

## **Written Representation – One Earth Solar Application, Rebecca Walker, Resident of North Clifton – 29 July 2025**

This representation outlines serious concerns about the inconsistencies and misinformation presented by the applicant regarding the One Earth solar scheme, particularly around operational noise impacts, the siting of inverters, the consultation process, and the overall treatment of affected residents.

### **1. Inconsistent and Conflicting Information on Inverter Placement and Noise Impact**

There are major discrepancies between what has been said by the applicant at hearings and what has been submitted in formal documentation:

- **At the Open Floor Hearing (8 July 2025)**, the applicant claimed that inverters would be located no closer than 100m to residential dwellings and 50m from public rights of way (PROW), unless acoustic mitigation is used.
- However, **APP-158 (Appendix G-2.4 – Statutory Consultation booklet, Page 68)** stated that noise-emitting infrastructure (like inverters) would be at least **300m from properties** to avoid any significant impact.
- **APP-044 (One Earth Solar Farm Environmental Statement Volume 2: Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration)**. I respectfully refer the ExA to Pg 25 Operation and Maintenance, point 15.5.6) states that PCS/inverter units are **likely to be 200m from properties**, with potential to be closer if "not feasible."

These contradictory statements undermine public confidence in the scheme and its supposed mitigation measures.

### **2. Lack of Clarity on Noise Mitigation**

The applicant frequently references "acoustic mitigation" without explaining what that entails. Residents have not been given sufficient information on:

- What mitigation measures will be used,
- How effective they will be,
- Why the previously stated 300m distance has been reduced.

Given that the applicant's own documents (APP-158) claim that inverter noise could travel up to 300m, locating them closer than this, even with undefined "mitigation", is unacceptable and potentially harmful to residents.

### 3. Request for Clarification from the Examining Authority (ExA)

Given these contradictions, I respectfully ask the ExA to request the following from the applicant:

1. A definitive statement on minimum enforceable distances from residential properties and PROW.
2. An explanation as to why information presented to the public (such as APP-158) differs from recent technical statements.
3. A detailed, transparent noise mitigation strategy if these minimum distances cannot be maintained.

### 4. Criticism of Site Selection and Design

The applicant's justification that "some adverse effects are inevitable" is not acceptable given:

- The scheme is in a **flood-prone area**, necessitating **increased panel height** and worsened visual impact.
- The applicant could reduce impact further but appears unwilling to do so, likely due to cost or convenience.
- Residents most affected by the scheme, like my family, are not being meaningfully prioritised or protected.

### 5. Failure in the Consultation Process

The consultation process was inadequate and, in several instances, misleading. Key failures include:

- **No initial home visit** pre the non-statutory consultation was made to my property despite its significant impact; contrary to claims made by the applicant.
- **Technical questions went unanswered** during the non-statutory consultation. Many were not followed up in the statutory consultation.
- **Information has changed or contradicted earlier statements**, including the project duration (40 years → 60 years → indefinite) and tree removal (initially denied, later confirmed).

- **The applicant has been unresponsive** to written questions and failed to follow up on safety complaints (e.g., blocked single-track roads).
- **The inverters, despite public concern, have been removed from the plans entirely** to avoid scrutiny, increasing anxiety for residents.
- **Community benefits have not been clearly defined** — unlike in other NSIP projects, making any proposed benefit feel insincere.
- **Photographic material used by the applicant is misleading**, downplaying the real visual impact on nearby homes.
- **3D visualisations were inadequate and incomplete at the initial statutory consultation meeting**, causing distress and failing to properly represent future screening, which will take over 15 years to mature.

## 6. Neglect of Residents' Views and Site-Specific Impacts

- APP-151, which records site visits to my home, **misrepresents the discussion** and omits key concerns raised by me and my husband.
- The design has **not mitigated loss of key views** from our property — we are left with **3.5m high panels only 40m from our boundary**.
- In some areas, **PROW are better protected from panel proximity than our family home**, which is entirely unjust.

## Conclusion

The applicant has failed to provide consistent, accurate, and transparent information about the One Earth scheme, leaving residents confused and distressed. The consultation process was flawed and dismissive of those most affected. There are major issues of trust, misinformation, and poor planning, and residents have been given neither proper protection nor sufficient voice.

I respectfully urge the Examining Authority to:

- Require the applicant to provide clarity and consistency across its documentation.
- Demand enforceable mitigation strategies.
- Consider the disproportionate burden placed on residents like myself, who have not been adequately consulted, considered, or protected.