



APPENDIX 15

Copies of emails (anonymised)
sent to the Applicant
in response to its Consultation

Objection to development at
Maggotts End, Manuden
(Pelham Spring Solar Farm)

PINS Reference: S62A/22/0011

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Linda L
Sent:	01 August 2021 16:31
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon;
Cc:	Pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; Cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; Stop Battles Solar
Subject:	Battles Solar Plant/Pelham Spring solar plant

I strongly **object** to the proposition of Battles Solar Farm and all the associated projects that have been put forward.

For the following reasons I **object**.

Solar energy is inefficient + is generated when we don't need it, also it is stored in unsafe battery units. The location is so very wrong for so many reasons. Prime farmland should be used for growing food. From a personal perspective, I do not want to live in the middle of a huge solar farm. The countryside here is beautiful and many of us live here for that reason and we do not want it unnecessarily spoiled by these developments.

Solar has become a blight on the countryside. There are far better places it could go, if it must go somewhere. It seems to me that this is land owners just jumping on a bandwagon with no thought for the protection of the natural environment + protecting our cherished landscapes.

Linda L

Resident of Little London

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Helen MW
Sent:	08 August 2021 11:37
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Cc:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Subject:	Brick House End site (Pelham Spring)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am emailing you to lodge my **objection** to the above mentioned site for a solar farm. I **object** to the industrialisation of our community that includes our surrounding fields and farm land. As a regular walker, I do not want to walk amongst solar panels. I moved to the countryside to be able to move around and enjoy the countryside. I also **object** on behalf of my neighbours whose views will be adversely affect by this installation.

The impact on local wildlife will also be detrimental. The only advantage to this installation is the generation of electricity via the sun, but there has to be better locations for this. There is a site along side the A11 at Six Mile bottom. This away from residents and on a site that is probably better suited. To the side of motorways and many A roads would surely make better sense.

It would be nice to think that your company will 'do the right thing' instead of be driven purely by profits.

Regards,

H. MW

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Gill R
Sent:	05 August 2021 16:59
To:	'Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon'
Subject:	battles solar farm

Dear Sirs

I **object** most strongly to the proposed development of Pelham Spring Soar Farm for the following reasons.

The only substantial beneficiaries will be the landowner and Low Carbon investors or subsequent purchasers. There are no benefits at all for the local residents whose homes have already plummeted in value.

Solar farms should be installed on brownfield sites, the roofs of industrial buildings or unused land where carbon sinks are impossible not in the heart of the countryside and not on high quality Grade 2 agricultural land. There are huge opportunities for such developments on land owned by Stansted Airport. The Government planning policy encourages the preservation of the countryside and states that planning decisions should 'contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.' This proposal does neither.

The local wildlife including hares and a herd of fallow deer which has roamed these fields for centuries will be denied access by a 2m high security fence surrounding the site. You will not be protecting existing habitats as you claim in your information leaflet.

The construction access will be anything but temporary. More substantial material than rolled stone will be required to support the number and weight of the many construction lorries entering the site. Are you planning on digging it all up and reverting the area to farming land again? I see you have anticipated the results of this consultation and subsequent planning application and have already prepared the entrance to this 'temporary' road off the Clavering Rd.

The existing footpaths and bridleways which pre

Sently enjoy views across open countryside will be enclosed by a 2m high stock proof fence with 'Danger of Death' signs placed at regular intervals. A far cry from the Gov. planning policy to 'enhance the natural and local environment'

This proposal is morally wrong. To ruin the lives of two small communities and the local environment in order to make enormous profits for the landowner and a faceless asset management company is morally unacceptable.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Marianne G
Sent:	03 August 2021 18:15
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	FW: Object ion to the Pelham Springs 180 Acre proposal

Subject: **Object**ion to the Pelham Springs 180 Acre proposal

Dear Madam,

I totally support the need for renewable energy. However, the land earmarked for the Pelham springs solar farm is very good farming grade and should not degraded to meet the country's renewable energy targets. As part of Brexit, the UK government shared its ambition to increase food self-sufficiency in the country. This proposal goes totally against supporting this ambition. Have alternative grey site locations been fully explored?

Additionally, it is recognised that solar energy production is very inefficient. Why is Low Carbon not considering this option instead of solar panels?

The benefits of this project as it stands would not outweigh the negative impact, the proposal is far from optimum and for this reason, I strongly **object** to the 180 acre Pelham Springs solar farm development in Berden/Stocking Pelham area.

Kind regards

Marianne G

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	James P
Sent:	6 August 2021 at 22:57:13 BST
To:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk , cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk ; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Battles Farm Solar development

I am writing, as a Berden resident, to let you know that I have today posted my **objections** to the Low Carbon proposal on their site. I have thought carefully about the proposal, as I am strongly in favour of transition to net zero and green energy.

But the heart of this proposal is to makes us feel that opposing development here means we oppose all solar development or are “Nimbys”. But the reality is we badly need a coherent policy on where solar development should take place.

The Government has consistently set out the position that agricultural land, particularly high quality land such as that here, should not be used. They have also been consistent that solar should not blight our countryside. But this fails to meet those requirements.

I do not complain of farmers or developers seeking to make a profit by developing the lowest cost available land. But the lowest cost land will always be greenfield, like this. That is a crazy approach to take and flies in the face of an appropriate policy for Uttlesford.

I am concerned that when Uttlesford has developed its policy on solar and green energy, it will inevitably not support developments such as this, or the nearby proposal on the other side of Berden. So it would be completely wrong to adopt such proposals, “creeping through” simply because a policy has not yet been developed.

Uttlesford’s inevitable and proper desire to contribute to green energy transition, needs I suggest to take account of an appropriate policy in its national context. Uttlesford already has high generation capability, I understand, but the influx of solar and battery developments could lead to us moving from being one of the most rural regions in the South and East, to being one of the most developed and scarred for generations (anyone who believes these sites will return to agricultural use clearly has no experience of development history).

I urge you to - oppose this and the further proposal at Berden - to support the urgent development of an interim policy on solar and green development in Uttlesford, so we have a coherent approach to the issue, not the Wild West of development going on now.

Uttlesford should consider seriously its appropriate role in the green transition, but it should not create an irreversible change to the area before it has properly considered the principles of its approach. No special justification to justify giving up agricultural land in such a rural location, affecting residents, has remotely been argued, let alone established.

Thank you for reading this.

Best wishes

James P

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Kika P
Sent:	08 August 2021 20:37
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
	Cc:cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk ; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objections to Battleswood Solar Farm proposal

To whom it may concern,

The following **objections** to the development of Battleswood Solar Farm development sites should be noted and considered to the fullest;

1. A significant area of the Essex countryside and arable farming land should not be sacrificed in order for a few to profit. Green energy is fantastic but not when it is serving the financial needs of a small group of people to the detriment of the larger local community. Please see <https://www.shareenergy.coop/leominstersolar/> on how community green energy can be the least impacting on land and local residents.
2. The villages of Manuden, Berden and Stocking Pelham should not be forced to suffer for the absence of Uttlesford District Local Development Plan. It is my view that the fact that there is no Local Development Plan in place authored by Uttlesford Council is earmarked by development companies and investment agencies are targeting Essex landowners.

The future of the Countryside under the custody of the local council is in peril as the success of this solar farm will inevitably lead to an influx of others all over the region. Close the stable door before it has bolted, not after and consider the current solar farm proposals untenable.

Many thanks,

Kika P

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Andrew N
Sent:	Sun, 8 Aug 2021 at 18:33
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Cc:	Chair of Berden PC clrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk ; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Object ions to Proposed "Solar Farm" at Battles Wood

Hello, As a local resident, I was interested to visit your recent presentation in the Manuden Community Centre.

Your representatives were enthusiastic and very personable, but unfortunately did not seem able to satisfy some of my misgivings about your proposal.

Very briefly, I am concerned about the following;

The loss of good quality agricultural land to light industry (calling the project a "solar farm" does not convey agricultural status). This is contrary to stated Government policy;

The intrusion into open countryside, which is contrary to UDC planning policy: Change of use from agricultural to light industrial – again contrary to UDC policy;

Potential hazards/noise pollution from the battery units which are integral to the installation. May I suggest that there is a huge area of car parking at nearby Stansted Airport, which could be clad in solar panels with no loss of amenity, farm land, or visual beauty?

A few moments' research shows that many airports over the world have taken this route. Have you approached MAG, owners of the airport, about this?

If and when a Planning Application is submitted by you to UDC, I will have no option but to register my **obj**ections, in more detail, on the above grounds.

I would of course hope that you will come to understand the strength of local feeling about this project and abandon the idea of submitting an Application.

I look forward to your response,

Sincerely,

Andrew N

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Mary N
Sent:	Sun, Aug 8, 2021 at 3:47 PM
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Cc:	Janice Loughlin <cllr1oughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk>, cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk <cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk>, stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring

Dear Low Carbon group,

I wish to register my **objections** to the proposed Solar development at Pelham Spring.

I **object** for the following reasons. In the government paper on ‘A Green Future our 25 year plan’ there is a section on “Enhancing beauty, heritage and engagement with the natural environment”. Here they state “We will conserve and enhance the beauty of our natural environment, and make sure it can be enjoyed, used by and cared for by everyone. We will do this by;

safeguarding and enhancing the beauty of our natural scenery and improving its environmental value while being sensitive to considerations of its heritage.

making sure that there are high quality, accessible, natural spaces close to where people live and work, particularly in urban areas, and encouraging more people to spend time in them to benefit their health and wellbeing”

The proposed solar farm goes directly against this. Walking along footpaths next to proposed solar panels with high fencing is hardly providing high quality, accessible, natural spaces where people from our neighbouring towns can spend time to benefit their health and well being. The Government’s Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land updated Feb 2021 refers to the ‘Government Paper on A Green Future our 25 year plan’ Where they state that the government plans to;

protect the best agricultural land

The agricultural land on which the proposed solar farm would be sited is good quality agricultural land which the government is seeking to protect so this project goes against that government policy. In Farming for the future Policy and Progress updated Feb 2020 published by DEFRA there is a section entitled ‘The importance of Food Production’. In this they say

‘During the Health and Harmony consultation you told us that food production and food security were important, and we agree. In the policy statement published in 2018 we reassured you that our priority was a productive, competitive farming sector – one that will support farmers to provide more home grown, healthy produce made to high environmental and animal welfare standards. This is hardly likely to be met by giving over good quality agricultural land to industrial usage. Another of my **objections** is that commercially solar panels are far less efficient than wind generated power in this country.

The UK Government has announced significant investments into wind power as part of its clean energy programmes. It has for instance, has announced a £60m investment in upgrading the country’s offshore wind capacity, increasing the target production from 30GW to 40GW by 2030, a change that would see the UK generate enough electricity from offshore wind to power every home in the country. And finally, rather than use good agricultural land why not do what other countries

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

have done and put solar panels on airport car parking facilities. One example of this is at Perpignan airport.

Another is Abu Dhabi Airport (AUH), which has completed the development of a solar-powered car park with nearly 7,542 solar panels, this three-megawatt (MW) solar photovoltaic (PV) project is said to be the largest solar-powered car park in the region. This solar project is expected to save nearly 5,300t of CO₂ annually. The solar panels have been deployed on the car shading at the short-term car park of the airport's Midfield Terminal. The grid-connected project will provide energy to power the car parking space while the surplus energy will be diverted to other areas of the airport. Adelaide and Brisbane airports have solar panels on roofs and car parks. With Stansted on our doorstep shouldn't we be looking at this rather than good quality agricultural land.

Yours sincerely

Mary N

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Sarah Y
Sent:	07 August 2021 13:51
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Cc:	Berden Parish Council; clrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Subject:	NO to solar factories!

Berden is soon to lose it's identity as a village and will be known as an energy factory!

We have had the substation and related pylons on our doorstep, blotting our landscape for several decades now and that was accompanied by a battery farm several years ago, adding a further eyesore to our landscape, taking over further valuable agricultural land and adding another huge safety risk to our village.

The land around Berden is high grade agricultural land. Government policy says high quality farm land should not be used for solar factories. Farm land should be used for farming. The UK needs to be more self sufficient in the amount of food we produce for consumption. Taking our high grade agricultural land away from farming and handing it over to solar factories will have the opposite effect. We already import 48% of the total food consumed. Handing over farmland to solar factories will increase the amount of food imported which surely goes against all green polices and makes a mockery of the reasons for installing solar factories.

Solar energy is incredibly inefficient. The Government's Build Back Greener Strategy promotes the use of offshore wind for a reason. A single wind turbine will generate almost as much energy as the whole of Pelham Spring in the course of a year. This would allow us to to keep our farmland for use it was intended. A no-brainer don't you think?

Government planning policy recognises the value of the countryside and that it should be preserved. Government planning policy says planning decisions should “contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”. I fail to see how the installation of a solar factory in our beautiful countryside achieves that.

We do not need to further industrialise our countryside to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. Solar panels may have a role to play but not by creating solar factories on agricultural land which helps form our beautiful countryside. Solar panels belong on the rooves of industrial and commercial buildings as well as houses. There are enormous housing developments around this area which all could be fitted with solar panels with no negative impact on the environment.

The new housing development Stortford Fields promotes the site by saying it is close to beautiful countryside. Ironic when it is built on what was formerly agricultural farmland and beautiful countryside! If we continue to build houses and install solar factories on our agricultural land there will be no beautiful countryside to enjoy!

You can window dress this solar factory as much as you like - sheep grazing around the panels, wild flowers planted for our bees!! Oh please!! Our agricultural land provides a greater haven for wildlife than a solar factory could ever achieve. The conservation strips which surround many of these fields are full of wild flowers for our bees. The fields themselves are havens for hares, deer, birds of prey and many other birds and animals. Leave them alone!

Sarah Y (Berden)

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	John A
Sent:	04 August 2021 10:31
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Stop Battles Solar
Subject:	Objection two Pelham Spring and other solar farms in this area.

I should like to register the following **objection**.

To put solar panels on prime farm land is a nonsense. Wind generation of electricity is many times more efficient, can be sited offshore and because it is more consistent and reliable, needs fewer lithium batteries.

