**Rejoinders to the written summary of the Oral Submissions at the Open Floor Hearing 2 and the Applicants Responses**

The following statements are submitted in response to the matters arising from the Open Floor Hearings held during the week of December 9th. Those submissions met with a written response by Greenhill Solar which is contained in GH8.1.24. The following contains rejoinders from:

- Philip Anthony
- Nick Frampton
- Linda Twohey
- Linda Twohey – forwarded comment on behalf of Catherine Wilson
- Gary Elliott
- Shena Howell

These responses have been prepared by each individual and have not involved the use of AI.

## 2.4 Philip Anthony

| ExQ | Theme | Issue | Comments / Issue raised | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PA-001** | **Human Health** | House Prices and Mental Health Implications | EN-1. Indirect health effects, house prices and the data used. | The applicant refers to previous answers (GH8.1.23) and KB-007 which in turn refers to an agreed scoping out of house price assessments. However, the answer given **does** directly respond to the earlier question on the basis that there is no evidence for such an effect. The applicant, by virtue of answering to PA-001 and KB-007 with substantive information, is therefore not ignoring the issue.<br><br>The applicant does not respond to the quoted research by Dr David Rogers which confirms that house prices are indeed impacted by large scale solar proposals and the question is therefore justifiably included as part of an answer about the economic and health impacts of the scheme.<br><br>The issue should therefore be included as a material factor in consideration of the proposals, with its impact on local residents. |
| **PA-002** | **Human Health** | Professional Experience | Authors' professional experience | The applicant continues to refuse to supply details of the actual academic qualifications of the technical lead and authors for the Statement of Competence. The citation of previous experience can only conceivably arise from projects that have been granted permission but not yet completed, therefore meaning that any such professional experience is not based on post-development evaluation and must remain in the category of speculation. |
| PA-003 | **Human Health** | Consultation | When were meetings on health held and what was the | GH6.2.18 states that: "The scope of consultation was agreed with the host local authorities through the Statement of Community Consultation, with any additional required consultation being undertaken following statutory consultation and prior to DCO submission". The applicant has failed to provide any documentary evidence of meetings held with public health |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | mitigation proposed as a result? | bodies, or whether "additional required consultation" was undertaken, or what the actual advice from Office of Health Disparities and Improvements was. The "suitable mitigation measures" quoted are largely short term but the possible impact on residents of Oakfield is recognised and welcomed.<br><br>In an answer relating to GE-001 (the comment submitted by GE), regarding his depression about the installation of panels, is responded to with a suggestion that specific mental health support should be obtained. This is not only a patronising response but a tacet acknowledgement that the impact of the development is real. |
| PA-004 | **Human Health** | Consultation | Absence of consultations in Mears Ashby and Holcot | The applicant states that consultation events were not held in Mears Ashby or Holcot due to "lack of suitable venue availability". This response is hard to swallow. Both locations have excellent village halls and booking availability on a regular basis.<br><br>This response is wrong in point of fact and unacceptable. |
| PA-005 | **Human Health** | Assessment Undertaken | Static data; impact on community connections | In defending the basis of assessment, the applicant initially falls back on previous points about available data and consultation. The applicant then falls back on "professional judgement" (already criticised above in PA-002 and previously), and apparently from "other types of development". None of these "other types of development" are referenced and the examiners are entitled to request further details.<br><br>The applicant continues to insist on consequences that are "not significant adverse effects" without good supporting evidence and relying on dubious, contestable judgements. |

## 2... Nick Frampton

| ExQ | Theme | Issue | Comments / Issue raised | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NF-001 | **Cultural Heritage** | Heritage and historic character | Greenhill agree a moderate adverse effect on the Conservation area, and maintain that the removal of fields eliminates that effect | The initial documents and drawings released by the Applicant, (available in the local libraries) showed fields already (supposedly) released from the scheme. (I personally took a copy of these). The reality is that the scheme was designed around a maximum land grab, right up to the edges of the village, with a view to then releasing fields closest to the village to give the impression that they are removing fields to appease the residents, thereby getting the maximum land take that they wanted. |
| NF-002 | **Transport and Access** | Highfield Road | The access points for Highfield Road provide for a mix of construction and operational uses, providing flexibility | Multiple access points on Highfield Road will do nothing, other than create excess verge damage and multiple points of conflict and delay on an already narrow road, 4.3m wide, where 2 HGV's cannot safely pass. This is a significant commuter route through to the A45, and a significant cut through to Mears Ashby school from the north side of Wellingborough. School pick-ups are around 3pm and many return to the Wellingborough area. This falls within the stipulated working day for GHS and significant delays will occur. Motorist will take risks and accidents will happen. Motorist will be forced off the road on to the verges and the HGV,s will do similar.<br><br>Who will repair the damaged road edges and verges? Who will oblige them to do so? The highway authority are not their paymasters. They have no jurisdiction over the contractors' actions or inactions. |

