

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Peartree Hill Solar Farm](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Our response to the Examining Authority  
**Date:** 27 August 2025 15:08:40  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

Dear Jake

Thanks for getting back to me. Please find below summary of our submission. I hope this suffices?

George

## **Objection Submission to the Pear Tree Hill Solar Project**

**PINS Reference: EN010157**

### **Examination Stage**

**Submitted by: ERASE** (East Riding Against Solar Expansion)

---

### **Introduction**

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.

We understand that the 2008 Planning Act was passed by Parliament to ensure that projects of significant national infrastructure such as HS2, Heathrow Airport and nuclear power stations should not be blocked by planning delays. We do not believe that solar farms covering thousands of acres of productive farmland, which will have an enormous impact on both heritage and countryside legacy, were in the minds of legislators at the time.

There is little evidence to support the argument that such projects will make more than a marginal difference to net zero targets. In fact the World Bank concluded that in a study of 290 countries and their suitability to produce solar power, the UK was at the bottom of the table. We therefore hope that the PI will either recommend refusal of the application or at least consider a delay until further work can be done both on public engagement and in response to the many questions and objections which have arisen included ours which are listed and summarised below.

## **Our Objections :**

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

Objection 2: Grid Reliability and Curtailment Risks

Objection 3: Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Objection 4. Unsuitability of Local Road Infrastructure

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

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

Objection 7. Inadequate Ecological Assessment

Objection 8. Lack of Glint and Glare Assessment

**In our detailed submission we have also raised concerns regarding a number issues raised at the open floor hearing on July 22nd 2025. These include, Impact on Food Production, impact on the Character and Heritage of the area and Slavery in Supply Chains**

## **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.**

Kind regards,

George McManus, [REDACTED]

on behalf of ERASE (East Riding Against Solar Expansion)