

I am totally opposed to the principle of the proposals for the following reasons.

The loss of good agriculture is key, particularly with current world affairs driving up prices. We must maintain a sustainable balance, the destruction of such a large area as proposed must not be allowed. There are better alternatives such as warehouses, carparks and all building roofs.

The proposals are not eco friendly despite the written reports. The wildlife will be displaced during construction and with all the fencing will never recover. The trees will take years to recover. We must really take this into consideration, we must not be fooled by nicely written reports.

Great emphasis is placed on fitness, health and exercise, the area is rich in pleasant footpaths in natural surroundings, who wants to walk through fenced off routes through acres of glass 3m High.

I do not have faith in the reinstatement proposals, we must question what is proposed by experts who really understand the situation, it will be easy for any operator to renege and leave the cleaning up bill with the government of the day. The area is massive and will be blighted for a considerable time.

Employment is mentioned as being beneficial for the local people, it will not benefit the local area. The labour used to build it will travel in by car, affecting the local roads which can barely cope with the current situation. The local roads suffer from serious degradation which cannot be repaired effectively by the council. The proposals note busing in of labour. It must be questioned will it really happen? The situation will get considerably worse for the local people.

There really do not seem to be any benefits for the local area apart from total destruction of the countryside. There are many more efficient alternatives to solar panels for generating electricity, and if solar panels must be used then alternative locations which do not affect the countryside must be considered.