

I wish to state that the above document totally fails to address the issues I raised in my initial submission.

The Applicant's opening comments in the above document claim that "some" RRs indicated general support for the scheme whilst "several" RRs indicated opposition to the scheme. I would like to make it clear that only 9 RRs expressed support, most of whom have a financial interest in the scheme whilst the remaining 1297 RRs expressed total opposition. The applicant mentions each criticism in turn, using the same phrase multiple times – "The applicant acknowledgesHowever " before going on to dismiss all negative comments with "the Applicant is satisfied that" Merely referring back to the original documents does NOT address points of objection, and the Applicant seems to rely wholly on their own subjective judgements.

My points of objection :

1. Failure to adhere to Government guidelines re use of BMV farmland – The Applicant dismisses this merely by emphasising the "avoiding where possible" element of policy.2.8.9
No evidence offered of a genuine search for alternatives
Inefficiency of Solar 2.1.12 & 2.23.18 The Applicant does not address this at all merely restating government policy on solar development
2. Inappropriate scale/detrimental visual impact. Issues of inadequate mitigation are dismissed by the Applicant with comments about 3m high panels being "easily screened"
2.8.29 Applicant claims that "considerable mitigations" mean that the scheme would not industrialize the countryside. This is a highly subjective view which is far from the reality of existing solar plants.
Applicant claims to have removed areas from the scheme – in fact very small areas of literally a few meters were removed but replaced with alternative areas to retain the 400MW headline rate and the original acreage 2.1.54
3. Cumulative impact on the area. 2.20 The Applicant claims that the cumulative impact of major infrastructure projects in North Bedfordshire including EPE Solar Plant, East West Rail construction, Universal Studios development and a new city at Tempsford are "not significant". This is unrealistic in the extreme and fails to understand the huge pressure currently being placed on one small area of the country
4. Failure to consult – again the Applicant merely repeats the type of consultation carried out and states that they believe they sought engagement. They fail to address the criticism of the transparency of the process 2.2
5. Human impact – this was totally downplayed with the Applicant's response being to appoint a community liaison officer!

The Applicant dismisses noise concerns again just referring back to the original plans. Concerns over endless hours of pile driving were only mentioned as something "panel installation mitigation measures will eliminate" !! 2.15.2

Increase in crime was not seen as an issue and the Applicant mentions liaison with local police – failing to realise that we do not have local police in this area!! 2.7

Loss of access to the countryside. Applicant simply states that there would be no loss of access but fails to address the issue that walkers would not wish to walk between miles of fencing and panels. 2.8

Dangers of BESS 2.4 Again the Applicant fails to convince in this area, given the well known and well documented examples of BESS fires at existing sites around the country.

6. Traffic Management. This is a huge concern yet the Applicant again just refers back to the original plan. 2.15
The Applicant relies on the use of the cross field access to the site being used 2.1.35. However from the experience of existing Solar plants it is well known that HGV drivers will use the shortest routes regardless of instructions.
Lack of monitoring and enforcement was dismissed with terms such as "encouragement" and "instruct" still being seen as sufficient to stop HGV and worker traffic using local lanes. The risk of material damage to local lanes was not accepted and an example of mitigation measures was a wheel wash facility !! – obviously damage to road surfaces, verges, properties and danger to road users is far more pertinent
The Applicant failed to quantify the ongoing increase in traffic levels and disruption involved in the ongoing replacement of equipment across the whole site

7. Environmental Burden – no acceptance of this by the Applicant who seems unwilling to undertake further and more comprehensive studies but states that there will be "adverse impact on species but the effects are not significant".
2.3.10/12 "Assessment concludes no significant residual adverse effects on any ecological receptor". How is it possible to cover 1900 acres of fields with glass panels with no significant effect ?? – this is physically impossible. No explanation for this subjective statement is offered by the Applicant.

I believe that the Applicant has totally failed to address concerns and objections and there seems to be a reluctance to do any more to address issues raised or justify subjective decisions made.