

**From:** CLAY, Kevin [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 05 March 2023 11:42

**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

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 Kevin Clay, and I live at [REDACTED]

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

### **The size of the development simply too big!**

- Uttlesford's 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.
- If approved, this would be the biggest solar farm in Uttlesford by some margin and one of the biggest in Essex.
- The visual impact of such a huge solar farm would fundamentally change the character of the area.
- The scheme will not contribute to the energy needs of local residents and even if it did it could never compensate for being BULLIED into living in an industrial landscape not of our choosing.

### **I am concerned about the impact of the development on the rich variety of wildlife on the site**

- The site for the development is rich in ecology.

- Page 36 of the Ecological Impact Assessment concludes that it is possible that Greater crested newts are present on the site given that their presence has been detected in five ponds in close proximity to the site.
- A number of red listed bird species noted as being present on the site including skylarks, yellow hammers, yellow wagtails, linnets and song thrushes.
- A study carried out in 2016 estimated that utility-scale solar farms around the US may kill nearly 140,000 birds annually. One leading theory suggests birds mistake the glare from solar panels for the surface of a lake and swoop in for a landing, with deadly results.
- The Ecological Impact Assessment notes that hares are seen on the site but concludes that they are unlikely to be affected! How can this be true when their habitat is being ruined and the site is being surrounded by 2m high perimeter fence.
- I frequently see Roe deer wandering across the site because they shelter in Battles Wood. These beautiful creatures will be lost.
- I often see deer roaming freely and the occasional hares and badgers sometimes accompanied by their young. These could not possibly exist in a heavily shaded low level vegetative solar "farm". The high fences would probably bar their access anyway. The whole huge area would become sterile and barren.

### **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?
- It is no longer credible to argue that solar panels on industrial roofs can't be used because they are too heavy
- Solar panels thinner than a pencil have now been invented and which will revolutionise renewable energy.
- 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.
- Why not place solar panels on the rooftops of the huge terminal buildings owned by Stansted airport?

- 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 UTT/21/2664/SCO)
- I find it ridiculous that the vast amount of housing developments all around us ( Stansted, Dunmow, Bishops Stortford etc ) do not appear to have solar panel technology incorporated into their builds. Tens of thousands of acres of wasted opportunity with no need for expensive inter connecting cables to the grid.

### **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.
- The 7 visual assessment submitted as part of the planning application were not shared as part of the consultation.
- Low Carbon claim that the evolution of the proposal is significant – it is not. It will still have an overwhelming impact on the countryside and on enjoyment of local residents.
- The overwhelming feedback was that the development should not go ahead. This has been ignored

- I for one am sick and tired of the developers being beaten in their applications simply to come back again and again hoping I imagine that the objections will cease. They WILL NOT.

### **The local roads are not suitable for such large construction vehicles**

- The supporting text for Uttlesford Policy ENV15 states development will only be permitted in locations where the local road network is capable of handling any additional traffic generated by the proposal.
- Low Carbon estimate that there will be a total of 922 vehicle movements during construction.
- This includes a total of around 749 deliveries by 15.4 metre articulated vehicles and of 59 deliveries by 10-metre-long rigid HGVs. The will be a substation measuring up to five metres long and three metres wide will be delivered to site individually by 15.4 metre artic vehicle.
- The road between Manuden and Clavering is a small country road. It is barely wide enough to accommodate two regular cars. Cars currently need to stop in order to allow tractors to pass. It is completely unsuitable for articulated lorries or large HGVs.
- Access point off the road is simply not suitable for vehicles of this size.
- All vehicles will pass directly in front of the primary school in Clavering – I am concerned about the safety of primary school children
- One of access routes will also pass directly in front of a secondary school – Joyce Franklin Academy – – I am concerned about the safety of secondary school children.
- Lorries cannot possibly get under the low bridge in Newport.
- Permanent access to the site will be along a protected lane which would perforce have to become a wider road to make it safely useable even by the contractors vehicles.

- The state of the current road system is dire with many very dangerous potholes being apparently ignored by Uttlesford District Council. The roads will become even more dangerous and if the large amount of lorry traffic is allowed then time would probably not be allowed to effect repairs to enable safe and non-domestic vehicle damaging use to be made of the proposed routes.

Regards

Kevin Clay