Solar panels tend to generate electricity when we least need it, hence it needs to be stored - in lithium batteries! Lithium batteries are a serious hazard especially from the risk of fire and explosion.

Prime farm land is needed for food and we do need to strive to be as self sufficient as possible. To be reliant on food supplies from the EU or further afield is both expensive and foolhardy. Solar farms should be on brown field land, on buildings, alongside runways and motorways.

In this area, a significant proportion of farm land has already been given up to new housing, all WITHOUT solar panels on the roofs. Hence it's hard to believe these proposals are really based on a concern for the environment rather than pure greed.

The alternatives for energy generation seem to be wave motion, being used successfully in Scotland at the moment, wind power, solar power and in the near future, hydrogen based systems. Of all of these, solar power does seem the least efficient and the most disruptive. These proposals should be withdrawn until a properly considered policy can be developed that evaluates the risks, benefits and options, considered and agreed with the local residents. Uttlesford District Council or Essex County Council should be stepping in to establish this policy. Of course we could always plant 240 acres of trees to reduce the pollution we have already created and do wonders for the environment!

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Charlotte W
Sent:	07 August 2021 11:00
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Cc:	
Subject:	Objection two Pelham Spring and other solar farms in this area.

Good Morning

I would like to lodge my **objection** to the Battles Farm Solar Farm proposal. There are several proposed solar farms in the vicinity all of which would be on arable farmland. I do not agree with using good quality arable farmland for solar farms. It is not government policy to do this. There is plenty of land that cannot be used for other purposes that would be far more appropriate for solar farm. I also believe that there are far more efficient green energies that should be promoted such as wind turbines before we remove arable farmland for solar farms. We should value are countryside and protect this - developing and Industrialising it with solar farms is not the answer.

Regards

Charlotte W

Sent from my iPhone

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Emma C
Sent:	02 August 2021 13:07
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; Stop Battles Solar
Subject:	Objection to “Pelham Spring” solar farm development / Low Carbon

Please find my **objection** detailed below for your attention;

I totally **object** to the vast proposal of solar panels ‘eating up’ our precious, beautiful and high quality farmland which is needed more than ever now for long term food production. Farmland should be used for Farming and we need to protect our countryside!

I am frustrated and saddened that developers such as Low Carbon are proposing to steal this land away from our local community, to change our landscape to one of a ‘solar panel graveyard’ for their financial gain. To develop this industrial site, where they propose is obvious that it is purely for the financial aspect and convenience of a easy connection to the existing grid.

A thorough and intelligent understanding of the impact to our area that would avoid taking away huge amounts of our high quality farmland to facilitate this huge development would conclude this as being unnecessary and a totally unsuitable site. The government policy states that ‘High Quality land should not be used for solar farm developments’ and that all poorer quality land should be used first. “Our countryside should be preserved, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”.

The countryside is proven across multiple studies to reduce the risk of mental health problems including anxiety and depression for which is currently at an all time high. Installing these vast number of solar panels over such a vast amount of acreage will be taking the privilege away from our community to enjoy the beautiful countryside views thus making a significant contribution to existing and future health problems.

This proposal should be diverted to an alternative, suitable site - away from our established wildlife and preserve our high quality farmland and beautiful countryside and place any solar panels in suitable, established environments such as existing industrial sites & New build’s etc.

Yours sincerely

Sent from my iPhone

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Debbie T
Sent:	08 August 2021 09:24
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Cc:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to Pelham Spring Solar Farm

I am writing to register my **objection** to the proposed Battles/Pelham Spring Solar Farm both the original and now enlarged site.

It is extraordinary that you should decide that it is acceptable to use high quality agricultural land and blight a number of listed buildings, scheduled monuments and scenic countryside for your development.

This area already has to contend with the disruption and noise from Stansted Airport and the M11 and it seems madness to inflict this further blow to residents. But maybe these earlier development provide an answer - don't the airport and motorway create the ideal apron land on which to site your solar farm? Are you considering this?

I feel very strongly that this site is wholly inappropriate for a solar farm and I take no comfort from its 40 year life span. I understand that the land will be stripped of its top soli before the panels are installed, leaving it unusable for decades after the panels have gone (if they are not replaced by the latest green alternative). What will you do with the thousands of redundant panels? This may be a cost effective way of producing clean energy now but at what cost in the future?

I understand that this consultation closes tomorrow, Monday 9 August and I would be grateful to receive confirmation that you have received my **objection**.

Regards

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Jill N
Sent:	04 August 2021 13:05
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; geoffrey.willamson@eastherts.gov.uk; graham.mcandrew@eastherts.gov.uk
Subject:	OBJECTION TO PELHAM SPRINGS BATTERY AND SOLAR FARM

Please see my **objections** to the above;

Objection to Pelham Springs Battery and Solar Farm

1. We do not need to industrialise the countryside to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. Solar may have a role to play but solar panels belong on the roofs of industrial buildings and houses and not on productive farmland.
2. Farm land should be used for farming. The UK now imports 48% of the total food consumed and the proportion is rising. The amount of arable land being taken out of cultivation is almost 100,000 acres a year.
3. Land which is not farmed should be used as a carbon sink. For example, land should be used to create new native broadleaved woodlands. This is a key aim of the Government’s Landscape Recovery Scheme. The Government’s Woodland Carbon Guarantee is also designed to encourage farmers to create new woodland in return for payments as trees grow.
4. Solar energy is hugely inefficient. Solar panels generate only 10-12% of their potential generation capacity during the year and the panels become less efficient as they get older. The Government’s Build Back Greener strategy promotes the use of offshore wind for a reason. A single wind turbine will generate almost as much energy as the whole of Pelham Spring in the course of a year.
5. Government policy states that high quality farm land should not be used for solar farm developments. There is plenty of poorer quality land West of Bishop’s Stortford (particularly around urban centres such as Stevenage) and to the South of Chelmsford. This should be used first.
6. Government planning policy also recognises the value of the countryside - it should be preserved. Government planning policy says that planning decisions should “contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside....”

Jill N (local resident)

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	David T
Sent:	08 August 2021 10:16
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
cc:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to Pelham Springs Solar Farm

I am writing to register my **objection** to your proposal for a 241 acre in this location before your consultation period ends tomorrow.

I **object** strongly to this use of prime agricultural land and beautiful open countryside for the following reasons;

Is this really a low carbon project when all the processes are taken into consideration i.e. the panels are imported and they go to landfill after 40 years (if they last that long).

How many hours per day are these panels actually creating energy from the sun?

Are plants that photosynthesise not better at reducing carbon than part-time solar panels?

The land used will be stripped of its top soil and take decades to recover! I fear this is a short term opportunity for a few people to make money with little regard for the long term health of the environment or the people who live in Berden.

Regards

David T

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Andrew M
Sent:	08 August 2021 22:02
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; And
Subject:	Objection to plans for solar farm

To Low Carbon

I am writing to state my strong **objections** to the 250-acre solar farm proposed for the site known as Pelham Spring (Berden/Manuden, Essex). There are many reasons why I find this proposal **objectional** as outlined below;

1. Whilst renewal energy is clearly preferable to burning of fossil fuels, solar energy factories constructed on high quality agricultural land makes no sense in a country where a large percentage of our food has to be imported. The UK is losing arable land at an alarming rate, with grave implications for future food security. Government policy states that high quality farmland should not be used for solar farms. The land in question is mainly Grade 2 and Grade 3 land, currently used for growing crops. The direct consequence of this loss of farmland will be a need to import more food which will require fossil fuels to be burned for transportation.
2. Solar energy may make sense for investors who care little for anything other than making a return on their investment but not as a major component of a future energy policy. In contrast to tidal and wind energy which deliver energy at all times of day and year, solar is most productive at times of the day when energy consumption is at its lowest (daylight) or in the summer when power demand is also lower. Thus the inefficiency of needing to store solar energy makes it unattractive compared to other renewables. All this solar farm will do is to produce electricity at t times when it is not needed.
3. By contrast, solar panels on the roofs of buildings provide local generation without the need for expensive and environmentally damaging connections to the grid
4. A key aim of the government’s Landscape Recovery Scheme is the creation of native broadleaf woodlands. These act as carbon sinks and are far more environmentally friendly than large-scale solar farms which are not an efficient source of renewable energy and become less efficient with age - and at the end of their usable life, there is currently no means to recycle the raw materials used in the panels' manufacture.
5. Government planning policy also states that planning decisions should recognise ‘the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.’ The proposed site is a peaceful, unspoiled area on the Essex/Herts border which is visible from many listed buildings and serves as an amenity to local people. Lockdown underlined its value for health and wellbeing more than ever. Five much loved and well used footpaths would be affected by this large-scale development, including one which has been in existence for over a thousand years (Blakings Lane). Once surrounded by 2-metre high chainlink fencing and other unsightly security infrastructure, these paths would be effectively unfit for purpose and deprive residents of a cherished and vital amenity.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

6. Uttlesford District Council does not currently have a policy for solar energy within the Local Plan. That a major development of this kind would be granted permission in the absence of such a policy means that future generations would be left to live with the consequences of a policy vacuum which permits a Wild West, unregulated trashing of the countryside - a terrible legacy to leave to those who care passionately about the environment.

7. There is widespread and unanimous opposition to the proposed solar farm from the residents of Berden and the nearby villages of Manuden, Stocking Pelham and Furneux Pelham. Low Carbon's publicity materials, which were not received by all residents when the first proposal was made in February 2021, disingenuously repre

Sent the solar farm as compatible with sheep-grazing, a suggestion one local farmer derides as completely impractical, while bland references to tree planting, bird hides and other mitigation measures are frankly unconvincing and could not in any case possibly make up for the loss of fields, hedgerows, and paths. The general view expressed in a recent consultation with villagers on August 6th 2021 was that in this case green energy is being used as a greenwash and that the true purpose of the solar farm is not to help solve the climate crisis but to make money.

8. From my own observations, the area proposed sustains a significant population of birds which have been in national decline, including yellowhammers, skylarks, lesser whitethroats, linnets, wheatears and stonechats. We have also observed four of the UK's five species of native owls including a rare Long eared owl. There are clearly populations of butterflies and bats which will be destroyed by the environmental vandalism which this proposal represents.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew M

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Jane C
Sent:	15 July 2021 22:01
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to Proposed Solar Farms

Thank you for your recent communication, received by post.

I write to express my **objection** to your proposal to repurpose this Grade 2 farming land from food production. With a growing global population, I believe very strongly that prime agricultural land should not be taken out of food production. There are many other more suitable places that solar panels could be housed - brown land, warehouse and domestic roofs, railway sidings and city locations. A solar farm, and such a large industrial farm in this location will be a devastating blot on the countryside and forever take the land out of food production. Low Carbon have also failed explain why the development is necessary when

Uttlesford already has sufficient solar generation capacity to supply around 70% of the homes in the district (and this does not take into account the sites which are currently with Uttlesford for planning permission);

and

Solar farms are hugely inefficient when compared to other renewables. Over the course of a year, the generation capacity from solar is generally only 10% of the "installed" capacity. This explains why a single offshore wind turbine will generate almost the same amount of electricity as 180 acres of solar panels.

No explanation is given as to why this is the right place for a solar farm. I strongly **object** to this proposal and ask that this be registered with all those copied on this email.

Yours sincerely

Jane C

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Charles K
Sent:	08 August 2021 17:36
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to proposed three solar farms bordering the historic villages of Berden /Stocking Pelham /Furneux Pelham and Manuden on the Herts and Essex border

To All concerned

I wish to **object** in the strongest possible terms to the above proposed solar factory units of Furneux Pelham unit (size TBA) Berden 165 acres and Battles/Pelham springs 241 acres ! Plus additional dangerous battery storage units

If any of these solar factories were approved for development the very nature of these delightful rural communities and surrounding areas would be lost forever . It would change the landscape from idyllic rural and agricultural communities to an industrial wasteland .

There are any number industrial and brown field sites within Uttlesford far more suited for this type of industrialisation .

The scale and size of these proposals are just eye watering and devastating for all members of these communities

The use of such vast amounts of agricultural land for this type of industrial activity is nothing short of criminal .

The visual and noise pollution would be so destructive ,its just too high a price to pay for a relatively inefficient form or energy .

These proposals go against all central government policy which states high quality farm land will not be used solar farm development and that the value of the countryside will be recognised and preserved at all times .Any planning decisions should enhance the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside .This is government policy

To whom I am writing please ensure this policy is upheld at all times

yours

Charles K

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Mark & Sarah
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:38
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to Solar Farm Development at Berden

We write to **object** in the strongest of terms to the creation of a Solar Farm at Berden (known as Pelham Spring) and the surrounding area of Berden considering the following:-

1. The development is proposed in Greenbelt and on high quality farm land which should be preserved and used for the production of food stuff and not inefficient solar energy production;
2. Berden and the surrounding areas comprise of some of the most beautiful and picturesque countryside and is in an area of outstanding beauty. The development would ruin this unique location which is enjoyed by a huge number of individuals
3. The development is within close proximity of Listed buildings and protected monuments and so breaches planning guidance and Governmental recommendations;
4. The development is poorly designed and sited in an unsuitable location and will be visible from all surrounding areas;
5. The close proximity to the Switching station at Stocking Pelham is not a justifiable reason to "overload " the Berden area with a massive development of this nature. It is completely out of scale and there is no justification for burdening Berden and the surrounding area with inappropriate over development;
6. Brownfield and low quality land should be used for production of renewable energy and not high grader farm land.

Mark & Sarah

Residents of Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Melanie A
Sent:	16 July 2021 18:19
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to solar farm proposal

Having received your leaflet showing the horrifying extent of your proposal, I am writing to **object**, in the strongest possible terms to your proposals for solar "farms" at Battles Field (and in Furneux Pelham, together with the proposal to also build TWO battery storage units (East End and Crabbs Green) near our homes, putting us in danger and making our homes (devalued) places of danger, for the sake of profit.

This is NOT the right place for a project like this. You will be building on Grade 2 farm land which should be used to produce food. The mitigations you have suggested will be unable to disguise the impact of this massive industrial development in a rural area.

