

THERE ARE 3 ISSUES THAT The Applicant has not addressed.

Firstly the fears that Residents have in regards to the danger of fires. In July '24 I emailed the applicants project manager regarding my concerns that the risk of fire/toxic smoke spreading if a fire was to start in the Solar Farm close to residential properties. She gave me a link to Environmental Statement Volume1. Chapter 16

I read the whole of the document and there was nothing related to my concerns regarding the safety of Residents living in close proximity to the solar farm and the dangers of fire/toxic smoke spreading and the risk to life.

In another email she said that if they were given the go ahead then they, (the applicant) would then do a risk assessment at that point. A risk assessment should have been carried out BEFORE anyone plans to construct a solar farm CLOSE to residential properties.

The local and further afield Fire Brigade should receive specialist training for the fighting of fires within a solar farm and the burden of this cost should lie solely with the applicant. There should also be an early warning alarm system for fire/toxic smoke installed within the solar farm. And a fire extinguishing system under the solar panels. The workers monitoring the hundreds of cctv cameras to be installed on the boundary of the solar farm, cannot possibly notice everything that is going on deep within the solar farm, before it is too late and a fire has taken hold and spread. Residents and their properties close to the solar farm will be at great risk.

Previously I sent, to The Inspector, newspaper reports of fires starting within solar farms, (not the batteries) which prove that this IS A RISK and it should be addressed BEFORE the applicant is given a DCO. A safety barrier of at

least 200mtrs between residential properties and solar farms would help give the Fire Brigade more time to extinguish any fire before it reaches any residential properties.

Secondly I do not believe the Applicant has addressed the funding concerns expressed by Sir David Davis and the Examiner's Second Questions Q3.0.3 At first glance the business contract between Boom and Pelion, as described in the Funding Statement looks like cooperation between a British engineering firm and a German financial institution. But, if you dig a bit deeper into Company Records, a different picture emerges. The following companies were set up four years ago: Boom Developments Ltd, Boom Power Ltd, Pelion New Energy GmbH and Pelion Green Future GmbH (as well as other four- year- old Pelion companies). All the companies had Heinrich briefly as director (2021), then Fusari (2021), Krueger (2022) and now von Bary (2024). The

two UK companies also have Hogan as co-director and shareholder. So, when Jan Krueger wrote the Pelion letter of support to Boom in 2023 he was actually writing a letter to himself. They are, for all practical purposes, one organisation masquerading as an international collaboration.

And is it sufficient for a young start-up company just to state that it has the requisite funds WITHOUT providing any proof of funds.

The Pelion letter does not provide any proof of funds and its letter of 'support' states that 'nor does it create any legal obligation and none shall be inferred. No provision of this letter of support shall be interpreted counter to the preceding sentence'.

Can the Inspector please insist that Boom show proof of funds.

Thirdly, in regards to the Noise to be expected during the construction phase, On the Cleve Hill Solar Park Responses to the EXA's WRITTEN QUESTIONS – APPENDICES Appendix 6 – Arna Wood Solar Farm Piling Noise Investigation a document by ARCUS states that the noise level of the engine of the piling machine is 108db and when it is piling the noise level increases 134db. Little wonder that the Applicant changed their wording that 30db where possible as they would be already fully aware that 30db (the sound level of a soft whisper) would be impossible to achieve.