

Written Representation
East Park Energy solar application by BSSL Cambsbed 1 Limited

Further to my initial written objection registering as an Interested Party and my verbal objection at the Open Floor Hearing on Tuesday 17th March 2026 I have now uploaded same as requested by the Inspector, Mr. G. Sword on the day.

Further Observations based on the Preliminary Hearing, Open Floor Hearing on Tuesday 17th March and the Issue Specific Hearing on Wednesday 18th March 2026 follow.

Having studied the detailed proposals of the application, my overriding impression is one of surprise and dismay that it has reached this stage. The siting of such a colossal industrial array of steel and glass on productive farmland in a historic, rural landscape is something that should not be permitted.

The 'detailed' application, although large in volume is remarkably short in detail with much being left until after the DCO is issued. As was highlighted many times by those who spoke and indeed the legal representatives and experts speaking on behalf of the applicant, the facts on the ground are being twisted by reference to technical documents which although produced with the best of intent lend themselves to subjective interpretation.

It is well known that Planning Consultants employ those best able to present a superficially robust case in the knowledge that communities generally lack equal financial resources and technical ability to seriously challenge what is being contended. It is not a level playing field and the scrutiny must therefore come from the planning inspector.

In this instance the community have worked together tirelessly to highlight in detail the many flaws contained within the submission. So many mistakes and omissions across all areas, not least in the calculation of net zero, construction plans (particularly with regards traffic movements and the unsuitability of the local road network), flooding, soil analysis, biodiversity and the role of the Bess within the scheme which is designed to be used for arbitrage and will almost certainly involve the import of all energy from the grid, not just that from green sources.

Although I trust individual objections will carry weight, the detailed document prepared by Stop East Park Energy (an unfunded, community group), I hope will demonstrate by technical reference that the application is nothing more than a tick box based on the belief that the Secretary of State is intent of waving these applications through regardless of the case against, no matter how strongly founded.

I know that the Inspector has made an initial visit to the area and intends to conduct a more detailed reconnaissance trips during the examination process. I do believe that matters on the ground will speak for themselves regardless of the alternative spin put on things by the applicant and their advisors.

The abiding memory for me whilst attending the preliminary, open floor and specific hearings was that of the applicants Rural Land 'experts' smugly speaking for 30 minutes on why their tests show that the land in question is not Best and most Versatile farmland. Having lived in the area for ■ years I can say that the area has regularly yielded very good crops and I feel it is extremely disingenuous and deliberately misleading to try and suggest otherwise.

If it were needed, that is just one example of the whole submission, which as I said at the beginning has only one aim. That is to secure permission for the development

despite the vast array of evidence that has been produced demonstrating its unsuitability and the unanimous objections of those within the local community.

I would urge the Inspector please to take full cognizance of the extremely detailed, well researched and overwhelming conclusions of the submissions made, that the proposed development is entirely unsuitable for the area concerned and to recommend its refusal.