

Feedback on REP3-065 Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) Document Reference: EN010159/APP/9.22

Apologies for the late submission of the comments below in relation to the above document, which I believe should have been submitted possibly by Deadline 4. Due to the way the Applicant has changed the titling of their documents in response to action points and the action point document initially not being listed in the Examination Library which is what I use to look at documentation. I therefore missed the Applicants response to ExA Action 4 and I am therefore responding now and hopefully the ExA will accept.

Within the above document on Page 13 the Post hearing note stated: The Applicant has provided supplementary information to explain the process undertaken to prepare the photomontages. This information is provided in Appendix A and comprises: LiDAR scans for two viewpoints, a summary of the methodology utilised in the preparation of the images, and the addition of a person (measuring 1.5m) and measure stick in one photomontage. This information has been prepared to provide greater transparency and confidence in the reliability of the imagery presented. (ExA Action 4)

I would like to point out the information provide by the Applicant to demonstrate the accuracy of their photomontages appears to still be misrepresentative of the site. I refer the ExA to Viewpoint 9 Part B on Page 59 of the pdf document. The Applicant has added a person at 1.5m and a 3.5m ruler along the fence line. If you zoom in to view this up close the solar panels do not appear to be as high as the 3.5m ruler, despite the panels in this area being 3.5m nearest to the fencing viewable in the below picture and then raising to 3.8m high. There is no visibility of higher panels in the background of the picture where they should be 3.8m.



There is also misrepresentation of the PCS units which are planned to be 6m high due to this area being within a flood zone, yet when you refer to the photomontage of Viewpoint 9 Part B, the PCS unit container appears to be barely higher than the 3.5m solar panels or the 3.5m ruler.



As demonstrated by Mr Walker and the mock solar panel during the ExA site visit to Moor Farm, North Clifton and the above addition of a 3.5m ruler by the Applicant, the photomontages submitted by the Applicant are not accurately representative of what the landscape will look like. If the above is showing this information to be a misrepresentation, then it could be assumed other photomontages are also likely not accurate.