

BARRY SMITH CBE BA IP NUMBER [REDACTED]

## FOSSE GREEN DEADLINE 4 SUBMISSION

### Executive Summary.

The submission below highlights significant gaps, inconsistencies, and unresolved issues in the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's (ExA) Second Written Questions (REP3-045) submission and in the Revised Solar Technical Guide (REP3-037). The Applicant's responses demonstrate that key matters remain unaddressed and unresolved. Several Applicant statements are contradicted within their own evidence and I would contend that material design changes are required.

Of concern, Deadline 3 was 20 March 2026 with the submissions posted on the Planning Inspectorate website on 24 March 2026 and Deadline 3A was 24 March 2026 with the submissions posted on 26 March 2026. A plethora of documents were submitted at these deadlines and it has proved impossible as an individual to process all adequately in such a short timescale prior to Deadline 4. I believe the current schedule to be unreasonable and materially disadvantaged individual objectors

This submission is in 2 sections; Section A covers the Applicant's responses to the ExA's second written questions and Section B refers to the Revised Solar Technical Guide required.

### SECTION A:

1. Failure to Address Sequential and Cumulative Impacts. The Applicant dismisses the need to assess sequential development, despite the ExA's explicit concern that phased construction over many years may cause greater long-term disruption. No evidence is provided to demonstrate otherwise. The Applicant also fails to confirm when the required Interrelationships Report will be submitted.

2. Misinterpretation of Carbon Intensity Assessment. The Applicant refuses to assess Green House Gas offsetting using anticipated carbon intensity for May 2033, arguing that future carbon intensity depends on schemes such as Fosse Green coming on stream. This misrepresents the ExA's question: in May 2033 the FGE scheme will not yet have contributed any output, making the applicant's reasoning irrelevant. The requested assessment remains outstanding.

3. Inadequate Consideration of Resilience and Environmental Risk. The destruction of Porth Wen Solar Farm during Storm Darragh (Dec 2024) demonstrates real-world vulnerability. The Applicant has not explained how similar damage at Fosse Green would avoid heavy-metal contamination of a protected drinking-water area.

4. Maintenance Regime and Component Replacement. The maintenance schedule provides no assurance that large-scale component replacement will not occur under the guise of "maintenance". With only 10% of modules inspected annually, some

may go 10 years without inspection - an unacceptable risk given real-world storm damage failures on existing sites in the last few years.

5. Decommissioning Costs and Funding. The Applicant has not answered the ExA's question on decommissioning costs. The Applicant previously stated it was "committed to setting aside money", but now shifts responsibility to "the undertaker". Given the intention to sell the project, post-consent, this commitment must be secured through the DCO.

6. Permanent Land Take Misrepresented. The Applicant claims ignorance of NSIPs that classify access roads, compounds, sub-stations and BESS areas as permanently sealed land. This view is contradicted by the Mallard Pass, Heckington Fen, Gate Burton and Beacon Fen projects, all of which adopt this approach.

7. Unsupported Landscape and Perception Claims. The Applicant asserts that some will view solar farms as "important, sensitive, rural and even agricultural", but provides no evidence. The cited Lancaster University study merely states that solar farms are becoming common, not that they are perceived positively. The ExA's request for the evidential basis of this claim remains unanswered.

8.. Overplanting Ratio Unsupported by Applicant's Own Data. The Applicant proposes an initial overplanting ratio of 1.6, but a ratio of 1.17–1.20 is sufficient to meet Year-30 performance. Mixing STC and NOCT data is methodologically invalid. A justified ratio of 1.2 would require removal of ~139,250 panels, constituting a material design change.

9.. Maximum Output Achieved Only 5% of the Year. Table 8.1 shows only 460 hours per year at full output (5% of the year). The submission calls into question how such extensive land take can be justified when maximum output is so infrequent.

10. Battery Storage Modelling Unbalanced and Incorrect. All the BESS examples provided show summer-like conditions; no seasonal variation is presented. The Applicant's earlier claim that the battery will "only store and discharge energy generated by the Proposed Development" is also incorrect.

Hence, the Applicant has failed to answer key ExA questions, provided inconsistent or unsupported evidence, underestimated environmental and financial risks and justified design choices using flawed methodology. The overplanting analysis alone indicates that a major redesign is required. A comprehensive and evidence-based response from the Applicant is still outstanding

## Section B. Revised Solar Technical Guide

The following section refers to REP3-037 Solar Technical Guide (Revision 2). Paragraph references and quotes in italics refer to this document.

### B.1 Solar PV Overplanting

B.1.1 Paragraphs 5.3.1 – 5.3.4 explains why Nominal Operating Cell Temperature (NOCT) conditions are preferred above Standard Test Conditions (STC). Referring to Table 5.2:

STC:

Year 1: 373.55 MWp (DC) 1.56 Effective Overplanting

Year 30: 327.75 MWp (DC) 1.37 Effective Overplanting

If an initial effective overplanting ratio of 1.2 were used the figures would be approximately:

STC:

Year 1: 287.35 MWp (DC) 1.2 Effective Overplanting

Year 30: 241.55 MWp (DC) 1.01 Effective Overplanting

NOCT:

Year 1: 279.89 MWp (DC) 1.17 Effective Overplanting

Year 30: 245.57 MWp (DC) 1.02 Effective Overplanting

Therefore, notwithstanding what the Applicant states in Paragraph 5.3.6, according to their own data provided in Table 5.2, if effective overplanting commenced at 1.2 for either STC or NOCT conditions, the effective DC capacity and effective overplanting in year 30 would be sufficient to meet their grid commitment. Hence, the Applicant has, by default, argued that an overplanting ratio of 1.2 is appropriate. As a result, a reduction of 139,250 panels (fixed south facing option) needs to be undertaken. This requires a re-design and should be treated as a material change.

## B.2 Battery Storage Management

B.2.1 REP3-037 Section 12. In response to the ExA requesting an explanation of how the battery storage element is managed, including the most efficient way to utilise battery storage, noting seasonal variation, weather variation and how that relates to when there may or may not be much solar generation in the electricity system, Plates 12-1, 12-2 & 12-3 all show a yellow area depicting solar being exported. If solar is being exported to the grid it can only come from the solar arrays associated with the development. Plates 12-1 and 12-2 appear to be at the height of summer during the 5% of the year when maximum output is predicted. Plate 12-3 which shows 'solar export' peaking at above 200MW is clearly not in winter. A more balanced view is required; for example a monthly plot across the year.

B.2.2 The Applicant's statement at APP-031 paragraph 6.4.76 that "*As the lifetime generation figure of the BESS is significantly less than that of the Proposed Development, it is reasonable to assume that the battery will only store and discharge energy generated by the Proposed Development.*" is incorrect as the intention is clearly to both export and import.

