

LIME DOWN SOLAR PARK - Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010168**Deadline 3: 15 June 2026****Unique Reference Number: [REDACTED]****Response of January Farrington ([REDACTED]) to the Applicant's replies at Open Floor Hearing 1 (EXAM/9.19) and to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions****1. How has our farm actually been assessed?**

1.1 The Applicant keeps saying [REDACTED] has been “considered and assessed,” and that it is “specifically and individually assessed” in Appendix 16-2 [APP-241]. But that assessment only looks at the immediate views from the farm and the hacking routes nearby. That is not an assessment of a working stud. It looks at views, access and recreational use, but not at the things that actually matter to us: equine welfare and breeding, our broodmares, foals and youngstock, staff safety, insurance, bloodstock investment, operational as well as construction noise, the moving tracker panels, and the proximity of substation and battery (BESS) infrastructure. It ignores almost everything I raised in my Relevant Representation, my Written Representation and my oral submission.

1.2 No one acting for the Applicant has ever been to [REDACTED], and before I sent my representations no one asked me a single thing about our business. So, I do not understand how it can have been “individually assessed” at all. It looks like a desk study done by someone who does not know what actually happens here.

1.3 I asked the Applicant directly, by email on 2 June 2026, how the assessment was done and whether they knew anything about our business beforehand. Two weeks later I still have no real answer only a holding reply (**Annex A**). If our farm had genuinely been assessed properly, they should be able to tell me how, and by whom.

2. There will be a significant effect on [REDACTED]

2.1 The Applicant says that because there is “a buffer of approximately 500m” to the Order Limits, there will be “no significant effects” and “no significant residual effects.” A buffer (distance not confirmed) does not stop noise, traffic, dust, lighting and disturbance.

2.2 Breeding thoroughbreds are extremely sensitive. Mares in foal and at foot, and young stock, startle and bolt. That risks injury to the horses and to people, lost condition, and the loss of a breeding season we can never get back. The Applicant's own assessment already admits “up to a moderate-minor adverse effect” from views and hacking alone, it has simply not looked at the effect on the stud as a business. It keeps concluding there will be “no significant effects,” but it has used no equine-specific method and has shown no evidence of how it reached that conclusion for a breeding stud like ours.

2.3 Treating equine businesses as “of local importance and therefore low sensitivity” [APP-068] underplays both how sensitive the animals are and how much studs here matter to

the wider bloodstock economy. Other interested parties have given evidence on equine health and construction noise (REP1-158, REP1-202 and REP1-214), on electromagnetic fields, and on harm to a stud business (REP1-191). And the uncertainty has already forced us to pause investment. This is a real effect now, not a hypothetical one.

3. Our horses are not an ordinary “recreation” receptor

3.1 The Applicant assesses noise on horses using the human noise threshold, but the risk to a horse is not about how it “processes” decibels. It is the sudden startle and flight response, an unpredictable reaction to an unfamiliar noise, machine or person that can make a 500kg animal bolt, hurt itself, hurt a handler, or lose a foal. A human comfort threshold does not measure that.

3.2 The British Horse Society quote the Applicant relies on is about glint and glare from panels. My concerns are about construction, noise and electromagnetic fields not just glare. “No evidence” about glare does not answer them. And telling me horses “adapt quickly” is no comfort when the construction would run for years right next to our foaling paddocks.

4. Surveyors on our land without permission (CA I.5)

4.1 On 3 June 2026 we found two surveyors from Storm Geomatics inside one of our electric-fenced paddocks, working for the Applicant. We had not been asked and had given no permission. They carried a letter from Arthian saying landowners had been contacted but it appears we and others have not. We only realised because our mares and foals were galloping around in alarm.

4.2 The Applicant apologised and told me “the surveyors should not have entered your property,” and that surveys had been “paused” as soon as I emailed (**Annex B**). But the surveying did not actually stop. The very next day, Thursday 4 June, they were surveying the Gauze Brook in Area E (off Avril’s Lane), and they carried on until Friday 12 June when they back on Mill Lane.

4.3 We are also aware of other stretches the surveyors have simply gone onto without asking. The pattern seems to be that they go ahead regardless and only ask permission if they happen to come across the right person.

4.4 The Applicant says this work is to gather data on the Gauze Brook because “there is no data of this nature held by statutory bodies.” That leaves two possibilities, and both matter for question CA I.5 and for how much weight can be given to their evidence: either the Gauze Brook was not modelled before the DCO was submitted, so their flood and environmental baseline is incomplete, or they had already been on our land before without us knowing.

4.5 I would ask the Examining Authority to press the Applicant on: when and how the Gauze Brook was modelled for the application; exactly what survey access has been taken across [REDACTED] and along the Gauze Brook, where, and under what authority; and how needing more access now fits with their claim that our farm has already been fully assessed.

5. The Examining Authority’s questions about horses

5.1 I support all three of the Examining Authority’s questions. To my mind, the fact that the Examining Authority has had to ask them shows that the equine assessment is still unresolved, the questions reflect the very concerns I raised in my representations.

