Evans, Rebecca

From: Dave Burton [redacted]@manufacturing-solutions.co.uk>
Sent: 14 June 2024 11:19
To: East Yorkshire Solar Farm
Subject: Ref : 20047337

Categories: Deadline Submission

Dear Sir,
I have tried several times to lodge my comments on the portal but it keeps getting blocked. To my knowledge I have not included anything that would warrant this and hope you will accept this email as an alternative.

Best Regards
Dave Burton

Tel. [redacted]
Mob. [redacted]
Email. [redacted]@featureservices.co.uk

.....

I fully understand and support the need for infrastructure to support a diverse alternative energy plan and understand the part that solar must play in this. I have for some time been considering a Solar system for the roof of our home, when finances permit, and we can justify the payback we may well invest, I therefore support the appropriate use of solar energy in this diversified plan.

However, I'm afraid that I cannot support the Boom proposal for the following reasons:

- The installation is far too large and of an industrial scale
- The concentration of panels in such a small area is completely out of keeping with the rural landscape and amenity
- Most of the proposed land is well managed and very successfully farmed with a wide variety of crops. The annual cycle of this farming activity is at the heart of the amenities and quality of life currently enjoyed by many residents.
- There are many bridal ways and footpaths which currently benefit from field side views of uninterrupted countryside. These views are significantly enhanced by the crop cycle through the seasons. No amount of spacing away from footpaths and bridleways will avoid the destruction of this amenity and the consequent effect on resident and visitor quality of life
- Many of the proposed sites will be directly overlooked by residential property, the residents of these properties currently enjoy rural views from windows and gardens. To impose a sea of solar panels on these residents is far from equitable and will significantly change their relationship with their property, the surrounding landscapes and the current landowner. The stress and impact of this changed relationship should not be underestimated
- Land quality has been quoted in the "Why Here" section of the proposal, the report also references that the majority of the 1,200 hectares under consideration is "mainly poor-quality grade 4 land". The land has always produced a commercially viable crop essential for maintaining on shore food production. I understand that the majority of the land has now been graded higher than grade 4 and is

therefore suitable for farming. Furthermore, the difference between acceptable for consideration for solar and un-acceptable for consideration for solar is very marginal.
Modern farming equipment works with detailed agronomy analysis of each field allowing equipment to be programmed to enrich the poorest soil to achieve a balanced / optimised yields from each field.
I would therefore make the following points:
1) Soil conditions are variable across a given area, random soil sampling will struggle to reflect a true picture of land quality.
2) Farmers have the ability to deploy targeted enrichment of each field to optimise output and produce the most commercially viable crop over the farm as a whole. It is our the UK interests to support farmers in the adoption of this capability in order to gradually improve soil conditions leading to the continuous improvement of yields.
3) To turn our backs on land for a marginal, current state, difference in soil quality is to unnecessarily reduce the UK's food security leading to increased reliance on imported primary food sources.
4) The cost involved in successfully decommissioning this enormous Solar Farm will mean that once the land is covered in panels it is extremely unlikely that it will be returned to food production.

• In the “Why Here” section of the consultation it is also stated that flood risk has been considered when selecting land for the installation of solar panels. I understand from conversations with Boom representatives at Boothferry Golf Club that no provision has been made for additional drainage as part of the scheme. I would make the following comments:

o The physical properties of a solar panel dictate that a significant proportion of the land surface will be sheltered from rain and that rainfall will be concentrated to a runoff point at one end (non-tilting design) or perhaps two ends (tilting design). This will lead to a concentration of water in channels.
I have received no feedback nor seen evidence that percolation tests have been carried out, the food risk therefore remains a major concern.

Solar definitely needs to play a part in our diversified energy plan but this does not need to be at the expense of the issues raided above. We have millions of acres of roofs in the UK, what percentage of these are benefiting from Solar. I accept that retrofitting is not always possible but we are constantly constructing commercial and domestic buildings. Surely it is better to incentivise the provision of solar on as many of these roofs as possible.
The advantages seem so logical …
Generation at the point of use.
Reduction in domestic energy bills.
Utilisation of extremely large warehouse roofs already in an industrial landscape.
Supporting the transition to EV
When used in combination with batteries (EV or supplementary) provide the grid with the ability to manage peaks and troughs at the point of use.
Has the ability to provide a democratic diversified energy solution not creating winners and losers.