, planting, fencing and specially constructed roads for movement about

the site and associated materials will be removed after 40+ years. Without this hedges and fencing, and new access roads will interfere with arable farming machinery.

Thanks in anticipation of your consideration of these points.

Shaun Woodward

[Redacted signature block]