

East Park Energy Project – Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made by CCC at Issue Specific Hearings 3 & 4 (ISH3 & ISH4), and Compulsory Acquisitions Hearing (CAH1)

This document summarises the oral representations made by Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**) (the **Council**), Bedford Borough Council (BBC), and Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) at the Issue Specific Hearings 3 & 4 (ISH3 & ISH4) on 9th June 2026 and oral representations made by CCC at Compulsory Acquisitions Hearing 1 (CAH1) on 10th June 2026 in relation to the application for development consent for East Park Energy (the Scheme) by Brockwell Energy (the Applicant).

This document does not purport to summarise the oral submissions of parties other than CCC, BBC, and HDC, and summaries of submissions made by other parties are only included where necessary in order to give context to this submission in response, or where CCC, BBC and HDC agreed with the submissions of another party and so made no further submissions themselves.

The document contains three separate tables – Table 1.1. for Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made at ISH3, Table 1.2. for Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made at ISH4, and for Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made at CAH1. Each table is structured according to the order of items in the agenda for the Hearings published by the Examining Authority (ExA).

Table 1.1. Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made at ISH3 on 9th June 2026

Agenda Item	The Councils' Submission
3b PRow and Landscape The applicant will be asked to explain its overall approach on the impact on views by users of the PRow network, significant effects and mitigation proposed.	The host authorities highlight paragraph 2.10.35 of EN-3, the National Policy Statement, states 'Applicants are encouraged where possible to minimise the visual impacts of the development for those using existing public rights of way, considering the impacts this may have on any other visual amenities in the surrounding landscape'. Footnote 94 gives the example, 'screening along public right-of-way networks to minimise the outlook into the Solar Park may, impact on the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscapes'. (EN-3, December 2025, published 6 January 2026). Landscape and Visual Amenity That presented at the hearing was a further elaboration of the matters raised at Relevant Representation and Local Impact Reports from the councils. That presented at the hearing is as follows. Rebecca Condillac – Associate Director Landscape Architect, AECOM on behalf of the authorities. Significance Ratings in relation to receptors along the PRow network 1. It is noted that wherever there is a moderate effect on visual amenity this is taken to be non-significant, noting the methodology indicates it could and, in some cases, should be a significant effect as stated in Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 5-1 LVIA Assessment Methodology P01 [APP-069]: Paragraph 5.2.6 '<i>Greater than 'moderate' effects are more likely to be significant. This does not preclude a 'moderate' effect or lower being significant or a greater than 'moderate' effect not being significant. This judgement will depend on the specific circumstances being considered.</i>' 2. The Host Authorities overall conclusion in respect of this is that there is some slight under-representation of significant effects and that the screening of views as a result of mitigation planting has generally been assessed as an improvement to magnitude of impact and not been assessed as a potentially adverse change. PRow and mitigation

	3. Effects on visual receptors are broadly accepted as appropriate, noting that there is a heavy reliance on the landscape mitigation to screen the solar panels but any effects of obstructed or truncated views, as a result of mitigation planting, are not referenced and will adversely change the experience of users of PRoW. 4. Paragraph 6.11 of the Bedford Borough Council Local Impact Report [REP1-071] states: <i>'Effects on visual receptors are broadly accepted as appropriate, noting that there is a heavy reliance on the landscape mitigation to screen the solar panels, but any effects of obstructed or truncated views are not referenced and will adversely change the experience of users of PRoW. Similar to the comments for landscape character, it is noted that wherever there is a moderate effect on visual amenity this is taken to be non-significant, noting the methodology indicates it could and, in some cases, should be a significant effect.'</i> 5. Within ES Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual P01 [APP-041] a selection of viewpoints where mitigation encloses views alongside PRoW are assessed as significant for the duration of the Proposed Development. 6. There are also a number of viewpoints where mitigation encloses views alongside PRoW and impacts are assessed to be significant during construction, reducing to not significant effects from year 0. During the Issue Specific Hearing 3 on Public Rights of Way, the Applicant provided evidence in relation to Viewpoint 12 and the assessed moderate adverse (not significant) effect, arose as a result of the retention of part of the open view from that location. This is at odds with the assessment for impacts on PRoW users where assessed impacts are reduced to not significant effects at year 10 when there is a total enclosure of the view from solar panels and/ or mitigation planting. Examples within ES Appendix 5-4 Effects at Viewpoints P01 [APP-072] include: a. Receptors at viewpoint 15 (footpath 29) as illustrated on Figure 15.19 Viewpoint 15 [APP-131] are assessed to result in a major adverse significant effect during construction, reducing to moderate adverse not significant during year 0, and further reducing to minor to moderate adverse not significant effect at year 10. The view to the north-west along a large stretch of the footpath will contain views of solar PV panels during the early stages of operation. Once hedgerow vegetation is established, by year 0 the view will be enclosed by hedgerows, reducing the extensive views. b. Receptors at viewpoint 77 (bridleway 112/7) as illustrated on Figure 15.81 Viewpoint 77 [APP-142] are assessed to result in a moderate to major adverse significant effect during construction, reducing to moderate adverse not significant during year 0, and further reducing to minor to moderate adverse not significant effect at year 10. The proposed mitigation would enclose the view, although it is noted that there are gaps in
--	---

