

Further to my 3 earlier submissions (Deadline 1 & 2 and at the Open Hearing) I would like to add the following observations and questions in more detail.

1. I am still very concerned at the way in which land was allocated to this application and I do not feel my earlier questions about this have been addressed sufficiently. As I previously stated it appears that the Applicant had no part in the choice of land (even though they are supposed to research to find the most suitable) apart from approaching a local farmer/s who then contacted their friends to see who wanted to be involved. This meant that the land was put together in a very illogical and inconsistent manner by a group of landowners who saw a very lucrative financial opportunity. Due to this piecemeal approach, there are far more residents who will be affected by solar panels far too close to property than would be if this application had been thoroughly and adequately researched in the first place. It is no mistake that this has happened but simply a lack of proper consultation and due diligence from the Applicant which seems to have been par for the course throughout the process. I was on the bus for the whole of the ASI and was extremely shocked by the proximity of a number of properties to the proposed site (as well as my own). I was not impressed with the reaction of the Applicant's representatives on the ASI who certainly seem to take the approach that we really must live with it and that was simply a box ticking exercise for them. There has been little or no proper consultation with residents living very close to the development – no visits to residences even when invited. I believe that in most cases the day of the ASI was the first time most if not all the Applicant's representatives had visited actual properties.

I would be grateful therefore if Mr Warder delved a little deeper into the whole aspect of the land acquisition for this project; the reasons why these fields were chosen above other more suitable land further away from residential property and what due diligence was exercised in this process (if any).

I must also express deep concern at the comments made by the Applicant after Deadline 1 submissions where they deliberately tried to down grade our home by suggesting that it was on an industrial site. It is far from that as was seen on the ASI. It is still our home and our livelihood, and I did not appreciate the callousness of that comment. It was as if they were saying because we run a business from the premises we don't count. I feel that may be the reason why we have been given very little by the way of screening or buffer zones – there has been no consistency with that either.

2. It is still not at all clear what panels will be used for example how big they will be, where they will be sourced from and how they will be constructed. Will they be fixed into the ground and south facing? Will they be east/west or west/east with tilting mechanisms, so they follow the sun throughout the day? How will they be constructed – piling or not? Obviously, these questions need to be answered soon because the way they are fixed will make an enormous difference to the visual appearance. If I wanted to build an extension to my home and indeed when we built our new warehouses recently we had to give every tiny detail in the application. What bricks would be used, what roofing, what colour, what provision for wildlife, planting, and landscaping. Every tiny detail. Yet here we are with a massive 3000 + acre development and they don't even say what the panels will actually look like! Do they even know? How can anyone make a sound judgement without ALL the detail?

3. At the Consultations I got very few answers to my questions. Just vague generic replies which were often contradictory. It seems that nothing has really changed even though the examination process is well under way. It is so worrying that there are so many vagaries in this application. As I stated in previous submissions the Applicant should have replied to every individual email, completed form and verbal question. The excuse that they had had so many responses they couldn't reply to them all was unacceptable. It is their decision, as a private enterprise to apply for planning permission for their development which is, due to its sheer size, absolutely unprecedented in the UK and therefore must be absolutely thorough in their dealing with the public and their concerns.