

I feel very strongly about the priority of land categories being used for solar energy projects – these should be as the Government's NPS EN-3 – starting with brownfield land being the most desirable, and BMV land as the least desirable. A large proportion of the proposed site is using BMV land, and much of the other agricultural land is still quality productive land.

Food Security is supposed to be an important priority for the nation, and part of achieving net zero, so it should be part of the balance in refusing this project.

All proposed sites in this general area of North Kesteven District Council, wishing to connect to another proposed site, a Sub Station at Navenby, are all sited on the same BMV and quality farmland.

The cumulative effect of all this will be massive.

There will be drastic changes to the area, changing it from rural with villages to an industrial landscape.

This will have a knock-on effect with the Witham Valley Nature Park, and the Whisby Nature Park.

There appears to be no good reason why the Fosse Green Energy project has to be located where proposed.

The density of the development around Thorpe on the Hill, and loss of Public Rights of Way with views over agricultural fields, would have serious repercussions on the local community.

Instead, they would be walking along paths lined by security fencing, with views of black glass, and this would have an adverse effect on the wellbeing of residents.

All this must surely cause serious harm to the local economy for businesses, as well as tourism and visitor numbers.

The quantity of battery storage on the site seems excessive to the function of the site itself.

If there are batteries now planned to be used for storing off-site energy, that is not the remit of the solar energy project as applied for by Fosse Green Energy.

All those affected by the Fosse Green Energy project, but particularly those living in the general area of the large BESS site would want to be re-assured that the latest guidance is being applied in all aspects, for example, the National Fire Chiefs Council, NFCC, and that advice and comments from UKHSA are also being taken fully into account.

I hope that this is in place.

In Coleby, and along the Cliff Edge, we are worried about the grid connection corridor and what the end result will be – will it be fenced off, will there be inspection points, what do these look like, what size are they, etc?

The Cliff Edge is a Valued Landscape, and the view of it from the Lowfields, as well as the view of the Lowfields from the hillside are extensive – for example, Bassingham and Aubourn villages are clearly visible from the Viking Way footpath, and views extend beyond the north side of Newark to the hills towards the west around Ollerton.

The Decommissioning stage is another big area of concern, will those responsible actually clear the land of all the solar infrastructure and return the land in a fit state for agricultural farming?

The worry for locals is that there will be acres of toxic wasteland, no solar company still in business to rectify the situation, and land owners claiming it is not their responsibility, etc

If the site had originally been placed on brownfield or previously contaminated land, then there would be no great harm to the worried public.

I hope these aspects will be considered by the Examiner.