

From: Jeff Attfield [REDACTED]

Sent: 19 February 2023 15:09

To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>;
[REDACTED]

Subject: Objection to Solar Farm on land East of Pelham substation, Maggotsend Manuden

Objection to Solar Farm on land East of Pelham Substation, Maggotsend, Manuden

Application Number: s62A/2022/0011

My name is Jeffrey Attfield

I live at:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

Given recent events it is even more nonsensical that agricultural land should be given up for solar panel 'farms', we need to produce more food at home rather than import it. There are plenty of more appropriate sites for solar panels – on houses, industrial buildings and brownfield areas. The size of the land identified at 196 acres (not including the land needed to build a road for access) would be the biggest in Uttlesford. Furthermore the land is not flat and the Planning Guidance that Low Carbon refers to, notes that 'local topography is an important factor in assessing whether large scale solar farms could have a damaging effect on landscape and recognise that the impact can be as great in predominately flat landscapes as in hilly or mountainous areas'. The Pelham Spring topography will certainly have a severe impact and will not be hidden by over 3 metre tall panels, with a worse view in winter than in summer, which will be bad enough. There are many walkways around and within the proposed industrial site that will be impacted. As a walker, in particular, I have picked out Blakings Lane, the ancient right of way, which features on the Chapman and Andre Map of Essex from 1777, and will be completely ruined by the looming presence of a large swathe of solar panels. It is shameful to be thinking of this action. A solar farm should not be built next to an ancient woodlands. Not only will Battles Wood and Pump Springs change in character but lead to a loss of habitat for wildlife.

Low Carbon has deliberately downplayed the impact on the listed buildings beside the proposed solar farm and has ignored the views of local residents. Having seen sites in the Trent Valley area, where promised hedging etc was never carried out – would Low Carbon?

The proposed site of this Solar Farm is totally inappropriate as there is no obvious route for transport to the construction site. It would have to go through villages with narrow, difficult roads running through which will impact on residents as well as having to pass primary schools. Uttlesford already has approved sufficient ground mounted solar panels to power 132 per cent of households so why is there a need for Uttlesford to approve this large scale development?

Regards

Jeff Attfield