

From: [Jean Tunstill](#)
To: [East Park Energy](#)
Subject: East Park Energy Application Reference EN010141
Date: 13 July 2026 21:25:40

Post-Line 4 Submission submitted after an official approved extension until July13th

Interested Party Reference Number [REDACTED]

Mr Sword,

I have lived in Pertenhall since [REDACTED] with my husband. I have three children who were all born in this rural North Bedfordshire village.

As a long-term local resident and an Interested Party, my perspective of East Park Energy is informed by direct involvement with the 2015 Manor Farm solar project.

In that instance, the Bedford Planning Department correctly rejected the application - and planning permission was refused. This was due to severe localized impacts.

The decision to not grant approval was subsequently overturned and voted through by the Borough Councillors on the Development Management Committee.

This historical precedent demonstrated a systemic, long-standing issue in the planning system: the disenfranchisement of the local community's voice by higher-tier authorities who fail to understand the localized reality on the ground.

The East Park Energy Project cannot be allowed to disrupt the lives of so many local residents: solar capture should be on rooftops - not on green fields which are needed for food production.

Have we forgotten the slogan "Dig for Victory" - this was launched to help the nation survive severe food rationing and U-boat blockades.

The recent decisions by the Energy Secretary to overrule independent planning inspectors on major solar sites have caused profound alarm across the North Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire border communities.

It signals a dangerous shift where localized democratic consensus is treated as secondary to national targets.

The national need for renewable energy is not an absolute mandate to override severe, localized harms. Ed Miliband - in my opinion - is making a mockery of the whole process of the NSIPs and emphasizes a harsh reality that whatever we prove:

- That this area of 1,900 acres of farmland - stretching over 15 miles across Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire of good quality best and most versatile Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land.
- The cost of transporting the panels from China.
- The use of [REDACTED] to produce the panels.
- The foreign labour-needed workforce.
- The loss of wildlife due to destruction of local habitation.
- The detrimental effect on the village communities.
- The proposed three years of substantial disruption and noise - which is planned by the construction phase - is unrealistic for the rural roads.
- Local impacts on the public rights of way.

All of the above need to be further addressed before the end of this consultation period.

Nothing is going to stand in the Energy Secretary's way, and we will be ridden rough-shod over "like it or lump it"!

From the many meetings that I have attended and the on-line consultations that I have listened to, I can see no meaningful engagement, from East Park Energy's Management Team, to address the concerns raised in the objections made by over hundreds of residents and many other interested parties.

Their stance seems to be "to make it up " as they go along!

The body language at the recent meeting, at Wyboston Lakes, of many from the East Park contingent seemed to be one of irritation to many of the questions directed at them!

My opinion is that they did not either want to give an answer - or they just didn't know WHAT THE ANSWER SHOULD BE

- The data-driven assessments from CPRE Bedfordshire and Stop East Park Energy have frequently been sidelined by the developer, prompting widespread community backlash and yet more questions to be answered.

- **I hope that the Inspector will re-look at the developer's environmental and site-design models that appear to downplay the true impact of the 400MW solar complex.**
- How will the Inspector conclude that the Landscape and Visual Impact model, provided by the developer, will adequately screen 700,000 solar panels?
- Does the Inspector agree that there has been enough evidence from East Park Energy to offer reassurance that fire safety has not been compromised for financial gain?

There is a distinct lack of evidence that there is a secure financial buffer for decommissioning and restoration of this industrial SOLAR FARM.

For my part, I do not believe or feel reassured by the developer's dialogue - given recently on the fire safety aspect. Does the Inspector intend to ask for further evidence on the proposed safety and serious fire hazards?

There are no adequately- operating fire stations near to the site.

I did feel that, at times, there seemed to be less time given to interested parties to speak at Wyboston Lakes - especially when due to an administration error, there were two extra slots that were not being used - as below.

- The lady that spoke on the Bess Connection. The lady from the Horse Society and the lady that was so knowledgeable on the environment all had valuable contributions but were very much cut short.
- It seems OK for the developer to keep saying "we will put it in writing" when they were unable to answer specific questions directed at them.
- It did seem that the interested parties were not given the opportunity to speak fully.
- I would also question when the interested parties are going to be able to view the video footage of the site, that was promised by the developers, after they requested an extension of time to produce this.
- I BELIEVE THAT THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN PROVIDED BEFORE JULY 10th.
- It is now July 13th and the next major submission date is July 21st Will the interested parties be given adequate opportunity to respond to this video before the next submission date? Or will there be an extension to the next submission date?
- I have documentary evidence - from the last solar farm that was built in Pertenhall - regarding the impact on the rural roads. I do not believe that anyone from East Park

Energy will have any knowledge of a solar build unless they had actually been through it and have firsthand experience. I have no confidence in the developing team's answers.

- I do not believe that the developer has given any reassurance on any of the aspects of the deliveries on the rural roads, the impact of a three-year build on all the communities with traffic noise, pollution and physical and mental health for each individual resident.
- The loss of green space and fresh air will have an adverse effect on mental well being

I would state that I do not believe that adequate responses to all of the above questions will be provided and that local democratic needs and concerns will be met.

I hope that I am proved wrong and that our voices are heard and common sense prevails.

Jean Tunstill

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, obscuring the name and any contact information that might have been present.

This e-mail is intended solely for the addressee. The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete the message and any attachments and notify the sender of mis-delivery. Any use or disclosure of the contents is unauthorized and may be unlawful. All liability for viruses is excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law.