

**From:** John Groves [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 February 2023 17:19  
**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

Application number: S62A/2022/0011

I am writing to object to the proposal by Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited to construct a solar farm in the loss of 196 acres of productive farmland.

My name is John Groves

I live at [REDACTED]

The reason for my objections is as follows:

1. Primarily, having read the planning proposal put forward, it is clear there has not been properly reviewed and sufficient due diligence completed including looking at alternative ways of generating electricity, which will not take up precious arable food producing farming land for the next 40 years. There are plenty of brownfield locations which are suitable for an installation of this nature. It is obvious, to all of us that this location is being favoured because of its proximity to the existing Stocking Pelham Electricity site and existing battery installation. From a technical point of view, it is still feasible to locate such sites in brownfield location, none of these options appear to have been considered.
2. Uttlesford's own policy at ENV15 says that small scale renewable energy development schemes to meet local needs will be supported providing it can be demonstrated that they do not adversely affect i) The character of sensitive landscapes; ii) Nature conservation interests; or iii) Residential and recreational amenity.
  - a. This is not a "small scale" scheme.
  - b. The area covered by solar panels is even larger than the area which was contemplated at the time of the application to District Council for a Screening Opinion.
  - c. The land identified by Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited as the site for Berden Hall solar Farm extends to 196 acres of productive farmland.
  - d. The visual impact of such a huge solar farm would fundamentally change the character of the area.
  - e. The scheme will not contribute to the energy needs of residents.
3. The cumulative effect of the solar farm and the adjacent industrial battery storage facility is unacceptable.
  - a. Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that the adverse impacts of solar farms must be addressed satisfactorily and that the cumulative landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development must be considered.
  - b. The cumulative impact of the hugely visible and poorly screened battery storage facility (built by Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited) and the proposed solar farm will completely industrialise this rural area.

- c. The size of the proposed solar farm is excessive. The location (i.e., next to the battery storage facility) has not been chosen because of its suitability but because it will be cheap for the developer.
- 4. Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited have not demonstrated that the use of high-quality agricultural land is necessary.
  - a. Eddie Hughes MP, a Minister at the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government confirmed in June 2021 that the statements made by Eric Pickles in 2015 are still applicable. Therefore, must consider whether the use of agricultural land has been shown to be necessary.
  - b. '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.
  - c. As the land identified for development is high-quality agricultural land its use must be justified by the most compelling evidence.
- 5. Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited have not considered using roof tops.
  - a. 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?
  - b. It is no longer credible to argue that solar panels on industrial roofs can't be used because they are too heavy.
  - c. Solar panels thinner than a pencil have now been invented and which will revolutionise renewable energy.
  - d. These ultra-thin, lightweight panels are made by Singapore-based company Maxeon Solar Technologies and are predicted to take over the European market very soon.
  - e. Why not place solar panels on the rooftops of the huge terminal buildings owned by Stansted airport?
  - f. 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 S62A/22/0000004)
- 6. Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited
  - a. Principally, have not considered other sources of renewable energy generation, in land wind turbine would provide more effective renewal generation and in doing so have a considerably smaller footprint and would lead to a lot less reduction in 196 acres of productive farmland which we need more now post-Brexit and for our future generations.

There are a lot more options available to some highlight above, this Berden Hall Farm (Pelham Spring Solar Farm) application should be rejected on the grounds of insufficient evidence of to substantiate tearing up the countryside for future generations, without considering sensible alternatives.

Kind regards

John Groves