

Stonestreet Green Solar – Written Representation A

I am submitting this document as a resident of Aldington who has gained an informed viewpoint of the Stonestreet Green Solar project, based on an engagement with the project throughout the consultation process.

Sham

Noun: a thing that is not what it is purported to be

Adjective: bogus; false

Verb: falsely presenting as the truth

1.The applicant company’s identity

The application emerged under the name of Evolution Power Limited and morphed, without explanation, into EPL 001 Limited (coinciding with the time that 165MW emerged surreptitiously as the intended rated capacity)

2. The applicant’s propaganda

When announcing the project, the applicant falsely stated that it would ‘act as a buffer to future housing development’.

3. The community consultation process

The process failed to meet the legitimate expectations of residents living in the vicinity of Aldington and Mersham that they would be consulted in a fair and open way and be provided with enough and proper information and evidence, so as to make an informed decision and to be able to comment in an intelligent manner

An Adequacy of Consultation Representation was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 31st January 2024 and copied to Ashford Borough Council and the Parish Councils, all of whom failed to provide a response

4. Falsehoods

In 2021 the project was stated to cover 400 acres. It is now close to 500 acres

The consultation process repeatedly portrayed 99.9MW as the stated capacity, whilst failing to disclose 165MW as the intended figure

The image on the applicant's home page falsely portrays the project as being on level ground, with mitigation provided by significant numbers of mature trees. Whereas the site occupies a great deal of undulating land, which prevents effective mitigation

5. The applicant company

The only EPL001 address is in the financial area of the City of London

EPL001 Limited has no operational premises

EPL001 Limited has no operational staff

EPL001 directors have not provided any evidence of prior experience of the construction of solar arrays, battery storage systems and supporting infrastructure

6. Speculators or developers

There are more indicators and evidence in the process to date to suggest that the applicant is a financial speculator rather than a project developer

It is acknowledged that such a status is legitimate. Indeed, the existing solar array in Church Lane was developed by a company who openly declared their speculator status

The potential duplicity is deceitful, raising doubts concerning the applicant's ability to meet their post-construction obligations, such as to maintain the required levels of mitigation throughout the lifetime of the project

Similar concerns apply to the efficacy of such as the applicant's support for the government's energy policy, when their aims are financially orientated and motivated

ENDS

Stonestreet Green Solar – Written representation B

I raise the question of whether the Battery Energy Storage System (the BESS) should or should not be a constituent part of the application and the Examination. I make this observation on the basis of the following:

1.1 - That the Stonestreet Green Solar project consists of 2 individual components. One, the solar arrays, two the BESS. Each of which can operate independently of the other, or in tandem with the other.

1.2 - The BESS does not qualify for consideration as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, in the context of renewable energy generation and the qualification of having a rated capacity of 50MW or more.

1.4 - The health, safety, fire and intoxication issues related to the BESS component.

1.5 – The safety risks associated with the placement of the storage units throughout the site.

1.6 - The ‘outline’ status of the Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP).

1.7 – The failure to consider alternative means of energy storage which are emerging into the renewables arena, such as that provided by The Heat Vault concept, which above all would negate all the safety risks associated with the current proposal.

1.5 - The failure to provide any meaningful BESS related information throughout the consultation process.

ENDS