

I write to follow up on my written submission following the Specific Hearings 3 (REP4-048) and the subsequent response from the applicant CL-D5-01, CL-D5-02 and CL-D5-03

Firstly CL-D5-01 my concern over the creation of a new ridgeline - I can not agree with the applicant response. When I met with them in Oct 2024 on the ridgeline, I had erected a series of 3 metre high stakes all along the ridgeway set back some 25m from the Bridleway 37. These could be very clearly seen from Mill Hill in Keysoe, from Church Road in Keysoe and from the Riseley Road in a number of places. I would also state that they could be seen from many other areas further away as they sat on top of the ridgeline from where you can see for many miles in a Easterly and Southerly direction. The applicant did react and moved the panels back by some 25m (50 m from their original plan) saying that they would not be seen. This is totally incorrect - The ridgeline is flat across the top and then slopes down to the north being visible from Swineshead. Since their revised plans I have again waded the Bridleway and then inserted the poles 60m back from it in a northerly direction - they remain visible from Mill Hill, Church Road and some of the Riseley Road, as well as from many other areas further away. There is absolutely no doubt that a new ridgeline will be created which is fundamentally against planning policy and thus this area must be removed from any scheme. In October 24 they were shown fields that were not included in the scheme for panels, where they would have been hidden from all residential homes and thus a better more considerate positioning - this was ignored, demonstrating that the welfare and concerns of the local population means nothing to the applicant.

Secondly re CL-D5-02, with regard to my question as to the suitability of the proposed location and the reasons behind its choice – I do not accept the response from the applicant. It is clear that it's the grid connection that has driven the choice of location and the fact that there are numerous strong reasons to reject the choice of location were ignored.

These include

- Over 74% good Best and Most Versatile Land.
- An unrivalled network of Public Rights of Way which are used extensively by locals and by the Duke of Edinburgh's scheme as one of its first choice areas for safe trekking for the youth trying to attain their awards,
- Some significant heritage assets that will have their setting ruined
- Some significant archaeological sites
- The inefficiency of the locations due to the amount of north facing slopes to be used
- Some significant ecological factors including rare plants and species as well as the area being heavily populated with Greater Crested Newts.

Overall with the existing other Solar Farms and those currently being built the area of North Bedfordshire and West Cambridgeshire selected is becoming a sea of glass which will destroy the open landscapes and sense of a rural living we all enjoy. Furthermore is becoming clear from studies now being carried out at other solar sites that they are having a catastrophic impact on the wildlife with many species declining in very significant quantities.

Thirdly re CL-D5-03, the point relating to the use of more mature trees and not the 18inch whips that tend to be used has not been answered in their responses nor was it responded to in the specific hearing 3 when written up afterwards in section 2.2.16. I understand that the applicant does not want to commit to trees before the award of the DCO. BUT on award it will then be a good period of time before they commence work and then even longer before the first planting can commence. I do agree planting can only be done at certain times of the year to promote growth and increase the chances of survival but in order to give some degree of screening before 10 years the applicant must be advised it has to use larger older plants. I have researched the availability of UK grown, natural and indigenous hedging and have received a number of confirmations that if an order is placed for 4ft hedging /trees then they will be available in 36 months - and many will be available sooner - so the point is that the examiner, should he support the scheme, should condition it that the landscaping and screening needs to be done with more mature trees/hedging

Finally I just want to make the point that It appears to me that the applicant is not wanting to incur the costs for delivering proper professionally back plans for a number of the issues still outstanding until after the award of a DCO - this can not be right, they must be forced to have full and detailed plans for rigorous review and consideration by experts who are able to judge them with the degree of knowledge required – just spouting a whole load of pre prepared words and making a preprepared answer fit a question is not acceptable and that what I saw all through Special Hearing 3 and 4 (in particular all the concerns regards BESS.

I remain a major supporter of renewable energy but not when its poor thought through, is located on good food producing land and involves a very inefficient solution. There are many better ways of helping to achieve the goals we need in the years ahead – East Park Energy is NOT one of them and should be refused.