

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cleve Hill Solar Park](#)
Subject: Cleve Hill Solar Park – Response to RIES
Date: 31 October 2019 06:57:09

Dear sir/madam

Cleve Hill Solar Park – Response to RIES

I write in response to the RIES dated 23rd October 2019.

There are a tremendous number of detailed points and opinions regarding wildlife. The sufficiency of the foraging area for Marsh Harriers including the potential decommissioning of solar panels, if the area is insufficient, is a good example.

The applicant, NE and KWT have been trying to mitigate various issues whereas perhaps common sense would say a LSE is certain.

When the RSPB stated “As it stands, we do not agree that the current impact assessment enables a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity of the [Swale] SPA/Ramsar site to be reached” perhaps they knew that the facts would be unable to conclude with sufficient certainty that there could be no LSEs and simply took a common sense approach.

The amount of management required at the site to deal with wildlife now seem excessive and perhaps too complex to “police”.

The various views and uncertainties in the RIES confirm my December 2018 comment of:--

“The proposal takes away agricultural land, which is used for growing grain, and creates an inappropriate industrial type site on the internationally important North Kent Marshes wildlife area. These two strategic disadvantages outweigh the benefits gained from solar power which are more appropriately sited on land which has less agricultural production capabilities and are not within a long established internationally important wildlife area.”

The numerous uncertainties point to the proposal being located at an inappropriate location.

Stephen Ledger