

## WBSP ISH1 9<sup>th</sup> Nov 2023.

Firstly, I must comment on the Applicants numerous “impartial specialists” and their blatant and consistent narrative, that this and the other 3 solar NSIPs in the immediate area would bring many benefits and no harms to the area. This solar utopia was promoted by all without exception. I am sure these people would argue black is white!

In the real world, the truth would in fact be dystopia. On a scale never seen before in this country. Selling solar industrialised zones in this way is without doubt “The Emperor’s new clothes”.

We see through the solar propaganda and hope the Examining Authority can see through this too.

My Comments and submissions.

3a.

The proposed 4.5m/15ft high solar arrays are unsuitable over such vast areas in the English countryside. Screening of such apparatus would be impossible and their visual impact considerable.

Sunnica solar in Cambridgeshire/Suffolk propose 2.5m/8ft high panels, far more acceptable and easier to screen in a countryside setting.

3b.

“Overplanting” The scheme’s overall land use efficiency is further reduced if the theoretical output is greater than the maximum 480MW export. This overplanting is just adding to the industrialisation of the countryside and takes the misuse and waste of farmland to another level. The many thousands more panels being used than are required to generate a maximum of 480MW is unacceptable and was certainly not mentioned during consultation.

This overplanting of panels is at the expense of greater visual impact of the scheme and further detriment to communities.

This spare capacity should be used as a means of physical size reduction and mitigation improvements.

The physical size of the scheme is far larger than it needs to be.

3c.

The BESS is not associated development, it is quite independent from the PVs, it would largely be charged by Grid power not from the PVs own limited output, especially in the winter.

160MWh or as stated 20MW over 8 hours is a mere drop in the ocean when put into context of national demand. As an example, 40,000MW required at any one time in this country would make the 20MW (0.05%) of even 160MW (0.4%) for one hour extremely limited in its contribution to these large and ever-increasing quantities. But what it would make, is the operator a lot of money when imported low and exported high. The potential harms of BESS in this setting far outweigh the benefits.

Solar power plants on leased farmland are money making machines at the expense of Net Zero progress, landscape, food production and rural communities.

4a.

IGP have stated during meetings and consultation that the reason Lincolnshire had been targeted for these giant solar schemes, is that there was no suitable land in Nottinghamshire close to the old power stations.

There has recently been an announcement of another giant solar farm "Steeple Solar". This proposal is adjacent to West Burton power station. Arguably in a more practical location?

This news seems to undermine the site selection narrative and is another area where unfortunately the Applicants trust has been lost.

It appears that it is not really "site selection" at all, but it is areas offered by large landowners exchanging agriculture for an easier and elevated revenue stream. The distance from the Grid is considerable with many natural obstacles and significant disruption to humans and the natural world. 10,000 acres of solar industrialisation is not acceptable in one area, all these applications in one locality have unnecessarily created serious and complex planning issues.

4b.

The utilisation of one of the 400kv grid connections that will become available at the end of the decade at West Burton substation is contradictory to the need for more electricity by 4x, an increase stated by the Applicants specialist.

The use of one of these spare connections would replace one of the now closed coal fired units at West Burton power station by only around 10%, so we are actually going backwards in the quest for more power.

It has to be remembered that the final generating figures reached by these old power stations are significantly reduced from their true maximum potential, due to a 2 shifting regime and their flexible and demand following generation over the last 25 years. They still outperformed solar many times over. We get none of this flexibility or vast electrical output from solar. But it must be realised that this is what we need moving forward!

I am certainly not promoting using a power source from a bygone age, but I object to being preached at for the need for more power when that opposite would be happening, and I take offense to consultation literature and promotion tactics stating that the WBSP would replace 24% of the generation capacity of the West Burton power station. It would be a tiny fraction of this... The public have been deceived.

4c.

As stated before, the land lost to solar here and across the country could be of catastrophic proportions, solar plants are not an appropriate use of land. I realise that the 3a BMV threshold is stated in planning policy, but this does not mean that high quality 3b land is ridden over roughshod. The loss of any arable land puts undeniable pressure on what remains.

4d.

The Applicants specialist stated that solar schemes were similar in output and size to onshore wind. This is incorrect.

UK's average load factor for solar is around 10% (DUKES)

The onshore wind load factor is far higher, at least 2.7x greater than solar and the land beneath would continue to yield crops for the nation. The gross size of a wind farm may be similar to a solar farm but the land loss is far less. This solar scheme cannot continue to grow crops for the nation and the land occupied is in effect agriculturally sterile. The proof is out there for all to see!

Offshore wind power around this windy island of ours can have around a 50% power yield.

This significant power output is what we need.

Nuclear power stations of all types only need to cover a few hundred acres and provide reliable power in even greater quantities.

'We need lots of power and we need lots of land to satisfy out Net Zero and domestic needs.'

5.

It was implied by the Applicants specialists, that we live in an unattractive and ecologically deficient area and these projects would considerably improve this. I wholeheartedly disagree and I think that the people that live here that are without a financial agenda will be the true judge of that.

I, for one wish to maintain this wonderful natural and semi natural agricultural landscape, that I chose to live in, and I do not wish to lose vast and unproportional swathes of farmland to a generation folly promoted on Ill-founded Net Zero threats.

10,000 acres is the size of Lincoln and its boroughs, what a waste!

Thank you.