

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Peartree Hill Solar Farm](#)
Subject: Fw: Our response to the Examining Authority
Date: 26 August 2025 15:40:13

Objection Submission to the Pear Tree Hill Solar Project

PINS Reference: EN010157

Examination Stage

Submitted by: ERASE (East Riding Against Solar Expansion)

Introduction

The Examining Authority should be aware of the challenges faced by volunteer, community based organisations like ours, in preparing and submitting responses to this consultation.

As was mentioned at the Open Floor Hearing on 22nd July 2025, a tsunami of information has been released by the project proposers since this project was first mooted in autumn 2023, which is quite overwhelming. We believe this is a major factor in the public's lack of awareness and to an extent unwillingness to engage in, the proposals being brought forward.

ERASE wishes to congratulate the Examining Authority on the production of Document ExQ1 published on July 29th.

This 53 page document is a perfect example of the confusion and lack of clarity in this application. Questions ranging from anticipated damage to Figham Pastures, lack of permission to cross Crown Estate land and no detail on funding for reinstatement are highlighted and we look forward to seeing the applicant's responses to these questions. We would, however suggest, that any such responses would merit being put out to further public consultation before being allowed to proceed.

On their website, RWE say they have conducted 'extensive consultation'. We have not seen evidence of this. We don't doubt that RWE have complied with the AoCR pro forma but we feel that for a project on this scale and significance, this has been wholly inadequate and should be deemed inadequate by the Examining Authority.

What we have seen is a small number, over a long period, of poorly attended meetings, reflected in the low number of responses received by RWE from the public. This was brought into sharp focus at the meeting on 21st July, when only 2 members of the public attended in person, accompanied by over a dozen officials. Unfortunately this gives the impression of a detailed and important consultation being reduced to a box ticking exercise.

This lack of awareness has been reinforced in recent months by 3 pieces of work undertaken by ERASE and the local FOG (Fields of Glass) campaigns..

In October 2024, FOG (Fields of Glass), a local campaign group based in Arnold, launched a media campaign to assess the level of public support for these proposals. The overwhelming response was a lack of public awareness and shock at the scale of the proposals.

In February 2025, ERASE launched an umbrella campaign which it took to the East Riding Council. The response from councillors reflected the findings of the FOG campaign and the council unanimously agreed to launch its own public awareness initiative.

In July 2025, ERASE undertook non scientific straw polling at the Driffield Show, East Yorkshire's premier agricultural event attended by 20,000 people. Of the hundreds we spoke to, 10% were in favour with 10% against. 80% were unaware of the proposals.

As already stated, we don't doubt that RWE have undertaken the absolute minimum of consultation required by the Secretary of State, but we do feel that for a project of this scale and significance, this has been wholly inadequate. Indeed, the Examining Authority's own, extensive list of questions to the developers as mentioned above, reflects the myriad of questions being raised with us by members of the public.

The Pear Tree Hill Solar project, as proposed for East Yorkshire, presents a range of concerns and issues which we believe are inadequately addressed within the Planning Inspectorate's examination process. ERASE, a community group representing residents of surrounding villages, respectfully submits these objections in response to the initial consultation and planning documents provided by the project developers.

Objection 1: The Pear Tree Hill Project is not required for Clean Power 2030 or 2035

- **The proposed scale and location of Pear Tree Hill Solar is not aligned with the immediate needs of local energy demand or national clean energy goals.**
- The current energy production needs, both at the national level and for East Yorkshire, do not justify the large-scale conversion of agricultural land for this solar farm, especially when alternatives such as rooftop solar, brown field sites, and smaller-scale community-driven projects are more appropriate and sustainable.
- The **UK Government's Clean Power 2030 and 2035** strategies emphasize diversified energy sources, with an increasing role for decentralized, community-based energy systems. Pear Tree Hill, a highly industrialized solar farm, is inconsistent with this vision and undermines the potential for more localized, low-

carbon energy solutions.

Objection 2: Grid Reliability and Curtailment Risks

- A significant concern is the **reliability of the grid** in accommodating the scale of energy generation from the Pear Tree Hill project. As the national grid faces increasing pressures from intermittent renewable energy sources, there are legitimate fears that the additional energy generated by this solar farm could lead to **curtailment**, where surplus energy is wasted because the grid cannot absorb it.
 - This would **undermine the project's contribution to sustainable energy generation** and raise questions about its long-term viability. Increased energy curtailment could further stress the national grid and harm the efficiency of the UK's energy strategy.
 - We urge an in-depth assessment of the grid's capacity to integrate Pear Tree Hill's energy output without causing disruptions or unnecessary energy waste.
-

Objection 3: Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- The **Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)** submitted by the developers is insufficient and does not comply with the requirements of Reg. 12(2)(b) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
 - Key aspects that the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) required to be scoped into the **Environmental Statement (ES)** are either **missing or inadequately addressed**. Specifically:
 - **Cultural heritage, legacy and landscape impacts:** The visual and cultural impact of such a large-scale industrial project on East Yorkshire's landscape has not been properly evaluated.
 - **Local bio diversity:** The impact on local flora and fauna has not been comprehensively assessed, particularly given the ecological importance of the site for various species.
 - **Soil quality and agricultural productivity:** There is a lack of consideration for the long-term impacts on soil quality and the ability of the land to support food production, which is a critical issue in the face of rising food security concerns.
-

Objection 4. Unsuitability of Local Road Infrastructure

- The existing country roads surrounding the proposed site are narrow, winding,

and feature poor visibility.

