

[REDACTED]; I represent Dean and Shelton Parish Council. I wish to talk about the traffic disruption during the construction phase of the development and the problems that this will bring.

The 1900 Acre site is well documented by the applicant; it is mapped and the boundaries well known. Within the site there are several parishes that will be detrimentally affected during both the build and the run phases of the proposed development. In addition to these parishes there are, in a ring around the edges of the development site other parishes that will also be affected by the proposed development particularly during the build phase; Dean and Shelton parish, to the Northwest of the development site being one of these.

The applicants documentation talks about the use of A1 junction near St. Neots for primary access to the development site. However, the development site has trunk roads to the west, the north and the east. Namely, the A6, the A14 and the A1. All these roads provide access to the development site via smaller roads passing through the ring of parishes surrounding the site. For the duration of the construction (an estimated 30 months) these parishes and the parishes within the development site area will be subject to a daily bombardment of noise, air and traffic pollution. The applicants document EN010141-000094-2.4 Street Works, Rights of Way and Access Plan P01 shows access points to the site off many minor roads in the whole site area. While the applicants intention seems to be to control traffic access the development from one junction on the A1, human nature would indicate that traffic approaching from the west (the A6) is unlikely to travel all the way around the outside of the development site to the A1 and then access from there. For example, traffic exiting from the A14 to the north and travelling south on the B660 (a road passing through the centre of the development site and having site access points situated on it) would have to pass through the villages of Catworth, Kimbolton, Stonely and then on to Pertenhall. I would urge the Examiner to travel this route and see the unsuitability for himself.

The B645 and the B660, and the smaller feeder roads that pass through local villages are unsuitable for any volume of traffic particularly HGV traffic. All of these will likely be used to gain access to the development site. The High Street through Upper Dean for example could be a route from the B645 for access to the western end of the development site via Swineshead and Pertenhall.

My comments are focusing on HGV and lorry movements, however the vastly increased commuter traffic from the site workers must also be considered. Can the applicant control the movement of its HGVs and its site workers so that these completely inappropriate roads are not used to gain site access? The applicants APP-011 2.5 Traffic Regulation Measures Plan P01 does not seem to extend to areas around the development site that will be subject to traffic movement.

The emergency services in this area are manned and geared towards the local population numbers and the incidents and accidents that this can bring. The police total 12 officers including 3 support officers based out of Riseley and Wyboston. The B645 and B660 are well known locally for accidents and fatalities (East Northants Council designates the B645 as an accident blackspot and has signs posted to indicate this). I would suggest that the increase in traffic and a consequent increase in

incidents has the potential to cause problems for these services. I will, however, leave them to comment further on this.

I feel that to help alleviate the potential traffic problems all Parish Councils in the affected development and the surrounding areas should be able to participate in planning for all traffic movements on the basis that we are the experts in our own areas and therefore know what traffic movements will and will not work.

While I have focused on traffic and the disruption that will bring across a wide area there are several other areas to consider:

Construction Noise and Disruption: These will have major impacts on local people across the development site and the surrounding areas.

Damage to local buildings: Potential structural impacts from construction traffic on local buildings, in particular heritage buildings.

Potential for increased criminal activity in the area: Data from Opal, the national intelligence unit focused on serious organised acquisitive crime, points to rising solar site crime from organised criminal gangs.

Disruption to wildlife: The construction process will be disruptive and harmful to wildlife. This includes the 40 miles of mesh fencing that will impact local wildlife movement, including deer.

As a Parish Council Dean and Shelton are against the whole development as we feel it will be detrimental to the area and bring no benefits. We echo the Stop East Park Energy campaign in that we are not opposed to solar energy, but it needs to be deployed in the correct locations and way. Best and most versatile land is not the correct location as we need both food and energy security.