

## **East Park Energy Written Representation**

### **Insufficient local infrastructure to support the project**

There is a complete lack of local infrastructure in the area to support large-scale construction, and no meaningful plans to address this issue. Thousands of heavy-duty vehicle movements would be required and must not be permitted to pass through or between any of the existing villages in the area, all of which are connected by unclassified or minor B-roads. The existing roads are entirely unsuitable for heavy or wide vehicles as they are narrow, without pavements, and only just wide enough for two cars to pass each other. They pass close to very old historic properties, many without footings, and over weak bridges. For example The Town in Great Staughton has no footpaths, is not wide enough to accommodate two large vehicles passing each other, is ungritted throughout winter, passes over a small weak river bridge and it would be dangerous and irresponsible to funnel further heavy good vehicles along this road.

In addition the volume and nature of the construction traffic would irreparably damage these properties as well as present an unacceptable level of disruption to residents and rural communities and must be routed away from existing communities and access roads.

### **Irreversible damage to rural communities**

The colossal scale and design of this 1900-acre proposed development is disproportionate to the scale and nature of human development in the surrounding area and will have devastating, long-lasting and irreversible impacts on the local area, both for its communities and the natural environment:

- The permanent negative visual impacts, both during and after the construction, of industrialising an area of natural beauty and English rural history.
- The project is far too close to the newly-discovered Roman Small Town near Great Staughton ([Cambridgeshire Roman Town Given Protection | Historic England](#)). The archaeologists involved in that project believe that there is considerably more of the town still to be identified under adjoining land, which should therefore be afforded the same heritage protection as the site that Brockwell have already identified in order to prevent damage from the construction works planned.
- The construction noise and traffic is expected to last for 3 years and will have significant adverse impacts for the daily lives of all the residents,

services and businesses based in the local area in terms of noise, traffic, mud and access.

- The loss of beautiful countryside, so important for human health and wellbeing, as well as for flood management and protection of the neighbouring town of St Neots.
- The siting of enormous battery storage facilities in rural areas close to communities presents a significant fire risk, surrounded by fields of combustible dry grass and crops, coupled with severely limited emergency services locally and poor emergency vehicle access.

### **Devastating adverse impacts on wildlife**

An immediate and permanent loss of habitat and biodiversity for local wildlife, already under immense pressure from humans. Mile upon mile of impenetrable chain-link fences preventing native animals access to fields, woodland and water, with no sanctuaries or corridors to alleviate the impacts. This area is home to large numbers of native mammals including deer, badgers, foxes, hares, rabbits, stoats and weasels – as well as diverse bird, insect and plant species – all of which need hundreds of acres of unrestricted territory in order to survive.

### **Solar panels are not economically viable**

The current drive to destroy thousands of acres of high-quality land comes from self-interested developers and landowners making speculative and largely unsubstantiated claims, looking to access lucrative taxpayer subsidies under the banner of 'net zero/sustainability,' rather than as a result of a cohesive approach to the UK's energy supply and demand picture as a whole. The current 'green strategy' appears to be predicated upon maximising the number of apparent renewable energy developments they can force through planning at the same time, simply to meet political targets, with scant regard for their cost-efficiency or long-term damage, and before the press and public have sufficient evidence of the significant and inherent flaws in their claims.

Indeed large solar farms such as this proposed development are so ineffective that they are not economically viable unless propped up by substantial taxpayer-funded subsidies, and they represent a negligible return on investment. Add to that the enormous hidden costs of decommissioning the equipment when it reaches the end of its life, and the developers and landowners are no longer around to be held accountable, and this proposal is exposed as a monstrous time bomb left for the next generation; a hollow sham of a 'green initiative' and in truth a government-sponsored raid on the Treasury by a small group of self-interested

individuals, akin to the disastrous Private Finance Initiative which left future generations saddled with eye-watering amounts of long-term expensive debt.