	the vegetation which allow for buried utilities, mitigation largely restricts views along the line of the PROW. c. Receptors at viewpoint 78 (footpath 112/5) as illustrated on Figure 15.82 [APP-142] are assessed to result in a moderate to major adverse significant effect during construction, reducing to moderate adverse not significant during year 0, and further reducing to minor to moderate adverse not significant effect at year 10. There would be views of solar PV panels along the majority of the route, although it is noted that there is an existing solar farm located to the south that may be visible at points along the PROW. 7. We acknowledge that screening planting provides landscape character benefits, yet will result in adverse visual impacts. The effects of obstructed or truncated views are not referenced and will adversely change the experience of users of PROW and these are not fully addressed in the LVIA. Public Rights of Way and visual impacts to users Daniel Ashman, Highway Records and Definitive Map Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council on behalf of the authorities. 1. We are concerned that the Public Rights of Way (PROW) within the vicinity of the proposed development will suffer a loss of amenity during the operational phase, resulting in a potential diminishment of public enjoyment of the countryside environment. a. While the Council acknowledges that disruption to the amenity of PROW may be unavoidable during the delivery of a new development, the development will introduce long-term impacts on the local landscape, which will impact on the public's enjoyment of the affected PROWs. The applicant's landscape and visual impact assessment [APP-041] identifies a selection of representative viewpoints on the PROW network where the development is considered to have a long-term moderate to major adverse impact on receptors. Within Cambridgeshire, these are points 54 and 56. These negative impacts are noted to persist even after 10 years of operation of the solar park, when screening planting will have matured. b. There are a number of other viewpoints on PROW within Cambridgeshire where the visual impact after 10 years is not judged to be significant according to the methodology of the assessment. These include viewpoints 60, 68, 77 and 78 (addressed above), and 83. In many cases, the impact on receptors in these locations is explained as being reduced to insignificant levels. In some of the locations this is as a result of proposed
--	---

	screening planting. c. The County Council accepts that in some cases the negative impact of being able to view the solar arrays in the near- or middle-distance may be offset by screening planting. However, what this does not do is remove the fact that the local landscape will have been transformed not just by the solar array, but by the screening itself. This has the potential to have a direct impact on receptors using PROW. To demonstrate the authorities concerns, we have considered viewpoints 60 and 77 below. Viewpoint 60 is on Footpath 213/2, south of Great Staughton and to the west of site C of the development. The applicant has produced present-day, 0-year and 10-year visualisations from this location, which demonstrate the effectiveness of the screening vegetation in concealing the solar array from PROW users. What the images also demonstrate is a considerable truncating of the countryside views by the introduction of vegetation in the middle distance, obscuring the view of the ridge in the background. Viewpoint 77 is on Bridleway 112/7, next to Pastures Farm in the parish of Hail Weston. This is within site D. This location is relatively elevated and currently affords long-ranging rural views across the Kym Valley to the north and west. The landscape and visual impact assessment identifies a minor to moderate ten-year adverse impact in this location. However, the County Council is concerned that the broad countryside views from this location, and indeed along the whole section of the bridleway that passes through site D (approximately 560m), are likely to be restricted by the introduction of new hedgerows or tree-lines designed to reduce sight of the solar array. d. What is clear from this is that while screening planting can be effective in reducing the visual impact of the solar array, it can also have a 'side-effect' of altering a receptor's experience of the landscape. In the example of viewpoint 60, this has the effect of shortening receptors' lines of sight, while at viewpoint 77, the planting potentially funnels the PROW users' view of the countryside to a narrower aspect than at present. e. Impacts like these cannot simply be restored or un-done by the applicant. The County Council therefore expects the applicant to support the enhancement of the wider network of PROW in the vicinity of the application site, to provide public access benefits to local communities and so help to offset the transformation of the rural environment. This would, similar to that in the NPPF paragraph 105, contribute towards protecting
--	---

