

7000 Acres

7000 Acres Response to Applicant's Responses to OFH and Relevant Representations

Deadline 2 Submission – 21st November 2023

As a general observation, the Applicant has chosen to recycle answers and cross-reference to sections of their documentation, rather than engage in answering points raised.

For instance, in relation to Energy Need and the potential for rooftop solar to meet this need, the Applicant has answered this by referring to various sections of APP-350, the Statement of Need, restating their conclusion that there “on their own, brownfield developments are unlikely to be able to meet the national need for solar”. This does not address the points raised by 7000Acres, that commercial and domestic rooftop solar can make a significant contribution, as evidenced by reports from Ecotricity and the Warehouse Association. These, along with smaller scale ground mounted schemes, rendering the need for such schemes as Cottam unnecessary. This topic is described in more detail in 7000Acres REP-117

7000Acres raised the issue of “curtailment” – where energy is wasted when there is too much electricity generation for the demand and highlighted the need for flexible generation. In their response, the Applicant has simply restated the need for low carbon generation and not addressed the issue raised.

The Applicant has continued with this approach in other areas, such as security of supply, efficiency of land use, displacement of food and energy crops.

7000 Acres response to Cottam Response to the Relevant Representations 7A-06 Health and Wellbeing

The applicant has failed to understand the importance of open green spaces as being beneficial to people’s mental and physical health as well as their wellbeing. People choose to live and work in rural areas to gain benefit from what the open countryside and its environment has to offer. Building new hedgerows, trees to hide the solar panels (4.5metres high), placing panels 15 metres away from Public Rights of Way and bridleways in no way mitigates against the open space and current landscape which has been present for many years. Nothing will strengthen field boundaries which already exist and which we accept as normal. The strengthening of field boundaries will be metal palisade fences! This will have an impact on the people!

This scheme offers no benefit to the community, the tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. In fact, it does quite the opposite as who would want to visit a countryside that has been industrialised!

For the locals, this scheme will fragment our society, marginalise further those areas that are already deprived, create outward migration of young people, leaving the older and vulnerable to become more isolated, lonely, and future issues around social care provision. There are considerable higher rates of pensioners living in our community who are single. Ultimately, this has the potential to widen health inequalities which have not been addressed by the applicant.

In response to health and wellbeing, the applicant has only concentrated on the cumulative effect to access, desirability and use of recreational facilities being anticipated during construction, which they regard is short term. They refer to table 18.2 (APP-053), where health and wellbeing is considered around “fear and intimidation from HGV traffic on highways used by workers, cyclists and horse riders, as well diversion closures (nuisance factor) or access impacts to Public Right of Way”. This is not what health and wellbeing is all about! What the applicant fails to identify is the forty year gap this scheme will have on the people who live and work in the area affected. They reference as per table 18.2 (APP-053), by stating that no significant adverse effects to socio-demographic and human health indicators. How do they know?

Where is the up-to-date local Public Health intelligence? There is a requirement for a HEAT (Health Equity Assessment Tool) to be completed. This is a Public Health England tool to assess for potential health inequalities.

Where is the up-to-date NHS Integrated Care Board health intelligence?

Where is the Qualitative data following a well-informed public consultation, indicating how people feel emotionally, physically and mentally?

How will this impact on the NHS Core20PLUS 5 programme around health inequalities?

Merely doing a desktop review on health is insufficient.

We therefore request that a thorough Health Impact Assessment be carried out, and in particular to draw attention to the impact this and the cumulative impact of the other schemes will have over the next 40-60 years.

Please refer to the Written Representation 7000Acres on Human Health and Wellbeing.