

## January Farrington Written Representation

Interested Party Reference: [REDACTED]

### Summary:

This Written Representation focuses on IGP's response to my RR and areas where the evidence base in my view falls short, and where I respectfully ask the Examining Authority to look hard at what the Applicant has, and has not, demonstrated. The NSIP regime is, in my view, being used in a way that the Planning Act 2008 did not envisage. My concerns include:

- **Assessment of impacts:** The Applicant repeatedly concludes “no significant effects” across multiple topics including flooding, landscape, construction, decommissioning, socio economic impact, equine welfare and mental health. I do not consider these conclusions to be supported by robust, site-specific evidence.
- **Equine impacts:** The impact on [REDACTED] and the wider equestrian and rural economy. Horses have been treated as recreational receptors. No equine-specific assessment has been undertaken, despite the site being located within a highly active equestrian and breeding landscape. The effects of construction activity, moving tracker panels, operational noise and associated infrastructure on equine welfare and safety have not been properly assessed.
- **Business and economic effects:** The impacts on established rural businesses, including equine operations and the wider local economy they support, have not been adequately considered.
- **Site selection and alternatives:** The Applicant has not demonstrated that this is the most appropriate location when assessed against reasonable alternatives. The site selection process, the use of the NSIP regime, and the question of alternatives.
- **Governance and transparency:** There are outstanding concerns regarding the accuracy of public claims and the transparency of aspects of the scheme, which I respectfully ask the Examining Authority to examine carefully.

I want to be clear about something at the outset. The toll of this process has been very real. My family and I live and work at [REDACTED] in Corston, a thoroughbred stud which sits immediately alongside the proposed panel areas of Lime Down D and opposite the substation. [REDACTED]. They have shared my time and attention with Stop Lime Down since before they began either of these. Missed matches, rushed conversations, hours in front of a screen instead of with them. I mention it not to elicit sympathy but because the term “NIMBY”, used freely in the press and elsewhere about people in my position, fails to recognise what is being asked of communities like ours. We are being asked to absorb, without compensation and with almost no meaningful dialogue, a development that is fundamentally incompatible with the place we live in. For me this is not about a back yard. It is a question of what is right.

Ultimately, this is not simply a question of whether Lime Down can be engineered or mitigated. It is whether it is the right development, in the right place, at the right scale. I do not believe that it is.