Submission ID: 17532

The land being targeted by the Canadian/Chinese company is 6% grade 2, 47% grace 3a and 47% grade 3b
On this basis alone, it is clear from Govt's own assessment (based on food security and long term benefit to the UK) that this land is wholly inappropriate for such use - I am so upset that it is even being considered.
Energy is not the only crisis pending. Global food shortages need also to be taken into account. It seems quite clear that this land would be more efficient and is better suited to food production than energy production, given the UK climate. We have had considerably less sunshine this year than almost anywhere in the UK, but I note that the crops are doing fine.
I have concerns about biodiversity. I have concerns about the impact of the construction let alone the long term damage to the environment. Our small Rutland/Lincs roads will not cope with the traffic/destruction and pollution that will inevitably arise during construction of such a vast industrial project. Over 60 lorries each day on roads that are already under pressure from limited rural traffic.
I also feel strongly that no company or institution that has such clear links to forved labour in Xinjiang China should be permitted to work ANYWHERE in the UK, let alone on a national infrastructure project of this magnitude. We will have blood on our hands if we allow it
Finally, I seriously question the fitness of Windel energy to be entrusted with any project, let alone something so high profile and significant to the whole country. According to information listed publicly in Companies House – the managing director of [redacted] Windle Energy is owned 50% by Enroly Holdings ltd and 50% by Sandals Wealth Management. Enroly Holdings accounts at Companies House (31 July 21) show the company as insolvent with £40,000 bank loan outstanding. Sandals Wealth Management's accounts at 31 March 21 show it holding £177 of shareholders funds. We cannot seriously be viewing these operations as responsible reliable or even trustworthy? Let alone fit to manage a project that involves using a company accused of a [redacted], and the destruction of over 2000 acres of prime agricultural land?