

I do not believe the applicant's response adequately addresses my question regarding the consideration of alternative sites. In fact, I find the response contradictory.

All of the land surrounding my property, [REDACTED] in Little Staughton, is classified as Grade 2 agricultural land. This directly conflicts with the applicant's assertion that alternative sites closer to the existing solar installations were rejected on the basis of being Grade 2 agricultural land.

If the land surrounding [REDACTED] is of the same agricultural grade as the land that was rejected, then it is unclear why one area was considered suitable while the other was dismissed. The applicant has not provided a consistent or convincing explanation for this distinction.

Furthermore, siting the scheme closer to Little Staughton Airfield would appear to make significantly more sense given its proximity to existing solar schemes and the grid connection infrastructure. This would logically reduce the need for additional infrastructure and further concentration of development elsewhere.

Given that the agricultural quality of the land is the same in both locations, I fail to see how the applicant's justification can be considered valid or consistent.

I would therefore continue to put it to the Inspectorate that the selection of land appears to be highly selective and influenced by the interests of particular landowners, including the apparent protection of existing game shoots, rather than being based on a transparent and objective site selection process.