

Dear Sir I make this submission following the Issue Specific Subject Hearing 3 at Wyboston on the 9th of June relating to Public Rights of Way and BESS.

In the opening statement the applicant referred to a planning principle 2.2, I quote from the transcript "the design principles established for the project, with reference to section 5.2 of the design approach document, reference APP 034 These design principles include firstly, principle 2.1 protect views towards tall church spires, which are visually prominent landmarks in the landscape, and contribute towards creating a sense of place. Principle 2.2 protect the sense of openness, wide views, and skylines within with long views from elevated positions across the Kim Valley" which I understand relates to the creation or changes to skylines and how this should not be part of the scheme. I respectfully state that the panels proposed for the ridgeline north of the Bolnhust and Keysoe Bridleway 37 are on the top of the ridge line. I acknowledge the fact that, following the initial consultation, the applicant moved the panels back from the bridleway in a northerly direction by about 50m. However the top of the ridgeline is relatively flat, so this change will have made very little difference. The panels will be seen from many miles in both an easterly and southerly direction, and in addition they will create a new ridgeline when viewed from Mill Hill (B660) and church road in Keysoe, as well as from the historic church of Saint Mary's in. Thus, I believe this area of proposed panels is breaching the principle stated in section 2.2.

Secondly, Sir can I ask why the applicant has chosen the proposed development in an area with such a high density of public rights of way? The sheer number of bridleways and footpaths in the area of North Bedfordshire is one of the outstanding qualities of the area and offers unrivalled opportunities to walk freely and joyfully in beautiful open countryside. I understand that this area has one of the highest densities of public rights of way in the UK and this surely makes it an inappropriate location to locate such a huge solar farm.

Thirdly, Sir, can I ask the applicant to commit to using not tree whips at 18 inches but more established planting, for example 4ft saplings. I have researched this with a number of the leading UK growers, and they have all confirmed that they grow at circa 30cm per annum so an order placed before the build commences would ensure saplings of at least 1m or more. So, saplings are readily available if planned for and should be treated as part of the cost of the application and should be ordered in the expectation of getting permission or at the very worst immediately on the granting of a DCO.

Finally, I just wanted to say that I sat in the hearings all day and heard a lot of very well thought through and professionally delivered points made by the audience. However, I was particularly unimpressed by the applicants responses. They mainly read from prepared answers, finding the one they felt responded to the question, being the nearest they had in their book of answers, but often totally missing the point of the question and answering something totally different. There was no demonstration of any empathy as to the impact of the proposed development on the local area or any attempt to explain some of the technical jargon in a way that the audience would understand. I fully support the point made by Bedford Borough Council that the applicant needs to fund the provision of leading experts to support the evaluation on behalf of the local authorities as the area of BESS is moving so fast and is so specialist whilst at the same time being potentially very high risk.

I trust the examiner will take all the considerations into account and reach what has to be the most obvious solution which is to deny approval to this awful scheme that will destroy a beautiful area in North Bedfordshire/ Cambridgeshire