

Submission from ERASE - East Riding Against Solar Expansion

[REDACTED]

Peartree Hill Solar Farm <PeartreeHillSolarFarm@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Apologies, for the late nature of this submission. I had been hoping to receive further information from the developers which has not, unfortunately been forthcoming so I will summarise:

ERASE would like to raise the following points:

1. Loss of BMV land. On May 22nd, I was informed by the East Riding Council that 55% of land currently being considered for solar farm development across the council area is classed as Grade 3a or above.

REF: [REDACTED] MRTPI Interim Director of Prosperity and Place ERYC

I have asked the council for clarification specific to Peartree Hill and await a reply.

On May 30th I wrote to the developer requesting clarification. I received an automatic response saying they hope to respond in 5 days. Today I received the following response: We are currently liaising with the technical team to confirm a precise figure.

You will be aware that the Secretary of State's guidance is that permanent BMV land loss should be avoided. In their bundle, the developer's assess this to be less than 1% at contract end, not during the contract's lifetime. I believe this to be disingenuous and goes wholly against the spirit of the Secretary of State's guidance.

I would suggest that without this information, the Secretary of State is unable to make a decision on this application.

2. Cumulative Impact: Since the close of the Examination period, further proposals have been received in the near vicinity of Peartree Hill. These are the Clean Air proposals and the Humberhead proposals. Clean Air is a much expanded revision of the earlier Kingfisher proposals and will extend the area for solar to west of Beverley. If Peartree Hill and Clean Air progress, along with smaller schemes and cable routes, Beverley will be completely surrounded in solar development. This will have a disproportionate impact on the town.

Humberhead, could see 4000 acres of development to the west of Beverley with a planned life of 60 years.

Alongside the other NSIPs in the pipeline this clearly represents a massive cumulative impact on the immediate area and will also impact Areas of Natural Beauty.

3. BESS Safety Numerous questions have been raised which have still not received satisfactory responses. During the examination, I provided references to research conducted by the South Korean government into fire causes and risks. I have not received satisfactory explanations from the developers as to how these are to be mitigated particularly in relation to available water for extinguishing fires in remote areas. The suggestion is that these would simply be allowed to 'burn themselves out.'

Since the closure of the examination, research has been published by the French safety institute INERIS, which reveals that large quantities of dangerous, solid residue waste result following the complete burnout of batteries. In addition when water is added to such fires, large quantities of highly toxic, Phosphine and Acetylene are produced. This a completely new and unexpected hazard which must be investigated.

Ref: [REDACTED] et al, 'Toxic and flammable phosphine gas emissions from solid-state lithium-metal battery fires'. March 2026

4. Impact of light pollution The area in question is renowned for its 'Dark Skies' In October 2024, I, as a Dark Skies ambassador for the North York Moors National Park, raised the issue with the developers. Since then I've had numerous discussions as to how this might be measured and monitored before construction and during and after construction. So far no progress has been made. This is wholly unsatisfactory.

5. Human Rights violations in supply lines. During the application process, I raised the issue of concerns regarding [REDACTED] particularly relating to the supply of products from China. China is, of course, a very closed society with a Marxist, single party system of government. I asked whether the developers had their own quality control checks in place on the ground. I provided a link to research by Sheffield Hallam University which suggested that [REDACTED] in the supply chains was fact. They responded

in the negative saying that they complied with the rules and regulations as laid down by the UK government.

Since then, our parliament has moved to ban GB Energy from investing in renewables where evidence of [REDACTED] has been identified. The Danish Human Rights Institute has also raised similar concerns.

The importance of this issue cannot be overstated especially at the pre contract stage. I believe that until robust mechanisms for independent third party audits are put in place, on the ground, it will not be possible to verify compliance and identify potential risks.

Until we can guarantee that these safeguards are in place, or alternative, compliant suppliers can be sourced, the issue of a Development Consent Order should be put on hold.

[REDACTED]

ERASE- East Riding Against Solar Expansion

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]