

Application for DCO by FOSSE GREEN
Summary of Representation by Interested Party reference [REDACTED]
Deadline 2

1. This representation comprises my comments to the Applicant's response to Written Representations (REP1-047).

Landscape and Visual Impact – Cumulative Effects

2. The Applicant refers to the Joint Interrelationship Reports which found that given the distances and lack of intervisibility between the schemes, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. However, the Secretary of State in the Cottam and Tillbridge schemes said that this approach neglected the sequential cumulative effects experienced when receptors move through the landscape.

Public Health- Mental Health

3. The Applicant proposes to address concerns about mental health by a number of measures. From a personal point of view the measures to be taken by the Applicant will not compensate for the anguish that is being caused to me and many in the local communities by the proposed solar developments.

BESS fires

4. The Applicant states that the BESS which have caught fire in the UK were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance. The fires which broke out in East Tilbury and Rothienorman (both post NFCC guidance) were at BESS under construction.

Bassingham Conservation Area

5. The definition of "substantial harm" in the CA case of Bramshill and the application of this to the West Burton NSIP is considered. I reference my analysis of the level of harm to Bassingham Conservation Area in my REP1-106.

Noise impact on St Michael and All Angels Church

6. The church receives visitors from all over the world who comment about the peacefulness. Their experience will be marred by construction activities being carried out and whilst the pile driving will be the loudest, other machinery will contribute to the noise. The area between the proposed solar arrays and the Church is open and over a flat landscape with no intervening buildings that might attenuate the noise.

Impact of noise on PRoW users

7. The WHO guidelines consider adverse health effects according to specific environments. The reference to an outdoor living area in the guidance is to areas such as residential gardens or balconies. More akin to the PRoW is the environment described as "Outdoors in

parkland and conservations areas” where the guidelines state that existing quiet outdoor areas should be preserved.

8. The Applicant asserts that the levels of operational noise along the PRoW are akin to the existing sound environment as evidenced by the baseline sound surveys. None of the monitoring locations for the sound surveys were on the PRoW. The applicant has therefore no evidence of the existing noise levels along the PRoW.

Impact on Food Security

9. The current use of part of the principal site for bio energy crops is evidence of the mounting pressure on the finite amount of food producing land in the country. The urgency of taking steps to protect food producing land is highlighted in a report issued by DEFRA on 20 January 2026.

Safety Concerns and Fire Risk (BESS)

10. The Applicant suggests that the BESS failure rates as a proportion of BESS deployment has sharply decreased as the BESS technology has matured. However the failure rate from 2020 onwards is on a far less steep downwards trend. Not all of the BESS failures are included in the EPRI database which shows 8 BESS failures in 2024 and 13 BESS failures in 2025.