

With due respect to the planning officer, I have some concerns in that the planning application for East Park Energy is getting to critical time line points before final stages/decisions making. I wish to highlight my concerns on points made to date and as to - what is the current status of the topics listed ?, who the points have been raised with ?, what are the responses or who has owned the outstanding action?. Upon viewing this information, I can then decide on whether concerns in my consultation comments have been addressed or need follow up submissions in time for deadlines set out for this examination.

I note both the applicant's response to SEPE on deadlines and repeat information, and the response SEPE has sent on the issues regarding time for responses. Unfortunately, I also do not feel I have these responses from the applicant, or responsible parties (e.g. highways) for me to know if further questions exist around the responses. So would respectfully request the planning inspectorate to highlight how to resolve these matters within current timescales.

- Firstly, I would say it is very difficult to raise comments against the categories given, an understanding of definitively what to lodge comment against in my view lacks clarity, even after reading support docs. I obviously do not have experience using this system but have worked in many technical business areas for years, so would hope it was intuitive to the public
- Additionally tried putting some points in the search box on the planning website does not bring up detail related to the points, so how can I therefore feel that consultation has taken place, as I do not have the ability to access answers
- Thirdly at this point I have raised numerous 'have your say' comments and attended a number of meetings, so have engaged fully with the process, but unfortunately at this point have no idea who points have been highlighted/allocated to, and if a single one raised has a response comment or status of it. This concerns me greatly as the timetable is progressing towards a point where responses to points should be known, not be at a point where consultation is closed, which is not that far away. Surely this is an iterative process discussing points raised, so do not agree with East Parks statement about SEPE re raising questions etc, I am experiencing a similar situation.

Could I respectfully request that responses are provided as to what has been determined under all the have your say comments I have raised and the pics taken to support the points, or a document that clearly addresses the issues raised, in clear unambiguous terms of mitigation

Below I have included various points raised (all photos are already on the planning website), but have included a couple to support one comment raised, which are substantial issues to be considered particularly the ones around safety (e.g. site entrance proposed at Little Staughton) as one key item.

I would respectfully request some timely responses please, before the examine process gets to a to later stage to have my say.

One example a comment raised is in following text, along with a few referred to pictures

To be read in conjunction with uploaded pictures

1) Site Access points

SA09

Can the applicant explain further the reasons for site access SA09 near Little Staughton Village. The access point has been placed in a dangerous position just past a bend and with limited long visibility of the road in both directions, also it has been proposed to be very close to Little Staughton village & houses. Why is it not sited further away from the village on straighter roads and also why widen the road impacting the view considerably when entering our village, potentially with impact to hedgerow/screening to widen the road, and provide access. Surely not a suitable location for safety reasons and to near the vicinity of the village.

**See uploaded [pic no's AC1, AC2, AC3, AC4, AC5 \(access photos\)](#)





2) All Access points

Secondly would like to understand how the applicant would construct all the access points, specific detail like how much tree/hedge row would be lost to each one, how wide is the access proposed to be, what will be done to stop mud going on the road over 3yrs work, and which access points on the map are construction vs longer term.

Impact statement: Views every time passing these points will show the swathes of panels across fields every time you come into green end Little Staughton and all other access points will be a similar dramatic impact on currently enjoyed scenic views, with little screening in a number of places if this is not carefully considered and details specifically stated up front.

The solar panel development near St Neots, shows a depressing mud bath with signs and barriers, wide openings, this needs to be avoided in this application.

3) Drainage

Further issues need to be flagged to the planning inspector and highways department/council around drainage in the area of the proposed development and its knock-on impact due to the undulating landscape and type of soil, linked with very narrow country lanes, and in some cases insufficient ditches for increased water runoff.

- a) The absence of farmers being able to maintain channels through the soil underground (e.g. mole buster equipment) which helps drain water off some of the 1900 acres of land, would subject to permission being granted for this application be covered in panels and become a major concern, in that run off water into ditches (and likely mud/silt) would be irregular instead of a steady trickle through these channels, it would mean a mass run off of water as soon as rain occurs as a result of the umbrella created by the circa 700,000 panels, and no underground drainage performed by farmers any longer.

The impact of point a) above would be:

b) Excessive water run off flowing into ditches WHERE ditches exist, and due to the increased volume of water would not likely be able to cope, as many ditches have not been designed with great amounts capacity. Even the one pictured in (DR02 very large field ditch) Is flowing into another ditch (pics DR4 +DR6) that has very small capacity therefore has no substantial flow rate to take the increased volume of water, Additionally, sites without ditches or poorly maintained ones would just flow straight onto roads, as already occurred over many years but substantially worse, along with mixed sludge.

c) Roads would become even more likely to be unpassable for road traffic due to deep flooding (as has occurred on this same stretch of road where pics are taken) and mud onto roads in numerous places. Already historically villages have been unable to get through to their destination or return to houses by car on many village roads due to flood levels and road closures in multiple locations, and that's without any additional water.

d) Kimbolton river near the bend has constantly over flowed, if water from this development causes further problems Kimbolton may become cut off and children not get to Kimbolton school as it has only two directions of access in Kimbolton. Other flood spots are bridge in pictures at Great Staughton and near the Kangaroo junction (Pic BR01,BR02), and the brook running alongside houses in Staploe

[See examples Pics DR1.DR2,DR3,DR4,DR5,DR6,DR7,DR8,DR9,DR20,DR11](#)



4. Road Suitability

- Excess water flooding roads, along with the likelihood of mud being left on the road and large increased volumes of traffic due to construction, is a recipe for disaster for anyone using the surrounding network of minor roads, so serious safety issues exist.
- Visibility along these unclassified class roads, and sharp bends is again a recipe for accidents to happen, these are country lanes not

A class roads and are insufficient to support this development/volume of increased traffic.

- Increased flooding is likely to further damage these small village roads, when winter comes and roads break down due to ice expansion especially when used by heavy traffic with increased weight volumes (e.g. heavy machinery/Substantial amount of Construction materials). Has funding for of any repair/road resurfacing costs over the 3 years development and afterwards due to the wear put on them, been allocated by highways agency/council/developer, and what about the serious impact to locals trying to use these narrow routes along with associated pot hole/ car damage?
- Roads in the vicinity planned for this development are not at all in a good state of repair (see example pics), pot hole repairs in this country are already under financial stress and need billions spending to resolve the issue. Therefore, two issues exist, firstly the construction traffic generated by workers cars and lorries can only damage the roads further, or even cause an accident as they become substantially worse supporting this planning application project. Eventually if this is approved when completed in 3 years' time, it is likely to leave a legacy for highways department having to do substantial full-scale resurfacing on numerous roads that have been impacted for miles, putting a major cost on the government/public

[*See Pics RS1 thru to RS11 \(road examples\)](#)

5. Views

There are so many views across the fields that will be absolutely devastated if this proceeds, attached are just a few selections of pictures that explain this, and viewing them should need no further explanation of why this development in this place should not proceed

- Pic View from Little Staughton church from churchyard, church dated from C13, bench in churchyard to be able to sit in and reflect

[*See pic VW02, VW03](#)

- Pic general across fields near Little Staughton, views would be obliterated

*See pic VW01

Summary: There are many other such views that make this area the place it is, to propose putting panels across this farmland is fundamentally flawed on so many fronts raised by so many people, and is unbelievable the developers consider it viable in their opinion, due to the impact to countryside and risk mentioned











