

## Comments on responses to the Examining Authority's proposed schedule of changes to the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)

PC001 - no comment

PC002 (funding) - Applicant simply stating that they have previously stated in their application that they (or anyone they sell the development to) have an obligation to fund decommissioning does not in any way expand on how they will guarantee this. Neither does stating that another project (Oakland Solar Park) has made similar statements and been approved. Citing that another project has made promises (promises yet to come to fruition as Oakland is obviously not at the decommissioning stage) is not evidence that funding will be available.

PC003 (traffic) - "the Applicant accepts that a highways side agreement may be a reasonable request in relation to more substantial highways works". By now the Applicant should know if more substantial works are necessary and dealt with all the appropriate submissions. As a general comment the predicted traffic increases, including of HGVs (for example 270 vehicles, 177 of which are HGVs, on the tiny B4044), are going to cause absolute havoc in an area already beyond capacity in terms of traffic. What mitigation is in place to allow traffic to continue to move and to ensure the protection of pedestrians and cyclists?

PC004 (Farmland Birds) - The applicant themselves have concluded there will be "a significant effect from habitat loss on wintering birds could not be avoided" and have offered no mitigation nor methods of monitoring. The Applicant states with regards to provision of scrubland "although not quantified at this stage" - at what stage did they think it would be appropriate to quantify this?! Various unsubstantiated statements such as that a more resilient population of skylarks will take up residence. No mention of Corn Bunting AT ALL despite this question being specifically posed by the examiners. I think it perfectly appropriate for the examiners to request independent monitoring of farmland bird populations - in too many areas of this proposal the Applicant is proposing to essentially police itself.

PC005 - no comment

PC006 (biodiversity) - the Applicant appears to accuse the examiners(?) of unilaterally imposing BNG targets, however it was they themselves that made the initial claims of the % gain (which they have subsequently lowered) and there is no concrete, independent evidence to confirm these targets are achievable, relevant to the current local wildlife (net gain is not per se better) or how the gains will be independently monitored.