

This project cannot be allowed to go ahead for a number of reasons, most notably the totally immoral practices of the company, using forced labour in China, the destruction the local wildlife face, and the blatant misuse of perfectly good agricultural land. It is no surprise or revelation that as a country we must aim to be more local with our produce, as the importing of crops and foods have very detrimental effects on our environment - it is totally backwards to take up this land for an 'environmental' cause whose impacts and subsequent consequences will be considerably worse than if the land was never used for renewable energy. The reward does not surpass the risk, the benefits gained from renewable energy (in an area that is not known for its sun anyway) do not in anyway compensate for the destruction of the local area (both whilst building and then when it's finished and ready), and the fact that our country will have then lost prime agricultural land meaning more crops will have to be imported, an act in itself which is hugely damaging to the environment and global climate change. It makes no sense and we cannot let it happen.

George Eustace MP - on environmental audit committee- said in a letter dated 29 June 2022 clarifying govt guidance on the use of agricultural land for solar development - that there is a 'strong presumption against the use of best and most versatile agricultural and (graded 3B and above).

The land being targeted by the Canadian/Chinese company is 6% grade 2, 47% grade 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.

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. Food shortages are not only such a big issue, but also locally sourced crops and food. To take away this land that produces British crops and have it be used for something else could then require the exact same crops that are normally produced locally to be imported, and the emissions from imported goods alone have catastrophic impacts on the global climate. We should be aiming to be more local, which has many benefits including the reducing of emissions etc, not taking up perfectly good agricultural land to create energy to aid the 'renewable and sustainable' effort, which in all likelihood will result in our country having to import more food and crops to feed the nation, when the land was available and ready to use before.

In addition to this, 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, this will have huge impacts on the local wildlife and if this project goes ahead it will be unavoidable.

I also feel strongly that no company or institution that [REDACTED] 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 Windel Energy (Gary Toomey) holds or has held over 70 directorships – most of which are now insolvent and owe substantial amounts to creditors. 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 March21 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 human rights abuses and the destruction of over 2000 acres of prime agricultural land?