

East park Energy 21.05.26

Applicants Response to Written Representations April 2026

Regarding the above document, I note that the applicant has responded directly to only one of the issues that I raised, namely the applicants assertion that the proposed site should be within 15Km of the substation. Their response appears to be that the decision was entirely down to the profitability of the project. If profitability is so important to the applicant, why have they chosen a site with large north facing areas?

I did raise the issue of the north facing aspect of much of the site (particularly site C and D). I see in another document – Applicants response to SEPE April 2026 (page 59) , reference is made to the topography of the site. “National policy does not require an applicant to undertake a quantified assessment of solar resource or energy yield by slope aspect”. It beggars belief that because something so fundamentally important to solar efficiency isn’t a planning requirement, Its been effectively brushed under the carpet. Having even a modest north facing slope will have a huge detrimental effect on the energy output, particularly in the winter when domestic demand for energy is at its highest. During most of December/January the maximum altitude of the sun even at midday is less than 17 degrees on this site. The optimum angle for solar panels at this time of year in the latitude of the proposed site is 66 degrees. On even a modest north facing site the effect of the shadow cast by the southernmost array of panels will be hugely detrimental to output of all the panels to the north. The applicant claims that the effect of a north facing slope (up to 5 degrees) would have a negligible effect on yield. Where did they get that information from?

Other concerns that I raised including onsite and Cyber security, origin/behaviour of workforce, local accommodation, etc all went unanswered. How many other unanswered questions are there?