

ORAL REPRESENTATION AT AND COMMENTS FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION
BY THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE OF AN APPLICATION BY BSSL CAMBSBED 1 LIMITED
FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE EAST PARK ENERGY
PROJECT 'EPE' BY MR CHRISTOPHER LACEY- LOCAL INTERESTED PARTY AT

ISH3 -PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY “PROWs” AT 10.00 AM ON TUESDAY 9th JUNE 2026

POINTS

1. Part of the Draft DCO is the Outline PROW Management Plan which covers the applicants plan for the PROWs within the Site Order Limits during the 3-year construction period and beyond. This plan has serious flaws with narrow corridors through masses of solar panels over the construction period with pile drivers knocking in the something like 1.4 million piles supporting the 700,000 solar panels, the noise is likely to be too loud for horse and rider to navigate the bridleways and byways safely even with 20-metre-wide exclusion corridors surrounding the PROWs during construction. Please would the applicant provide calculations of the anticipated decibels generated by their proposed pile driving for a rider or walker using the PROW at the edge of the applicants proposed 20 metre exclusion corridor/ buffer between the user and the works?
2. The visual impact of the PROWs are also covered in 6.1 ES Vol 1 Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual (APP-041) in which the applicant sets out numerous viewpoints which appear to be deliberately chosen to play down the impact of this massive industrial solar complex on the visual amenity and views over open uninterrupted views of open countryside and the views and settings of important heritage assets from PROWs. The number of viewpoints dilutes the fact that at many of the most important viewpoints the applicant themselves assesses the project impact as having a moderate or major adverse impact on the significance of the view from the PROW. For many more of the PROWs the applicant considers there is no impact or the harm is minor adverse these routes. These PROW routes are important to both local users together with many other visitors including ramblers, walking and equestrian groups who benefit from experiencing important views of nationally, regionally and locally significant heritage assets and open agrarian countryside. The applicant's classification of these views as not suffering harm or only a minor adverse harm is NOT an objective assessment of the user experience and the damage to it that the EPE project would cause.
3. There is not one of the footpaths, by ways or bridleways running through, adjacent to or overlooking sites A, B, C and D that would not suffer a major adverse effect on the significance of the views and settings looked across. The

majority of the PROW's would be devastated by this proposed vast industrial solar complex whose impact would be massive and irreversible.

4. I can speak as a regular PROW user and as a keen walker, birdwatcher and historian there is not one of these PROW's that I do not walk month to month on sites A, B, C and D and on the first three sites I usually walk most of the major PROWs over a typical week. Almost all these PROWs benefit from inspiring views over heritage assets and or the rural habitats of flora and fauna including many precious RSPB red and amber list British bird species as well as those equally appreciated green list species.
5. This proposed massive industrial complex covering 1900 acres, a site the size of Gatwick Airport with 700,000 panels/arrays sitting at 3.15metres in height or about twice the height of an average human with a substation and equipment in the proposed BESS facility of 13.6m high well over the height of 8 average human on-site D. The user of the PROW's would have the experience of walking along an industrialised funnel with overwhelming damage to or total loss of visual amenity. To use a phrase coined by a well-known local author this solar complex would be a "Blot on the Landscape". Views over and the settings of treasured scheduled monuments and Grade 1, 2* and 2 listed buildings together with the Great Staughton Conservation area would suffer major harm to its significance permanently.
6. The damage and magnitude of harm to the significance of the views and setting of nationally important heritage assets such as the Roman Town on EPE site C and the Villa and Bath House above EPE sites C and B. In these instances, the significance lies in the interrelationship of this settlement and its interaction with the nearby Ermine Street which was a principal road running South to North in the Romano-British period. The Roman small-town settlement on site C may have been a garrison town for Roman troops in transit. The PROW user's understanding of this interaction would be damaged materially by this EPE proposal.

Another heritage asset where the views and setting from the PROW would be hugely impacted is the double moated manor house of Cretingbury the home of important retainer of King Edward I, Sir Adam de Creting. This C13th scheduled monument and its relationship to the grade 1 listed C13th Church of All Saints Little Staughton with the unspoilt and unbroken causeway PROW between which is Little Staughton parish footpath 26, would be suffer irredeemable major harm or loss of its significance. These assets and their interrelationship are of regional importance at least. Also, of regional importance

to understanding the history of the Knights Templars in the East of England are the views from Pertenhall footpath 5 above the grade 1 listed C12th St Peter's Church Pertenhall where a Knights Templar chapel formerly sat at the end of the North Aisle. The Church's interrelationship with the site of a Knights Templar medieval moated Manor House positioned on the hill to the East of the church near to the intersection of Pertenhall parish footpath 5 and Pertenhall parish byway 25 is also of regional importance. The PROW's view of and the setting and backdrop to St Peter's Church would suffer a major or total loss to their significance should this EPE industrial complex progress.

This preposterous project which it has not been proved would not produce more CO₂e than it saves over its proposed 40-year lifetime as well as causing multiple harms not least to the PROW's and their views over locally, regionally and nationally significant heritage assets and the surrounding agrarian countryside of the North Bedfordshire Wolds and this rare rolling scenic area of Southwestern Cambridgeshire is NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

For the Inspector this is an opportunity to recommend consigning this ill-conceived EPE Project to the dustbin of the Secretary of State.

Thankyou