

Dear Planning Inspectorate,  
Re: East Park Energy Solar Farm – Development Consent Order Application  
Applicant: BSSL Cambsbed 1 Limited

Location: [REDACTED]

Project Reference: East Park Energy NSIP

### 1. Introduction

I am writing to register a formal objection to the proposed. East Park Energy Solar Farm, a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) currently at the Examination stage. The scheme proposes a 400 MW solar generating station with a 100 MW battery energy storage system, spanning multiple sites across the Bedfordshire–Cambridgeshire border, with grid connection at Eaton Socon.

While I support the transition to renewable energy, this proposal raises significant concerns regarding land use, landscape impact, cumulative development pressure, biodiversity, heritage setting, and local amenity, which I outline below.

### 2. Scale, Land Use and Loss of Agricultural Productivity

The proposal covers a very large area of predominantly arable farmland, including land around Pertenhall, Keysoe, Little Staughton and near Stonely/St Neots. The developer confirms that the scheme spans four large sites across two counties.

- This scale represents a major industrialisation of open countryside, inconsistent with the character of the rural landscape.

- The loss of productive agricultural land is not justified when alternative brownfield sites have been adequately demonstrated.

### 3. Landscape and Visual Impact

The project area includes elevated ridgelines and open fields north of Keysoe and Little Staughton, as well as land west of the B660.

- The introduction of extensive ground mounted solar arrays, fencing, access tracks and roads will obscure long established rural views.

- The developer acknowledges the need for additional screening and set backs (see the Visual Impact Statement, Bridleway 37), which indicates that visual harm has already been identified.

- Even with mitigation, the sheer scale of the scheme means the landscape character will be permanently changed for decades.

### 4. Cumulative Impact with Other Energy and Infrastructure Schemes

Cambridgeshire County Council notes that this project is one of several major NSIPs affecting the region, requiring coordinated scrutiny across three host authorities.

- The cumulative effect of multiple large scale energy schemes has not been adequately considered in terms of landscape, traffic, biodiversity, and grid connection infrastructure.

- The area around St Neots, Eaton Socon and the surrounding villages is already experiencing significant development pressure.

### 5. Traffic, Construction and Local Amenity

The proposal includes multiple temporary construction compounds and use of existing access routes such as the B660 (Kimbolton Road).

- Construction traffic will place additional strain on rural roads not designed for heavy goods vehicles.

- Noise, dust, and disruption during the multi year construction period will negatively impact residents and cyclists.

### 6. Biodiversity and Environmental Concerns

Although the developer claims a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain, the scheme still involves:

- Large scale land take

- Habitat fragmentation

- Disturbance to ground nesting birds and other wildlife

The need for new hedgerow and woodland planting to mitigate impacts demonstrates that significant ecological disruption is expected.

### 7. Heritage and Rural Character

The area around Stonely, Pertenhall, Keysoe and Little Staughton contains historic field patterns.

- Industrial scale solar infrastructure is incompatible with the historic and rural character of the area.

- The proposal risks eroding the distinct character of these villages and their surrounding landscapes.

### 8. Procedural and Consultation Concerns

The project is being progressed under the NSIP regime, meaning decision making is centralised with the Energy Security and Net Zero, not local authorities.

- Many residents feel that the NSIP process limits meaningful local influence.

- The scale and complexity of the documentation make it difficult for communities to fully engage.

### 9. Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, particularly the scale of landscape change, loss of agricultural land, cumulative impacts, ecological disruption, and harm to rural character, I object to the East Park Energy Solar Farm proposal in its current form.

I respectfully request that the Examining Authority:

- Give full weight to local environmental, landscape and amenity impacts

- Require the developer to explore alternative sites or a significantly reduced footprint

- Ensure that cumulative impacts with other NSIPs are properly assessed

- Consider whether the proposal genuinely represents the least harm option for the region

Thank you for your consideration.