

I am completely opposed to the East Park Energy application. AS requested this is a summary of my earlier submission which exceeded 1500 words but I sincerely hope that you will read and consider my full submission

I vehemently object to the applications proposal for the following reasons:

1. The proposed scheme is so vast (six miles from end to end) completely overwhelming existing villages
2. 74% of the land being used is Best and Most Versatile
3. The developer, BSS has no experience of building solar, let alone on this vast scale
4. The UK is ranked 229 out of 230 globally for photovoltaic power potential, and the potential solar output does not warrant the cost to the environment and local communities.
5. Solar is not the cheap energy fix claimed and solar proposals deliver exceptional returns for developers without delivering the lower energy costs people are expecting.
6. The developer has not evidence consideration of alternative sites
7. The ecological surveys had been carried out at a time when the weather had been extremely hot and dry for a long period of time resulting in data that does not reflect reality.
8. The enormous amount of fencing along footpaths, bridleways and around the site will have a huge negative impact on the wildlife currently existing in this area.
9. Existing footpaths and bridleways will need to be closed during construction having a negative impact on peoples ability to use the countryside and their well-being.
10. The impact of the build noise (particularly from the pile drivers), dust and disruption is unacceptable.
11. Huge numbers of construction vehicles and workers will need to travel to the site, further increasing traffic on the small local roads which are not suitable for such large vehicles and volumes of traffic and also resulting in increased carbon emissions
12. Too much fencing is required for security.
13. Increased evidence of organized criminal activity targeting these sites.
14. The battery storage systems are know to have fire and explosion risks
15. The proposed screening is insufficient to provide viable screening
16. Increased risk of flooding
17. The panels will need to be replaced at least once in the lifetime of the project
18. No proven recycling of panels at the end of life at least 50% will end up in landfill
19. EPE have not provided evidence of secured funding arrangements for the site to be returned to its current condition at the end of the scheme