

Re ISH 3 Public Rights of Way and Landscape:

It is notable that despite what the applicant chose to have put forward at ISH3 regarding the long lasting effects of its proposed scheme on PROWS, the applicant has contradicted itself in EN010141-000853-8.33, confirming at Q1.6.2 on page 61 that the 'long term visual effects remain from PROWS', whilst their response to Q1.3.1. regarding decommissioning, retention of trees and hedgerows altered by the scheme will 'ultimately [be] subject to landowner agreements and future agricultural and land management practices'.

So again, what would the long term actual effect be of this scheme on PROWS? Permanent or not?

Any DCO must deal with this issue as part of decommissioning requirements.

Re ISH4 and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)

Again, the applicant's position is contradictory.

At the hearing, the applicant presented (via its turgid consultant) that there was no concern about the BESS - no safety issues, unlikely likelihood of thermal runaway, so no problems with particulates being released or toxic smoke whilst stating that the BESS hasn't yet been designed!

This is reiterated by the applicant in EN010141-000853-8.33.

in its response to Q1.1.1 it states that 'it intends the use of an 'LFP' battery system, but says that 'there is no firm commitment to this' and confirms in its response to Q 1.1.13 that there is 'no independent review of the design'.

The applicant cannot reassure anyone, including the Planning Inspectorate, that any BESS (which are known to have incidents over their construction, lifetime and replacement lifetime, as evidenced by various national and international problems with thermal runaway (and eg evacuation) that a system which is not yet designed can meet any health and safety concerns at all.

There is also a problem with the lack of water supply to the site and BESS.

Anglian Water and the Environment Agency have made it clear that as the scheme would be in an area of limited water supply, this scheme would not be connected to the mains water supply.

Even today (10th July 2026) Anglian Water has sent out another message to households stating that water pressure has been lowered in order to be able to continue to supply water in this area and that bottled water will be distributed and a hosepipe ban imposed.

Yet in the same document, as referenced above, at Q1.12.5 on page 77, the applicant still says that it intends to apply for a mains water connection.

During any construction phase, it states (and stated at ISH4) that it would tanker water in - that is a lot of water to be supplied and it is not stated how or where it would be sourced, or whether this transportation requirement is included in:

1. Its CO2 calculations
 2. Its transportation calculations
 3. Its worker calculations
- for the scheme.

Please reconfirm all of these figures, taking this factor into account.

It is also unfeasible to rely on lagoons to supply water to put out thermal runaway 'fires' at the BESS in this proposed scheme. The applicant's representative stated that ISH4 that these would be filled by rainwater. Any such lagoons would not remain full - the current weather pattern clearly demonstrates this, therefore lagoons cannot be a suitable water source for thermal 'fires' with the BESS.

Does the applicant propose that the solar panels would be washed? How would the water be sourced for this?

What are the calculations for this, as part of the response to the question above re CO2, transportation and maintenance?

Additionally, the failure to be able to present a design for BESS also means that the archaeological impacts (including on the Roman Town) cannot be assessed.

The applicant admitted at the ISHs and in its document referenced above at its response to Q1.1.15 that there have been no site investigation works, save for agricultural land classification and trial trenching and that this is all to be undertaken during "detailed design phase".

It is not acceptable to leave these critical design matters until after any DCO may be granted - they must be dealt with now and sufficient details included in any potential DCO.

More generally, in taking any decision about this application, the Planning Inspectorate effectively has to certify that the scheme is in fact an NSIP.

Given that the useable electricity which might be generated by this proposed scheme is considerably less than the applicant's stated capacity, this is unclear.

It is also unclear that this scheme meets the public benefit requirements.

The applicant's calculations on CO2 must be double checked independently of them.

This also affects:

1. Transportation (including worker) calculations
2. Renewal of panels and other equipment over the lifetime of the scheme and
3. Decommissioning

Given that the applicant doesn't have Gate 2 connection to the Eaton Socon substation for any BESS (and no guarantee of getting one), this scheme may not be financially viable (a Gate 2 connection is required in order to be able to import electricity (however generated, including by gas) from the grid, in order to resell it at a higher price).

Therefore, there also need to be ISHs about financing/funding and decommissioning and relevant financial guarantees to be written into any DCO to prevent a scheme being approved which is undeliverable in practice, a scheme being partially constructed and then abandoned, a scheme which fails to deliver the legal requirements of an NSIP, a scheme where components are not repaired and replaced over the lifetime of the scheme and/or abandonment at the end of the lease - by whomever might own this scheme at any point.

It was noted that Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service did not attend ISH4, despite being requested to do so by the Inspector.

It is also noted that the combined authorities made it clear that they would require funding to carry out an independent

review of any BESS in this proposed scheme.
This must be a requirement of any DCO.