

**From:** Chris Simpson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 February 2023 08:00  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Objection to Solar Farm on Land East of Pelham substation, Maggots End Manuden - Application number: S62A/2022/0011

I am writing to object to the application to construct a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar arrays together with (among other things) battery storage, inverter cabins, a substation, fencing and CCTV cameras on land near Pelham Substation Maggots End Road Manuden CM23 1BJ, for the same reasons that I had objected to the previous application. As far as I can tell the only difference between this application and the previous application with the exception of 2 small areas of panels being removed which would still result in the loss of 196 acres of prime farmland.

My name is Christopher Simpson and I live at [REDACTED]

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:**

1. The scale of the solar factory is vastly out of proportion to any development in the area. This would have the impact of industrialising and urbanising much needed farmland in an area where ancient woodland is located. Low Carbon states that this is "*a small scale renewable energy development scheme*". I'm sorry, but this is far from a small scale development, as this more or less urbanises the entire land between the villages Berden and Manuden and this is TOTALLY unacceptable. The residents of this area will therefore suffer all the consequences of industrial urbanisation and degradation of the surrounding countryside with absolutely no benefit from it.
2. The impact of this development would be devastating for a number of reasons. The catastrophic effect on local wildlife would be immense. Deer routinely cross this area which would effectively be a no go zone due to the construction of 2 metre high fencing, destruction of the land, storage unit construction and constant construction traffic. This area also has many bird species including the relatively rare Red Kite. I believe that Solar Farms in the USA killed over 140,000 birds annually, so the argument that this construction will improve the environment is null and void. The area where this is proposed is rolling landscape, and therefore would be a complete eyesore and would also not be compatible for the construction of a solar farm which would be impossible to hide from view by hedges alone. I have also absolutely no confidence that Low Carbon has considered the environmental impact this will have. A great example of this is the disgraceful way the electricity storage units were developed at Stocking Pelham power station. Huge white blocked construction which is an eyesore for miles around and the promised screening of this was an unmitigated disgrace. This project is a greed project. Nothing more, nothing less.
3. The proposal states that this construction is temporary (40 years). Again I'm sorry, but 40 years IS NOT temporary. If you look at the demographic of the people living within the area of the proposed construction, the vast majority of people are middle aged (45 years and above). Therefore a construction lasting 40 years IS NOT temporary, it's a life sentence. Its permanent...
4. This project is NOT GREEN. Building on prime grade 2/3 farmland such as the land found in the Berden/Manuden area would mean a total eradication in crop yield. When you consider hundreds of these projects are being considered on similar sites this would mean Britain would be increasingly dependent on importing food from abroad. This in turn increases the carbon footprint due to increased transportation which would then offset any advantage (there is actually none at all) that a solar factory would give to the environment. Which brings me to my next point. At night solar energy production is redundant. In the winter month (and at night) the Solar Factory would almost be

constantly redundant due to lack of natural sunlight. So how is this going to benefit either electricity production or the environment? If you want a solar factory that would be constantly producing energy with minimal impact to the environment or residents, make a planning application in the Sahara Desert, NOT England. The project is ludicrous.

5. If the environment is top of the agenda, why haven't Carbon Sinks been considered ahead of Solar Factories. This would involve the planting of large forested areas in the locations suggested which would have the effect of reducing CO2 levels within the atmosphere, reduce the risk of local flooding and would promote and enable the local animal species to flourish. On top of that ITS NOT AN EYESORE. This surely should be the foremost consideration, however I suspect this will not be the preferable option for the greedy corporates that want to exploit the land in Uttlesford for pure monetary gain.

If you want to building solar panels: Look at Brownfield sites, put them on rooftops of houses, find industrial locations such as Stansted airport (has hundreds of acres of unused land due to its failed application for a new runway), but DO NOT consider prime farmland and much needed countryside.

For all these reasons I strongly object to this proposal IN ITS ENTIRETY.

Regards... Christopher Simpson.