## 2.7 Linda Twohey

| ExQ | Theme | Issue | Comments / Issue raised | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LT-001 | **Ecology and Biodiversity** | Impacts to habitats and hedgerows | Removing AF14 and AF29 would not make a difference to bats or birds | Important hedgerows: Greenhill explain where to find the definition which is understood. However, the point is that these are legally protected, and permission is needed to remove them. Therefore, it makes sense to design the scheme to minimise the removal of any part of important hedgerow. APP-192 shows that fields AF29 and AF14 are surrounded by important hedgerows; so different choices of within Site design would reduce this impact. The fact that Greenhill intend to plant more hedgerow is irrelevant; they can do that anyway, but they will not have the same value as long-established hedgerow for ecological, landscape, and historical reasons.<br><br>Bat roosting sites: Greenhill repeat information already in their documentation which describes what actions they will take during construction to minimise impacts. But bats will not stay roosting in trees near a 6.8 metre substation emitting buzzing and noise, so mitigation during construction is irrelevant as long term use of these potential roosting sites will be negated. They need to explain why they have chosen field AF24, near a concentration of the most suitable trees for bat roosts, for the substation. Why not choose AF22 or AF 23? They state there are receptors near AF17, but why not at the eastern edge of AF17? Surely it makes sense for the substation to be easily accessible by road?<br><br>Ground-nesting birds: Skylarks – Greenhill admit to a significant adverse effect. So why not remove 2 fields from the scheme in Site A which has the highest density of Skylark nests within the whole scheme? This also has the |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | linked benefits of protecting the use of the Quiet Lane for recreation by significantly reducing the adverse landscape and visual impact, and potential noise, and disturbance during construction. Overall, it appears that there is more scope within the whole Green Hill Solar scheme to take more fields out from solar arrays, and the Applicant has not at any time explained why they need to use so much land.<br><br>Breeding birds of boundary habitat: Yellowhammers – my point was that I know from personal observation over about 30 years that yellowhammers are concentrated in the hedgerows surrounding field AF29. Their assessment of neutral impact seems unlikely to me, as these birds will not stay or breed during the disruption of construction, which could potentially be avoided. It is part of the joy of walking or cycling along Newland Road to see the yellowhammers perching on the top of the hedgerows and singing their characteristic song in the spring and summer.<br><br>Greenhill quote their document ES Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-042] as setting out the reasoning for design choices made at Green Hill Site A. However, all this does is to talk about the general principles of overall site choice and design and does not in any way detail specific reasoning for choices within each Site. It could have detailed their considerations used to choose the positioning of the substation, for example, but it doesn't. I have speculated on some of the reasoning for choices in my OFH statement, but the Applicant does not enlighten us any further. |
| LT-002 | **Transport and Access** | Impacts specific locations | Newland Road Quiet Lane status | The Applicant states that they were aware of Newland Road's Quiet Lane status before public consultation, saying that this is why it wasn't proposed to use it directly for construction traffic. However, the reason it can't be used for construction traffic is more basic; it is a narrow single track rural lane with broken down edges totally unsuitable for larger load vehicles. If they |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | were already aware of the Quiet Lane designation (the representative I spoke to at the consultation appeared unaware), this fact did not appear anywhere I could find in the PEIR. And my whole point is that if they were aware, they could have made choices to Site A's layout which did more to minimise the impact on this important recreational resource for the village. |
| LT-003 | **Scheme Description** | Alternatives | Design process referred to. | Greenhill provide a rationale for not using AF17 for the substation, but not a rationale for choosing AF24. |
| LT-004 | **General Matters** | DCO Process | Comments noted by the applicant | I realise it is not within the Applicant's power to address the NSIP process, but I feel that they could have presented their DCO application documentation in a manner which made it more accessible to the general public, and demonstrated genuine response to the public consultation process by clearly making changes as a result of it.<br><br>In conclusion, I am not in any way satisfied with the Applicant's responses to my OFH submission, as they have not answered the questions that I raise. **Please can the Applicant explain why they cannot take fields AF29 and AF14 out of the scheme, redirect construction traffic to the west part of the site, and find an alternative site for the substation.** |
| LT-005 | **Agricultural and Soils** | BMV | Field AF29 and site selection | Again, they do not explain the within-site design decisions for Site A in terms of Agricultural Land Classification. |
| LT-006 | **Transport and Access** | Newland Road construction traffic | Why can construction traffic not access the west of Site A from Broughton Road? | They have not answered the question at all. They need to explain why as maintenance routes for the west side of Site A will be from the Broughton Road near Old, why can't construction routes be also from the Broughton Road to avoid any construction traffic having to cross Newland Road? This would also avoid any need to close Newland Road at any time during construction. If also fields AF29 and AF14 were removed from the scheme (or used for arable, mitigation or wild flowers) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | there would be no need to build a vehicle track through important hedgerows. |
| **Comments on behalf of Catherine Wilson** | | | | |
| LT-006 | **Landscape and Visual Impacts** | Site A impacts | The rural landscape, noting Green Lane and Newlands Road, will be negatively affected | Katherine Wilson responded that “All the responses are incredibly woolly and just direct to an already written page/paragraph/number in their many thousands of pages of writing, which indicates that they have no interest in the public response. The other point I make is over my disagreement with GHS use of the word temporary for the sixty-year installation. Their response is "the scheme is temporary ". My Collins dictionary defines temporary: “lasting only a short time” . GHS obviously have a very different definition of the word temporary.” |

