

14th June 2023

My clients land directly neighbours the proposed development in the northwest corner of the site.

The principal concerns are.

1. The sheer scale of the development and the loss of quality arable land when land required to grow food is needed more now than ever. Food price inflation is running at 19% and the war in Ukraine highlights why such land is needed to produce food at home to not rely on imports. Land used for food production will greatly improve habitat and biodiversity too over the use of this site at this scale.
2. The impact to biodiversity and habitat loss as above. The plans and proposals do not set out in detail how the baseline value of biodiversity is calculated and then by what percentage this is to be improved and critically how this will be created? On a scheme of this size, it is not acceptable to simply highlight areas on the plans as "Mitigation and Enhancement areas". The panels, roadways and fencing will provide hard boundaries preventing nature from transiting the area. More detail is needed in respect of the construction phase too. Typically, the developer is looking at the redline boundary of the site inwards, not considering the natural environment outside that redline boundary, for example on woodland edges and how nature transits these areas?
3. Impact on nature and SSSI protected verges during site preparation and construction phases. Having read the compulsory purchase application it can be seen that sections of roadway, junctions and hedges are to be permanently altered for construction. Many of these verges are protected SSSI's and those that are not form part of a wider scheme run by Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust or are Local Wildlife Sites to improve habitats and natural flora and fauna. It is the relationship these verges have with the neighbouring fields (both in and out of the proposed scheme) that give rise to their unique character. Nature is not defined by a red line on a plan. It appears that whoever has designed the "mitigation" has looked at this on a redline site basis. Thus, missing the relationship of each. Many of these verge side species are critically endangered. We question if thought or consideration has been given to this?
4. Linked to 3 above we are concerned that the mainly single-track roads surrounding the Northwest end of the site are not suitable for construction traffic especially during times of the year (like harvest) when large agricultural kit is used to access fields. We are concerned about local school bus routes and question why a section of hedge and verge is set to be permanently removed from What 3 Words ref (frame.highlighted.noted)as there is no reference as to why on the commentary provided in the plans? It is the displaced traffic that would otherwise transit through the construction site taking to unsuitable roads which is a safety concern to us. This often occurs if there is an accident on the A1 or the B1176 North of Stamford when the single-track lanes become extremely dangerous. potholes and current condition of roads

5. We are concerned that access is to be gained for construction traffic at the junction of the B1081 and the Pickworth Lane heading north from Great Casterton. This congested narrow lane runs directly past Great Casterton Church of England Primary School, and we would question the safety of using this access? We see that a minor junction improvement is noted but believe this will not adequately address the tight access to Pickworth Lane or mitigate the inevitable issues associated with the school.
6. There is a weight restriction on a section of road at the north of the site between Holywell What3Words Ref (tinned.globe.spearhead) in the centre of the hamlet heading east to the Pickworth Lane junction, What3Words Ref (lottery.putts.riverbank). This may not impact the construction traffic directly, but it will impact any displaced traffic because of the construction work. The road here is narrow and steep and single track.
7. We disagree with the proposed construction hours of work set at 07.00 am to 19.00 hours with travel time for staff to / from one hour either side, 06.00 – 20.00. These hours should be reduced to 08.00 – 18.00 instead.
8. We are concerned to learn as it has been widely reported in press that the panels that will be used on this development are made in China by workers that do not benefit from the same human rights as workers from the UK and that the developers will benefit from this low wage, low welfare manufacture process.
9. We have also learnt that the panels are not effective above the temperature of 25 degrees centigrade which we find frankly astonishing as during the design life of the scheme the average temperature in the UK is set to rise. Should consideration not be given to a better performing panel so that less panels will be needed?

E P Christmas FRICS

14th June 2023