

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 March 2023 15:05
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]

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

My name & address is: Howard Farmer, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Objection to application no. S62A/2022/0011

I object to the proposed Solar Farm on Land East of Pelham substation, Maggots End, Manuden, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal removes a large area of quality food producing land from use, for 40 years: **Soil vs Solar?**
2. The proposal will leave Uttlesford with a massive multi-acre brown field site in the middle of verdant countryside when solar power loses its shine, in a few years' time: **Call that a Brown Field Site?**

Reducing CO2 emissions (the problem's source) is **really** important to reduce Global Warming BUT the negative effects of Global Warming (the problem itself) are reducing the extent and quality of fertile land now. Thus, safeguarding food production is **really, really, really** important for the world's survival.

1. Soil vs Solar

Global Warming is the overriding problem facing us all, the world over. Even if and when we halt Global Warming its effects will be felt for many years or perhaps for ever. Whereas Solar Farms are just a small and, almost certainly, temporary part of reducing its causes.

Global Warming is already taking effect and many of these effects will adversely impact the UK's food supplies, indefinitely. Already, we see massive examples across the world every day: Torrential rain events wash away soil, plants and animals; Rising sea levels destroy coastlines and increase flooding; Major fire events destroy crops animals and habitats; USA Multi-State Tornadoes destroy farmland as well as buildings; Heat domes and extreme cold events disturb growth patterns as well as animal and plant reproduction.

Plants in general, and food plants especially, do not thrive in extreme conditions. All of these affect the World's (and the UK's) ability to grow food now and in the long term. Already we see major Countries and States becoming unviable in food production e.g. in Australia, America, Africa, China, etc.

Clearly, the solution to Global Warming is NOT to take good quality soil out of the food production pool indefinitely and cover it with solar panels.

Sheep are a red herring. Sheep farming is unprofitable in the UK, The meat doesn't cover the cost of production and a whole fleece is only worth about 70p. According to a university study "sheep farmers could make more money by getting rid of their flocks and growing trees instead." Hardly the conditions to encourage sheep farming even without the added costs of: shepherding under a sea of solar panels; reduced grass yields; and the need for extra resources to enable sheep to be found, tended and controlled.

It is much more sustainable to keep good food production land to feed people and use poor/infertile land for Solar Farms. Solar Panels and Battery Parks work just as well if built over infertile soil, rocks, concrete, brownfield sites, etc. as they do over good food production land. That's why the Government's focus is on offshore wind farms.

Your decision on this Application is not a choice between saving CO2 emissions or not: it is a choice between having food or not, i.e. between life and death!

2. Call that a brown field site?

The useful life of solar panels and farms installed today will be quite limited. In 5, 10, 20 or 30 years' time; solar panel technology will have changed immensely and panels installed at this solar farm at Pelham (and elsewhere) will be obsolete. In addition other solutions (e.g. wind, wave, hydrogen, even small nuclear) will also have progressed greatly.

Depending on that progress, this Solar Farm will become obsolete in the easily foreseeable future. What will happen at that time?

Who will remove the panels, etc. so the land can be re-used for its proper purpose (feeding our people)?

- Not the original constructors/owners – they will have disappeared (gone broke, stopped trading or “done a runner”).
- Not the farmers – the massive task of dismantling and removal won't be cost effective for them.

So then, responsibility (i.e. the problem) will revert to The Government and Uttlesford Council, who will have to explain why they destroyed highly productive “green field land” and are stuck instead with responsibility for a 196 acres covered by obsolete panels –

Now that really is a Brown Field Site!

Thus your decision is not only a choice between protecting food production or erecting solar panels:

it is also a choice between feeding people or creating “a 196 acre brownfield site in Uttlesford.”

Please reject this (and similar) Applications!