

**ISH2 Wednesday 12th July 2023**

**Contribution by Linda Davies IP No: 20035925**

This hearing is specifically about environmental matters. The Examining Authority listed all matters regarding this topic as stated in the agenda numbers 3 to 12. In addition to all the points raised in the discussion I would sincerely request you to consider the following:

**Landscape and Visual.**

The Applicant clearly demonstrates a lack of understanding of the difference between landscape and visual effects. This fundamental error questions my trust in the knowledge and expertise within this vitally important area for consideration and impact judgements.

The proposed development will have significant adverse effects on the site landscape character and the wider landscapes.

The close and further views will be adversely affected for all those that use this area recreationally.

The Applicant provides inadequate baseline information and analysis. There are errors in the methodology and process which underestimates levels of value, susceptibility to change, sensitivity, magnitude and the overall levels of their effects on all the affected residents.

The Applicants assessors for mitigation, enhancement and compensation, do not demonstrate their understanding of the difference between enhancement and mitigation. The mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant are cited specifically to avoid and or reduce levels of effect. These are NOT counted as benefits, enhancements or compensation and therefore they are to be considered separately not doubly counted as in their explanations.

The Applicant seems to understate the necessity for robust security fencing due to the increase in crime on solar areas and at this scale the implications of safety are immense. This sentence for keeping everything in or out is truly impactful.

**Ecology and biodiversity**

Once any living creature or plant is killed by the development process and usage the natural biodiversity of the area changes. The knock-on effects to the natural balance is obliterated and no subsequent man-made pathways provision for both people or wildlife will compensate for their loss of habitat and food chains altered irrevocably.

**Land use and soils**

The Applicant is using an inordinate percentage of good productive BMV farmland in this development. This is unprecedented at such scale. The Applicant showed a complete inability to acknowledge the fact that due to the current world conflicts there is a crisis in food provision and costs. The impact on the whole area and the UK is immeasurable. In order to enable the UK to have a future and become independent from external adverse effects EVERY crisis needs to be considered with usage of land effectively maximised.

**In-combination and cumulative effects**

The Applicant's proposal is on a scale unprecedented. The impact therefore is not known. However, the LVIA for the Applicant have assessed the impact on mental and physical health and wellbeing and are convinced that during construction the impact on local residents would be significant and major which would reduce to moderate at year 15. In reality this assessment does NOT reflect the adverse effect on the health and wellbeing of the residents. The combined issues and proposed permanent changes to this area has already created anxiety, stresses and misery which could last for the rest of their lives and for the next generations to come. This could therefore be the greatest harm inflicted on all the communities in this wider area.

It cannot be overstated that to diminish the impact on peoples lives and wellbeing by an unjustified and unjustifiable vast scheme is reprehensible. When the mental health and wellbeing aspect was discussed during the hearing the body language of the whole MPSFL team was one of embarrassment and lack of empathy. It was very quickly "covered".

The Applicant has continuously demonstrated an approach that reflects errors in judgements and minimal engagement with affected parties. Those that care about this locality, the UK and the world have learnt from the effects of trauma in historical conflicts, food shortages and mental and physical health issues. They agree that solar renewables may play a role in tackling the crises but not in this way. The cost is too high.

I am requesting that the Examining Authority rejects the proposal.