

SPEAKING NOTES

The Parish of Easton Grey supplemental comments Summary
21st April 2026

Introduction and preliminary points

Sirs, Madam

I am [REDACTED], Chairman of the Easton Grey Parish Meeting.
I have lived in Easton Grey for 24 years.

This will be an inadequate summary of the points from our
community.

Disparity of resource

The Parish has £825 annual precept versus the Applicants' £1 billion. One volunteer Chairman versus many employees and hired "experts".

However, the Parish has a sound local knowledge of the community, landscape, environment, and flood risks coupled with commonsense. Accordingly, the Examining Authority are requested to ask the Applicant the pertinent questions we highlight in our written comments.

Landscape

Parts of our Parish will have impacted sight lines. The beauty of Easton Grey, a conservation area and Parish within the Cotswold National Landscape, will have its setting assaulted by the adverse impact of two storey high solar panels.

All residents and visitors, to and from our wonderful village, will have to go past these panels. Without justification, the fields to be covered are high quality and versatile agricultural land.

Much loved Rights of way, used by walking, cycling or horse-riding members of our community and its visitors, will be blighted, not least by the tunnel effect and noise of the proposed development. The benefits to mental and physical health and tourism will be severely disrupted or just ruined. Falls in property prices, or an inability to sell will cause mental and financial distress.

Heritage, Tourism, Noise & Transport

The Applicants make bold and highly dubious assertions, with questionable bases of assessment. The tourism assertions are at odds with the size and numbers of communities and businesses affected. For example, we have a country spa hotel and a local pub whose businesses will suffer adverse, if not existential, financial impacts.

Displaced traffic, to and from Malmesbury and Sherston, will be pushed from the designated construction routes onto the single-track road between Norton and Easton Grey. This road will not cope with the additional traffic.

Decommissioning

Absent for example, bonded guarantees, criminal sanctions or claims for breach are both toothless and prohibitively costly to enforce. The Bank behind this applicant has a terrible track record; The Applicant is just a Special Purpose Vehicle of no worth and with offshore owners.

Flood risk

The Applicants responses demonstrate ignorance, or a misunderstanding of the land impacted. The 1.8 million square metres of panels seem designed to concentrate run off towards areas that already flood or are very prone to flooding. Our community sewage plant is at risk. All the examples we identify for the adverse effects of run-off are designated with the highest risk - Flood Zone 3. The critical rail route to Wales, that sits in a cutting through the site, is already noted as high risk due to climate change.

The Applicant addresses the security of their assets with an apparent disregard for the run-off flood risk, born by our communities that will not benefit from the scheme.

Conclusion

Others have been more eloquent than I on these points. Lime down is the wrong scale and in the wrong place. The harm caused will be substantial and permanent.