

I object strongly to the proposed solar energy plant development as it would be detrimental to my well-being and it will destroy the rural landscape and environment I live in:

- The scale and overwhelming size of this development is far beyond what ourselves and the local community should be asked to endure. The energy plant will drastically change the local area changing it from that of a rural landscape to one of an industrial development. This is quite contrary to the guidelines outlined in the East Riding Local Plan (7.61). "In determining the character and sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate development, the impact of the development on the historic character, sense of place, tranquillity and remoteness of the landscape should be considered. Some energy developments appear industrial in nature, and where there are proposals in rural areas it will be important to ensure that any cumulative effects do not lead to a perception of industrialisation, either within a particular landscape or wider area." We would welcome small scale solar projects but not wholesale industrialisation on this scale. The area already has several wind farms, a bio-mass generation plant and Drax power station is in close proximity and the cumulative effect will be overbearing.
- The solar energy plant does not provide a good use for the land, I feel that there should be an independent investigation into the actual energy output of the proposed scheme. This should be compared to other methods of power generation which would have far less impact on the landscape. Wind turbines or bio-fuel crops would allow the farmland to be almost fully productive whilst still producing low carbon energy. These alternatives also have far less impact on the open landscape and rural nature of the land. Drax power station is currently importing bio-fuels which could be grown on its doorstep. Drax power station is also overwhelmed by submissions to use its grid, it is therefore essential that best use is made of the grid load by using the most efficient power generation schemes. As battery storage is no longer included within the scheme, the power output cannot be used to smooth the supply needed at peak times and the plant will produce the majority of its power during the summer months when the power is least needed, meaning the plant may be redundant during these times. Wind turbines provide peak energy when most needed and bio-mass can be stored and used when most needed, providing more flexibility in our power supply.
- Unfortunately, I cannot access the breeding birds list on the planning submission but I have concerns that the monitoring on bird species and mammals was not sufficient. The area of the planned development covers around 3,000 acres, to monitor this adequately would take a large team of observers and would need to be carried out on a very regular basis over a full 12 months period, if not longer. We have seen no evidence of this level of monitoring and recording. We own 3 ½ acres of native woodland adjacent to the development and were approached to give permission for a mammal survey, we gave permission for this but no survey has been carried out to our knowledge, we have recorded both hedgehogs and badger visiting the site along with many smaller mammals. We have not been told what impact the development would have on our woodland, which is managed as a nature reserve and home to many species. I believe that the development will detrimentally affect threatened species such as skylark, turtle dove, curlew, cuckoo, lapwing and barn owl; species we see and hear on a regular basis and which form part of our rural lives. The decline of these species would be very stressful and be detrimental to our well-being, they are literally part of our daily lives. The sound of a living wild landscape will be replaced by the mechanised noise of an industrial plant. Rural wide open views will be exchanged for one of hemmed in fencing and industrialisation. I have seen no evidence that the mitigation proposed will provide nesting sites for endangered farmland species such as curlew and skylark which need open spaces for nesting or mitigation for over-wintering species such as geese, short-eared owl, fieldfare and redwing which use the fields. No evidence has been produced for the affects of large panels on insect species, which may mistake these panels for water. Insect species are a key part of the food chain and part of the bio-diversity of the area. Is there a danger of birds flying into these panels? The temperature of the environment must be affected by the number of glass panels, what effect does this have on the local environment, micro-climate and ecology?
- Mitigation measures suggested such as wetland areas and over winter stubble, simply duplicate farming practices already taking place on these lands and cannot therefore be seen as mitigation against the huge loss of 3,000 acres of our rural landscape. These areas were not part of the original scheme and were added for the sole purpose of giving a false impression of mitigation
- Long-term trial tests should be carried out to prove the efficiency of these new large panels as well as their impact on the environment. These should be on a moderate scale and be carried out over a number of years. It is ridiculous to give permission for such a large scheme with no proof of its real energy output under local conditions or knowledge of its effects on the local environment.
- As chairman of a local heritage society I was alarmed to see the haste in which archaeological survey work was carried out. The over reliance of geophysical surveys such as magnetometry is well known, in this case the magnetometry survey appeared by observation to be carried out at 1m intervals between probes, where as 0.5m would be far better. Even at higher resolution archaeological features are often missed by relying on these techniques. I know of at least one Romano-British settlement close to Gribthorpe, that we have factual hard evidence for, that did not show on the magnetometry results. Given this how many other archaeological sites were missed by this survey? Again, the scale of the project makes survey work of any kind almost impossible to carry out with sufficient diligence.
- I feel that the public consultations held were severely inadequate with representatives of Boom being unable to answer basic questions such as whether piling would be used during construction, effects on drainage, actual energy output etc. This has led to much confusion for ourselves and other local residents.
- In particular my home village of [REDACTED] will be disproportionately affected, it's approach being surrounded by solar panels and security fencing for several miles. The open fields and footpaths provide a valuable local amenity and the placement of a large solar development with enclosed fencing will impact severely on our mental health and well being. Mitigation planting will NOT provide screening in any reasonable timeframe. The visual impact caused by the loss of open views will be enormous and something we will have to live with on a daily basis.
- Due to the increase of crime experienced at other solar developments high security fencing will inevitably be needed, this has happened elsewhere. These fences will be a permanent scar on our landscape.
- The construction noise created by thousands of steel piles being hammered into the ground will be extremely disruptive and stressful to local residents, particularly as some of the planned construction is only yards from our homes.
- The vast majority of the energy plant is located down single track roads which serve our village. With narrow twisted

bends, these are quite unsuitable for such a weight of traffic required for such a large development. Use of these roads CANNOT be avoided. Mains water services run beside many single track roads close to our village and have been damaged numerous times by heavy vehicles.

- The loss of agricultural land, which local farmers have vouched is highly viable, will impact on food security and local employment. Lowland farming is an important part of our cultural heritage and will be greatly diminished by this development. These fields provide valuable crops such as rape seed and wheat which are currently in critically short supply, the soils are also very drought tolerant, which is vital given our changing climate. These fields are unsuitable for sustainable sheep farming and no evidence has been provided to suggest otherwise.