

My comments relate to the presentation of the developer's solicitor at the Open floor meeting on Thursday 7th December 2023.

I have attempted to link my comments to the timings on the recorded video transcript.

44:00. Climate change was presented as a "matter of fact". This is a slight of hand. Climate change is indeed a matter of fact. In the natural history of the globe the climate had changed many times - why would it stop now? What is unclear is how much industrial activity contributes to a detrimental climate change. Science is never set, by its nature it is an evolving process. The argument that detrimental climate change is man made is often made against a back drop of climate change alarmism (COP 28 was also slipped in as is usual in these cases).

44:17. It is suggested that our elected representative to Parliament is inconsistent in regard to what is being said locally and in National Government. We would like more specific detail to support any contention that undermines faith in someone we have elected. This theme is returned to at 56:40.

50:58. The figure of 0.1% of total land is proposed for solar is given. It is the percentage of farmable land that is important.

52:14. An argument is made that re wilding and set aside is not objected to despite these taking away from crop production. Re wilding does not deface our natural environment like a solar factory and it absorbs carbon for a generation. Set aside land can be returned to production in a season unlike a solar factory which deprives it of production for half a century and leaves a potential brown field legacy.

52:46. An argument is made that Lincolnshire has a heritage of power production and this justifies continuing blight with solar factories. We have suffered some of the downside of power stations and they were placed here not because of an overarching plan but because of the convenience of the proximity of the Nottinghamshire coal fields and the cooling water of the Trent. Similarly, the placing of the proposed solar factories has been driven by the convenient access to the grid and presence of rapacious absent landlords willing to profit.

The Trent power stations did at least provide ample power from a comparatively tiny footprint as opposed to the feeble intermittent output of these projects on a massive footprint. Also, the Trent power stations did provide lifetime, well paid jobs for the locals to offset any disadvantages.

Is the case being made that "you people in West Lindsey are used to having environmental blight so just suck it up"?

53:32. A strange comparison is made between domestic television purchase and millions of solar panels. Many people strive to purchase electrical goods produced locally avoiding China but cannot. The dominance of Chinese production in electrical goods is not something the residents of West Lindsey have control over. Like many retired residents we cannot afford a plasma screen TV or an I phone in any event.

58:17. Reference is made to the "legacy". By which we suppose is meant the vague benefits of running a solar factory for half a century. When the putative solar factory finished use is it proposed that 6 months later the site will be a sea of golden grain? What is a likely legacy is a brownfield site. Then developers using the same argument as "you are used to power stations" will propose that such land is suitable for shopping malls, industrial estates and open prisons. I doubt our grandchildren will thank us.

58:38. Reference is made to "the greater good". This is another version of climate change alarmism emotional blackmail. Similar to guilt tripping over plasma screen televisions. The group of the 4 contiguous projects are presented as being National Significant Infrastructure. Individually big enough to Nationally Significant but kept discreet to disguise the enormous glass prairie they represent. Being "Nationally Significant" gives the impression that we re contributing to the Greater Good of the nation. Other distant bodies are the real beneficiaries.