

We are long standing residents of Thorganby living close to the industrial landscape of solar panels planned for Escrick and proponents of 'recycled energy' but not when used with the insensitivity of blanket obliteration of good agricultural land of such a huge continuous area. It appears to be a development based on greed and profit for the few rather than carefully considered benefits to the environment and the local and regional community. The Escrick solar development is in effect a huge industrial development of good agricultural land deep in an open countryside environment.

Presumably the two main reasons for this development are energy security and de-carbonisation both, in my opinion, worthy objectives. However, for the former, we need a considered appraisal of how solar panels could be used on rooftops and in particular on the myriad of industrial sheds that characterise the motorway landscape, on brownfield sites and adjacent to existing infrastructure such as roads, railways and industrial developments. There also needs to be a consideration of a balance between wind (both on and off shore) and solar power with consideration of the environmental costs of both approaches. Huge scale industrial use and the obliteration of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land on a national level may contribute to energy security but calls into question the possibility of ensuring food security. On the question of de-carbonisation there are many ways that working with the natural world can contribute to this cause; for example, the use of biofuels have an important role and amongst the many recent developments, the use of hemp as a valuable fibre in construction and industry generally together with being a net absorber of carbon.

There still seems to be a serious lack of detail as to the design of the solar panels in particular their individual scale, their density and their vertical orientation. This is both surprising and telling given that the developers have no doubt already undertaken detailed costing exercises in order to get to this stage. Based on similar schemes it can be concluded that there will be minimum sunlight reaching the ground and when this is replicated over many square miles a catastrophic loss of habitat and biodiversity together with food growing potential is inevitable. How can the public or indeed the planning inspectorate assess such a huge area that is the Escrick development with the current lack of detail provided together with the

absence of credible ecological and environmental investigations of similar areas of solar panels over an extended period of time?

The proposed 13 miles of 'cable pipeline' will presumably be designed to hook into further expanses of solar panels in the future; this would indicate that this predominantly rural area, from Escrick to Monk Fryston, could become one of largest industrial power complexes unless of course there is proper binding controls written in to any permissions granted.

Given the above we would urge the planning inspectorate to reject this application on the basis that the Escrick solar development is far too large to be safely assessed in terms of its environmental and ecological damage and that the blanket use of good agricultural for solar collectors should be avoided in favour of more sustainable approaches as mentioned above.

David Tasker
Susan Tasker

August 2026