FAO Matthew Sheard

## Ref EYSF AFP 142

I have tried repeatedly today to submit my comments via the official portal but have been unable to access the site.

My comments are:-

Having attended sessions at the Parsonage Hotel and followed comments made by others I have been struck by the dismissive attitude of the applicant team to the concerns of local residents. Rather than engagement the applicant team relied on reciting a litany of headings from acts and regulations to justify their position and evade critical comment. Claims on the suitability of the land in zones 2E and 2F were clearly dubious and very selectively chosen from, I suspect, outdated data and went utterly against the experience of residents living in the area for over a quarter of a century.

This area of East Yorkshire has a high density of wind farms. I believe that at one time it was rated as the most densely covered in the country. This acknowledged and exploited the almost continual, predominantly westerly winds. This alone should indicate that wind power would be preferable, especially as arable farming can continue around the sites of turbines. This is in contrast to the dubious suggestion of sheep grazing. Looking around the area would immediately show that there is little sheep farming in the area and we have not seen sheep grazed on these two zones during our 25 year plus residence. Such an idea ranks alongside an early applicant comment that they expected many of the intended construction workers would arrive by bicycle clearly a desperate and cynical attempt to add a green gloss to a high impact and destructive scheme.

Regards

Stephen Lunn