

It is clear that the application being examined has changed as a result of the BESS component only having a potential Gate 1 connection (i.e not guaranteed) to the Eaton Socon Power Station, yet the Applicant has not filed a change to its application.

This means that the application submitted and the application being examined are different.

There has been a whole section of the examination which has been omitted/elided so that Interested Parties' rights to consider and respond to further information from the applicant has been omitted - giving the applicant an opportunity to submit information for the final Deadline 8 which cannot be reviewed and responded to.

The Examining Authority has also muddled the uploading and availability of various documents regarding the Scheme on its portal.

These two matters have been highly prejudicial to Interested Parties, who have a statutory right to make their views known and to be responded to.

This application affects 75% Best and Most Versatile land. As we have seen from the drought this Summer, food shortages are already predicted as inevitable. Taking prime agricultural land out of production. will exacerbate this problem.

The lack of a water source at the application site is a critical factor in why this application should also be refused.

Given the current drought, there would be insufficient water being collected and/or replenished on the site (from man made lakes or lagoons which are supposed to self fill with rainwater) to be able to deal safely with any fires on the site, including the risk of BESS batteries catching fire and needing significant amounts of water to be cooled - perhaps repeatedly if there is a chain reaction in the batteries and/or they reignite.

There is no final design for the BESS batteries and they are known to be inherently dangerous, as seen by multiple BESS fires both in the UK and internationally.

If this scheme is approved it will devastate this rural area with an industrial scheme, which in my opinion amounts to a land grab.

There is no evidence that the applicant or its group has the experience or the funding to develop a site on this scale and it may well wish to obtain the weakest possible terms of any DCO simply to be able to onsell an asset.

There would only be a significant detriment to local people and their lives - without any measurable and guaranteed benefit.

Public Rights of Way would be significantly and adversely affected.

Issues which relate to traffic on the unsuitable local roads, both during a lengthy potential construction phase and any replacement of component parts (which would be a meaningful and ongoing requirement over the life of any such scheme) remain unresolved and would require strict regulation in any potential DCO.

There would be traffic accidents, especially on the totally unsuitable B645, an existing accident blackspot.

There is now a clustering of other solar 'farms' (meaning industrial facilities) in the vicinity of this intended site, which also use or intend to use the same road network, as does the facility at Zantra, near Garden Farm in Gt Staughton, spurring off the same access road and road network as this intended site.

Solar panels will be old technology before very long, meaning the possibility of a stranded rust belt. Enforceable indemnities must be made available to guard against such probabilities.

The panels and components are currently not easily, if at all, recyclable.

This Scheme would create more carbon footprint than it would save, so it would not be 'net zero'.

It would not generate the amount of projected useable electricity, particularly in the UK and not at times of peak demand.

Therefore, I suggest that it cannot be properly classified as an NSIP at all and the application should be rejected accordingly, including for all of the reasons set out in this comment.

These arguments have been fully put before the Examining Authority and must be taken into proper consideration.

All in all, totally unacceptable.

Submission ID: SDBC611D7

Comments as above.