



EWERBY & EVEDON PARISH COUNCIL

Beacon Fen Open Floor Hearing 2 (OFH2), 11th November 15.00

The Ewerby & Evedon Parish Council (the 'Council') have the following remarks and questions which are made without prejudice:

1. Parish council's position -objection

- 1.1. Register for the record the council's objection to the proposed development as requested by parishioners. There have been zero opinions in support of the proposal.

Principal objections

- 1.2. **Scale** - the parish is 1,973 ha of open countryside. The Development's solar arrays alone amount to 529 ha (1,307 acres) which is 27% of the entire parish. The scale and loss of the countryside is an enormous wholesale transformation of the parish's landscape. The Council would support a smaller scale development, up to 132 ha (325 acres), in the south eastern quarter of the proposed site away from highways, footpaths and residential properties.
- 1.3. **Location** – it is given that transforming countryside from open farmland to industrial energy use is a detrimental transition for the locality. Such sites therefore should be chosen where their impact is minimised, such as shielding by woodland or the topography of the land. For example the nearby 160 acre solar park at Ermine Street Farm, Cranwell, Sleaford is a good example of a considerate location.
- 1.4. There is very little screening of the applicant's site and the proposed screening will take over 15 years to establish and will not be effective against such tall installations. Given the trees and hedges planted along the top of Ewerby Waithe Road are 49 years old, it can be argued that screening can never be achieved.
- 1.5. **Cumulative impact in the area** – this project is just one of a goldrush in the area that is making a wholesale change in the landscape that we live in. The concentration of solar farms in the area is overwhelming, please can the Examining Authority collate a definitive list of these projects completed; already approved for construction; and in the planning system, then opine on a what point we should be considered saturated? The council's opinion is that this point has already been reached in our immediate area and, in fact, our county.
- 1.6. In addition, the local area is also being inundated with other NSIPs, please can the Examining Authority takes these into consideration as well when assessing the cumulative impact. These include but are not limited to the following projects South Lincolnshire Reservoir; Grimsby to Walpole; Eastern Sea Link 3 & 4; Ossian; Outer Dowsing; Triton Knoll; Viking Link; Amith Interconnector; and NU-Link Interconnector. The volume of infrastructure projects in the area are unmanageable for the local communities.



EWERBY & EVEDON PARISH COUNCIL

Impact

- 1.7. **Wellbeing** – Already there has been significant anguish and anxiety within the parish. The Council has been approached by multiple households to ask for help with regards to the project. The effect on the local residents has been very sad to witness. Sleepless nights, tears and anxiety are described to the Council and witnessed by the councillors. This trauma and upset is very real and happening, the Applicant has been silent on this topic, does the Applicant want to help and if so how?
- 1.8. Individual **residents loss of value** of their primary asset. Cumulative devaluation of residential properties in the parish without recompense. How does the Applicant propose to address this issue and the issue of entrapment?
- 1.9. **Loss of agricultural land** and agricultural heritage for the area – loss of agricultural jobs in the rural supply chain from this and the cumulative affect of all the nearby projects is detrimental to our local heritage and agricultural economy.
- 1.10. The All Party Parliamentary Group on Science and Technology in Agriculture (APPGSTA) presented to Westminster on the 3rd November 2025 detailing the governments current plan to reduce farmland by 25% over the next 25 years resulting in a loss of productivity of 32% or 39% per capita. The chair of the committee George Freeman MP singled out solar farms on productive land in particular as being detrimental. Please can the Examining Authority review this report and its recommendations before making his conclusions to the Secretary of State? As the proposed site is in the top quartile, by yields and output, of arable land in the UK.

2. Decommissioning bond

- 2.1. The Parish Council is not aware of any provision for the event of the site becoming redundant.
- 2.2. This may be through technology superseding solar power generation; administration of the owner of the site; flooding of the site; loss of insurance protection; unforeseen events, which by their nature are unforeseen. How does the Applicant envisage the site will be decommissioned, who would be responsible for the costs of decommissioning? The Council is concerned that the parish will be left in perpetuity with an industrial wasteland in the event of the failure of the business operating the site.

3. Traffic management

- 3.1. The haul road is noted as a relief for the local road network which is not suitable for a project of such scale.
- 3.2. How will the Applicant police the use of this bespoke access? What are the consequences of not using the bespoke access?



EWERBY & EVEDON PARISH COUNCIL

- 3.3. Experience dictates that once planning is achieved by one party, the party that comes to build or operate the site will engage with contractors to build the project who themselves engage with subcontractors. These persons are not involved in this stage of agreeing terms and will be inclined to use whatever access they please (example: 156 page soil management plan for the Triton Knoll pipeline wholly ignored by staff on the ground performing the work).
- 3.4. The onerous will then fall on those affected to raise a compliant.
- 3.5. The council would like to propose an independent officer, from the local community, to be employed by the project to monitor the traffic situation and receive and manage complaints from the residents and an agree framework for action on transgressions.

4. Construction

- 4.1. As above for traffic management, how will the Applicant police working hours; noise; dust pollution; mud on road et al?
- 4.2. What mechanism will they put in place for receiving feedback from the residents? What are the consequences of causing harm to the local residents?
- 4.3. The council would like to propose the above mentioned independent community officer is similarly involved in this process too.

5. Screening

- 5.1. The site does not have adequate natural screening from local housing, highways and byways. Suggested planting of screening is welcome but will be ineffective for 15 years or more until they are established and at the height of the panels they are intended to screen. Even then they will be ineffective for six months of the year when the hedgerows are not in leaf. As previously noted the 49 year old trees already on the road do not achieve a screening of 4 meters.
- 5.2. Given the above and the topography of the site the counsel requests the Applicant installs a 500m buffer zone between the solar arrays and housing, highways and byways.

6. Community fund

- 6.1. There has been no discussion with the parish council about a community fund, whether one is being proposed, what level it will be, how its mechanics would work.
- 6.2. Is the Applicant offering a community fund? Will it be in line with NKDC¹ Solar Energy Community Benefit Policy (£500/mw/yr index linked for generation; 50% £500/mw/yr BESS)?

¹ <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/planning-building/planning/solar-energy-community-benefit-policy>