

Points which I feel are not properly resolved and I would like to highlight for consideration by the examiner:

1. Financial viability and security of decommissioning: How will the Applicant be held to account for decommissioning? If they cannot state precise financial plans then they have no real plan. There should be a financial bond paid upfront covering all costs.

2. Gas pipeline: Why is the Applicant resisting providing full financial security given the implications of potential damage to this? I note the submission from National Gas (REP4-042) highlighting that an indemnity without appropriate financial backing is "essentially worthless".

3. Why is the legacy fund so trivial compared to the profits the application will expect?

For each of the points above, it would seem to me that the Applicant want to minimise costs to themselves and protect the communities as little as possible. Perhaps we should be putting people and community first.

4. As the freehold owner of my home and the land on which it stands, located in close proximity to the proposed East Park Energy construction routes and working areas, my property will be directly affected by prolonged construction noise, heavy vehicle movements, and loss of amenity over the three year build period. As a Act 2008, I am concerned that these impacts are not adequately addressed by the Applicant's proposals.

I note the Bushmead Estate's request for a Land Value Impact Agreement for affected neighbouring landowners. Given the scale of disruption and the number of homes impacted, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority extend this principle to all affected landowners, including residential homeowners. I reiterate my points that the Applicant's proposed £6 million Legacy Fund is trivial relative to the size of the development and offers no meaningful or proportionate compensation for individual landowners experiencing amenity loss or potential diminution in property value.

I therefore ask the Examining Authority to consider recommending that the Secretary of State require the Applicant to enter into Land Value Impact Agreements with all affected landowners to ensure fair, transparent, and proportionate mitigation should this scheme be granted.

5. I am concerned about safety at the junction between Wood End Lane, Pertenhall, and Kimbolton Road. This junction has difficult visibility. Inevitably there will be more traffic in the whole area and including Kimbolton road, increasing the risk of accidents.

6. Why have there been a range of new documents submitted and barely any time to review before the latest deadline? And similar for previous deadlines as highlighted in Stop East Park Energy Submission of 21st July 2026.

7. Finally, we will all be aware of this years weather conditions across the country, with many parts of the country experiencing drought. It would seem likely that we will experience more of these kinds of conditions in years ahead given the gradual impact of climate change. It is also apparent that crop yields this year will be reduced as a result of the drought, which is concerning. This illustrates the need the find long term solutions to climate change that do not require use of best quality farm land since even during drought the highest-quality agricultural land consistently outperforms and out-yields poorer-quality land during dry spells.

As has been highlighted many times, solar is one part of the solution to our energy needs in the context of net zero and climate change, but should be done in a way that doesn't impact high quality farm land, countryside, and essentially lead to the degradation of the environment which the drive to net zero is meant to actually protect.