Uttlesford already has enough solar capacity to supply at least 70% of homes in the district.

Solar farms are far less efficient than other sources of renewable energy. You would need to use 180 acres of farm land to generate the amount of electricity that a single wind turbine would produce,

I am utterly horrified by your proposals to industrialise our local area in this way. It is short sighted, shows poor judgement and speaks volumes about the credibility of your organisation.

If you decide to try and press on with these devastating plans, we will fight you for as long as we have breath in our bodies.

Melanie A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Jon S
Sent:	26 July 2021 18:44
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to the proposed Pelham Spring Solar Farm

Dear Madam,

I am a resident of Berden and I am deeply opposed to the proposal in any form. You are taking beautiful countryside and turning it into an industrial area. Whilst I fully appreciate the need for diversity in our sources of energy (I chair my company's sustainability strategy group - the Financial Times), this is an inappropriate and disproportionate invasion of a heritage asset. The effect on residents who use the land for wellbeing will be deeply significant, effectively rendering a huge swathe of land unusable for anything other than this light industrial farm since public rights of way will either border or run through the industrial area. Clearly the visual impact, as well as loss of important agricultural land will be vast, to say nothing of the significant disruption during the many months of proposed construction. By responding to very significant disapproval from residents in your first consultation by proposing 'flexibility over the options' you have chosen to completely disregard the strong resident sentiment complaint about the entire project, thus rendering your entire 'consultation' a falsehood - it's a bait-and-switch tactic. You have currently proposed nothing of any direct benefit whatsoever to the community into which you intend to force this scheme. We lose a huge amount and gain precisely nothing. I am also unimpressed with your 'key facts': a temporary structure of up to 40 years is as good as permanent. Finally, you state that brownfield sites are unfeasible because of the economics and pass-on price of the energy produced. It would be more truthful to say that the profits of your business are impinged - otherwise you should provide financial evidence to the contrary. I will be fighting this proposal and encouraging my fellow residents to do likewise.

Regards,

Jon S

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Daniela M
Sent:	07 August 2021 18:49
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; Chair of Berden PC
Subject:	Object ion to the Solar Farm , Pelham Spring

To Low Carbon

I am writing to state my **objection** to the 250-acre solar farm proposed for the site known as Pelham Spring (Berden/Manuden, Essex). I **object** to this proposal on the following grounds;

1. Solar panels belong on the roofs of buildings and by the sides of major roads, not on productive farmland. The UK is losing arable land at an alarming rate, with grave implications for future food security. Government policy states that high quality farmland should not be used for solar farms. Especially in the view of Brexit, perhaps it will be more important for future gain to ensure we grow things we can afford and eat? The land in question is mainly Grade 2 and Grade 3 land, currently used for growing crops. Roofs are plentiful in industrial areas. Yes, undoubtedly more complicated and costly to harness in comparison to establishing a huge solar farm in the open countryside with a direct tap to the batteries and power station, I suppose.

2. A key aim of the government’s Landscape Recovery Scheme is the creation of native broadleaf woodlands. These act as carbon sinks and are far more environmentally friendly than large-scale solar farms which are not an efficient source of renewable energy and become less efficient with age - and at the end of their usable life, there is currently no means to recycle the raw materials used in the panels' manufacture. What are the calculations regarding the loss of the proposed amount of trees versus the gain of electricity?

3. Government planning policy also states that planning decisions should recognise ‘the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.’ The proposed site is a peaceful, unspoiled area on the Essex/Herts border which is visible from many listed buildings and serves as an amenity to local people. Lockdown underlined its value for health and wellbeing more than ever. Five much loved and well used footpaths would be affected by this large-scale development, including one which has been in existence for over a thousand years (Blakings Lane). Once surrounded by 2-metre high chainlink fencing and other unsightly security infrastructure, these paths would be effectively unfit for purpose and deprive residents of a cherished and vital amenity.

4. Uttlesford District Council does not currently have a policy for solar energy within the Local Plan. That a major development of this kind would be granted permission in the absence of such a policy means that future generations would be left to live with the consequences of a policy vacuum which permits a Wild West, unregulated trashing of the countryside - a terrible legacy to leave to those who care passionately about the environment.

5. There is widespread and unanimous opposition to the proposed solar farm from the residents of Berden and the nearby villages of Manuden, Stocking Pelham and Furneux Pelham. Low Carbon’s publicity materials, which were not received by all residents when the first proposal was made in February 2021, disingenuously repre

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

Sent the solar farm as compatible with sheep-grazing, a suggestion one local farmer derides as completely impractical, while bland references to tree planting, bird hides and other mitigation measures are frankly unconvincing and could not in any case possibly make up for the loss of fields, hedgerows, and paths. The general view expressed in a recent consultation with villagers on August 6th 2021 was that in this case green energy is being used as a greenwash and that the true purpose of the solar farm is not to help solve the climate crisis but to make money.

6. The sheer scale of this is affecting a large area that accommodates wildlife such as animals and birds. This disruption will displace the majority as paths/fields for deer as an example will be closed off. Birds will not tolerate the scale of the building and removal of their breeding facilities.

7. Alternative energy is a necessity but this should not be resulting in this to be a hindsight case where only too late the realisation sets in that environmentally we cannot replace what we have lost, and the profiteers are retired or dead. Which makes finger pointing easy but does not solve the legacy they left for the next generation.

Those solar panels have a life expectancy of 50 years. Where is the proposed disposal site?

Many are made in China, how likely is it that they have been produced by forced labour? Has anyone looked at this potential flaw?

We get all that lovely electricity in the summer, the need is greater in the winter (unless we all plan on air-conditioning?) How many sunny days? More chance of wind than sun.

How much electricity is actually generated per effort. England is really not a sunny country. We get more out of growing crops that can be eaten and used for roofing, and making alternative fuel from crops too? Those solar panels are hardly producing a good yield per square meter. The stats are not looking good.

The solution is to look at the bigger picture and consequences. Not how to quickly tick some boxes and earn a good profit (for a very few) in the short term.....

Finally, how will this produce affordable energy? Even with my limited maths, the price for the kWh must be gold-plated looking at the rent that is paid to the farmer, the cost of setting this up, the little electricity actually generated?

Yours faithfully,

Daniela M

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Barry C
Sent:	08 August 2021 19:18
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
cc:	Chair of Berden PC; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Objections to Pelham Spring Solar Farm

We would like **object** in the strongest possible manner to the proposed solar farm. Firstly, we cannot understand how after **object**ions to a 180 acres proposal that you have the audacity to then propose a larger 240 acre proposal.

The land is high grade arable land that should be used to produce food for the UK and exports to other countries. The lose of this land will mean more food needed to be imported into the UK to satisfy demand. The argument for solar is to utilise natural resources to power our homes but it causing more transportation into the UK to satisfy our need for food.

Lower grade land positioned near roads, motorways and industrial areas would be far better suited positions for solar farm that will also not be to the detriment of the landscape. There are miles and miles of motorway in the near vicinity that would be far less detrimental in all respects except we assume for your profit predictions. There is also Stansted airport close by where solar panels within the airport boundaries would not effect then environment. How many farm workers are going to be put out of work and their homes by farmers selling off their 100's of acres of land for a quick buck and then no longer need the workers?

You and other developers are targeting the areas closest to the grids to minimise your costs for connection. You are dangling huge financial gains to the farmers to sell out their villages that have been supporting them for many lifetimes. As much as I can blame the farmers themselves for being bought, they are being relentlessly hounded by the likes of yourselves and others in your effort to make a quick buck. We have moved back to the area recently for the peace and quiet, village life with the expanse of countryside and country walks on footpaths for dog walking. This might sound a bit NIMBY but we moved from Old Harlow to get away for house developers who has decimated the local countryside and walks. We have moved back to what now seems like a far more dangerous and threatening opposition than developers as you are offering far more higher rewards for the land than housing developer's are.

In addition the road infrastructure in rural areas is not designed for and cannot cope with the vast amount of heavy traffic that the installation and maintenance of the solar farm will require. Solar is not an efficient form of energy and although all alternatives have their place, the countryside is not it. As the former minister energy and climate change, Greg Barker stated back in 2013

Solar is a genuinely exciting energy of the future, it is coming of age and we want to see a lot, lot more. But NOT at any cost... NOT in any place... NOT if it rides roughshod over the VIEWS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES. As we take solar to the next level, we must be thoughtful, sensitive to public opinion, and mindful of the wider environmental and visual impacts".

These comments are as true today as it was then. The Pelham Spring development is everything that his quote says it shouldn't be.

Mr and Mrs Barry C

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Kevin C
Sent:	03 August 2021 09:24
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Ob jections to the development of Solar "farms" in Berden, Furneaux Pelham, Manuden and Stocking Pelham

Madam

I have returned your Community Feedback Form with additional comments as I felt your form did not supply sufficient space.

I strongly **object** to all of your planned developments

Support of **obj**ections to the development of Solar “farms” in Berden, Furneaux Pelham, Manuden and Stocking Pelham.

My overall **obj**ection is the vaguely veiled strategy of the big business concerns to persuade local people with sugar coatings which after all may, or may not even happen (re-hedging, beehives, wildflower meadows etc etc) to accept their proposed Solar Farm Installations.

They will never be able to compensate for the 40 year (minimum) destruction of our wonderful carbon neutral countryside. We would also not be alone as I read in the Sunday Mail of 29th May 2021 of several other areas in the country blighted by such “farms”.

It appears that the Low Carbon company has already asked us to accept their “wonderful low carbon power generation ideas” once for Pelham Spring Solar Farm and we have rejected it. So they have asked us again with the similar documentation. Do they really expect us to eventually just give in? To become a community hemmed in by an industrial landscape? There is very little space within what I view frankly to be a biased and propaganda laden Community Feedback Form for any true comments of **obj**ection which has compelled me to write as I have. I feel that the several considered good reasons to **obj**ect to Pelham Spring Solar Plant put forward by the “Say No to Battles Solar Farm protest group” are very valid and have NOT been answered by Low Carbon and frankly many could not be.

1. Solar energy is inefficient 10% at best. That is at best ill-conceived and given the fact that we don't have a climate, we only have weather which for the majority of the year is dull and overcast that 10% is probably optimistic.
2. Solar energy is generated when we don't need it. Yes it can be stored in vast lithium battery banks but at what cost? At least the hydroelectric dam system at Dinorwic in North Wales can supply electricity to the national grid with 16 seconds warning and uses off peak low cost electricity to pump its' water back to the top dam for only 7 hours after complete usage. Thereafter it sits waiting for its' next usage. The Lithium battery storage will need constant 24/7 power to cool it to a non-explosively safe level. How ridiculously inefficient is that?
3. This is the wrong location. Why allow good quality farm land to be squandered where there are thousands of acres of brownfield site around plus tens of thousands of acres of

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

factory/warehousing roofs that could be used to site solar arrays. What is to stop all newly built homes from having built in solar panels if they are deemed useful.

4. Low Carbon make no mention of the fact that the vast majority of solar panels, some 80%, are made in China and according to BBC sources as recently as 21st June 2021 in China use is made of forced labour in Ugyhur “re-education camps”. The Ugyhur people’s only “crime” is that the majority of them follow the Muslim religion. A human rights abomination.

5. Farmland should be used for food farming. It seems tragic that the UK now import 48% of its’ foodstuffs and it would appear that some 100,000 acres of good arable land is being taken out of use annually for solar, non-food production “farming”.

6. How water absorbent are Solar panels? Not at all else they would stop functioning. Water shed onto hardened ground due to non-cultivation will run off and significantly increase the risk of flooding.

7. Loss of wildlife. Currently incumbent wildlife will not be able to exist naturally among a glass and steel jungle whose undergrowth will be sparse due to shading. The numbers of deer of all kinds, rare hares, badgers, foxes and birds will all be reduced due to loss of habitat. Low carbon have not addressed this matter adequately and once the damage has been done it may not be reversible.

8. Increase in traffic. Construction traffic will be a nightmare for the whole community and will our already potholed roads (apart from the superb work done by Uttlesford District Council between Berden and Manuden) will be further wrecked by multiple heavy delivery lorries. Not to mention probable congestion and traffic lights as and when they are convenient for the developers to set up.

9. Last but not least - what will become of the worn out and indeed in-service replacement item solar panels? I put this question to Humphrey at the exhibition in Manuden Village Hall On 2nd August and he gave me to believe that they will be recycled. It seems unlikely that this will happen as recycling would have an attendant cost which may not meet the Low Carbon Company 2061 business model. Might they not be dumped in landfill instead? complete with their poisonous cadmium content. Humphrey did not have an adequate answer to the Chinese forced labour question either, he simply suggested that they probably make televisions as well.

I passionately hope local **objections** and local Government support will prevent these proposed developments from going ahead.

Sincerely yours

Kevin C

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Alastair G
Sent:	07 August 2021 19:55
To:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk
cc:	stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Subject:	Pelham solar farm objection

Hello

I am writing to register strong **objection** to the Pelham Spring Solar Farm project, currently under proposal, on behalf of myself and my partner.

My sister and her husband live in the Berden area, and are regular users of the local roads and footpaths for recreation. We also often visit from Bishops Stortford to go walking or take a picnic into the nearby countryside.

If this solar farm project goes ahead, access routes will likely be restricted, but most importantly the attractive aesthetic of the surrounding area will be heavily and irreversibly impacted.

Please do not build an enormous industrial facility on this area of natural beauty.

Thanks and best regards

Alastair G

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Jo C
Sent:	15 July 2021 20:43
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
cc:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk
Subject:	Pelham spring

Hi

I am writing to raise my concerns re this unsightly use of now not 180 acres of arable land but 241 acres known as Pelham Spring but it is not near Furneux Pelham a Hertfordshire village and much nearer to Manuden and Berden both Essex villages. I know Uttlesford are considered an easier option for planning than East Herts .

