

Having attended the open floor hearing on Wednesday 16 October 2024, I was struck by a few things and would like to add these comments and questions to my RR of 1 August 2024.

As health is very important, this topic hasn't been addressed by experts on behalf of the applicant, so it is worrying just how many people's health has been affected already during the application process of these four gigantic schemes. This is before the horrors of this enormous solar project is even granted. So many people are going to have worsening mental health problems in this area from the cumulative effect of this and the other three solar projects, two of which have been passed already. The large scale of these projects should be reserved for countries where the sun shines and not near to any inhabitants.

The questions that I would like answering are:

- Can the applicant tell us who wrote the very poorly done health part of their application? What is this person's background and their area of special interest?
- I noted how many times the lawyer for the applicant, in her response to questions posed, used the word 'urgent' for this project. Can the applicant please supply evidence that this project is in fact urgent? It needs to be scientifically proven evidence not a tick box exercise for the Secretary of State, who is on a mission, and for the greedy applicants who don't live here or pay their taxes in this country and are not interested in local people.
- What is being done to mitigate all the displaced wildlife and migrating birds?
- Each solar application we are told that 300,000 homes are to be powered by the scheme. We have never been told which households are to benefit. Can the applicant let us know which areas and to whom this scheme will be of benefit?
- Can the applicant tell us categorically that the price of electricity will be reduced for households? I doubt it because the successfully approved sites will be sold on and then everyone is at the hands of yet another company making billions in profit annually.
- Can the applicant supply the crop yields for all the land that they are currently looking at? Maybe an independent person should supply this data, not someone with a vested interest.
- Can the applicant give the grading for each field, although we all know that until now crops have been grown successfully.

I feel that it is an insult to our intelligence trying to sell us the 'solar dream'. We all want to be green, but as we have said in each of the other applications that bringing in solar panels from China is anything but green. We are all able to locate the evidence from other countries where these large, ground based solar schemes do not work. Why re-invent the wheel when we should be taking the experience of other countries into account? The argument for the other three large projects in the area is no different to this one. We do not have sufficient sunlight to power the country by solar in the months when we need it. Why must 'little old Britain' be the one to be in this headlong dash to be the first to reach net zero (another myth), when we are allowing other countries to manufacture products for us? We decarbonise and they carbonise! It just doesn't make any sense at all.

We all know that roof top solar should be used first, but then this won't make the few very wealthy – it'll just help each household with their own electricity bills, which is how it should be.

This is a David and Goliath moment and if the masses were told the truth there would be a huge outcry. We are all local residents who are trying to fight these schemes on top of day jobs and normal life activities. We are not paid, like the lawyers, to do this and with the thousands of pages of reading it is quite a feat that we have put up a counter argument at all. Trying to bamboozle the public with four separate applications just shows the lengths these companies will go to, to ensure they have the outcome that they want. If this had been submitted as a single application, it would never have been passed being so large. Even though this is the fourth application we are still as passionate about saving our agricultural fields as we were at the start of the first application. We want to live surrounded by nature, in a quiet location, enjoying better health (mental and physical) and knowing that food security is as important today as it is for the future.

Does the ExA read all our submissions or are they just shelved, because these proposed applications are a given? I am saddened by the injustice of it all and even more, I am disgusted that three days into his new role, the Secretary of State passed three applications. There is no way that he could have read the documents provided, especially as at least one had been advised not to go ahead by the ExA. If the ExA's opinions and advice isn't taken seriously, what is the point of going through the charades of this process?