

From: Ian and Teresa Priest [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 March 2023 19:27
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

To all Addressees:

We attach a copy of our objections to the original application for this scheme when it was first submitted; they all remain valid.

To these we would like to add the following points:

We understand that the electricity from the new wind farm to be constructed off the east coast of the UK is to be on-shored in Suffolk, thereby making available a large additional quantity of electricity to the region. Uttlesford already has in excess of 100% of electricity supply for the needs of the District. On both these counts therefore the use of prime agricultural land for solar farms is not necessary and surplus to requirements.

It can also be said that solar panels are the least efficient form of renewable energy. By definition they cannot work more than 50% of the time, and generally at a maximum of no more than 40% efficiency when they do. According to some estimates, a single offshore wind generator can produce as much electricity as 140 acres of farmland. It is also likely that, well within the 40 year lifetime of the proposed farm current technology will have been overtaken; also that government policy may mandate that the roofs of new-build housing and industrial buildings must be equipped with solar panels.

The use of prime agricultural land for this purpose is starkly at odds with the need to increase domestic food production, at a time when this country is at least 40% dependent on food imports. Much of the infrastructure required for this project, such as concrete piling to support the panels, will be hard – and costly - to remove at the end of the 40 year period proposed, making a nonsense of the supposedly 'temporary' nature of the project. Likewise, the common practice of removing a layer of topsoil from the site before construction gives the lie to its temporary nature. The disturbance to residents during the construction should be taken into account: pile driving can be heard for miles around.

The proximity of the Pelham substation and other factors make it easy to see why this would be a profitable investment for the financial backers and other parties involved, but given the existing supply of electricity to the area there is no foreseeable benefit to the residents of Uttlesford in this scheme. If solar farms must be accepted within Uttlesford, why can they not be situated on grassland at Stansted Airport, or on one of the disused airfields in the District, or better still, alongside the M11 which provides many hundreds of acres of vacant land, as well as on the roofs of the large number of existing commercial premises in the area?

Finally it must be stressed that the narrow access roads to the site and the constrictions within the village of Manuden mean that there will be an entirely unacceptable volume of heavy traffic on roads altogether ill-equipped to handle it. This constitutes a serious danger to users of the pavements and roads generally, especially to children on their way to and from school; this is true of

all the villages that have schools, such as Manuden, Clavering, Newport, Great Hornead and others, through which it is proposed to route heavy traffic. Manuden is a particular case in point: in the centre of the village residents' cars are parked along one side, limiting the roadway to a single lane. There is a constriction at the north end of the village where a 500-year old cottage projects into the road, again limiting the road to a single lane. Pavements are narrow, and small children coming from school only have to overbalance on their scooters to fall under the wheels of a heavy vehicle. I would not want to be the driver of such a vehicle responsible for the death of a child.

Regards,

Mr & Mrs T I Priest (2 Objectors)