

Submission ID: 37821

My submission is in response to Open Hearings discussions and agenda items at ISH2 not discussed due to lack of time. It includes photos and videos. The latter may need to be submitted by e-mail due to file size.

## Deadline 6 Submission - Response to Open Hearings discussions and agenda items at ISH2 not discussed due to lack of time.

1. The Applicant's reliance on the mantra "NPPF Net Zero targets trumps all".
  - 1.1. I note that the NPPF long term goal is net zero by 2050 and legally binding Government target is 81% reduction by 2035.
  - 1.2. It should be noted that, in ES Chp 14, Climate Change the Applicant states that "the earliest payback period is 6 years" (Table 14.6). It is curious that this has changed from the statement in Chp 14 of the PEIR (Table 14.4) which gave 10 years and, conveniently, almost exactly compensates for the delay in connection date to at least Oct 2029 (subject to a Grampian condition) since the date originally provided by Nat Grid (now NESO) of 2026.
  - 1.3. Whilst not technically qualified to comment on the accuracy of their calculations, I do have 2 comments to make:
    - 1.3.1. The carbon cost of replacing all 2.2 million panels over the lifetime of the project - possible starting as early as year 5 - has been played down by saying "it is anticipated that emissions related to manufacturing and transport will be significantly decarbonised by the time replacement is required as such this provides a conservative assumption." They provide no evidence.
    - 1.3.2. A study by Cranfield University for the Stop Sunnica campaign states that the Sunnica Scheme (albeit with some different parameters including battery storage and no panel replacement) **"does not reach net-zero in its lifetime and can be considered a carbon emitter"**. Ref: EN010106-004294-DL2 - SNTS Written Representation Annex F - Carbon - Cranfield University - 11Nov22.pdf. The ExA recommended not to grant a DCO for the Sunnica proposal.
  - 1.4. It starts to look that it is not correct to sacrifice all other considerations on the altar of "Net Zero". If the Applicant is serious about saving the planet, they should cancel the project altogether.
2. Food Growing Areas. (ref ISH2 Agenda item 3G Socioeconomics, omitted from ISH2 due to lack of time)
  - 2.1. Cherwell Collective told us a lot about the merits of "Food Forests" at OH3 but there is no indication on their website - or indeed in the few "gardens" they do operate that they have any experience of actually growing Food Forests. They rely heavily on volunteers and it is not clear how well managed their existing projects are. What happens if they abandon the areas "given" to them on BWSF? What obligations do they have to maintain the site and avoid leaving an unsightly mess?
  - 2.2. We are told that most of the 30 hectares are to be put to commercial use not for the Community. Residents of CH have already objected to this (REP5-072). We have since then spoken to the farmer, who currently gets excellent agricultural crops from field 2.116. His opinion, based on years of experience farming in the area, is that the plan for commercial growing of onions on this field will simply not work.
  - 2.3. Therefore, with the backing of Hanborough Parish Council, we reiterate our call to remove field 2.116 and northern half of 2.115 from the order limits. As well as field 2.34 on the grounds of unsuitability on flooding issues and dangerous access.
3. Views from Purwell farm
  - 3.1. During the ASI on Tuesday 8 October, the ExA saw for themselves the view towards St Peter & St Paul grade 1\*, Church Hanborough from viewpoint 38. The photomontage of this viewpoint at year 15 shows a narrow corridor of 3m hedging but with the spire still visible at the end of the tunnel. Chris Lacoite, who was present, was keen to point out a band of trees planned for half way down the hill - it was not clear how this would mitigate the view - but failed to mention that the PRoW from Purwell that we followed along the edge of the field containing sheep, would also be entirely screened on its western side by a 3m hedge "in mitigation" -

obliterating the view of the spire (or, indeed the band of trees!) for the whole length of this path until a 90deg turn was made at viewpoint 38.

4. Noise. (ref ISH2 Agenda item 3h omitted from ISH2 due to lack of time)
  - 4.1. At issue specific hearing 1 on the 15th of May, I asked the applicant to explain why there is no assessment of noise during construction on residential receptors. Richard Calvert for the applicant claimed that there **is** such an assessment covered in appendix 13.2 which is app 212 so that is considered fully at all residential receptors - he then corrected himself and said "the **affected** residential receptors. For the operational phase noise he said they selected receptors based on those which are located closest to the redline boundary and those most likely to be affected by noise. That's how they were chosen.
  - 4.2. I have checked appendix 13.2 again and can confirm that there is **NO** assessment of noise on any individual residential receptors in the construction phase.
  - 4.3. I once again question their unsubstantiated claims in 1.5.10 and 1.5.11 of this appendix that noise from pile driving will be transient, lasting only 1-2 minutes for each receptor - even though admitting it will be audible from outside the site. At 1-2 minutes per pile, the noise would last for whole days at a time in the densely covered panel area of all 3 sites - especially in the highly contoured central and south sites where a bowl effect will cause the noise to reverberate around the valleys. Where is the Applicant's evidence that this construction noise will only be "minor adverse"?
  - 4.4. SBW's community Impact Report included a sound recording of pile driving at Blenheim's small solar farm north of Woodstock. A loud sound could be heard for days on end from Shipton Slade - over 1km away.
5. Bird surveys (ref ISH2 Agenda item 3c Bird Strike)
  - 5.1. The applicant claimed that bird surveys over the past two years showed no flocks of large birds.
  - 5.2. Local residents have provided photographic and video evidence to the contrary. Flocks have been observed summer and winter in fields due to contain solar panels. The evidence comes from several different sources.
    - 5.2.1. Swans in field 2.60 near Worton/Cassington dated Dec 2023



5.2.2. Canada Geese in field 2.60 near Worton/Cassington dated Sept 2024



5.2.3. Swans in field 2.110 near Cassington dated 11 Aug 2024



5.2.4. Canada Geese in field 2.01 near Bladon dated 28 July 2025



5.2.5. Video of Canada Geese in field 2.01 near Bladon dated 27 Feb 2025 is submitted at D6 under separate cover.

5.2.6. Video of Canada Geese in field 2.01 near Bladon dated 25 July 2025 is submitted at D6 under separate cover.