

Simon Skelton WR

August 2023

Dear Mr. Stone,

Gate Burton Energy Park (GBEP) is just one of four giant solar proposals in West Lindsey that fall within a 6 mile radius.

It is therefore quite obvious that this is one 2000MW peak solar project "salami sliced" into four. Two of the projects are even by the same developer!

All four projects should therefore be scrutinised with this unprecedented cumulative impact being the primary consideration.

*"Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that "When considering cumulative effects, the ES should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence)". For the purposes of this Advice Note, 'other existing development and/or approved development' is taken to include existing developments and existing plans and projects that are 'reasonably foreseeable'."*

We are unaware of there ever being 4 NSIP proposals in such a small area and engulfing such huge amounts of land and for such little benefit.

This appears to be part of a solar gold rush fueled by industry misinformation and false claims.

There would be a public outcry if these schemes were to go ahead, and the realities of solar generation were revealed to the population, and how much of our farmland this has cost us.

Solar is the lowest yielding and most land inefficient generator we have, so why is it being promoted in this oppressive way with such detrimental consequences to communities, landscape, food production and Net Zero targets.

What gives solar developers the right to demand such huge amounts of land. This is cumulatively an area the size of Lincoln.

Solar by its very nature cannot provide energy security and factored at 10%. The 500MWp GBEP would really only be a 50MW generator.

**GBEP would generate around 438,000MW/h per annum.**

**UK demand is 300,000,000MW/h per annum, and is therefore less than a 0.15% contribution.**

This cannot be deemed a beneficial amount of green energy compared to the massive amount of land which it covers.

Are these schemes really worth it when alternatives are available?

Is the loss of farmland, landscape, and people's wellbeing not of greater importance than this small amount of energy produced?

The batteries are a totally separate entity to the solar farm due to the crystal-clear intent of charging them from excess Grid power, and should they not be Brownfield located next to the Grid connection for safety and efficiency?

One thing that can be relied on is that solar panels generate exactly NOTHING for half their life! A sobering thought for a temporary proposal of 60+ years!

The whole proposal is a criminal destruction of our surroundings and Lincolnshire's agricultural heritage.

Biodiversity claims are a by-product of mitigation attempts and can only be measured when successful and not by mere potential. Biodiversity will swing negatively for a very long time if any mature hedging or trees are allowed to be removed. Only when new planting has matured and of equal stature to the original can this be classed as a quantifiable replacement.

Many plants will fail due to grazing Deer and Brown Hare or lack of maintenance. There is no suggestion of any extraordinary tree protection or any mammal exclusion measures.

This is a business opportunity fueled by Net Zero threats and climate boiling alarmism. Ground mounted solar will aggravate our food security, increase carbon emissions, destroy established ecosystems, and degrade our surroundings. In the end it will fall woefully short in our quest for reliance on low carbon energy, having no impact on Net Zero targets.

This is robbing Peter to pay Paul, in the extreme!

Solar panels on rooftops are a totally different matter altogether. Giving roof tops a secondary purpose, providing power direct to the end user and lowering grid demand, without the negatives of ground mounted solar.

Not until every available rooftop is used should we even consider using farmland for this highly inefficient process.

The proposal is deeply flawed. I look forward to answering future questions throughout this process.

Thank you.

