

Summary statement regarding matters that have previously been raised during the examination for final consideration by the Examining Authority.

The current avalanche of applications for large scale ground mounted solar schemes in West Lindsey and the surrounding area would displace tens of thousands of acres of arable land to the lowest yielding and most problematic form of electricity generation available. This infinitesimal amount of electricity generation is not more important than feeding the nation and why is farmland being treated so recklessly as if it were an unlimited resource?

DEFRA states that "croppable" UK farmland is around 15 million acres.

There are 600,000 acres of solar schemes on the National Grid TEC register, so this figure could be 4% of croppable farmland. This would be a massive national loss and a woefully inefficient use of productive land.

For some context, the whole of the UK's potato crops account for only 1% and cereals 19% of croppable UK farmland. 4% is significant and unnecessary. The solar industry is understandably playing down this scale of land loss with inaccurate or out of date figures, their numbers are seriously misleading.

Brownfield sites and rooftops have been rejected for various reasons, but most likely they are just inconvenient to the Developer, yet they are the sensible option for a small country with half its farmland at risk of flooding.

Planning policy has been cherry picked throughout. There is no urgency or indeed need for a power plant installation in the middle of the countryside that would only generate 11% of its installed capacity and only contribute 0.15% to national requirements. The inefficiency and harm caused by these behemoths is clearly unacceptable and should not be forced on local communities at this intensity.

Renewables are not of equal worth to the nation. As I write this, solar is yielding at just 5% of its capacity at midday, meaning that if consented, this 500MW scheme would be generating a maximum of just 25MW!

The 500MW Grid connection would be in effect sterilized by just a few Mega Watts of power, peaking around midday. A criminal waste of vital infrastructure for 60 years.

The loss of so much crop growing land and the industrial blight for a disproportionately small amount of electrical energy must not be allowed to happen. Solar is only fit for rooftops and brownfield sites. It is not a substantive or reliable electrical generator.

The UK is a small windy island not a large sunny one, solar cannot be a primary generator here. Yet it is being promoted as such.

The Increase in CO2 emissions from increased future imports and pollution from a scheme mainly manufactured in China are obvious.

Panel and battery replacement every 25 and 10 years respectively would make this simply tomorrow's, not so green energy folly.

Wind can yield up to 50% and Nuclear 90%. Solar delivering only 11% cannot be allowed to consume more land than any other type of development, this current trend would be the largest loss of farmland in planning history, and for what? There would be a public outcry over this 13,000 acre solar desert around Gainsborough. The equivalent of 13 Longfield solar farms in one area!

Solar can never be a major player in the UK, but it does have a role to play on rooftops giving them an important secondary function. Farmland Developers must not be pandered to. The lobbyists are leading us down a ruinous path, with the "rooftop revolution" for solar being bypassed.

Large scale solar on farmland is the "Emperor's new clothes" of electricity generation. The two new nuclear power stations of Hinckley point C and Sizewell C would generate around the same amount of electricity as 70GW of installed solar capacity but would only cover around 600 acres of land, that is 500x more land efficiency! Clean gas technology and onshore wind are also extremely economical with land, whose environmental and visual harms are no higher than the industrial and sprawling nature of these massive solar schemes of dubious provenance and lack of capability.

The WBSP would only contribute a maximum of 0.15% to the UK's current annual 300 TWh of electrical consumption, meaning a correspondingly low carbon saving, diminishing over time due to inevitable curtailment caused by mass solar development. This project's effectiveness is further hampered by its substantive distance from the Grid.

National Grid expects solar to make modest contributions by 2050 of around 8% of UK electricity demand. A 500MW solar scheme would therefore only contribute **0.05%** of the UK's annual demand! This cannot be considered a quantifiable contribution to the energy system to warrant the harms associated with ground-mounted solar development of the scale. Despite what the solar industry says, the amount of land required for this would be far greater than that of golf courses and Christmas tree plantations. Putting Solar panels on farmland is largely avoidable... Golf courses, Christmas trees and cereal crops on rooftops would be an absurd proposition. These applications are out of control, the brakes must be applied.

The mis-sold propaganda of powering 100,000+ homes is impossible for a solar scheme to do in practice... all this claim means is that the total generation in MWh is the equivalent to the energy consumption of 100,000+ homes. Theory and practice are very different things. Solar capabilities are being criminally mis-sold. This claim also requires some context. There are a further 28 million homes in the UK, so again the WBSP would only contribute a tiny fraction to this number of properties. It just would not deliver at any level and would always need equivalent capacity of another generation means to back it up. Electricity costs will inevitably rise. Solar is cheap for the Operator only!

There is little need for ground mounted solar and no need for it on this scale. These schemes would cover hundreds of times more land than any other energy source and still wouldn't deliver power in the right quantity or at the right time. I can only see harm.

The damaging nature of the WBSP and the 4 other schemes in the locality outweigh the benefit many times over.

- **Part of one of the largest solar industrialised zones in the world; 13,000 acres.**
- **The electrical output is very low and problematic.**
- **Decarbonisation effect is correspondingly very low.**
- **Inefficient use of farmland for 60 years.**

- The visual impact and effects on the landscape would be significant.
- Resident's mental health and wellbeing are at significant risk.
- Vast local opposition.
- A failure to prioritise and utilise Rooftop and brownfield sites.
- Socioeconomic loss for an already deprived area.

The West Burton Solar Project's electricity generation contribution has been shown many times to be a mere drop in the ocean at a national level, yet its associated cumulative land loss would cause so many harms and net zero hinderances. I feel that recommendation must not be given on this nor its nearby sister proposals.

I hope this short summary has helped show some of the negatives of the WBSP, and it will be of use to you in arriving at an informed and just recommendation for the Secretary of State.

Please see the map below.

9/10 Solar NSIPs include the 5 creating a 13,000-acre Solar Industrialised Zone around Gainsborough.