	and enhancing PROW.
3C Current position between the Applicant, local authorities, and other IPs. The ExA will ask the Applicant to set out progress in resolving concerns about the perceived negative impact on the PROW network. Local authorities and other IPs will be given the opportunity to set out their concerns.	Public Rights of Way Applicant's approach (overall approach to the design): In the councils' opinion PROW (footpaths and bridleways) the applicant focuses on maintaining footpaths and bridleways, rather than fully realising the opportunities to enhance the strategic PROW network. The applicant's proposals are not felt to meet the BBC and CCC Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIPs). The PROW network. The host authorities consider the following points: 1 The proposals at the moment don't currently consider and maximize opportunities to facilitate enhancements for the public rights of way. 2 While permissive paths are being provided, there is an opportunity for more to be delivered across the development site. 3 Accessibility and active travel. Concerned regarding the potential limitations in the permissive path provision due to the proposed widths and constraints in respect of both the permits 4 Approach to antisocial behaviour, the priority to construction and maintenance traffic on PROW, diversions and closures and use of PROW for vehicles. The Host Authorities approach is to promote - • A Strategic (regional) network – origin & destination. • Active Travel (should include disabled mobility). • 'Access to the Countryside' and Sustainable modes of transport. • Solar developments to deliver enhancements to PROWs. The County Council and Bedford Borough Council are aligned in the belief that improving non-motorised user access to local centres from smaller rural communities is important, and that this development presents an opportunity to support enhancements in the River Kym/B645 corridor. In the short term, improved non motorised users (NMU) access to destinations such as

	Kimbolton, St Neots and Grafham Water are considered to offer opportunities to benefit local communities. The application site is also proximate to National Cycle Network route 12, offering a chance to improve connectivity to a strategic network of non-motorised routes. In the longer term, it is anticipated that demand for NMU connectivity towards the proposed new town and railway station at Tempsford will increase. The siting of the East Park Energy development within the River Kym/B645 corridor means it is ideally placed to contribute towards a strategic ambition to enhance these links or to support the filling of gaps in the rights of way/NMU network, and we would welcome engagement with the applicant about how this could be brought about. The authorities would welcome more detail so to provide assurance that if there is failure in any planting landscape measures, there is a mechanism to replace the planting. The authorities have concerns relating to potential closure of PROW in response to antisocial behaviour. The councils would welcome a formal agreement for managing the permissive paths. This would detail the process to be followed ahead of any permissive path closing, establishing the thresholds to be reached to consider closure, with the understanding that permanent closure would be the absolute last resort. Additional notes to the matters summarised above. Permissive paths. It should be stated that permissive paths by their very nature are impermanent and therefore cannot be considered as robust a form of mitigation as new formalised public rights of way. However, understanding that the applicant is unlikely to become the landowner and therefore will not have the power to dedicate new PROW, we are prepared to work collaboratively with the Applicant to achieve a permissive path network that can deliver noticeable benefits to a range of users. Cambridgeshire County Council's Active travel design guide 2023 should be referred to inform the
--	---

