

From: Mark Trapmore [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 February 2023 09:45
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 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

My name is Mark Trapmore and I live at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

The size of the development simply too big!

- Policy 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
- This is not a “small scale” scheme.
- The land identified by Low Carbon as the site for Pelham Spring solar Farm extends to 196 acres. This important fact is not mentioned in the Planning Statement.

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

- 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 and ride along these paths.
- I often walk along Brick House End. Because the fields slope upwards, the solar farm will be visible at all times of year.
- The 10m wide corridor proposed will prevent me from seeing the countryside and enjoying the countryside as I currently experience it.

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.
- 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.

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?
- Why are new homes not ALL built with solar panels – this should be built into ALL planning permissions and should be enforced

The solar farm is inappropriate development in the countryside

- The development proposed by Low Carbon can only be described as industrial.
- In addition to large numbers of solar PV panels (the exact quantity is not specified) the development will include ; 26 containerised inverters; 40 containerised battery storage units a DNO substation and Customer substation.
- The development is not compatible with policy S7 which says that the countryside will be protected for its own sake

The land will not remain in agricultural use

- Paragraph 170 of the Planning Guidance on renewable and low carbon energy says where a proposal involves greenfield land it must proposal allows for continued agricultural use.

Farmland should be used for farming

- Low Carbon suggest that the majority of the land on the site is Grade 2 agricultural land. Over 81% of the site has been classified by Low Carbon as “best and most versatile” agricultural land.
- The Agricultural assessment is unreliable, because it does not reflect the actual site which is the subject of the planning application. For example, the area immediately to the West of Battles Hall has been included in the assessment but this is not part of the site.
- This is productive farm land which should be used for farming.

There is no benefit to the local community

- There is no benefit of this development to the local community
- Local residents will not get cheaper solar energy
- There will be a loss of rural amenities such as footpaths with open views

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.

