

In this examination process, there has been nothing resolved.

Why are we looking at up to 60 years as being temporary and accepting this? 60 years is a lifetime. This is not temporary, and it should not be allowed as a temporary planning application.

The panels are 4.5 meters high. Why? Never has approval been given for panels of this size and scale. There is no mitigation for the visual impact of panels of this size.

Solar is inefficient and very land-intensive. Why would we allow applications such as this to take up valuable grid connections that could be used for efficient renewable energy, such as nuclear fusion and even wind when available are connections are limited?

Given the pathetic, nonexistent performance of solar in our months of significant need in the winter and the fact that in the summer solar will cause the curtailment of existing renewable energy infrastructure, it would be ludicrous to agree to projects of this size and scale grabbing quality agricultural land. As stated by the Nfu in the parliamentary survey on page 31, The land in Lincolnshire is very versatile and capable of growing crops on 3B land better than prime land elsewhere in the UK, and it is not practical to take this land.

There has been no proper assessment of energy and what other options could be used to produce far more energy on much less land.

There has been no assessment of health and wellbeing at the appropriate level. Out-of-date data has been used. This development is unprecedented, and as such, proper evaluations by health professionals should be required.

There is nowhere else in the world that installs solar panels around rural communities. Why put them in Lincolnshire which is one of the worst places in the world for this in adequate renewable energy?

The planning requirements for these developments are to use brownfield land as a priority. The developer has paid lip service to this, and this pecking order clearly has not been adhered to.

Large-scale solar sites of this size are not at all proven to be carbon-efficient. The CO2 emissions from the heat from the panels are purported to produce significant emissions. The replacement of the panels through the lifetime of this project, the number of panels to be used and needing to be replaced, and the fact that they are so difficult to recycle and being transported from China.

The loss of wildlife and hedges and the loss of food production are just horrific for a renewable energy system that is so inefficient.

Why are we looking at compulsory purchase for something that is so inefficient?

Why are we allowing tenant farmers who have farmed for years to be driven off their farming land. Many farmers who have farmed for generations should not be allowed to be driven off their farms, for something so insignificant to net zero.

Solar should be on roofs and brownfield land. Farmland should be for food. Currently 27000 acres in North Lincolnshire proposed for solar and 13,000 acres in a 10 km radius. This is not acceptable, this cannot be mitigated against and the developer has not in anyway made a case for taking agricultural land when there are far more efficient forms of renewable energy.