

When it comes to objections the most obvious are:-

The Governments own National Policy states that solar farms should be sited on previously developed and non-agricultural land.

The Great Staughton Council stated that the land under threat is mainly very good arable land and at very worst good to moderate land.

If this land is built upon, it removes valuable fertile farmland which will put UK FOOD SECURITY at risk.

Lithium Ion Batteries are beset with operational issues, let alone the abhorrent ethical facts about the process of Lithium extraction.

Lithium Ion batteries have a shelf life of between 5 to 15 years and their disposal is not easy.

We are seeing cases of Lithium Ion battery fires rise exponentially, on smaller scales than that proposed in this development.

Documentation to demonstrate the in efficiency if solar power to delivery energy and the yield reduction for year on year storage in the battery life.

The environmental impact of taking away these vast swathes of land includes erosion of habitat for skylarks, bats and other animals that rely on this space.

These arable lands contribute colossal amounts of CO2 reduction every day.

The conversion to make this into a solar farm will add significant Co2 production daily.

The additional Traffic on the B645 and the surrounding areas will have a massive impact on the environment with over 800 extra vehicle trips per day over a span of over 900 days. It will see additional impact on CO2 emission and wear and tear on the road surface itself.

Noise pollution will be a massive negative impact to locals.

Houses affected by the site and traffic have a listed building status.

Significant rain increases will add the land having less security of flood defences.

After 40 years of operation the site will need to be closed down. This again results in negative impact for carbon emissions and in road safety. Solar panels are difficult to recycle, removing struts will be time consuming and noisy, and lithium ion batteries are NOT recyclable.

We all know that this land will never be returned to arable land after the 40 year period. The holding company will go bust and there will be no responsibility for any one to take the site down and reclaim the land, let alone remove the fences.

This proposal should be turned down on the basis of :-

- Environmental,
- Habitat,
- Biodiversity,
- Loss of Good Agricultural land
- Food security
- Transport Safety
- Listed Building security
- Diametrically Opposed to the National and Local planning policies
- Noise Pollution
- Population Safety
- Poor Yield of energy year on year and the reduction of battery life
- Poor recyclability of Solar Panels and Lithium Ion Batteries