

Andrew Johnson, resident of Glentworth Village

Firstly, thank you for allowing to speak today having spoken previously and submitted supporting documents my points are in addition to these.

I have attended and spoke at four public hearings for solar applications close to me and naturally expressed my concerns at elements of the proposals.

Whilst I do not wish to revisit areas I have already spoke about there are recent updates now have a bearing on certain aspects.

### 1, Landscape & visual impact

The developers have presented a proposal with hedges and trees to mitigate the visual impact from the Jurassic Cliffe I now understand they have now withdrawn this proposal to provide this, I wonder why this is and are they proposing an alternative or do they now concede it cannot be disguised?

If no acceptable alternative is on the table this then throws in to question what will the area look like!

Fences with CCTV points open for all to see surrounding the development – great for tourism and the local businesses provided accommodation for visitors and let's not forget the local population. This is a major point within the application and should the question be asked about the suitability of this application as a whole based upon this point alone?

### 2, Flooding

Over the last 2 weeks we have experienced considerable flooding of the Trent floodplain ironically where the developers wish to mount the solar panels. This flooding is not an isolated occurrence, it's a floodplain and therefore needs to remain so to reduce risk to neighbouring properties and places of work. Naturally all the rainfall works it way through a network of relief channels to the River Trent and naturally soaks into the ground to the water table.

The introduction of the solar panels is going to reduce the ability of the ground to absorb rainfall as the ground soak away area is massively reduced this in turn will lead to an increased flood risk.

### 3, Vehicle Movements

Kexby Road in Glentworth is down as a major entry & exit for the construction traffic, Kexby Road if you have not visited and reviewed the access road, I would recommend you do.

Upon leaving Glentworth it turns into a single carriage way with passing places. Whilst not being a specialist in road construction looking at the roads condition today it is obvious the road structure and design is not suitable for the heavy construction traffic.

I am not sure if the expectorant is aware of the other major development that are planning to use Kexby Road. IGAS have been granted permission to open another oil drilling operation to add to the existing wells. The movement of HGV vehicles involved in the construction of the wells and those carrying away the crude oil along this road will naturally increase traffic significantly. The combined traffic movements during the years of construction are predicted to exceed 2250 per day for these applications alone, this does not take into account the other vehicle movements from the adjacent solar applications nor local traffic – we may need to rename Kexby road as an extension of the A15.

An independent survey of traffic movements, road suitability along with effects on public health is surely required as part of this application.

4, I understand tomorrow you will be looking at the specific impacts of the application in depth. Will this include the production of the solar panels from China and the well-being of the people involved in this process?

██████████ are a hidden company behind this application (██████████) and are sighted 23 times as being involved in the exploitation of the Uyghur people within China in solar panel production.

Are we in danger of supporting this exploration by allowing this supply chain?

This area has already been brought to the attention of the government with Parliament debating as this exploitation flouts world human rights and our own UK legislation.

Should this application be successful in the years ahead there will be a point of reflection on how we arrived here and the true consequences of a “knee jerk” reaction verses a sustainable workable model and the words “if only” will resonate across the barren landscape for generation to suffer.

Thank you for listening to my points in seeking a fairer analysis of this application

Additional points after public hearing of 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025

Whilst I was unable to attend the session on health & wellbeing, I was able to view remotely and was very disappointed that the applicant was unable to provide a representative (whilst I appreciate the situation there must be a team of them) to discuss this very important topic. May I ask for an update as to what the actions will be taken to conduct this review - thankyou.

In addition to the above whilst not being a specialist I have researched and have had dialog with another solar development on the effects whilst the work is being carried out and would like the following points taken into account if I may.

1, Fire, it appears that during a battery fire certain gases that are given off are classed as a danger to life yet they are proposed to be housed close to dwellings, naturally with a wind assisted will travel for a considerable distance. As the fires cannot be contained, they are clearly a major danger and therefore should be refused in this application or the developers seek to rehome all residents within a defined area.

I heard your comments on the probabilities of a fire which at some stage appears inevitable whether from this application or the adjacent ones.

I am not sure if you are aware that there are 3 water reservoirs in very close proximity of the development. Would the contaminates of a fire have an effect on this drinking water and therefore effect the health of anyone or animals exposed?

2, I keep hearing references to the land being returned to original use and livestock grazing within the development.

I read that the degeneration of the panels overtime due to aging and weather impacts on the material composition within and the supporting framework allowing this to enter the supporting area, soil and water courses.

The composition of this is as I understand is dangerous to one's health and contaminates the soil etc. If this is the case the land cannot be returned and livestock health / wellbeing is also in question.

3, The grid is now restricting connections to developments that have a proven funding line, I am unable to find any documentation from the applicant that the funding is in place. Does this if this is the case have a bearing on this application?

4, Worrying and disturbing conversations with another development that has started, should these implications be discussed in full as part of this application?

1, A continual light haze from the work / security – seen for miles

2, Major damage to road infrastructure, gas and water services under the roads fractured

3, Unable to sell properties

4, Locals unable to move outside of village – due to traffic / access

5, Working hours effecting health, noise, sleep deprivation. Shift workers

6, Damage to resident's vehicles (only street parking available) by site traffic