

Deadline 6 Submission:

Project Reference: East Park Energy – Brockwell

Submitted by: Simon C E Lane

Date: 17th August, 2026

I have attended the open meetings and tried to keep abreast of the numerous documents that have been published by EPE and their various advisors.

My view has not changed to that at the outset and my objections remain the same.

1. The scheme is too large and overbearing for the area and will industrialise best and most versatile farmland for years to come and it is unlikely to be restored.
2. The claimed output of the solar panels as has been demonstrated and is supported by credible research is far below that claimed by EPE making the scheme only viable due to the Battery installation selling back energy taken from traditional power stations at peak rates.
3. The Battery Storage installation presents a huge fire, environmental and human pollution hazard which is being hugely glossed over.
4. The siting of the Battery Storage area over/adjacent to a live gas main demonstrates the lack of attention to detail from EPE and together with numerous other claims demonstrates that their only aim is to obtain an approval at all costs to enable them to sell the scheme at profit.
5. It has been demonstrated that EPE claims of Carbon Efficiencies are entirely negated when allowing for manufacture, transposition, construction and decommissioning output.
6. The effect of the traffic generated on the local road network and the community has been consistently played down. To effectively police the documented travel plan will be a huge task and well beyond the resource of the Local Authority.
7. Many of the technical documents produced and those that relate to BESS safety are beyond the expertise of the Local Authority as they admitted at the last hearing. It is strongly recommended that an independent audit be undertaken at the developers cost to enable an authoritative judgment of safety to be made.
8. May I politely suggest that the inspector should undertake a further, more comprehensive physical inspection of the area to better understand the local landscape and concerns of the communities affected. Other than two unaccompanied visits largely restricted to roads excluding footpaths, reliance is being placed on film footage presented by the developer which cannot hope to accurately reflect the physical situation of the roads, footpaths and landscape network covering six plus villages and encompassing 1900 acres of prime arable land.

And finally, but very importantly considering the very high and specialist content of the various expert submissions made on behalf of the Developer. I know that the inspector will be aware of the overriding duty of experts acting for the developer to act in a strictly impartial manner. This duty overrides client loyalty, should avoid advocacy, acknowledge detracting facts and not to defend the indefensible in a partisan manner. Could the therefore inspector please confirm how this duty has been enforced and tested during the hearing?

17.08.2026