	width and design of PROW in both Cambridgeshire and Bedford Borough Council. <u>Site C opportunities for further enhancement</u> In its response to the oLEMP [REP2-033], Cambridgeshire County Council stated its concerns with regard to the proposed permissive paths 6 and 7 that have been offered within parcel C, to the south of Great Staughton. Uncertainty around the final route that the proposed permissive paths 6 and 7 in site C will follow, meaning that we cannot fully understand the degree to which it will benefit the local population. Limitations on the type of user that will be able to access the permissive route, harming the inclusivity of the provision. Failure to maximise the opportunity presented by the land available in parcel C to deliver a more extensive permissive path network Failure to use the land available in parcel C to provide enhanced connectivity between adjoining PROW and to enhance safe, off-road walking routes. The County Council's response suggested the permissive paths offering might be improved by: a longer perimeter route for the permissive access; permission to be granted to equestrian users taking access from the nearby bridleway 112/7; and an additional connection to footpath 213/1. Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP). Antisocial behavior A significant concern arises from paragraph 5.3.45 of the oLEMP, where it is stated that the permissive paths may be removed following instances of anti-social behaviour. This is unacceptable to the Councils as it would have the effect of rendering the paths' very existence precarious. At present, these paths are the only benefit to public access that are being offered by the development, and so both Cambridgeshire and Bedford Borough Council would welcome
--	---

	discussions with the applicant to reach a better solution for these routes. (It should be noted that the possibility that permissive paths may be closed is also noted in the oPROWMP, and our objection applies to that section also.) Maintenance traffic Paragraph 6.3.11 of the oLEMP states that PROW will be kept free from obstruction, except where required to be crossed for maintenance. The County Council is concerned that this would lead to private maintenance traffic or related temporary infrastructure being given priority over highway users without appropriate consents or safety measures being in place, and may carry a potential disbenefit to users of the affected PROW. Use of PROW for vehicle access. Consideration of alternative designs to avoid the impact on the PROW network needs to be demonstrated. Outline PROW Management Plan (oPROWMP). Construction traffic Numerous paragraphs in the oPROWMP (6.16.3, 6.17.3, 6.18.3, 6.19.3) state that PROW users will be alerted to the presence of construction traffic crossing PROW for access purposes. This is not acceptable. While we accept that warning signage may improve safety for users of the PROW, it should be remembered that PROW are highways and any construction traffic seeking to cross should give way to the lawful highway users. Appropriate measures must be in place to force construction traffic to slow or stop when approaching the PROW. It is also notable that the draft DCO [APP-016] introduces permanent motor vehicular traffic (at the operator's consent) on the public rights of way 112/7 and 112/8, shown between points PMV-8, 9 and 10 on sheet 10 of the Street Works, Rights of Way and Access Plan [REP3-006]. This is a distance of almost 1km. This has the potential not only to impact the enjoyment of these PROW by the public, but also to introduce ongoing damage to the PROW surfaces and increased safety risks to users. Paragraph 7.1.5 of the oPROWMP [REP3-058] introduces measures to manage the potential impacts, but does not satisfactorily address the risks. At the very least it should be required in the oPROWMP that measures to protect public users in locations where PROW are to be used for operational vehicular traffic will be subject to the
--	--

	agreement of the local highway authority in the final PROWMP. The oPROWMP introduces a requirement to re-surface PROW at various points where construction traffic will be required to cross a PROW (noted at paras 5.17.7, 6.16.3, 6.17.3, and 6.17.4). Any changes to the surfacing of a PROW must be agreed with the County Council in advance of implementation. Detail and clarifications A number of other elements within the oPROWMP appear unclear. i. For instance, at paragraph 6.17.7 and 6.18.4, the oPROWMP states that there will be no restriction on use of Bridleway 112/7 and Footpath 112/8 'outside of construction hours'. Aside from the temporary diversion measures outlined in paragraph 6.17.2, it is not clear what restrictions on use are intended during construction hours. Any restriction to free passage along a right of way (unless authorised by the Council or stipulated in the DCO) is not acceptable. ii. At para 6.18.2 it is stated there will be a temporary diversion to footpath 112/8, despite the previous paragraph stating that construction traffic will use a separate access road and be separated from the PROW by a fence. The County Council would like to understand why a temporary diversion is being proposed here. iii. It is not clear whether section 8 of the oPROWMP also refers to management of the permissive paths within the application boundary. We request that the document is updated to cover this element, so there is a single document detailing the treatment of public access routes. iv. The oPROWMP currently contains no substantive detail on any temporary PROW diversions, such as duration, width, surfaces, and noticing strategy that the applicant will provide/follow. An indication of the intended provision is needed to enable the County Council to consider the appropriateness of these measures. This is particularly relevant in relation to Bridleway 112/7, where a 280m temporary diversion is required (paras 6.17.1 – 6.17.8), and would also apply to the potential diversion to Footpath 112/8. Any temporary diversion must meet or exceed the accessibility of the existing provision, and upon completion of works, the original PROW must be restored to its pre-existing condition or to an improved condition to be agreed with the County Council.
--	--

