

My comments don't fit into the items listed. I was advised to choose any item at random and submit under that. The Applicant has still failed to provide compelling evidence that alternative, lower conflict sites have been considered or more compact sites. Other sites should be considered that do not require such a high percentage of BMV land. The selection seems to be based solely on convenience. The proposed site is unusually fragmented and inefficient. Solar plants are inefficient in that they produce little energy during the winter months

This area is already making a significant contribution to energy security with wind power and solar energy. There are already a number of solar plants in the immediate area including Grafham, Manor Farm, High Wood, Little Staughton. Is it really necessary to use more prime agricultural land for another solar development?

A lack of a detailed Battery Management Plan despite the proximity of large-scale lithium-ion batteries to a live gas pipe is a major concern. This has become even more concerning due to the increasing temperatures in our summers, drying vegetation, drought and thus an increasing risk of wild fires. Indeed the fire service had to respond to a wildfire in Pertenhall in August 2026.

This year's drought has highlighted the issue of water security in this area. Where will the Development source its water supply for the washing and maintenance of 70,000 solar panels without sufficient rainfall?

The issue of Traffic Management remains unresolved. The Applicant understates the anticipated impact of the scheme with regard to transport. It is forecast to be negligible or minor. The 7,200 HGV movements over the three years construction plus up to 850 construction workforce traffic will have a dramatic impact on the local country roads, businesses and schools. The absence of enforceable monitoring or penalties for non-compliance of vehicles not using the official route is another major concern. Nearly 1,000 pupils attend Kimbolton School on a daily basis. The School is situated on the B645 and most pupils arrive and depart by car. The sheer volume of traffic will cause congestion. The Applicant has made a suggestion that someone will be appointed to monitor the traffic but how effective this will be with a patchwork of sites is questionable. The possibility of HGVs coming from the west on the A14 and taking the exit through Catworth will cause significant disruption. Are there going to be peak hour HGV embargoes?

Can the Applicant provide the financial assurance for decommissioning?

In conclusion, these are just some of my objections to the proposed development. My other objections are; the catastrophic impact on the local landscape, the possibility of an increase in flooding as compacted soil creates a less permeable barrier for rain which has the potential to change water run-off patterns and result in flooding, the Development would have a significant detrimental effect on local wild life.

I believe that the negatives far outweigh the positives, namely the low yield of electricity but with an unacceptably high local impact.

I respectfully urge the Examining Authority to recommend the refusal of this Development Consent Order.