

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cleve Hill Solar Park](#)
Subject: Cleve Hill Solar Park
Date: 12 November 2019 13:49:55

To whom it may concern :

I am writing to make representation against the proposed development of the Cleve Hill Solar Park.

Firstly, let me say that I realise that we have to get our power from renewable sources, and I don't want to be NIMBY about any plans in my local area. So, until this moment, I have been trying to be more accepting of the proposed plans. However, deep down I am really saddened and resentful of the plans, especially as the whole area is surrounded by SSSI land and estuary, and there has been talk of the Environment Agency planning a Managed Realignment programme for these marshes.

My urgent reason for making representation now, however, is that these plans have gone way beyond what I understood the original proposals to be. The initial documentation gave 350MWH as the proposed output from this site, and listed an "option for onsite battery storage" with no details of what that would mean. I gather that the capacity has now doubled to 700 MWH, with plans for 120 units of extremely dangerous and volatile Lithium Ion batteries. These have never been tested on this scale anywhere in the world, and the potential for very serious and irreversible destruction / pollution should these catch fire, or should there be flooding (which is what marshland does) is truly terrifying.

Why do these plans have to be SO extreme? Why does our corner of Kent have to be an experimenting ground for this industry? The town of Faversham is put seriously at risk, say nothing of the residents of Graveney right next to the site. The delicate and threatened natural habitat of tidal estuary/marshland would never recover from this development, and that's if it everything ran smoothly. If there was an industrial accident of some kind, the repercussions are not just local, they are global.

If we put solar panels on all the industrial flat-roofs in the country, that would create a huge acreage of power-production, with no damage to land/nature. Why is this not being proposed? because it's too dangerous to the buildings supporting them. I rest my case.

Sarah Holliday
[REDACTED]