	v. Condition surveys, more detail is required to establish benchmarks, monitoring & enforcement. A monitoring fee for authorities is wishing to be established. vi. PRow Order (diversion/ stopping-up) application and registering vii. Decommissioning Phase to ensure any damage to PRow are remedied. b. The authorities would welcome discussions to reach solutions to these shared concerns that are acceptable to both LHAs and the applicant.
--	--

Table 1.2. Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made at ISH4 on 9th June 2026

Agenda Item	Cambridgeshire County Council's Submission
3c BESS Safety – The ExA will ask the applicant on its approach to addressing perceived safety concerns and mitigation proposed including proposed water supply. The ExA will also invite feedback from Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service on its current position in regard to BESS, water supply and emergency access to the site.	Host Authorities Approach (Policy): Local Plans do not address Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) (& risk) specifically, rather through policies relating to nuisance, health, environmental pollution/ contamination. The councils note the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Guidance for Fire & Rescue Services (FRS) (2025). https://nfcc.org.uk/our-services/building-safety/grid-scale-energy-storage-system-planning-guidance-for-fire-and-rescue-services/ Host Authorities and CF&RS discussion: The council read an email from the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service outlining its position, and extending their apologies for being unable to attend the hearing. The email is understood to have been submitted to the Examination as part of Deadline 4 submissions. Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [APP-162] BSMP should have review mechanism to respond to potential emerging legislation and H&S regulations et al. The BSMP when submitted for discharge as per Requirement 10, needs to state the type of battery, the chemical mix, and quantities. It should also state if seeking Hazardous Substances Consent. BSMP written to current specification; if replacement equipment is different the management plan needs a review mechanism for statutory parties. Need it stated in the outline BSMP, the BESS site is complete, tested for all water and drainage infrastructure fully operational ahead of any battery being delivered to site.

	Cambridgeshire County Council would like the inclusion of consulting the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Resilience Forum in finalising the Emergency Response Plan ERP – add to Para 5.1.9, last bullet. The council also asks in the Emergency Response Plan, health services are informed. Add to para 4.5.12. Para 4.5.12 also mentions closing of the road if necessary – as a minimum this needs to be in consultation with the emergency services and the Highway Authorities informed immediately (BCC, CCC and National Highways).
3d Archaeological Impacts of BESS – The applicant will be asked to outline its approach, particularly in regard to soil stripping and foundations.	Cambridgeshire County Council has no matters to raise relating to Archaeology on the BESS site. Archaeological Mitigation Strategy we have made comments on and continue to engage with the Applicant to ensure all suitable mitigation measures are in place during construction, that to include the BESS site.

Table 1.3. Written Summaries of Oral Representations Made at CAH1 on 10th June 2026

Agenda Item	Cambridgeshire County Council's Submission
3c Update on Negotiation with Local Authorities	Host Authorities: There are ongoing discussions in respect of the rights and powers to public highway and those are progressing productively. This includes temporary closures, the alterations to highways, and the diversions of PROW (discussed above). For the authorities the concern is about how those will be approved and overseen by the authorities. The authorities with the applicant are continuing discussions as to whether this can be captured, either by way of protective provisions, which is the host authority's preference, or through a side agreement.

END