## 2.11 Gary Elliott

| ExQ | Theme | Issue | Comments / Issue raised | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **GE-001** | Human Health | Mental Health and financial burden | Views of solar farm and financial implications | Greenhill solar response to my comments about mental health is patronising in the extreme.<br>With respect to screening via tree planting and hedging, I repeat my doubts that this will screen the solar panels for many years if at all. |
| **GE-002** | Agriculture and Soils | Farmland and Food Security | Use of BMV land and impact on food production | The reports I have already stated show that land loss for all reasons will result in food self-sufficiency dropping from 60% to 35% in the next 25 years. For a small island nation such as this, surely this is unsustainable. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **GE-003** | Agriculture and Soils | Sheep grazing | There are successful examples of sheep grazing on solar fields? | Examples may exist but the contribution to food production is not significant compared to the arable production being lost to solar farming on good soil. |
| **GE-004** | Agriculture and Soils | Farmland and Food Security | Site B must be BMV?<br><br>Land conversion etc | The claim that converting arable land to grassland will enhance the soil over the lifetime of the project is not accepted or proven. Suggesting that using the land amounts to creating a strategic reserve is a bizarre claim.<br><br>Site B (Holcot) is, in this farmers' opinion, of BMV status and quality. I have no authority to take sample from the land but do not support their conclusion.<br><br>In summary, this project will remove 1200 hectares of good agricultural land from production and render it an industrial landscape. There are more than enough warehouses in the County accommodate solar panels. |

## 2.13 Shena Howell

| ExQ | Theme | Issue | Comments / Issue raised | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SH-001** | Design and Alternatives | Use of the Links | The links was not identified as being more environmentally suitable | The applicant's response to my suggestion to remove fields FF10, FF11, FF19 from the order limits and replace the land, if necessary, with the area known as the links has, in my view, not been given due consideration.<br><br>The links is **eminently and patently** MORE environmentally suitable due to the following reasons |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1. It is not as intrusive upon the hamlet of Easton Maudit and the Grade 1 church of St Peter and St Paul<br>2. It is not as visually intrusive upon the population of Grendon who look towards Easton Maudit<br>3. It would not impact on the several PROWs between Easton Maudit and Gendon (as there are none on the links)<br>4. It would, therefore, not have such a detrimental impact on the villages of Bozeat, Grendon, Strixton and Easton Maudit who use those PROWs on a regular basis to travel from village to village as we do not have pavements.<br>5. It would not therefore have the guaranteed destructive effect on the Internationally acclaimed Waendel walk with over 3k visitors annually and the tourism money that brings to the area.<br><br>If the applicant could exclude fields FF10/FF11 and FF19 it would make a material difference to the impact of the scheme on our rural communities. Whether this is achieved by substitution (ie using the links or by simple exclusion), the negative impacts for the communities would be minimised. |