

Good afternoon,

My name is Simon Lane, I have been a resident of Pertenhall for [REDACTED] years. Pertenhall is amongst several villages in close proximity to the proposed 1900 Acre site. The development plans show in excess of 700000 solar panels supported on over 200000 piles and claim that the output will be sufficient to generate power for over 108000 homes.

My written representation raises objections to the Development under 9 headings.

There is not sufficient time to go through all of these points now and therefore I would like to expand on just one, namely the inappropriate siting of the Development.

In my opinion this will cause an unacceptable and totally avoidable blight on the local countryside with the consequent loss of productive farmland and an industrialization of the area.

If the immense power of the sun can be effectively harnessed for power production that must be a good thing. If the use of solar panels is currently the best way, then the only argument is where they would be best sited. Patently this is not in the countryside on productive farmland.

We should accept that due to the nature of the UK climate, solar power will always be a supplementary power source and logically best sited on individual properties and within existing industrial areas adjacent to rail or motorway links or other brown field areas.

The roof area of the quoted 108000 properties which it is claimed the solar farm could power equates to an area of 2000 Acres. 2000 Acres of Farmland could feed a substantial part of the local community. Why not site the panels on the roofs therefore and avoid the need to obliterate the countryside with steel and glass.

2% of England's land surface is covered by buildings. That equates to 650000 acres of roof area without allowing for other suitable land use.

In terms of food security clearly, we should be retaining farmland and siting solar panels on these roofs and other industrial areas.

I would ask the you Sir ,to strongly consider these points when making your recommendation on this Application to the Secretary of State.

There are many other aspects of the development which should be highlighted and as I said at the beginning these are contained within current and future written representation and have been highlighted by others today and will be considered in more detail as the examination period progresses.

The first essential step of any well-prepared project feasibility is to select the correct site. The leaning tower of Pisa is a good example of the right scheme on the wrong site. Sadly, this project has fallen at the first hurdle of suitable site selection and hence the vast array of reporting, energy cost and substantial stress substantial stress to the local community being expended to try and justify the wrong scheme.

Surely it is time to draw a line under this unnecessary and lazy attack on the countryside where a few stands to gain a lot and the majority stand to lose food security and an important way of life and local community.

I would urge you sir to conclude that that line is here and that the time is now and would ask you to reject this Application.