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.
Brownfield sites and rooftops have been rejected for various reasons, but most likely they are just inconvenient to the Developer.
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 contribute a paltry 0.15% to national requirements. The inefficiency and harm caused by these behemoths is clearly unacceptable and should not be forced on local communities.

Today, the 2nd of January 2024 at midday the current installed 14GW of solar is generating just 0.47GW giving a 1.2% Grid contribution. That is a peak solar generation yield of just 3.5%.
The 24-hour solar average would be practically zero!
Renewables are undeniably not of equal value.

The loss of crop growing land for a disproportionately small amount of electrical energy and the industrialisation of the landscape at such an unprecedented level, must not be allowed to happen. Solar is only fit for rooftops and brownfield sites.
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 large amount of installed solar capacity proposed would mean between 300,000 and 600,000 acres of farmland would be lost to something that would only give an 11% return!
This is madness with current global food issues and would also harm other Net zero aspirations that genuinely require our finite land resource. Combining this with the increased CO2 from inevitable increased importation means that there is no national benefit. This is simply an 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

developments, this current trend would be the largest loss of farmland in planning history, and for what? There would be a public outcry.
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. Developers must not be pandered to.
The lobbyists are leading us down a ruinous path and the "rooftop revolution" for solar is being neglected.

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 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 capability.
I cannot see any need for ground mounted solar. 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 GBEP would only contribute about 0.15% of the UKs current annual 300 TWh, meaning a correspondingly low carbon saving diminishing over time due to inevitable curtailment caused by mass solar development.
The mis-sold propaganda of powering 100,000+ homes also requires context. There are a further 28,000,000 (28 million) homes in the UK, so again the GBEP would only contribute a tiny fraction to this number of properties. It just would not deliver at any level and would always need something else to back it up. Electricity costs will inevitably rise.

The harms of this and the 3 sister schemes in West Lindsey outweigh the benefit many times over.

- **The electrical output and corresponding decarbonisation contribution is far too low.**
- **The inefficient loss of so much farmland for 60 years is too high.**
- **The effects on visual impact and landscape would be significant.**

- **Resident's mental health and wellbeing is at significant risk.**
- **Local opposition is extremely high.**
- **A failure to prioritise and utilise Rooftop and brownfield sites.**
- **No socioeconomic gain for an already deprived area area.**

The Gate Burton Energy Park's electricity generation contribution would be a mere drop in the ocean, yet its associated land loss would cause so many harms and hinderances that recommendation must not be given.
Sir, I hope this short summary will help you come to an informed and just recommendation for the Secretary of State.

Mass Solar NSIP development of the region