

TO THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

PINS Ref EN010170

**APPLICATION BY GREEN HILL SOLAR FARM LIMITED for an Order Granting
Development Consent for the Green Hill Solar Energy Project pursuant to the
Planning Act 2008**

To the Examining Authority (ExA)

Written Representation No. 1,

By Bernard Livesey (I.P. No – [REDACTED])

representing The Chair of the Easton Maudit Parish Meeting

made by Deadline No 1 on 7th November 2025

1. Easton Maudit is a small 'Conservation' village of historic importance, with an outstanding Grade 1 church constructed in 1320 which is surrounded by undulating crop-bearing agricultural land and whose landscape setting is defined by tree groups, treed hedgerows, and hedgerows bisecting the open countryside, public highways and rights of way.
2. The principal concern of the villagers is the proposal to surround the village with arrays of 4.5 metre high PV 'tracking' solar panels, which will effectively destroy the appearance, character and amenity of the village itself not merely for the villagers but also those members of the public who choose to seek recreation and training while walking its footpaths now and for generations to come. As a result, none of the multitude of footpaths will retain views of the churches and familiar countryside landmarks over their whole length as their views will be replaced on one side (or both sides) of each path by a black curtain of 4.5 metre high PV Panels which will obliterate all normal views.
3. An additional feature of the panels is that they will be prone to 'glint and glare' which will negatively impact not only their amenity to walkers but also to riders and their horses, seeking to enjoy the views from bridleways: and this is likely to diminish the attractiveness of rides and diminish the financial viability of the Stables in the village.

4. Importantly, the damage that the Applicant proposes to inflict on the historic landscape surrounding Easton Maudit appears to be inflicted in wholesale disregard of Policy 3 of the North Northamptonshire Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 which is as follows:

“Development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting, retaining and, where possible, enhancing the distinctive qualities of the landscape character area which it would affect.

Development should:

- a) Conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and qualities of the local landscape through appropriate design and management.***
- b) Make provision for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of features of landscape importance.***
- c) Safeguard and, where possible, enhance important views and vistas including sky lines within the development layout.***
- d) Protect the landscape setting and contribute to maintaining the individual and distinct character and separate identities of settlements by preventing coalescence.***

5. As well as the damage to the Easton Maudit landscape, the villagers deplore the aggregate damage to the landscape over the whole Green Hill Project.
6. In addition, the villagers do not agree that the use of BMV agricultural land for the proposal is justifiable. The Applicant has obviously made no attempt to seek out and use land of lower quality, quite the contrary; it has deliberately sought to attract owners and/or tenants of good quality farming land. It clearly does not care about food security for the UK. Moreover, the Applicant has made no attempt to justify its use of 1,200 hectares of predominantly BMV land to generate “up to” 500 MW of electricity: the proposed “land take” is substantially in excess of the land normally required for the generation of 500 MW of electricity.
7. The villagers will be greatly discomfited by the noise and traffic congestion generated during the construction period by the considerable amounts of construction necessary. As regards the so-called ‘Targeted Consultation’ they require proper justification of the late decision by the Applicant to add a request to enlarge the scope of the land required for the scheme in order to

control (in a wholly unparticularised manner) the highways specified including, in particular, one segment over Easton Way between the west door of the church and the end of that road, a road that the Applicant had regularly assured residents would not be used for access to the site. The ExA should firmly insist that the Applicant must give careful justification for their attempt to seize control of this additional plot of the highway for their convenience and for the inconvenience of the villagers.

8. **The Bess Installations:** The second great concern of the villagers is the proposal to install a substantial quantity of storage batteries in the BESS areas in neighbouring Grendon and in the Green Hill C sector.
9. The villagers note that the Applicant has at every stage during both the informal and statutory consultations failed in its obligation to give appropriate information about the widely acknowledged acceptance amongst the scientific and industrial community of the fact that Lithium-ion batteries are at risk of thermal runaway and self-combustion due to a variety of circumstances including manufacturing defects, impact during handling and immersion. It is well known now that battery fires are notoriously difficult to extinguish and there is a risk of contamination and pollution of, inter alia, waterways and the River Nene and the Ramsar protected areas. Even now the villagers wish to investigate why the Applicant has persisted in giving so little information about the source and number of batteries which they propose to use and the risks to the community from their use.
10. What is more, it is now absolutely clear from the learned paper entitled ***‘Hazardous Substances potentially generated in “loss of control” accidents in Li-ion Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS); storage capacities implying Hazardous Substances Consent obligations’*** by Eurling Dr Edmund Fordham and Professor Sir David Melville that the storage capacities of the BESS installations in the present case are such that they are likely to impose on the Applicant the obligation to apply for Hazardous Substances Consent from the HSE and/or local planning authority. It is believed that it has not sought to do so. Nor has it complied with the requirement imposed by NPS EN-1 which confirms at 4.12.1 that
“All establishments wishing to hold stocks of certain hazardous substances above a threshold need Hazardous Substances consent.

Applicants should consult the HSE at pre-application stage if the project is likely to need hazardous substances consent.”

11. **Finally, Waste Materials:** If the Applicant is granted a DCO, the Villagers wish the Secretary of State to ensure that any Order is made conditionally on terms that the Applicant remains responsible for the disposal of all waste materials whenever arising, whether at the end of the proposed 60 year term or on any earlier date when the scheme becomes obsolete and financially unviable.

Submission ID: SAA7BF5A5

The Parish Meeting does not accept the validity of the Applicant's proposal for, inter alia, the following reasons: