

From: [christine.abbott](#)
To: [East Park Energy](#)
Subject: East Park Energy Objection
Date: 15 January 2026 22:23:56

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Team

Please kindly accept my late submission for the above Application.

I am writing to formally object to the proposed East Park Energy solar farm development. This project is fundamentally flawed in its location, scale, and potential impacts on local communities, agriculture, and the environment due to:

Excessive Scale and Industrialization of Rural Countryside: The scheme is overwhelmingly large—bigger than Gatwick Airport and seven times the size of the UK's largest operational solar site. It would span over six miles, include 700,000 photovoltaic panels, and require more than 40 miles of security fencing. This would transform vast tracts of open farmland into an industrial landscape, dominating small villages and hemming in residents with panels up to 3 meters high, inverters, transformers, CCTV, lighting, and battery storage systems. Such development does not belong in a rural setting characterized by centuries-old farming cycles and tranquility.

Loss of Prime Agricultural Land: The project targets high-quality, fertile farmland, with 74% classified as Best and Most Versatile (grades 2 and 3a). This land has been productively farmed for generations and could produce enough wheat for around 3.6 million loaves of bread annually. Sacrificing this for solar panels is shortsighted, especially when alternatives exist, such as installing panels on warehouse roofs, car parks, transport corridors, brownfield sites, or commercial rooftops (e.g., just two major supermarket chains could generate equivalent power from their roofs). We should prioritize food security and avoid importing more food due to lost domestic production.

Disruption from Construction and Ongoing Operations: The three-year construction phase would cause significant disturbance, including dust, noise (such as pile-driving that would shatter the area's tranquility), and increased traffic from hundreds of workers on narrow rural roads, past schools and villages. Access plans are likely impractical, leading to bottlenecks, mud, and unauthorized routes. Post-construction, risks from lithium-ion battery storage (e.g., fire hazards), potential flooding exacerbation, wildlife displacement, and increased crime (targeting valuable equipment) further compound the issues.

Inadequate Consultation and Profit-Driven Motives: The developer's statutory consultation appeared as a mere formality, with dismissive responses to community concerns and no genuine engagement. This project seems driven primarily by profit for the developers and a few landowners, generating multimillions annually, without a comprehensive cradle-to-grave carbon assessment or consideration of more efficient renewable options. The area already hosts significant solar and wind schemes (capable of 165MW), and adding this would create an unnecessary 2,800-acre solar corridor.

Broader Community and Environmental Impacts: The development threatens local livelihoods, including farmworkers and small businesses, while offering only a handful of low-skill jobs. It would devalue properties, stress communities through a prolonged planning and construction process, and permanently alter the character of our countryside for over 40 years. As echoed by local MPs like Richard Fuller and Ben Obese-Jecty, this is

"the right energy in the wrong place" and a "bad idea" that prioritizes financial speculation over environmental and social considerations.

I urge the Planning Inspectorate to reject this application, as it fails to meet the criteria for sustainable development and would cause irreversible harm to our rural communities.

Thankyou

C. Abbott