I have lived and ridden in this area all my life a lovely single track lane with no passing places . To the left and right arable fields, hedges and woods. Herds of deer, foxes, hares, rabbits, birds and bees already seen enjoying the landscape. Too think this will be developed with many solar panels is totally against the reason I choose to live in the countryside. This land has been farmed for crops , the farmer should not be incentivised with lump sum bank payments for 30 years for the detriment of the local people. What will it take for other farmers to follow suit. (as already being seen in our local area)

The traffic to this site also will affect the neighbouring villages, Albury , Manuden , Clavering , Furneux Pelham , Berden and Stocking Pelham where it is difficult to pass in a car let alone hgv traffic. The road is fast and drivers do not expect to see hgv vehicles, in fact I use Maggots Lane to ride as it is one of the only places cars have to wait as they can't get past.

Pelham substation was a local school's nature reserve it has been left to go to rack and ruin over the last 15 years, so there is definitely no argument for that as there was one only two fields away . (please see photo attached)

The Pelham grid station provides electricity for the south east and not our local area so why should the local residents have to put up with this unsightly look, traffic for absolutely no gain.

If this amount of land has to be used to power just 16581 houses why do the local housing developments not have a requirement to put solar panels onto their new builds?

I HAVE taken the government incentive for both solar panels and recently an air source pump , why do I have to look at glass mirrors instead of the lovely countryside that I choose to live in ?

Jo C

Stocking Pelham

Sent from my iPhone

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Barry S
Sent:	08 August 2021 13:13
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com; 'Clr Loughlin'; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; Chair of Berden PC
Subject:	PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FACTORY - IT'S NOT A FARM IS IT

Good Afternoon Pelham Spring,

May I start by introducing myself. My name is Barry S, and I've lived in Berden for 38 years. Whilst I live in the centre of the village it's important to remember that whilst Berden is the village centre, all of the closely located areas – Brickhouse End, Little London, Park Green – all of these are Berdenites as far as I'm concerned. In essence it appears that your proposal effectively surrounds the village with industrial development, which surely cannot be right.

I will therefore outline below my feedback on your proposal and would ask that you please acknowledge safe receipt of my response, kindly also copying in the cc's to this email.

I have perused the proposals outlined in the introductory pamphlet you

Sent to residents and the community feedback form, will pose some questions on that, as well as providing my end position on your plans. I think one of the first things I was drawn to was the use of the word “Farm” to describe what you are doing. It seemed to conflict with my own very basic understanding of what a farm is, so I decided to check the dictionary, in case I'd missed something. When I saw the definitions as being:-

- “plots of land that are used to grow crops and raise livestock”

that certainly afforded with the understanding of what a farm was from my early years, and I've no reason to change that view close to seventy years on. With that in mind I have replaced any references to a “farm” with “factory” or “plant”, as that is what it is, an industrial unit on prime agricultural land that surrounds our beautiful village.

So in front of me are two glossy brochures, with bee hives, wild flowers, sheep grazing, talks of grasses planted, if fact it sounds like utopia doesn't it? However that is far from the truth. What was initially outlined as a 180 acre site, albeit soon increased to one of 250 acres, it's all high perimeter fences, CCTV, buildings housing dangerous battery units, noise pollution, all of those and it quite simply engulfs and chokes us. On the

Subject of perimeter fences, you describe the maximum height of the panels as three metres, so ten feet – the height of a Rugby crossbar I think. That's high, but I can't seem to see how high the perimeter fencing around the panels is planned to be. Is that higher than three metres – please can you clarify this for me?

Your documents describe the following:-

- “following our initial consultation earlier this year, further available land has been identified in response to a number of suggestions received”

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

Would you be kind enough to articulate what the content of the “number of suggestions” were please, that prompted this change of plan?

You describe that 11,210 tonnes of CO2 would be saved each year from this scheme. Would you please be kind enough to tell me how many tonnes of CO2 are created as a result of the building, end to end, of your facility?

Solar Energy may sound a great idea, but it generates electricity predominantly when the sun is out and high – as in the Summer – when demand for electricity is far lower than when the demand is at its highest – in the Winter. Indeed solar energy would seem to be a relatively inefficient way to go green, given one wind turbine would produce almost as much as the entire Pelham Spring plant. Also manufacture of the solar panels is very largely carried out in China, and as BBC China has reported they are fabricated using Uyghur forced labour. Not good I’m sure you will agree to have that association.

So on the table is a proposal for an industrial site, built on prime agricultural land, providing an order of magnitude lower efficiency when compared to other green energy solutions, that intrudes close to many parts of Berden and its close outlying satellites, with precious little tangible community benefit. You’ve already moved the spec up, with a proposal now looking at a site close to half a square mile. That cannot be right and I for one **object** to your proposals in the strongest possible way.

Yours Faithfully,

Barry S

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Toby O
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:07
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Chair of Berden PC; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; Geoffrey.Williamson@eastherts.gov.uk;
Subject:	We do not want your solar factory

When did you last hear somebody say they're moving to the countryside because they want to overlook rolling solar panels?! The countryside is rolling fields and open space and an escape from industrialisation. So leave it that way. Don't turn our countryside into a solar factory.

The substation and pylons have blotted our landscape for many years. A battery store was then added to the perimeter of the substation. An ugly monstrosity with a huge safety risk to our village and residents. Both these things were built on valuable, high grade agricultural land. And now you want to build a solar factory!! NO!! WE DON'T WANT IT!!

The land on which you plan to install this further monstrosity is high grade agricultural land, for farming and producing food. Handing over our farmland to solar factories will result in us importing more food. We already import 48% of our food. We should be aiming to be more self sufficient, not less. I thought solar energy was supposed to make us "greener". How can importing food because our agricultural land is being used for a solar factory be green?! Government policy states high quality farm land SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR SOLAR FACTORIES. Why are you not sticking to Government policy?

Government Planning Policy recognises the value of the countryside and that it should be preserved. It also says any planning decisions "should contribute to and enhance the NATURAL AND LOCAL ENVIRONMENT by recognising the INTRINSIC CHARACTER AND BEAUTY OF THE COUNTRYSIDE" How on earth can solar factory do any of that?! Again, why are you not sticking to Government policy?

Conservation strips were created around fields as part of a government policy do draw in wildlife and pollinators. Where do they go when you destroy the fields, the conservation strips and their habitat? The wild animals will fenced out?

Solar energy is very inefficient. Wind turbines generates a huge amount more energy than solar. A single wind turbine will generate almost as much energy as the whole of Pelham Spring in the course of a year. The Government's Build Back Greener Strategy promotes the use of offshore wind for a reason. Why don't you listen to them?!

Solar panels may have a role to play on the roofs of houses and industrial/commercial buildings. Heaven knows we have enough of those! Why not make use of them? There is no need to create solar factories on our agricultural land and further industrialise our countryside to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. Installing solar panels on roofs in already urban or industrial areas will have no negative impact on the environment. Building solar factories in our countryside will have a serious negative impact on our environment.

In 2013, Greg Barker (then Minister of Energy and Climate Change) made the following comments. These are still relevant today;

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

"Solar is a genuinely exciting energy of the future, it is coming of age and we want to see a lot, lot more. But NOT at any cost....NOT in any place.... NOT if it rides roughshod over the VIEWS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES. As we take solar to the next level, we must be thoughtful, sensitive to public opinion, and mindful of the wider environmental and visual impacts".

Wise words!

Toby O

Berden Resident

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Dave & Ali P
Sent:	08 August 2021 10:41
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com; cllrbagnall@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrbarker@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrcaton@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrcoote@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrfairhurst@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrffreeman@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrgregory@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlecount@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlees@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlemon@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlight@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllroliver@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrpavitt@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrreeve@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrsell@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrsutton@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrdevries@uttlesford.gov.uk; kemi.badenoch.mp@parliament.uk
Subject:	Uttlesford (reference UTT/21/2158/SCO) - Pelham Spring Solar Farm and Battery Storage & The DESTRUCTION OF 180 ACRES OF FARMLAND

Dear Sirs,

I would like to strongly **object** to the construction of a 180 Acre solar ‘farm’ under the name of Pelham Spring Solar Farm.

As a local resident I am appalled at the proposals. Whilst in general I behind green energy, this location is just not suitable for a project of this size and scale.

The project will destroy a beautiful rural location with historic interest and natural habitat for many wild animals. The proposed access to the site for construction traffic would consist of roads that are totally unstable for HGV’s, it would be via a single track lane and a rural village that already has huge issues with traffic flow due to the narrow streets.

This proposed project is in direct contradiction to the Government's Planning Guidance (PPG). The PPG clearly "encourages the effective use of land by focussing large scale solar farms on PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED AND NON AGRICULTURAL LAND" and requires that where a proposal involves greenfield land, the proposed use must be shown to be NECESSARY and specifies that POORER quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land.

The whole project is not about green energy its about profit for the land owner at the cost of the countryside.

Regards

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Ellen L
Sent:	08 August 2021 17:47
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Stop solar farms

To whom it concerns

Hereby I would like to strongly **object** against the proposed build of industrial Solar Factories on the Essex Hertfordshire border between the beautiful villages of Manuden, Furneux/Stocking Pelham and Berden.

These are beautiful villages surrounded by prime agricultural land, that we need to work to produce food, so we are not so dependent on the import of food, which helps reducing our carbon footprint.

There's also a lot of wildlife here like deer, hare, badgers, foxes, songbirds and birds of prey, that would be in serious trouble, if this plan were to go ahead.

The roads over here, need a lot of maintenance, cause they aren't very good, nor very wide. In most cases you have to go in to a lay-by to let another car pass. Can you imagine what will happen to our villages, if there's all of the sudden loads of lorries during the whole day continuously going over these roads. Also very dangerous with the amount of people going walking here, who sometimes need to walk on them.

The thought of having Lithium batteries to store the energy in, I find very frightening, the firefighters now can't even put out a fire of an electric car, because of the battery, let alone batteries of this magnitude, the blast it would take, if the air conditioning around these batteries were to fault. Would we survive that ?

The three meter high fencing, CCTV, floodlights, it would destroy this beautiful historic landscape, and think of the sound pollution !

There's a lot of residential buildings going up in Bishops Stortford. Hundreds of them. Maybe even thousands, NOT ONE of them has Solar panels on their roofs. Why is that???

Also, if it's a government policy, to NOT use high quality farmland for Solar factories, Why is it being proposed here in this area? Alongside with the policy to recognize the value of the countryside. We are importing so much food from abroad, let's be self sufficient for as much as we can, I think we learned a lot about that during the lockdowns for COVID. I hope in future we can try to import a lot less, especially from China.

So put the Solar Factories next to high/motorways where it does no damage to wildlife, and the population. Or/and on the roofs of industrial buildings in industrial areas (Even make that mandatory) Further on, I've learned that the economical profit of a Solarfarm/factory of the size of around a 180 acre is barely higher than that of ONE wind turbine. While that will give you energie when you need it, like in winter. Not a lot in the summer when you don't need it So I don't understand the rezoning to put solar factories in this area

I STRONGLY **OBJECT** AGAINST THE SOLAR FACTORIES IN THIS AREA !

Ellen L, Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Rosamund C
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:37
To:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	STOP BATTLES SOLAR FARM

Myself and My husband are retired and moved to Berden X years ago , with the intention to enjoy the beautiful and peaceful countryside surrounding this lovely village Sadly we find that we could be surrounded on all side by Solar Factories.

We **object** strongly, as do most of the residents in the area affected. What started as 180 acre site has increased to 251 acres.

Already we have to put up with the noise and lack of screening from Berden Battery Unit We already have to import 48% of food from other Country's due to loss of good Agricultural land. Solar panels should be sited on roofs of houses and large buildings with owners con

Sent, rather than eradicate our farmland ,views and essential habitats for wild animals.

Farmers should be creating Broadleaf Woodland to promote nature.

One offshore Wind Turbine will generate as much energy in a year, than all of Pelham Spring.

Poorer quality land-can be used rather than prime Agricultural. We will do all we can to enhance our local environment and the beauty of our green spaces.

Solar Factories, have risk of explosion and fire, causing highly toxic gases endangering all life within the vicinity .I am sure that should this proposal go ahead most of our properties will be devalued.

We pray that this proposal is rejected.

On behalf of Rosamund and James C

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Maurice H
Sent:	07 August 2021 14:57
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	stop battles solar farm

Dear Kemi Badenoch,

Thank you for helping us to get a refund on our holiday to Japan last year.

We now need your help to protect good farming land being used near Berden, Manuden, and stocking Pelham near Bishops Stortford as cheap solar farms.

They are all very near the Electrical sub station, therefore making the electricity much cheaper to transfer to the electrical storers.

The Government policy states that high quality farm land should not be used for solar farms.

We do not need to industrialize the country side to have carbon neutrality by 2050. I fear that the hole projects are driven by large profits for the farmers and developers.

I would be very grateful for your comments.

Yours Faithfully

Maurice H

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Colin S
Sent:	08 August 2021 18:26
To:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	STOP BATTLES SOLAR FARM

This proposal is appalling ! To devastate what is pristine countryside on this scale is beyond comprehension. I would like to think that any development would have been given the proper consideration as to the impact on the local environment , in this case that does not appear to be the case. This land should be used for agricultural purposes and should not be covered by "inefficient" solar panels for the monetary gain of the landowners. What is the point of making efforts to retain our environment if it is then ruined by this kind of development for which there are many alternatives. I walk this area with my dog regularly and I am more than angry that such an insensitive proposal would even be considered.

Colin S

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Bronwen R
Sent:	25 July 2021 17:25
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Stop Battles Solar Farm
Subject:	Solar farm proposals

Please find attached my personal response to proposals for battles and other solar farms. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter to this e mail address. Thank you Bronwen

RE: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR SOLAR FARMS

Dear Beverley

I am writing to strongly **object** to the proposals to build solar farms in the immediate vicinities of Berden, Manuden, Stocking Pelham and Ferneux Pelham. I understand that three individual companies are involved in the planning applications which if granted will have a devastating effect upon our local environment.

Visually solar farms are ugly, regardless of efforts to ‘dress them up’. For the last 10 years it has been refreshing to walk the fields and footpaths of Berden, aiding positive mental health not just for me but for neighbours and friends also. The concept of walking routes surrounded by acres of metal fencing, danger of death signs and lines of solar panels is a horrific thought and in no way can be a positive mental stimulus. The power and beauty of nature is the main reason I choose to live here. To have this taken away from us in such an abrupt and thoughtless manner is unthinkable.