5.2 Horses are not standard recreation receptors. A stud is a workplace with valuable, unpredictable animals, and the safety risk to horses, handlers and riders is real. Assessing it through views and hacking routes misses the point.

5.3 There should be a proper assessment of the job losses and business viability across the equine sector and the businesses that depend on it including vets, farriers, feed, transport and skilled stud staff, rather than the limited information in Table 2-10 of Appendix 16-2 [APP-241].

5.4 The map of equestrian facilities within 20km should be produced with each one named, described and split into stud farms, livery and stabling, and other types. [REDACTED] should be shown correctly as a thoroughbred stud.

6. What I am asking from the applicant:

- explain, properly, how [REDACTED] was assessed, by whom, and on what information;
- carry out a real, evidence-based assessment of the effect of the Scheme on equine health, welfare and business viability, dealing with my concerns and the other evidence the Examining Authority has identified;
- look again at treating equine businesses as “low sensitivity” recreation receptors; and
- account for all the survey access taken on our land and along the Gauze Brook, and the basis for the powers they are seeking.

January Farrington

[REDACTED]

15 June 2026

Annex A – Emails about the assessment of [REDACTED]

My email of 2 June 2026 asking how [REDACTED] was assessed, and the only reply received.

From: January Farrington [REDACTED]
To: info@limedownsolar.co.uk
Date: Tuesday, 2 June 2026, 14:28 BST
Subject: [REDACTED] Assessment

You keep saying in DCO submissions that you have assessed [REDACTED] and I would be grateful if you could explain how this has been done.

We are not aware anyone from IGP has been to [REDACTED]. I therefore presume this has been a desk-top study and I'm wondering if you, or the person doing the assessment, took into account our business?

Were you aware of the nature of our business prior to receipt of my RR and WR?

You appear to continue to disregard the specific nature of our equine business and have not addressed any of my concerns.

Regards, January Farrington

From: info@limedownsolar.co.uk
To: January Farrington <january@dfarrington.com>
Date: 3 June 2026, 12:37 BST
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] Assessment

Dear January,

Thank you for getting in touch.

We have passed your enquiry to the relevant members of the project team for review and will come back to you as soon as possible. Thank you for your patience in the meantime.

Kind regards, [REDACTED] — Community Relations Team, Lime Down Solar Park

Annex B – Emails about surveyors entering our land without permission

Emails of 3–9 June 2026 about the unauthorised survey access, including the Applicant's acknowledgement that the surveyors should not have entered. Most recent first.

From: January Farrington [REDACTED] >
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: info@limedownsolar.co.uk; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]>
Date: Wednesday, 3 June 2026, 16:02 BST
Subject: Trespassing Again

Dear [REDACTED]

We have today encountered two people from Storm Geomatics working within one of our electric-fenced paddocks. No permission has been requested yet they are carrying out work for IGP/Lime Down.

It is clearly not the fault of Storm Geomatics as they have a letter stating relevant landowners have been contacted (attached). We have not been contacted, were completely unaware this was taking place and have not granted permission to carry out survey work within our farm.

We were first alerted to the presence of the two men in high-vis by our mares and foals galloping around their paddocks. This is simply not acceptable; it is a basic requirement to request permission to enter private land, something which you continue to ignore.

Regards, January Farrington

From: info@limedownsolar.co.uk
To: January Farrington <january@dfarrington.com>
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Date: 9 June 2026, 09:02 BST
Subject: Re: Trespassing Again

Dear January,

Further to our previous email, I wanted to provide an update and thank you for your patience.

It appears there has been a breakdown in communication, due in part to [REDACTED] last week. Whilst access permission was agreed elsewhere prior to [REDACTED] being away, the request to access your land was obviously not made and therefore the surveyors should not have entered your property. Please accept our sincere apologies for this.

I can confirm that, as soon as we received your email, surveys were paused to ensure that no one was entering your land while we investigated this further.

The work being undertaken is intended to gather data relating to the Gauze Brook, noting there is no data of this nature held by statutory bodies currently. This information will help identify potential opportunities for flood improvements. While these measures may not necessarily be secured through the Scheme's development consent order, they could provide a wider benefit to the local community given the number of representations relating to flooding in the area.

We would still be grateful for the opportunity to access your land, with your express permission, to complete the surveys. We fully understand that the earlier unauthorised access may have caused concern and affected your confidence in the process, and we are very sorry for putting you in this position. Please be assured that no further access will take place without your clear agreement...

Kind regards, [REDACTED] — Community Relations Team, Lime Down Solar Park

From: info@limesdownsolar.co.uk

To: January Farrington <january@dfarrington.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] >

Date: 4 June 2026, 15:49 BST

Subject: Re: Trespassing Again

Dear January,

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We are sorry to hear this and are looking into the matter as a priority with the relevant project team members and surveyors to understand what has happened.

We will come back to you as soon as possible.

Kind regards, [REDACTED] — Community Relations Team, Lime Down Solar Park

