

Deadline 5 Submission.

The manner in which the Deadline 4 submissions from EPE have been permitted to be submitted such a long period after the deadline made it impossible for me to respond to anything in detail.

I will therefore restrict my questions and comments to the VSI and the PROW and landscape management plan, as it impacts on the PROWs and also where incorrect titles have been used.

Personally I feel that the Examination has been wrongly weighted to ensure that the residents and organisations wishing to object/prevent this development have been thwarted at every turn.

- Deadlines have been set that EPE have not had to adhere to and information has been released to the public domain with inadequate time for people to read it comprehensively
- The periods for objecting/commenting have frequently fallen during holiday periods or included bank holidays, these have been included in the time period rather than later dates being given.
- Not all people requesting to speak and had applied to were not at the second examination then invited to. They had to make do with asking questions.
- The examiner knowingly or not made objectors feel uncomfortable and as if they were wasting time.

Visual Site Inspection

The rationale behind this was to give a true feel of the way that the solar farm would impose itself on the users of the PROWs both in the site and the surrounding area. At present these are of wide rolling countryside with views spreading for many miles.

This was not what was achieved. It gave a fishbowl view of a very blinkered nature. It also made it very difficult to gauge where the short pieces of film were taken from. There is no follow on order for the films as they are loaded on the website and no title to describe where they start and finish. The distortion is unbelievable. The cables from the pylons show this very clearly on the Hail Weston site. Several of the sections of film appear to be repeated under different headings. There are no views taking in the panoramas which make the area so popular with people. These will all be blanked out by tall panels and suspect trees and hedgerow planting. There will no longer be a landscape as such.

This was a futile exercise that does not fulfil the criteria of replacing a site visit and the area being looked at with human eyes from all angles.

6.1. Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual Impact 15 July 2026

Again this was submitted very late giving no real time for a thorough review to be undertaken.

I would draw attention to the fact that the Riseley Wolds are constantly throughout the document referred to as 5.6.28. Riseley Clay Farmland not as shown in all Borough documents including the Local Plan.

The reference to the condition of the present hedges can be tracked back to the start of consultation on this proposal – the farmers involved stopped managing them and also started to leave the fields to ‘wilding’ or seeded with inappropriate wildflower mixes.

The charts in 5.8.44 show that there will be a significant detrimental effect on a high number of the PROWS

5.8.71. actually states that there will be significant negative affects in sites A,B,C and D and several of the roads such as Great Staughton will be a significant negative impact.

These comments are very brief and concentrate on access and landscape only.

Put these with the submissions on the other facets of this proposals and it becomes a very flawed and negative proposal that should not be permitted to proceed.

If they can't win us over with their rhetoric what hope is there for the landscape and the future of this area if they get onto the land