It will also have a detrimental effect upon small local businesses. Many people walk / cycle around the rural lanes, visiting the villages and hamlets which house historic buildings such as Berden’s Medieval Church and Grade 2 listed buildings. They visit public houses, drinking, eating and taking advantage of local accommodation, providing es

Sential trade and employment through tourism for our local hostelries. Our rural communities and businesses will undoubtedly suffer if we take away what visitors come to view, namely nature.

As a country we are now alone, having exited, rightly or wrongly, the EU. Surely it would make more sense to grow our own food supplies here rather than import es

Sential crops. The land you are proposing to use is Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land, it is currently blossoming with crops. Surely this is an irresponsible decision to make when choosing sites for these monstrosities.

Lithium battery storage units are also part of the proposals for our area. Concerns all around the world by eminent professors are being raised about the safety of these units. There have been explosions, raging fires, releases of toxic gases into the atmosphere and people’s homes. You as companies are planning to build them close to our homes. Why?

Unfortunately, we are dealing with greed. You offer substantial sums of money to landowners and they find it difficult to say no. Rural communities such as ours are the losers in the battle and we all know who the financial winners will be.

I welcome a response to this letter and await with anticipation your comments to my concerns.

Regards, Bronwen R

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Bill A
Sent:	08 August 2021 13:37
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; johnburton@berden.org.uk
Subject:	Solar Farm Objection

To Low Carbon

I am writing to state my **objection** to the 250-acre solar farm proposed for the site known as Pelham Spring (Berden/Manuden, Essex). Although I am not a resident of Berden or Manuden, I lived in Berden until April this year, my family still live there, and I visit every weekend to walk the footpaths around the village, especially those such as Blakings Lane and the paths to Manuden which will be severely affected if planning permission is granted for the solar installation.

Solar farms are not an appropriate use of high quality arable land, and a solar farm on this scale will deprive local people and their visitors of a vital amenity whose value was especially evident in lockdown. Paths bordered by chainlink fencing will inevitably become unattractive and hence fall into disuse, and having seen the neglected and half derelict 'nature reserve' at the existing electricity station, I am highly sceptical that Low Carbon's stated commitment to mitigation measures will be sustained. At pre

Sent Berden enjoys a network of beautiful and much used bridleways and footpaths, and great biodiversity in the copses, hedgerows and fields around the village. On walks it is usual to see many species of deer and mammals (I have seen many deer and half a dozen hares in the past month) as well as unusual birds (raven, long-eared owl) and butterflies;

if the solar farm becomes reality their habitats will be degraded and in many cases destroyed. In the absence of a solar energy policy within the Local Plan, I wish to point out that permission should not be granted until an environmental impact assessment has been carried out, to determine what will be lost if the development goes ahead.

Yours faithfully,

Bill A

Sent from my iPad

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Richard E
Sent:	18 July 2021 12:03
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	clrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk
Subject:	Pelham Springs Solar "Farm"

I have received and read the papers relating to this project which were recently Sent to me.

I wish to register my total **objection** to this unjustified, unwanted, selfish and greedy development which, if it goes ahead, will be a social, agricultural and environmental disaster. It would ruin the lives of many families, be a gross misuse of high grade farm land, and wreck a large area of attractive and wildlife rich countryside used and enjoyed by many members of the public.

It must not happen.

Richard E

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Lucy G
Sent:	09 August 2021 17:34
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Springs Solar Farm

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

I am writing to you regarding the Pelham Springs solar farm plan.

Though I appreciate the need for renewable energy and understand the importance of driving green energy plans, I'm afraid I **object** to this particular plan. The grade of the agricultural land on which the 180-acre solar farm proposed is very high and would therefore it would be more beneficial to utilize the land for farming purposes. If not used for farming, placing a carbon sink in the form of woodland would be a more favourable purpose than a solar farm, since it would not only counteract current CO2 emissions, but also provide habitats for diminishing and vulnerable wildlife. Many other areas provide alternatives with little cost to agricultural land and to hedgerow wildlife. These include disused airfields, commercial roof space and disused quarries.

Additionally, other renewable energy sources may be better- such as wind turbines, of which a single turbine placed offshore would produce almost the same amount of energy as the entire proposed solar farm. Therefore, wind turbines should be considered as another viable alternative to the Pelham Springs Solar Farm. To conclude, while I can definitely appreciate the need for green energy and would be excited to see such development in the appropriate places, I **object** to the 180-acre Pelham Springs solar farm development plan for reasons stated above in addition to others.

Kind regards,

Lucy G

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	John F
Sent:	08 August 2021 11:25
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk
Subject:	Pelham Springs Solar Generation Station Proposal

I would like to register my **objections** to the expanded proposals for Pelham Spring Solar Farm;

The use of grade 2 and grade 3 farmland for extensive Solar Power Station implementation is fundamentally wrong and is against guidelines for assessing the land as suitable for solar power generation. The loss of public footpath access to extensive views over the local beautiful countryside represents a significant loss of local amenity which is highly valued by residents of the area. Walking between screening hedgerows is just not the same. Solar Panel Arrays are just a blot on the landscape in that they are singularly unattractive in appearance.

The modified proposals include battery storage within the solar arrays, this I don't think was identified as part of the original proposal. I have considerable concerns over the safety of lithium battery banks, would access routes support the attendance of appropriate emergency services in the event of explosion, fire or toxic gas release. They are quite close to public rights of way which are said to be kept open throughout construction and operation of the proposed facility.

The UK imports nearly 50% of the food we eat, and this seems set to rise, to use prime arable land for inefficient solar power generation does not make common sense, especially as one Wind Turbine could provide as much power on average over a year as this whole proposed facility. Use of unproductive land would be so much more sensible and allow us to continue to grow as much of our own food as we can.

There are many areas of lower grade land which could be used, this is where the attention should be given together with more innovative and distributed connection to the grid.

John F

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Jeff A
Sent:	02 August 2021 10:54
To:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; 'Stop Battles Solar'; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Subject:	Proposed Design of Low Carbons Consultation

I entered this comment this morning but it was sent through my wife's email,

“We should not be losing good agricultural land and certainly not to vast acreages of inefficient solar panels and conceivably dangerous lithium battery dumps. We should also beware of promises of spring lambs and beautiful green(wash) country sides that would threaten profits for years to come.”

Jeff A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Trevor H
Sent:	06 August 2021 14:16
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; Stop Battles Solar
Subject:	Proposed Pelham Spring Solar Farm - Objection

Dear Ms Rodbard-Hedderwick

I refer to your letter dated 7 July 2021. enclosing a Pelham Spring Solar Farm, 'Community Feedback Form'.

In general terms, I find the content of your letter and the content of the other documents enclosed and in particular, the 'Community Feedback' form, disingenuous nonsense.

It appears that Low Carbon Limited is naively attempting, via its documentation, and particularly the 'feedback' questionnaire, to distort and manipulate the overwhelming disapproval of the 'community' to the proposed so called, Pelham Spring Solar Farm, to appear to actually want the proposed solar farm and support Low Carbon Limited's selfish, commercial interests, not the interests of the 'community'..

I would also appear that as part of its overall attempt to distort 'community acceptance' of its overwhelmingly undesirable proposed solar farm, Low Carbon Limited is attempting to apply subtle, persuasive pressure on the community by adopting the naive strategy of applying pressure on the community by ;

1. Firstly, alerting the local community to its obviously unwelcome proposal.2. Secondly, subsequently distressing the local community even further by introducing the threat of possibly increasing the size and impact of the proposed solar farm, having miraculously acquired even more land to give Low Carbon Limited the opportunity to threaten to increase the overall size and associated impact of the solar farm beyond that of its original proposal.3. Thirdly, having exhausted its attempts to persuade the community to accept this unwanted, proposed Solar Farm, Low Carbon Limited will finally put forward a compromise proposal, at an overall size similar to its originally proposal, which it will then no doubt alleged that such final proposed scheme is supported and welcomed by the community based on distorted data manipulated from feedback innocently provided in response to Low Carbon Limited's feedback questionnaire etc and at public meetings.

I consider Low Carbon Limited's approach in this matter, both naive and an insult to the 'Community'. I will not involve with or complete, the 'Community Feed-back form'.

I **object** to Low Carbon Limited's proposed, so-called, Pelham Spring Solar Farm in totality.

While I appreciate and accept the benefit of renewable energy, I specifically **object** to Low Carbon Limited's proposed, massive, industrial sized Pelham Spring Solar farm development on the basis that ;

Low Carbon Limited gives no explanation whatsoever, as to why the proposed site for 'Pelham Spring' is the correct / most suitable location for a solar farm.

There are more suitable sites / locations available for solar farms such as adjacent to motorways, that would have little or possibly no effect on local communities.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

The proposed site is Grade 2 farming land and therefore, should be used to produce food and avoid unnecessary food imports.

Uttlesford Council already has 70% of its required solar generation capacity with sufficient proposed sites currently being considered under its formal Planning procedures to fulfil any outstanding, shortfall in its solar generation capacity without any need for the proposed Pelham Spring development.

Solar Farms are highly inefficient in comparison with other forms of renewable energy production such as offshore wind turbines.

Low Carbon Limited appears to have given little if any consideration either to the effect or to mitigate the effect of the significant additional HGV and LGV traffic and its consequences on unsuitable rural roads particularly during construction of this unwanted, proposed solar farm.

Yours sincerely

Trevor H

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Katherine A
Sent:	01 August 2021 16:56
To:	planning@uttlesford.gov.uk
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Chair of Berden PC
Subject:	Proposed Pelham Spring Solar Farm Berden/Manuden - Objection

Re: UTT/21/0643/SCO

To Uttlesford District Council Planning Department,

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposal to install a 251-acre solar farm at the site known as Pelham Spring between the villages of Berden and Manuden. I have already submitted a letter of **objection** to the original 180-acre proposal, but since the area under consideration has now increased very substantially, I write to **object** once again. The scale of the proposed development is, in the words of two villagers I have spoken to in the past few days, ‘truly shocking,’ and ‘utterly devastating.’ If planning permission is granted, it will have an irreversibly destructive impact on the environment, at a stroke industrialising a peaceful, ancient landscape of copses, hedgerows, fields and much loved and much used footpaths.

The loss of Grade 2 agricultural land to industrial use is of grave concern at a time when the country is losing almost 100,000 acres of cultivated land each year, and when food security is increasingly parlous. If the land is used to generate energy, we will need to import food to compensate – and this will inevitably increase the carbon footprint of those imports, so that any environmental benefit from the solar power which has been generated must be weighed against this environmental cost. In addition, the cost of the inevitable impact on wildlife in the area cannot be overstated. Less than 35 miles from London, this gentle landscape is astonishingly rich in wildlife.

As stated in my previous letter re the original 180-acre proposal, I have seen dozens of species of birds in the fields and woods around the village since moving here in 2017, including rare long-eared owls, ravens and barn owls. During summer skylarks can be heard in the open fields all around the village from dawn to dusk, including in the fields where the proposed solar farm would be installed. Some species will survive if a solar farm is built there, but the majority will not, and the mitigation measures outlined in the proposal documents distributed by the company concerned, Low Carbon, are to be viewed with deep scepticism.

I question the practicality of grazing sheep alongside solar panels installed on this vast scale, and have only to look at the neglected, half derelict nature reserve and dried up ‘wildlife ponds’ around the existing battery installation on the border with East Herts to feel deep pessimism regarding the likely commitment of Low Carbon to long-term maintenance of the mitigation measures outlined in their publicity materials. In the woodland close to my house we hear owls and woodpeckers throughout the year, but I have never heard either in the lamentably poorly managed woods near the existing Pelham battery plant, even though I have walked the paths there frequently, particularly during lockdown. The bird hide is locked and in any case in ruins, as are the picnic benches and pond dipping platform, while the thin bands of trees are never coppiced and are consequently inadequate in terms of screening the battery and associated infrastructure. This raises an equally important

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

point, which is the very great value of footpaths and nature for wellbeing, something which the pandemic has highlighted and continues to demonstrate.

The proposed site backs onto one especially beautiful path, Blakings Lane, which is known to have been in use for at least 1000 years. This and the network of old paths and bridleways and are in constant use by local people. We have few amenities here in Berden: no shop, no pub, no leisure centre, minimal public transport and no shops. The footpaths are therefore very, very important to us – they are where we exercise ourselves and our pets, where we take our visitors, where we meet each other to chat – the pandemic has underlined their importance more than ever, and we have a right to continue to use them – a moral right but also a legal one, as most are bridle ways and ancient footpaths. If those who hope to build the solar farms fence off the footpaths they might be abiding by the letter but not the spirit of the ancient rights to walk these paths, as the visual and auditory impact of the solar farms will mean that in practice hardly anyone will want to use them.

The government’s Solar PV Roadmap and Strategy (2013) insists that developers must ensure that proposals are appropriately sited and give proper weight to environmental considerations (landscape and visual impact, heritage, local amenity). It is impossible to imagine that the current proposal for this site and the others proposed very close by, would obtain permission if these criteria were upheld. I trust that given the scale of local opposition to this proposal, the opposition I understand there has been from the National Grid to solar panels being installed under existing power lines and around pylons, and the dubious green credentials of the proposal in terms of net carbon savings, Uttlesford District Council will refuse permission to Low Carbon.

I look forward to hearing from you once the proposal has been considered by the planning committee.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Clare Y
Sent:	08 August 2021 20:15
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Proposed Pelham Spring Solar farm

I am writing to strongly oppose the development of a Solar farm around Battles farm / Brickhouse end and the surrounding countryside. There is a place for solar energy, but it isn't industrialising good quality farm land which should be used for food generation. The effective use of farmland to generate food is even more important in the light of Brexit and the challenges we have faced during the global pandemic. As a country we should be more self sufficient with respect to food production. This would also reduce the huge carbon footprint created from importing wheat etc from further afield. Solar energy should be generated from solar panels on domestic and industrial buildings and brown field or corridor sites and it should be a requirement for each new build to have roof fitted solar panels. Not taking hundreds of acres of productive farmland out of food production for the duration of the site, up to 40 years! An additional impact is on the wildlife that inhabit this area. For decades we have enjoyed seeing the herds of deer that live in and around the proposed solar farm sites. This proposed site would decimate their habitat, and that of countless other species. I understand the need to have alternative energy sources but we should make the right decision that takes all the stakeholders into consideration, this is what should happen in a healthy democracy.

