Submission ID: 20720

The land involved in the proposal is clearly agricultural and rural in nature. The relatively small footprint occupied by the old power station does not change this and in any event will be removed. The developer is misleading in its statements to the contrary. The proposed development could be on commercial roof tops and brown field sites but these have been discarded in favour of the perceived easy pickings of agricultural land.
There are significant health and safety issues associated with lithium ion batteries, particularly when used at scale. The fire risk is significant and can clearly be demonstrated by the recent fire on a ship delivering electric cars. The materials in the batteries are a risk to health when damaged and this should be taken into consideration. The developer has not done enough to mitigate these risks in their proposal.
The developer also states that hedges will be used to limit the impact of the massive solar panel deployment but this cannot work given the sheer size of the panels. They will be visible and will completely change the character of the agricultural land that the developer pans to site them on.
Solar panels are not an efficient means of generating electricity, they don’t work well at night, when there are clouds or in the winter. In fact, they do not work well at times of peak energy usage. That is why the developer has proposed the deployment of a huge battery storage facility. Is it the solar panels that are the main element of this proposal or the battery storage facility? It is clear that the solar farm doesn’t generate power when it is needed but that the battery storage facility needs the solar panels to store electricity for the time period that it is required. It is clearly an inefficient use of land that would be better suited to growing food. There are other technologies that could be deployed on a smaller footprint that would generate power more efficiently than the proposal can.