

Good afternoon.

I represent the Parish of Egmanton, but in Particular, those of us that have outlying homes bordering Weston. There are 5 homes on Hagg Lane which is a small community off Moorhouse road, along with our closest neighbours at Partridge Farm which is directly off Moorhouse road - Unfortunately, they are the ones who will suffer the most from this development in terms of traffic and access amendments for the scheme.

As a small community we were initially content to make our own personal representation for mitigation with the applicant, which seemed to go reasonably well. However, over the years since we were made aware of the development and after countless personal discussions with the applicant and promises of little to no impact on our environment, things changed for our small outlying community in the final stages of consultation.

We initially struggled to understand the traffic and access requirements from the myriads of documents that were put forward by the applicant for the Phase 2 PEIR consultation, some of which were contradictory or ambiguous, but we held onto the initial face to face meetings that we'd had with the applicant that we wouldn't have any traffic disrupting our way of life.

We submitted our PEIR stage 2 representation requesting clarity.

What we did receive, a few months later was another stage of Targeted consultation on access changes. Which contained very little detail, no facts, no figures, no justification just a few paragraphs of text.

This stage of consultation redirected the majority of the traffic for the northern quadrant of the development past our homes off Moorhouse Lane and Hagg Lane, but particularly past Partridge Farm, it's hard to imagine a home more impacted than this from a traffic perspective. At a distance of only around 2m from the single track Moorhouse road, the residents now face a 1133% increase in HGV traffic rumbling past it along with all the other site traffic every few minutes.

Again, our parish submitted representation to the applicant for this.

Consultation is meant to be a two-way street, the applicant seems to have forgotten this and it really is a shame. And we are particularly disappointed at the U turn on traffic and access from the earlier stages.

We don't begrudge our fellow parishes respite from the traffic either, but we don't agree that the burden of this traffic for an indefinite period of time should be laid at the doorsteps of homes within our parish. In our response we suggested alternative measures that could be put in place to get the best resolution for Moorhouse, Weston, Ossington and Egmanton – because we stand by our fellow parishes.

When we did finally receive return comments back and decipher them following NSIP acceptance and publication of a very different scheme to what we been looking at over the past years. We noted that most of the return comments appear to have been answered retrospectively, reflecting on how the development is now presented, rather than how it had been at the time of consultation and quite a few of our suggestion's pertaining to alternate access, had been rejected out of hand for both stages of consultation with no clear justification.

We now ask, how can all the roads that have been introduced to meet this new access regime be categorised as a high sensitivity where previously there were no high sensitivity roads at all on the scheme. How is it right that an updated access strategy results in the use of arguably more dangerous roads being used than before?

We ask the planning inspectorate to carefully review the merits of the access roads chosen by the applicant.

We don't consider that the mitigation is appropriate for the users of the road. cyclists, equestrians and walkers, not to mention the users of motorised vehicles who will be impacted by the construction traffic but not only that, the mitigation suggested will add chaos. A quarter of a mile of road to get us out of the order limits will have imposed numerous passing places and 8 sets of what we understand (as layman) will be traffic lights just to get us all on our way for a quarter of a mile.

Traffic and access are now our largest concern.

We have other concerns - And I understand that several of these points have already been raised as topics by the inspectors over the last few days and I thank them for their interest in these matters, as well as representation by JPAG and fellow parishes in these matters.

Screening

We have ongoing concerns that applicant will effectively screen the closest arrays as promised, given the u turn on traffic and access. So far, we can't see the additional screening on the maps we have to date, the indicative maps suggest only diverse grass and not the bolstered planting within the existing foliage as previously agreed in the earlier stages of consultation.

We ask that promises made by the applicant in terms of screening are given adequate scrutiny by the planning inspectorate.

Cumulative Effect

Why is the scheme so diversely spread out? there are other schemes of similar energy claims across Lincolnshire and in the north of our district, they are all reasonably compact and whilst I don't wish those developments on their respective villages either, those developments don't impact around 20 parishes. The cumulative impact of this single development in the middle of Newark and Sherwood District is enormous and many of the parishes including ours already have consented or in service renewable or low carbon energy generation schemes within their borders.

We ask that the planning inspectorate continue to look at this development against the cumulative effect of all installed and proposed large scale solar developments.

Energy Claims

The applicants claim this scheme will generate 800MW **enough energy to power 400,000 homes**, but this seems to be at odds with one earth solar farm which is 740MW but that applicant claims only 200,000 homes. Half the number of homes for just a 60MW difference.

These claims matter, they are what end up in the media, they are what shape people's perspectives, but these claims seem outlandish. We look forward to the explanation on how these claims are generated.

Finally, In Egmanton – we're still here, we're still open to discussion, but this is Element Green's proposal into our environment, **you** can improve the situation that we find ourselves in and the disappointment that we've had in the consultation process. We look forwards to ongoing discussion, particularly in terms of mitigation for traffic and access for our portion of the development.