Clare Y

(Berden Resident)

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Liz A
Sent:	04 August 2021 14:03
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; 'Stop Battles Solar'
Subject:	proposed solar farm Pelham Springs

I **object** to the Pelham Springs Solar farm in all its entirety.

Vast amounts of land are needed to provide much less power than that produced by a wind turbine. The land used is high quality agricultural land which should be used to produce food, particularly post Brexit and at a time when, because of climate change, we are trying to reduce carbon emissions. Importing food from around the world to meet our current needs does not address this.

There are many sites that could be used for creating solar energy which would not damage rural communities, devalue their properties and reduce their quality of life. There is nothing in this proposal to benefit the people who live here – quite the opposite.

Wildlife, flora and fauna is depleted in this country and is getting worse with many species dramatically reducing in numbers. Working with nature means creating and maintaining wild life corridors, and leaving swathes of land wild and free of chemicals. This solar farm, particularly separates Battles Wood from Pump Springs – a valuable wild life corridor for animals and plants. For this development extra battery storage units are also being proposed. This poses a health and safety issue, especially being sited close to residential properties. The possibility of fire and explosions has not been researched and addressed and in this area we also have pylons and overhead electricity wires.

Please take your solar farm to an area that does not affect people's lives – we all moved to the country because of a love of nature at the expense of being close to facilities. For us to potentially live next to an industrial unit of this scale is devastating. Industrial units, brown field sites, quarries, disused airfields, adjacent to motorways – so many potential places that would not disturb anyone.

This proposal benefits landowners and the financial backers behind the project. The health of the planet is at stake with every decision made between now and 2030 and clear cut policies aimed at a greener future need to be made urgently. I feel you are exploiting a situation where this has not yet been properly addressed. If the right decisions are not made we are all at risk from climate breakdown and all the money you make from this terrible project will not help anyone then.

Liz A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Ulla M
Sent:	09 August 2021 15:34
To:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Re: A huge thank you to everyone who attended the Village Hall meeting on Friday.

Just a short message to say that we also have strongly **objected** in an email to Pegasus group.

Kind regards

Paul and Ulla

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Claire G
Sent:	06 August 2021 17:30
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Re: Object ion to the Pelham Springs 180 Acre proposal

Dear Madam,

I am getting in contact with you as I would like to make a formal **obj**ection to the Pelham Springs 180 Acre solar farm proposal.

Though I understand the necessity for renewable energy, I strongly feel that the land chosen for the Pelham Springs solar farm is inappropriate for this project. This is because the greenfield site is home to excellent farming-grade land which we have a responsibility to preserve not only for the livelihoods of the nature that inhabits it, but also for the local farmers who sacrifice years of their time to ensure the land is of the best quality possible and who share the fruit of their labor. To sacrifice such good land just to meet renewable energy targets is unacceptable. The British government has shared their mission to increase food self-sufficiency within the country;

Would you not agree that by removing the ability to farm on 180 acres of land, we are in fact going against the government's plea?

Furthermore, by doing some research on this local area, multiple neglected brownfield sites can be found. Why were these sites not considered for the solar farm? Some (including the one in Anstey in particular), would be a perfect location to do so... so why was this site not prioritized?

I am one of the younger members of my local community, and whilst I really feel that steps towards renewable energy must be made, I do believe that the project disrespects the good-quality land we have here, but also the community who appreciate it so much. For me, the cons of the project outweigh the pros, for which I strongly **obj**ect to the development of the Pelham Springs solar farm in the Berden & Stocking Pelham area.

Kind Regards,

Claire G

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Heather D
Sent:	05 August 2021 18:08
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk , "cllrmerifi" stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Re: Pelham Spring Solar Farm and Battery Storage

Dear Ms Rodbard-Hedderwick

With regard to the above project and your invitation to respond to your second consultation I have to tell you that none of your arguments have convinced me that this solar farm should be built in the location suggested for the following reasons;

This is prime farmland in a beautiful and ancient landscape and this installation would be a desecration of that. Farmers would not be so keen to allow their land to be used in this way if the government subsidised farmers as they have done in the past. We need to grow more of our own food to reduce the carbon footprint of transportation. It is very short sighted to let prime farm land be put out of action at this time.

This area supports a number of wild animals some of which are rare. There does not appear to be an acknowledgement of this for this particular site. Deer for instance follow the same pathways, regardless of danger to themselves. That is why warning signs are placed on motorways. These animals would be stressed and distressed to find an array of solar panels in their path. I am not sure what the result would be but the animals would definitely suffer. There are a lot of deer in this area. I find this unacceptable.

I believe that solar panels should be on roofs and industrial buildings/sites. Many new houses have been built in this area in the past 2 years yet not one of them has solar panels on them. Why?

You do not say where the solar panels will be manufactured. Does this mean that we will be supporting a repressive regime in China who currently manufacture huge numbers and are known to use slave labour? If so, what about the transport costs? I guess this would mean that the panels would not be low carbon?

I am not convinced that the battery storage units are 100% safe. There is no information how you will ensure that these units will not be a fire hazard threatening our village.

The roads in this area do not even have a B road designation and are entirely unsuitable for large vehicles to travel on. They are roads designated by Ordnance Survey maps as roads generally 4 Metres wide. How wide are your construction vehicles? I rather think that they will need more than half the width of the road. So what happens to us? We have just had our road resurfaced having waited for years for this to be done. Is it to be chewed up by your construction traffic within months? In addition there will be a danger to people and houses. There are many listed buildings which could potentially be in the way of your lorries. The roads would be more accurately described as lanes. The road from Newport to the site and the road from Bishops Stortford to the site both go through ancient villages on winding roads. We already encounter huge oil tankers delivering oil for central heating. This always means that someone has to 'give way'. So we are already facing stresses and strains on our lanes.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

A few years ago there was a landslide outside Manuden when heavy rain could not be absorbed by the ground. This resulted in a flood in Manuden as the water poured out of the field. I am not convinced that this has been addressed. The site is on a gentle slope. Manuden is at the bottom of it! Additionally there are a number of potential flood areas on all our roads which are regularly affected during periods of heavy rain. Some of them become impassable for some hours and require great caution when navigating them. So do not assume that flooding will not happen. It will. We see it every year!

I do not understand how the land underneath the panels will regenerate when it is not open to the elements. How do you know it will be in good condition after 40 years? This has never been tried. If so - please let us know. Or does it mean that we will lose forever that farm land and therefore the landscape which we all value so much.

Solar panels only work when the light is good. This year has been particularly low on sunshine. I know because I have solar panels on my roof and the amount of electricity produced over the summer months so far is the lowest in 7 years! I believe there are better ways of producing low carbon electricity at scale e.g. off shore wind turbines which would not affect the quality of life of both humans and animals.

This whole scheme appears to be a money making project for investment companies who do not care about my local environment. I cannot see any benefit to our locality. You offer the possibility of contributing to the community. In my view the best way to contribute is not to proceed with this installation. Nothing can recompense us for the loss we will suffer and it feels rather insulting that you should offer. We are being asked to sacrifice what we love in the name of cheap electricity and the profits of your investors. That feels like an abuse.

So - in conclusion - I **DO NOT SUPPORT** THE INSTALLATION OF PELHAM SOLAR FARM AND BATTERY STORAGE.

Heather D

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Emily H
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:33
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk <cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk>; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com <stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com>; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk <pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk>; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk <cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk>
Subject:	RE: Proposed Pelham Spring Solar farm

I am writing to strongly oppose the development of a Solar farm around Battles farm / Brickhouse end and the surrounding countryside.

Having lived in Berden for my entire life I have enjoyed many aspects of living in a village and the countryside, for me being able to walk through the fields and see nature is something that is very important to me and this whole community. Although I see the benefits of using renewable energy and it's specific importance now, building a solar farm on good quality farm land is not going to tackle this issue. Solar farms are highly inefficient sources of energy compared to other forms of renewable energy and comparing this to wind energy, building one offshore wind turbine would produce an equal amount of energy as this entire solar farm. Not to mention that it is utterly dependent on the sun and seasonality and the unpredictability of the English weather and days of sunshine can greatly restrict the amount energy produced. Another major issue with the installation of this solar farm is the detrimental effects on the natural wildlife directly impacting many species populations including that of wild deer that live predominantly in the surrounding fields. Building fences blocks and restricts the free movement of wild species and with these considerable alterations in nature it can be deeply disturbing to biodiversity. This major interference to the natural habitat will also have rippling effects in neighbouring environments. It has no need to be this invasive when more efficient options such as wind turbines can be installed which research has shown positive impacts on marine wildlife such as providing the "reef effect" creating safe and sheltered feeding grounds for animals such as seals as well as creating new seabed habitats for anemones, mussels and crabs increasing overall biodiversity.

Thank you for reading and I hope that you can greatly consider the other possible options stated above such as wind turbines for providing renewable energy instead of this invasive form which has destructive effects on both human and wildlife communities.

Emily H

Berden resident

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Jon H
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:01
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	RE: Proposed Pelham Spring Solar farm

I am writing to strongly **oppose** the development of a Solar farm around Battles farm / Brickhouse end and the surrounding countryside.

There is a place for solar energy, but it isn't industrialising good quality farm land which should be used for food generation to help our country to be more food resilient and rely less on imported food to minimise transportation and its associated greenhouse gasses. Solar energy should be generated from solar panels on domestic and industrial buildings and brown field or corridor sites and it should be a requirement for each new build to have roof fitted solar panels. Not taking hundreds of acres of productive farmland out of food production for the duration of the site, up to 40 years! An additional impact is on the wildlife that inhabit this area. For decades we have enjoyed seeing the herds of deer that live in and around the proposed solar farm sites. This proposed site would decimate their habitat, and that of countless other species. It is also highly intrusive to local residents and a blight on our beautiful countryside which is just not necessary. Solar energy is inefficient and off-shore wind farms are a far better solution. Sadly this solar farm is all about profit for business and is using global warming as a means to justify corporate bullying of local people.

I understand the need to have alternative energy sources but we should make the right decision that takes all the stakeholders into consideration, this is what should happen in a healthy democracy. I ask you to take a holistic view and consider all the applications together and prevent the rush for profit that these companies are only interested in. Nor do these companies care that these solar farms need huge industrial batteries which are another blight on the countryside with a poor track record for safety and huge potential for toxic pollution.

There has to be a better solution and it needs responsible local government to make sure that exploitation for profit does not put local people at risk. Let's put people before profit and bonuses. You can be sure that we will fight this collectively and I am know it will unite local villages who will have their voices heard and will make their votes count.

Jon H

(Berden Resident)

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Olivia H
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:56
To:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Re: Proposed Pelham Spring Solar farm

I am writing to strongly **oppose** the development of a Solar farm around Battles farm / Brickhouse end and the surrounding countryside. As I am sure many people have already outlined the catastrophic impact this proposition will have on our agriculture and wildlife, as a young person, I am writing to stress the impact this will also have on our mental health and the priority this should be given.

I have lived in Berden for my entire life and have appreciated the peaceful undisturbed habitats that surround our village. In lockdown I have especially come to appreciate the significance the beautiful countryside and thriving wildlife that inhabits our countryside has on everyone's mental health. Myself and many others will attest, that it has been one of the few joys I have found in these troubled times, and I dread to think the negative impact this would have had on many, had this proposition gone ahead prior to this pandemic.

I understand the need to have alternative energy sources but we must take into consideration all of the consequences this Radical decision will have, if this were to go forward.

Olivia H

(Berden resident)

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Chris R
Sent:	09 August 2021 16:47
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Subject:	Solar Farm at Manuden

I have read the materials made available at the recent exhibition at Manuden Village Community Centre. I intend to make most of my comments when and if your proposal becomes embodied in a formal planning application. So I make only a few remarks at this stage.

1. I regard your invitation to identify which of the zones 1-16 cause most concern as a cynical attempt to sow division among those currently **objecting** to the whole proposal.
2. I live out of sight of all but zones 8 and 9 but have walked the fields over the years. Not infrequently I have seen a herd of fallow deer either out in those fields or tucked away in Battles Wood. I have seen the same herd as far away as Uppend to the South and north of the Crump. Your promotional material is silent about what you intend to do in order to maintain the freedom for these lovely, wild animals to roam as they currently do. Leaving a few footpaths through the site will obviously not serve the purpose.
3. I note the equally cynical use of language that suggests concern for the natural environment but carefully avoids any commitment – “Low Carbon looks to place beehives on site...”. “We typically plant wildflowers or grasses”. [my emphasis in each case] Elsewhere there is reference to “Additional planting of... grasses and wildflowers...” with no connecting verb. Does this mean that additional planting:
 - ...will be undertaken?
 - ...will be avoided wherever possible?
 - ...will be a waste of time because, being sown on rich agricultural land, which has been subject to nutrient application for many years, most flowers will quickly be lost among the thick, coarse grass that thrives in that environment?
4. Having lived in the area for several years I have seen the land in question being farmed with the same intensity as other areas in the rich arable lands of North Essex and East Anglia. I find it very hard to believe that this is the sort of land suited to being taken out of agricultural use for any reason other than to put money into the hands of those who, having inherited the agricultural land that surrounds the village of Manuden, appear determined to concrete over or industrialise as much of it as they possibly can.
5. In this connection I point out that the land is almost in sight of Stansted Airport, which includes substantial tracts of land rendered useless for agriculture by the combination of airport infrastructure, motorways and access roads. I note that it is said that the solar panels do not cause reflection so there seems to be no flight safety issues to discourage the use of that blighted land.
6. Returning to the language of your materials, I note that the solar panel modules “would be decommissioned” after 40 years. The words chosen seem, again, to avoid a positive commitment. And who, in any event, is giving any commitment that may be made at planning stage? Your company, which describes itself as an “investment and asset management company” and will, I assume, be seeking an early exit to secure its profit? Or the pension fund or similar investor who

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

buys the facility from you? Or the landowners, in the form of a binding legal covenant that will run with title to the land and so bind their successors or assignees? The reality, I fear, is that once this facility has been constructed the land will be assigned to industrial use for the foreseeable future, leaving the landowner telling future planning committees that, as the whole area is already blighted by vast arrays of solar panels, a few hundred hectares more or some tasteful light industry units will not be out of place.

