

I repeat my earlier written representations sent on registration, including:

- The proposed scale of the solar farm is unprecedented in the UK and in any event far too large for a beautiful rolling rural area with long vistas, which provides significant outdoor amenity to the surrounding villages as well as Stamford
- It is built almost entirely on productive agricultural land, and food security should be considered alongside energy security
- There are significant concerns over the corporate governance & structure of the applicants, including evidence of use of slave labour to build the proposed solar panels, which would be deeply unethical
- 

Additional detail on additional traffic, environment & amenity: walking and cycling:

My wife and I frequently walk our dog in the proposed area, especially around Ryhall Heath. I am also a keen recreational cyclist and cycle on Uffington Lane 2 or 3 times each week, where I often see people running. The lane is narrow and poorly surfaced, and I am concerned about risk of injury from HGVs.

I also cycle regularly on Ryhall Road, as do many other cyclists. This is a narrow dual-track road with bends and blind spots, much currently subject to a national speed limit. There are frequent accidents and near misses, and the HGV increase would create added danger. The junction on Ryhall Road in Great Casterton is close to a primary and secondary school and there is frequent heavy congestion which would be exacerbated, as well as heightened risk of injury as many pupils walk down Ryhall road on their way to and from school or college.

There is a footpath on Ryhall Road, with a small parking area beside it, going onto Ryhall Heath. People walking in a loop from Ryhall via Tolethorpe and Ryhall Heath, whether going to or from Ryhall Heath, need to walk across Ryhall Road and then negotiate about 200 yards of road with a blind bend and no footpath, before accessing Salter's Lane to Tolethorpe. HGVs will make this much more dangerous.

I also cycle in many of the roads and lanes which go through the proposed site, and whilst HGV movements may not increase, I am concerned that other traffic will be driven onto those other routes to avoid the HGVs, which would add to the loss of amenity already caused by the site being so close to the lanes.