

From: Heather Brooks [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 March 2023 12:36
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>;
[REDACTED]

Subject: OBJECTION to Solar Farm, Maggots End, Manuden - S62A/2022/0011

Dear Inspectorate and Councillors,

I would like to register my strong objection to the above referenced Solar Farm at Maggots End, Manuden for reasons outlined below.

The area surrounding Bishops Stortford has already had to endure years of building, including the construction of circa ten THOUSAND houses, the A120 bypass and now the inordinately large solar farm at Wickham Hall. This area has suffered enough at the hands of new building works and if the whole area becomes covered in concrete, it will simply lose its beauty, character, population will increase, traffic will increase, social problems will increase, air pollution will increase etc etc and this area will simply become an extension of London. I am already told the 'area is getting worse'.

I ask that the inspectorate and councillors prioritise the protection of prime farm land at a moment when British food supply is under mounting pressure and really should be a government priority in post Brexit Britain.

The environment is also clearly a top priority but given that the construction of the solar farms will 1) generate enormous amounts of pollution in their construction 2) irrevocably lay waste to prime farming land which currently supports significant amounts of wildlife and local flora and fauna, and clean air and 3) are proven to be extremely low inefficiency in contrast to wind farms in the UK climate, I ask you to stop this project from going ahead.

Local councils and government should incentivise the solar farm companies to work together with house builders to ensure, or better still, legally require, solar panels to be installed on all new build roofs where possible - both domestic and commercial.

You should also support solar panel developments on existing buildings - particularly public and large commercial buildings (half a million acres of suitable roofs are apparently available). This would clearly cost more but history shows that cheap option is often approved and hindsight shows that it would have been best.

The sheer scale of this proposed development is too big and cannot be considered 'small scale', the land is not flat and it should not be sited next to ancient woodland.

Please do not take the easy option for an easy life - please protect our countryside!

Many thanks,

Heather Brooks
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]