

From: Kim Dunn [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 February 2023 10:10
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Dear Sirs,

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.

My name is Kim Dunn of [REDACTED]

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

I am keen walker – I don't want to walk through a solar farm.

- Low Carbon defines visual amenity as the “Overall pleasantness of the views people enjoy of their surroundings, which provides an attractive visual setting or backdrop for the enjoyment of activities of the people living, working, recreating, visiting or travelling through an area.”
- There are eight local Public Rights of Ways within and immediately adjacent to the site comprising of one Bridleway and seven Footpaths.
- As a local resident I frequently walk along these footpaths.
- I often walk along Brick House End. Because the fields slope upwards, the solar farm will be visible at all times of year.
- Access to open countryside is particularly important these days – it makes a significant contribution to my mental well being.
- I often do a triangular walk along Brick House End, along the footpath PROW 5_52 and back along Park Green. This walk will be ruined by the appearance of solar panels. I do not accept that the impact can be satisfactorily mitigated by planting hedges – there is no existing hedgerow.
- The planting adjacent to the existing battery plant adjacent to the Substation at Stocking Pelham demonstrates that hedges do not provide adequate screening.

Low Carbon have not demonstrated that the use of high quality agricultural land is necessary.

- Eddie Hughes MP, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government confirmed in June 2021 that the statements made by Eric Pickles in 2015 are still applicable. Therefore, Uttlesford must consider whether the use of agricultural land has been shown to be necessary.
- Uttlesford's Policy ENV5 also says that development of the best and most versatile agricultural land will only be permitted where opportunities have been assessed for accommodating development on previously developed sites or within existing development limits. Where development of agricultural land is required, developers should seek to use areas of poorer quality except where other sustainability considerations suggest otherwise.

- As the land identified for development is high-quality agricultural land its use must be justified by the most compelling evidence.
- No evidence has been provided by Low Carbon to demonstrate that there has been consideration of other sites for a solar farm.

Low Carbon have not considered using roof tops.

- The Building Research Establishment announced in 2016 there were around half a million acres of rooftops facing in the right direction for solar panels. Why haven't these been considered?
- It is no longer credible to argue that solar panels on industrial roofs can't be used because they are too heavy
- Solar panels thinner than a pencil have now been invented and which will revolutionise renewable energy. · These ultra-thin, lightweight panels are made by Singapore-based company Maxison Solar Technologies, and are predicted to take over the European market very soon.
- Why not place solar panels on the rooftops of the huge terminal buildings owned by Stansted airport?
- Clearly Stansted airport don't think that there is a problem with this because they have just applied for planning permission to put solar panels on their own land (see UTT/21/2664/SCO).

Low Carbon has ignored the views of local residents.

- Low Carbon says that it has listened to all views expressed by local people during the pre-application consultation and has made appropriate changes to the proposed development to address and mitigate concerns raised where possible. This is not true.
- Low Carbon received 133 comments on its proposal on its consultation website. Only 7 of those comments supported the development. Therefore 95% of the people responding were against the development. In addition Low Carbon received 69 emails objecting to its proposal.
- In the Consultation report which accompanies the Planning application Low Carbon admit that 5% of respondents were positive toward the proposals, 4% neutral and 92% negative. However, this does not reflect the comments sent by email.
- Low Carbon claims to have given "meaningful consideration" to the feedback received from the local community and has made a number of additions and changes to the design of the proposed development. There is no evidence of this.
- The 7 visual assessment submitted as part of the planning application were not shared as part of the consultation.
- Low Carbon claim that the evolution of the proposal is significant – it is not. It will still have an overwhelming impact on the countryside and on enjoyment of local residents.
- The overwhelming feedback was that the development should not go ahead. This has been ignored.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Kim Dunn