7. I strongly suspect that the absence of any clear commitment to reinstate the land to be used as access by construction traffic means that this too will become a permanent feature. If it is to take heavy lorries delivering panels to site it will need to be a substantial piece of civil engineering. Then it will continue to be used by maintenance vehicles on the pretext that this will keep commercial traffic off the lanes around the site. From there it is but a small step for the landowner to persuade the planners that it will form a safe and effective access route for some more housing to the North of Manuden – a modest extension to the small housing estate it already has planning permission for to the North of Stewarts Way. As mentioned at the outset, I reserve other comments until the planning process gets underway.

Chris R

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	John R
Sent:	08 August 2021 17:18
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	Cllr Loughlin; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Springs Solar Farm Consultation.

I wish to respond to the Consultation on the above Solar farm proposal and strongly **object** to it for the following reasons;

The site is good grade agricultural land which will be lost resulting in

- o Food having to be imported instead at increased cost and with increased carbon footprint
- o Together with the many other solar farm project in place or proposed around the country a significant loss of the UK's food production capability at a time when the world population is increasing
- o There is no government policy supporting solar farms on good agricultural land, indeed the opposite is the case
- o In addition, the site is unlikely to be returned to agriculture after forty years, particularly with Low Carbon having shown their disregard for this promise, by removing top soil from their site at Thaxted.

Solar panels are an inefficient method of generating electricity.

There is no rational reason for the selection of this site, except that it maximises profit for Low Carbon due to its short connectivity into the Grid.

There is a significant risk of fire associated with a battery storage facility, which would release toxic fumes and which our emergency services would be ill-equipped to tackle.

There would be a devastating effect on the environment and public rights of way with 3m high panels and security fencing. Birds crash into the panels thinking they are water;

ground condition is degraded by permanent shading;

rainwater would create run-off channels;

loss of routes and resultant confusion for deer. Sheep grazing and bees are token gestures and of little value.

The construction access would be cut across fields resulting in further damaging impact on ecology and agricultural land. The associated accommodation of the workforce and construction traffic access will have a widespread effect with large lorries travelling along roads that in many places are only wide enough for two cars to pass.

John R

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Fiona B
Sent:	06 August 2021 09:53
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Plant

Solar Farm is a misnomer, these are industrial electricity generating units turning productive farm land into a factory effectively industrialising the countryside. The use of the word 'Farm' is designed to disguise the fact that these are industrial units reportedly made in China using Uyghur forced labour.

The units are inefficient, only producing 10% - 12% of their generating capacity which diminishes over time. They are dependant on sun, something we have little of in winter, a time of greatest demand and in summer electricity demand peaks when the sun is setting. The lithium battery units are an explosive hazard if they overheat and need air conditioning to keep them cool.....using electricity.

We have a greater need for precious agricultural land to be used for food production. Even the Government Policy states that high quality farmland should not be used for solar developments. We have a growing need to produce more food with an ever increasing population. We cannot rely on imports which are

Subject to availability and a friendly supplier. Almost 100,000 acres of arable land is being taken out of cultivation per year. This is unsustainable and we cannot afford to waste precious agricultural land building inefficient solar factories.

The place for solar panels is industrial or domestic rooves, such as farm buildings or distribution warehouses for example, the sides of buildings, brown field sites and poor quality land.

Local planning authorities should be more active when giving planning con

Sent to building applications, insisting on ground heat source installations, improving insulation, and fitting solar panels on rooves to reduce energy use. Just because this is harder to organise and therefore more expensive, this is no excuse to use precious agricultural land which is an easy option.

Energy production should be seen on a wider scale. More wind turbines which are more efficient. A single wind turbine will generate almost as much energy as the whole of Pelham Springs. The use of wave power from tidal rivers. Planting a few wild flowers and installing bee hives is no substitute for the variety of wild life and habitats we currently enjoy and take pride in maintaining.

Solar factories are an unnecessary blight on the landscape, exploiting communities under a 'Green' banner, Pelham Springs is a pure profit making exercise which will disrupt and destroy productive agricultural land creating one of the biggest solar plants in Essex.

Calling a consultation meeting for the first week of the school holidays demonstrates Low Carbon was content to reach only a limited number of residents.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	John T
Sent:	07 August 2021 23:02
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Plant

Hi Low Carbon PLC

I wanted to write to you to express my disapproval of the proposed Pelham Spring Solar Panel site. It seems rather strange to rehearse the various **objections** one might have to the very organisation that proposes the site, I am sure you know both sides of the argument. I have considered both sides of that argument and have firmly concluded that the case against this location as a site for a solar panel industrial site is so much stronger than the case for this site.

This is surely the wrong location for the industrial nature of solar units. There are so many sites that could be identified that are more favourable. What about placing panels on every south facing industrial building, disused air fields, brown field sites and new build properties too.

One of the pleasures of living in an environment such as this is the joy of being able to take a walk across the fields and over footpaths. That these walks should be blighted by the installation of acres and acres of solar panels is unacceptable, even if they are superficially disguised.

Shouldn't farm land be used for just that, the production of food for a nation that currently imports almost 50% of the total food consumed. There is so much to be said for being able to trace the local provenance of food we consume. It makes no sense to me to import green beans from Egypt !

The notion that solar panels produce energy when it is not required seems entirely logical. Electricity demand being highest in winter when the days are shortest.

I am advised that solar panels produce annually just 10% of their capacity. If correct, and I believe it is, then it is an extremely inefficient way to generate energy.

I am also advised that the storage of electricity is undertaken in dangerous battery units that require air-conditioning powered by electricity. If not kept cool there is a danger of explosion.

That 80% of solar panels are produced in China using forced labour is insupportable.

Whilst in favour of green energy as a concept we have to adopt a strategy that makes sense and is effective too. At pre

Sent there seems to be no such strategy. and until there is my vote cannot be won.

Kind regards

John T

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Frank B
Sent:	08 August 2021 18:15
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Plant

I wish to add my **objection** to the Pelham Spring Solar development. This is not a farm this is industrialisation of fertile agricultural land by the backdoor, quite out of place.

Greg Barker, Minister for Energy and Climate Change said (2013) 'solar is a genuinely exciting energy ...but NOT at any cost...Not in any place and Not if it rides roughshod over the views of local communities.....we must be mindful of the wider environmental and visual impact'.

I fully understand the need to cut CO2 emissions and am not against solar panels but these should be on rooves of industrial buildings, farm buildings for example, brown field sites or poor quality land. We must conserve valuable, productive land for food production with an ever increasing population.

Solar panels on agricultural land will blight the countryside for decades and are being sold to us as 'green' when they are only 10% - 12% efficient . Wind turbines are much more efficient and although they would be seen from a distance we currently have pylons criss-crossing the landscape. Wind turbines would not utilise valuable agricultural land needed for food production. Just one turbine would produce almost as much electricity as Pelham Springs.

This development must not be seen in isolation but in conjunction with similar proposals within the jurisdiction of East Herts District Council, this would be only yards from Pelham Springs development and create a gigantic acreage of solar panels.

Frank B

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Steve K
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:53
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.co.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Park

I am **objecting** strongly against the siting of the proposed Solar Park. Although I am not against generating electricity by solar I feel it should be placed on poor quality land of little use for agriculture and not on high quality grade 2 land which is capable of growing good crops which may well be required in the next 40 years.

Steve K

Manuden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Tom A
Sent:	02 August 2021 18:29
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; johnburton@berden.org.uk
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm

To Low Carbon,

I write to express my **objection** to the solar farm proposed for the site referred to by Low Carbon as Pelham Spring between the villages of Berden and Manuden in North Essex.

I am 19 years old and have lived in Berden since my mid-teens. As a young person I have a vested interest in combatting climate change and an equally strong commitment to conservation;

I am a vegetarian and choose to reduce, reuse and recycle wherever possible. However, I seriously doubt the ecological benefits of the proposed development, on the following grounds;

The land in question is farmland currently used for crops. The UK already imports more than half our food;

industrialising the countryside and therefore relying on increased imports will also increase the air miles and carbon footprint of the food we eat. This must be taken into account when assessing any environmental benefits from the solar energy which is captured by the installation. Low Carbon's publicity materials imply it will be possible to combine the solar farm with grazing sheep. I have spoken to a local sheep farmer who states categorically that she knows no examples where this has been achieved on any significant scale and says she completely disagrees that it is possible to graze sheep among solar panels;

it simply is impractical.

Another local farmer says she is convinced the land could continue to be be farmed very profitably for arable crops and should be used as such, for a range of reasons, from the impact on wildlife to our need as a nation for food grown within these shores. However, if no farmer can be found willing to farm the land, it should be used to create new woodland habitats. The government's Woodland Carbon Guarantee is intended to incentivise farms to plant trees. Such woodlands act as carbon sinks, as well as benefitting wildlife and contributing to the wellbeing of the people who live near them. They are far better for the environment than solar panels, which turn countryside into brownfield sites which are then most likely eligible for housing when the panels reach the end of their usable life.

Solar panels are inefficient and require the installation of noisy, ugly, potentially hazardous and energy-hungry batteries to manage surges in supply. In addition to this the downsides to solar energy would be exacerbated by the lack of an available reservoir for pumped storage.

As someone who studies electrical engineering I am very familiar with the economics of technological investment and just and microchip production is governed by Moore's law. The price of photocells largely follows Swanson's law, because of this any large scale investment at this time would be unwise in an economy fueled low-interest rates and borrowed money, especially given the current state of land which lends itself to farming, a safe and largely recession-proof business.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

I currently walk along the footpaths around my village almost daily, as do many local people, including Blakings Lane, the thousand-year-old right of way which borders the proposed development. The publicity from Low Carbon implies that these paths will be preserved if the solar farm is installed. I can state categorically that I will not use the paths if they are surrounded by chainlink fencing and other unsightly security infrastructure. To reach alternative amenities would require me to drive, using fossil fuels, or cease to take exercise at all. Neither option is compatible with the government’s stated commitments to tackle obesity and the climate crisis, and suggests to me that Low Carbon’s claims regarding the eco-credentials of the proposed development are, rather than genuinely motivated by environmental concerns, a greenwash.

Yours sincerely,

Tom A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Mark H
Sent:	30 July 2021 09:17
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm proposal

Dear Beverley,

This is an environmentally outdated proposal fuelled only by individual commercial gain where the negative impact grossly outweighs any gain.

With a growing UK population there is a greater need for food production than there ever has been and this is set to continue. To sacrifice grade two agricultural land, spoil swathes of beautiful countryside and be forced to import more food from abroad (meaning a much larger carbon footprint) to sustain our population is completely counterintuitive.

This proposal needs to be seen in context with the UK's need for renewable energy as a whole, not simply a small part of Hertfordshire.

The paragraph below illustrates the infinitesimally small gain that a solar farm contributes to our national renewable energy needs versus the far more efficient and less environmentally impacting wind turbine renewable energy production.

"There is no doubt that wind is a far more efficient source of energy than solar. A wind turbines is cleaner than a solar panel (in terms of how much carbon dioxide is released) and can produce about forty-eight thousand times the amount of energy per kWh than a solar panel can. Last year, wind energy supplied 4% of the world's electricity needs, whereas solar energy provided just 0.5%. The reason for this is that wind farms, which are built offshore, can generate huge amounts of power thanks to the strong and constant supply of wind. Solar panels, on the other hand, have a very limited time frame in which they can produce energy."

In summary, this proposal is a short term, ill conceived money grab that will ruin stunning countryside and stunt our long term food production.

Yours sincerely,

Mark H

Sent from my iPhone

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Jezz S
Sent:	02 August 2021 21:56
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk
cc:	Stop Battles Solar
Subject:	pelham spring solar farm project(s)-

We strongly **object** to all the proposals put forward for the above project(s), regardless of the exact fields / acres to be sacrificed, as it all ends up with the same problem - a totally unnecessary deletion of fertile farmland, at a time when :-

a. There are other more productive, less destructive methods of achieving the same, or even better electricity generation levels. Within the European sphere Britain has the largest coastline (with the possible exception of Greece and its many smaller islands). Large sections of the UK coastline have relatively shallow seabed depths. This has to be the most logical place for us to be installing low carbon equipment - wind turbines - no loss of productive farm land, no unsightly / noisy installations right on top of rural / residential areas. Leaving aside the 'quick buck' motive, this has to be a no-brainer, and the only long term solution that we can all back with a clear conscience.

b. Britain has one of the highest population densities in the western world. If this type of project is allowed to proliferate, how on earth are we going to justify to our children and future generations that the we have allowed the very land that we rely on (and will increasingly do so) to provide us with our sustenance, to be sterilised, covered over with electricity generation panels - when patently there are solutions which would do far less harm to our environment (even if these would involve some harm to the profit margins of the solar farm concerns and opportunistic land owners)

Yours faithfully

Jezz S

Furneux Pelham,

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Elizabeth L
Sent:	09 August 2021 11:14
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm and Battery Storage - Second Consultation

Good morning

I have received a "Community Feedback Form" from Low Carbon and wish to state that I **object** to the proposal in totality.

Regards

Elizabeth L

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Martin R
Sent:	08 August 2021 10:26
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; cllrbagnall@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrbarker@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrcaton@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrcoote@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrfairhurst@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrrfreeman@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrgregory@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlecount@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlees@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlemon@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrlight@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllroliver@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrpavitt@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrreeve@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrsell@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrsutton@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrdevries@uttlesford.gov.uk
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm

Beverley,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my absolute **objection** to the proposed developments in the areas around and adjacent to the village of Berden. These developments will be a total disaster for all living in the area.

