

Hello,

I am a Bishopton local resident, with my wife [REDACTED]. I could not attend the recent physical meetings due to prior work commitments, but I have now had chance to view the recordings of the sessions held.

Had I been at the event, there are several topics I would have raised which I believe are not being addressed by the applicant. I raise these such that the Inspectorate is aware and can factor into the process.

I will keep my comments to three very specific areas. Flooding, the cumulative effect and human health.

Flooding:

Bishopton sits in a bowl and from Autumn through to Spring we are regularly cut off due to run off from the surrounding fields into the 'Bishopton dip'. There were certain points in Winter 23/24 when my house and others were entirely cut off from entry and exit due to flooding along Mill Lane and toward Bishopton Mill. This meant no emergency vehicles could gain access if required. As you can imagine, this is a circumstance that causes a high degree of concern. The applicant has given no detailed thought to the flooding specifics of the area, and my own research suggests the impact of a proposed development would increase flooding risk. This would in turn create a very real possibility of being cut off for more prolonged periods which presents a health and safety risk given the knock on impact of lack of access of emergency vehicles should we need them.

Cumulative effect.

We have 11, yes 11, solar projects already approved or in development in our area. Enough is enough. The applicant has not sufficiently appreciated the pervasive impact this further development will have on the local people. This is not about just a change in a view from one or two certain aspects or angles, but about the wholesale alteration of the fundamentals of our area. The Byers Gill proposal is wholeheartedly excessive and unfair to the residents of the village. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Given the proximity of one of the sites to the school, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The all encompassing and pervasive impact of this particular development, given the 11 other schemes in progress, is completely excessive for one small rural area.

Health and safety.

I note from the statement of common ground with BVAG that the applicant states 'it is anticipated there would be limited impacts on human health'. This is NOT GOOD ENOUGH. Why I should mine and my families health be put at any risk or detriment at all, no matter how small or 'limited' that may be. The developer has done nothing during the consultation process to allay what are genuine concerns and fears. There should be a full design and risk assessment process undertaken to fully reduce risk to nil rather than simply state the risk is 'limited'. Two simple examples of this would be the inability to access medical care (either by going to doctors/hospitals, or by the inability of emergency vehicles to access us) due to flooding, and the increased risk of fire and the resulting harmful fumes being blown towards residential properties and inhaled. No development should endanger in any way shape or form the health status quo of nearby residents. For that reason alone the developer should seek to move the project to an area where there are less residents, which they have simply not considered or attempted to do at all.

It is essential that during physical site visits, the Inspector considers the areas with history of flooding (to which the local authority has been unable to resolve), the proximity of panel areas to the local School and the general proximity of panel areas and battery storage to residential properties.

Many thanks