

Simon Skelton WR

December 2023

The West Burton Solar Project (WBSP) is just one of four giant solar proposals in West Lindsey that fall within a 6 mile radius.

It is therefore part of one 2000MW peak solar project "salami sliced" into four projects. This, and the 'Cottam Solar Project' have even been submitted by the same Applicant, Island Green Power!

All four projects should therefore be scrutinised with the unprecedented and significant 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'."

There has never been 4 solar NSIP proposals in such a small area.

These would engulf huge amounts of land for very little power.

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 truth of ground mounted solar generation was to be revealed to the population.

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

What gives solar developers the right to demand such huge amounts of land. These 4 schemes would cumulatively be an area the size of the entirety of Lincoln!

Solar by its very nature cannot provide energy security and factored at around 10%. The 480MW peak WBSP would really only be on average, a 50MW generator.

WBSP would generate around 420,000MW/h per annum.

UK demand is 300,000,000MW/h per annum, and is therefore less than a 0.14% national contribution.

This cannot be deemed as a large amount of green energy. It is totally disproportional to the massive amount of land of which it consumes.

Better alternatives are available and must be given a chance.

The Government make it quite clear that we urgently require LARGE amounts of clean energy. The WBSP would not deliver this but nuclear of all kinds for example, would. So, I agree with the UKAEA that using valuable 400kv Grid connections on solar would be a retrograde step in our overall ambitions and it must be halted.

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

The batteries are a totally separate entity to the solar farm due to the crystal-clear intent of charging them from Grid power, and they should be Brownfield located, or sited close to the Grid connection for safety reasons if nothing else.

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! Few of us will be alive to witness future land use, but I doubt it will return to agriculture after six decades of absence.

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 fresh planting has matured and is 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 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 positive impact on overall 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 an important secondary function, providing power direct to the end user and lowering grid demand, without all the negatives of ground mounted solar.

Not until every available rooftop is used should we even consider using farmland for this highly inefficient process. Many hungry nations across the world would see this act as sheer madness!

The proposal is clearly deeply flawed.

Thank you.