

I write to confirm my continued objection to the scheme as proposed. Principle concerns which have not been addressed include:

- 1) Both the non-statutory and statutory consultations were misleading and inadequate. Not an image of a solar array was included by the applicant in the public consultations and the plans were obscure, making it all but impossible for the public to understand the extent or scale of the proposed development.
- 2) The wholesale industrialisation of the environment around settlements of Essendine, Ryhall, Carlby will have an unacceptable adverse effect on the living conditions of residents in the area, contrary to the principles of sustainable development supported by the NPPF.
- 3) There has been much emphasis on loss of views, both from the public and private domains. Whilst these are important to the public wellbeing, it should be emphasised that the open and distant rural views will be replaced by the stark and overbearing appearance of the solar arrays with associated fencing and equipment. It is what the lost views would be replaced with which would do as much if not more harm to the wellbeing of local residents and visiting public as the mere loss of distant rural views would.
- 3) The disturbance to the living conditions of local residents resulting from noise during construction and operation does not seem to have been addressed. The solar farm would be in a naturally very quiet location and, consequently, even low levels of noise would be audible from within dwellings, resulting in significant harm to the living conditions of those residents affected.
- 4) The effect of the proposed development on protected species has not been adequately assessed. The proposed development would result in loss of large areas of habitat for protected species, including sky lark, quail, hare. There are currently long eared owls hunting on the land east of Essendine. It's not been made clear how the development could be implemented without harming the futures of these protected species.
- 5) Evidence has not been presented to demonstrate how the harms to the local economy which would result from the proposed development would be mitigated, if they could be. The scale of what would be an industrial development would result in considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area which would lead to widespread loss of property value both within the development area and in settlements like Stamford. This would undermine the local economy. Further, Stamford and the area attracts a lot of tourists/visitors, underpinning the economic viability of Stamford town centre and local services. The proposed development would result in a significant loss of visitor income, which would undermine the local economy.
- 6) Overall, the size, scale, character and appearance of the proposed development would result in considerable harm to the lives of local people without any significant gains being proposed. some permissive footpaths have been proposed but they would be through the solar arrays and offer very little if any benefits to the proposed users
- 7) I urge the Inspectorate to recommend refusal of the development as proposed