- These roads are not designed to accommodate Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), which would be required in large numbers during the construction and maintenance of an industrial solar plant. Increased HGV traffic would significantly raise the risk of accidents, congestion, and long-term damage to local infrastructure.
 - This presents a serious safety concern for local residents and road users.
-

Objection 5. Proximity to the Proposed Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

- The proposed solar development lies in close proximity to the proposed extension of the Yorkshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The scale of the development—spanning 4.2 square miles—would make it highly visible across a vast area.
 - This visual intrusion would fundamentally undermine the principles and objectives of the AONB designation, which aims to preserve and enhance natural beauty.
 - The industrial character of such a large-scale development is incompatible with the rural and scenic qualities of the surrounding landscape.
-

Objection 6. Flood Risk and Lack of Precedent for Impact Modelling

- The site lies within a known floodplain, raising serious concerns about the potential for increased flood risk to nearby villages and settlements.
 - The compaction of ground across such an extensive area is unprecedented in the UK, meaning current flood risk models may not accurately reflect the consequences.
 - In the United States, several communities have reported increased flooding following the installation of large-scale solar farms, with little to no recourse or compensation for affected residents. Similar outcomes must be avoided in East Yorkshire.
-

Objection 7. Inadequate Ecological Assessment

- The ecological assessments for this proposal were conducted during the winter months, a period when many species are hibernating or exhibit minimal movement. As a result, the data collected does not provide an accurate or comprehensive representation of the site's biodiversity.

- Proceeding with development based on incomplete seasonal data risks serious and irreversible harm to local wildlife populations and habitats.

Objection 8. Lack of Glint and Glare Assessment

- No adequate glint and glare assessment appears to have been conducted to determine the impact of reflective solar panels on surrounding road users and air traffic.
- The area is frequented by light aircraft, and the nearby road network is already hazardous in nature. Reflected sunlight from the panels could create dangerous visual distractions, further endangering both drivers and pilots

Specific Issues Raised at the Open Floor Meeting

During the Open Floor Meeting, several issues were raised by local residents and stakeholders, which further underscore our objections:

1. Impact on Food Production

- The site in question is currently used for agricultural purposes. Converting it into a large-scale solar farm poses risks to **food production capacity**, especially given the rising pressures on global food security.
- The land's suitability for food production, in terms of soil quality, water retention, and bio diversity, must be rigorously assessed.

2. Impact on the Character and Heritage of the Area

- The location of Pear Tree Hill Solar is within a region of significant **historical and cultural heritage**. The **visual impact of a large industrial solar farm on the landscape** will erode the character of the area, which is cherished by locals and tourists alike.
- The **historic significance** of surrounding villages, churches, and landmarks may be undermined by the scale of the project.

3. Impact on Dark Skies

- As a rural area, the **night sky in East Yorkshire is a valued natural resource**, contributing to the quality of life for residents and the local economy, particularly in tourism and stargazing.
- The project has the potential to **light-pollute** the area and disrupt local dark

skies, which have been safeguarded for environmental and recreational reasons.

- ERASE has reached out to RWE on this issue. We have taken a collaborative approach to gathering scientific based research which might support the developers claims but have failed. This reflects poorly on the developers stated desire to work with local communities.

4. Slavery in Supply Chains

- One of the most concerning aspects of large-scale solar farms is the **lack of transparency regarding supply chains**, particularly in relation to the use of forced labour or unethical practices.
- We strongly urge an investigation into the **ethical sourcing of materials** used in the Pear Tree Hill Solar project to ensure no direct or indirect links to **modern slavery or exploitation**. This is particularly important given the sourcing of materials like **silicon, cobalt, and rare earth metals**, where labour abuses are known to occur.
- The response from RWE has been extremely disappointing.

Conclusion

In conclusion, ERASE submits that the Pear Tree Hill Solar Project cannot, at this time, be in the best interests of the local community, regional energy strategy, or national clean energy goals. The project poses significant risks to **local food production, heritage, bio diversity, and community well-being**.

Furthermore, the **environmental impact assessment** is inadequate, and the project's role in supporting the UK's energy needs has not been properly substantiated.

Document EaQ1 highlights the lack of clarity in the applicant's proposal on an enormous number of outstanding issues and we respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate take these concerns into consideration and reject the current proposal or require a thorough and comprehensive review before proceeding.

Thank you for considering our objections.

Kind regards,

George McManus, [REDACTED]

on behalf of ERASE (East Riding Against Solar Expansion)