To provide you with my background, I have recently retired after 39 years working in the electricity supply industry. I have worked at a large number of thermal power stations since 1982 with the CEGB, PowerGen, National Power, ScottishPower, Iberdrola, and Drax (DGEL). At the end of my career I was the Engineering Manager for the Drax CCGT power plants in the south east of England. I was also the Station Manager at Rye House Power Station in Hoddesdon for a number of years. I have knowledge of the electricity market and understand the need for a balanced portfolio of power sources. Solar and battery do have a place in the market. I know why the proposals are to construct so close to the Pelham sub station and the difficulty and costs associated with obtaining a secure grid connection. I understand very well the challenges associated with managing underground cables and the subsequent electrical losses of having long distances between to power source and the grid connection points.

I agree with the work the UK are working towards to become carbon neutral, but I also understand very well the requirement for having spinning mass on the grid system to provide stability and to have the ability to react to system faults and sudden loss of generation both in the UK and from our interconnectors. Large thermal plants provide this stability and we cannot move towards a network of just battery, solar and wind power.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

The proposals for all the solar and battery units in and around the area of Berden are biased towards ease of grid connection and reduced interconnected system costs. There is very little consideration or thought to the real impact to the area and the community. I have lived in Berden for the last 26 years and absolutely **object** to all the plans being put forward. There are huge areas around the M11 corridor that are much better placed for these electrical systems.

So in summary I **object** 100%. I do know the electricity market very well and these proposals are focusing on reduced construction costs and not the long term impact to the people living in the area.

Regards

Martin R, Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	William H
Sent:	21 July 2021 15:44
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; Councillor McLoghlin; Councillor Merifield; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm

Dear Ms Rodbard-Hedderwick,

As a local resident I have received your questionnaire. I see no point in completing it, as I totally **reject** your proposal, to build a solar “farm” on prime agricultural land at Battles Farm.

William H

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Chris T
Sent:	08 August 2021 21:31
To:	BeverleyRH@lowcarbon.com
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk ; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm

I strongly **object** to the use of high-quality agricultural land for the placement of solar panels. I suspect that the choice of site results from its proximity to the Pelham substation and the resultant cost savings for connection to the grid, compared to a more suitable location.

The cost of sacrificing the agricultural land with, respect to food production and the environment, over a 40-year period should be taken into account, rather than short term cost savings for connection to the grid which will profit the company making the installation rather than the community. Low quality land of marginal productivity and brownfield sites should be prioritised.

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Keith D
Sent:	06 August 2021 11:39
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlesolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm

Dear Sirs,

We wish to **object** against the proposed Pelham Spring Solar Farm.

We believe that it is wrong to site this development on prime agricultural land. Our thoughts are that before farm land is used, solar panels should be erected on commercial and industrial buildings. At a time when the UK needs to produce more food for a growing population, it does not make sense to reduce agricultural capacity in this fertile region of East Anglia.

This area already has it's fair share of electrical infrastructure i.e. the Pelham National Grid sub-station, a battery storage unit and numerous unsightly pylons. We do not wish to see similar additional developments, which will bring more construction and maintenance traffic into the area.

To confirm, we oppose the Pelham Spring Solar Farm development.

Keith D

Berden

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Juliette B
Sent:	09 August 2021 21:48
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrroughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm (Factory).

I am writing to **oppose** the above planning application. I fully understand that we as a country need to look to new ways of producing greener energy but building solar factories (I refuse to call them farms) on agricultural land is not the way. It is well documented that solar panels' energy output ratio to landmass is a very poor performer and on top of this it creates another problem, of where are we going to get the replacement crops that were once grown on this land. When solar factories are installed all the growing medium i.e. topsoil is removed which effectively makes it financially inconceivable that the land could ever return to agricultural land. Agricultural land and the countryside is a very precious commodity to the nation and the people living in the rural communities, and once it is developed upon, it is lost for good. Due to the pandemic, people are re-evaluating their lives, often going back to basics, growing vegetables, gardening, walking in open spaces due to the increasing pressures put upon their everyday lives with more people than ever being diagnosed with 'mental health problems. Does it then seem right to you that local councils can then make decisions that can devastate our living habitat? Did you know that cargo ships carrying goods i.e. crops, is one of the biggest polluters running on the filthiest fuel or that these solar panels are built in China that have well-documented serious issues, concerning human rights? How are the panels to be disposed of when they are dysfunctional or past their sell-by date? Have you ever visited a Solar Factory with its eerie hum, wire fenced off with frequent signs advising you of 'danger of death' and not a wildflower meadow or a sheep insight? Does this sound like the sort of environment that local communities with their family and children should be cohabiting with? Since the UK made the decision to leave Europe and become a more independent country, it is more important than ever that we look to increase our food production, a basic human requirement. Otherwise what happens when third-party countries put their human population ahead of our own, due to increasing failed crops due to fire, drought, and floods of which we are hearing about on the news, on an almost daily basis? Or what happens when we have a political disagreement with a country, of which we have already witnessed when Europe attempted to withhold vaccines earlier this year? What if they do this with food? Many of these applications are coming from venture capitalist-type company's, who have no longstanding expertise in the green energy industry and are just looking to make vast sums of money to the detriment of the many people living in the local area. I understand that there is no government policy in place for green energy and with the local councils being

Subjected to applications for solar and battery factories on an epic scale, this has clearly become too big a problem for councils. I hold comfort that it is government policy that any development needs to be sympathetic to the communities and surrounding landscape of which a solar factory is clearly not, and that we have recently had a letter back from the Minister of Housing and Development assuring us that any planning would need a significant reason to build on agricultural land. I am confident that Uttlesford Council will make the right decision.

Juliette B

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Eleanor A
Sent:	02 August 2021 17:37
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; Chair of Berden PC
Subject:	'Pelham Spring' Solar Farm - Proposed Development Brick House End, Berden

To Low Carbon,

I write to express my **objection** to the solar farm proposed for the site referred to by Low Carbon as Pelham Spring between the villages of Berden and Manuden in North Essex.

I am 22 years old and have lived in Berden since my teens. As a young person I have a vested interest in combatting climate change and an equally strong commitment to conservation;

I am a vegetarian and choose to reduce, reuse and recycle wherever possible. However, I seriously doubt the ecological benefits of the proposed development, on the following grounds;

The land in question is farmland currently used for crops. The UK already imports more than half our food;

industrialising the countryside and therefore relying on increased imports will also increase the air miles and carbon footprint of the food we eat. This must be taken into account when assessing any environmental benefits from the solar energy which is captured by the installation. Low Carbon's publicity materials imply it will be possible to combine the solar farm with grazing sheep. I have spoken to a local sheep farmer who states categorically that she knows no examples where this has been achieved on any significant scale and says she completely disagrees that it is possible to graze sheep among solar panels;

it simply is impractical.

Another local farmer says she is convinced the land could continue to be farmed very profitably for arable crops and should be used as such, for a range of reasons, from the impact on wildlife to our need as a nation for food grown within these shores. However, if no farmer can be found willing to farm the land, it should be used to create new woodland habitats. The government's Woodland Carbon Guarantee is intended to incentivise farms to plant trees. Such woodlands act as carbon sinks, as well as benefitting wildlife and contributing to the wellbeing of the people who live near them. They are far better for the environment than solar panels, which turn countryside into brownfield sites which are then most likely eligible for housing when the panels reach the end of their usable life.

Solar panels are inefficient and require the installation of noisy, ugly, potentially hazardous and energy-hungry batteries to manage surges in supply.

I currently walk and run the footpaths around my village almost daily, as do many local people. The publicity from Low Carbon implies that these paths will be preserved if the solar farm is installed. I can state categorically that I will not use the paths if they are surrounded by chainlink fencing and other unsightly security infrastructure. To reach alternative amenities would require me to drive, using fossil fuels, or cease to take exercise at all. Neither option is compatible

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

with the government’s stated commitments to tackle obesity and the climate crisis, and suggests to me that Low Carbon’s claims regarding the eco credentials of the proposed development are, rather than genuinely motivated by environmental concerns, a greenwash.

Yours sincerely,

Eleanor A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

From:	Katherine A
Sent:	01 August 2021 17:03
To:	Beverley Rodbard-Hedderwick, Low Carbon
cc:	cllrloughlin@uttlesford.gov.uk; cllrmerifield@uttlesford.gov.uk; pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk; stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com; Chair of Berden PC
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Farm - Proposal

To Low Carbon PLC

I am writing to state my **opposition** to the proposal to install a 251-acre solar farm at the site known as Pelham Spring between the villages of Berden and Manuden. The scale of the proposed development is, in the words of two villagers I have spoken to in the past few days, ‘truly shocking,’ and ‘utterly devastating.’ If planning permission is granted, it will have an irreversibly destructive impact on the environment, at a stroke industrialising a peaceful, ancient landscape of copses, hedgerows, fields and much loved and much used footpaths. The loss of Grade 2 agricultural land to industrial use is of grave concern at a time when the country is losing almost 100,000 acres of cultivated land each year, and when food security is increasingly parlous. If the land is used to generate energy, we will need to import food to compensate – and this will inevitably increase the carbon footprint of those imports, so that any environmental benefit from the solar power which has been generated must be weighed against this environmental cost. In addition, the cost of the inevitable impact on wildlife in the area cannot be overstated. Less than 35 miles from London, this gentle landscape is astonishingly rich in wildlife. I have seen dozens of species of birds in the fields and woods around the village since moving here in 2017, including rare long-eared owls, ravens and barn owls. During summer skylarks can be heard in the open fields all around the village from dawn to dusk, including in the fields where the proposed solar farm would be installed. Some species will survive if a solar farm is built there, but the majority will not, and the mitigation measures outlined in the proposal documents distributed by your company are to be viewed with deep scepticism. I question the practicality of grazing sheep alongside solar panels installed on this vast scale, and have only to look at the neglected, half derelict nature reserve and dried up ‘wildlife ponds’ around the existing battery installation on the border with East Herts to feel deep pessimism regarding the likely commitment of Low Carbon to long-term maintenance of the mitigation measures outlined in their publicity materials. In the woodland close to my house we hear owls and woodpeckers throughout the year, but I have never heard either in the lamentably poorly managed woods near the existing Pelham battery plant, even though I have walked the paths there frequently, particularly during lockdown. The bird hide is locked and in any case in ruins, as are the picnic benches and pond dipping platform, while the thin bands of trees are never coppiced and are consequently inadequate in terms of screening the battery and associated infrastructure. This raises an equally important point, which is the very great value of footpaths and nature for wellbeing, something which the pandemic has highlighted and continues to demonstrate. The proposed site backs onto one especially beautiful path, Blakings Lane, which is known to have been in use for at least 1000 years. This and the network of old paths and bridleways and are in constant use by local people. We have few amenities here in Berden: no shop, no pub, no leisure centre, minimal public transport and no shops. The footpaths are therefore very, very important to us – they are where we exercise ourselves and our pets, where we take our visitors, where we meet each other to chat – the pandemic has underlined their importance more than ever, and we have a right to continue to use

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO “PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM”

them – a moral right but also a legal one, as most are bridle ways and ancient footpaths. If those who hope to build the solar farms fence off the footpaths they might be abiding by the letter but not the spirit of the ancient rights to walk these paths, as the visual and auditory impact of the solar farms will mean that in practice hardly anyone will want to use them. The government’s Solar PV Roadmap and Strategy (2013) insists that developers must ensure that proposals are appropriately sited and give proper weight to environmental considerations (landscape and visual impact, heritage, local amenity). It is impossible to imagine that the current proposal for this site and the others proposed very close by, would obtain permission if these criteria were upheld. I trust that given the scale of local opposition to this proposal, the opposition I understand there has been from the National Grid to solar panels being installed under existing power lines and around pylons, and the dubious green credentials of the proposal in terms of net carbon savings, Low Carbon will withdraw their application for planning permission, and that if they continue to pursue their proposals, Uttlesford District Council will refuse their application when it reaches the planning committee later this year.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine A

COPIES OF EMAILS* SENT TO LOW CARBON OBJECTING TO "PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM"

From:	Kirsty G
Sent:	08 August 2021 16:33
To:	pelhamspring@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Subject:	Pelham Spring Solar Factory

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my very strong **objections** and opposition to the proposed "Pelham Spring" solar factory. As a resident of Berden, I feel this is unnecessary destruction of the countryside in the pursuit of profit for shareholders and which will be detrimental to the wildlife and residents of the surrounding area. The solar panels could be put instead on the roofs of housing and buildings being built in Bishop's Stortford and other areas nearby.

Surely farm land would be better used for food production and not industrialisation? I do not consider the screening proposals as sufficient to stop the development being an eyesore in a beautiful countryside, which has already been blighted by the substation, battery facilities and pylons within sight of Berden village.

The government has a key aim to create "Carbon sinks" and, if not required for food production, the land currently targeted by the energy companies would be better used for woodland. This would be more in-keeping with the local area and less damaging to local wildlife.

Solar power is inefficient and destructive. Although the site is nominally "temporary," 40 years is not a short-term project and, even if this monstrosity is removed in 40 years time, the land and wildlife will take far longer to recover. There is also no guarantee that these solar factories won't extend in size in the future.

If farmland is not being used for food production, more food must be imported from overseas. This has a knock-on effect and increases our carbon footprint, thus negating any benefit from the so-called "green" energy produced. This means the solar factory is a pointless project if your intention is to reduce our carbon footprint. It appears instead to be a project driven purely by the pursuit of profit for shareholders.

Government policy states that solar farm developments should not be built on high quality farmland (the farmland around Berden is grade 2/3 listed). There are many other areas which should be considered for development ahead of this one, particularly brownfield sites.

Finally, this proposed development is not in any way enhancing our local environment and would instead become a blot on the landscape and affect the lives and house prices of local residents. There are grade 1 and 2 listed buildings (houses and Church) within the village and the proposed development does NOT in any way belong next door to these buildings of architectural significance.

I totally reject the necessity to build this industrial facility on the proposed site and trust that Low Carbon will reconsider their plans to destroy our village in this way.

Yours sincerely,

Kirsty G

Resident of Berden village