

I strongly oppose the proposal on the following grounds:

Inadequate Cumulative Impact Assessment:

Over 14 major projects (including 4 NSIPs including Sturton Quarry, North Humber-High Marnham Grid, West Burton decommissioning, and STEP fusion plant) plus smaller developments overwhelm the community, causing consultation fatigue, anxiety, and confusion.

Applicant's ES fails to assess: overlapping construction disruptions (prolonging impacts); exclusion of STEP despite its scale; and lack of cumulative visualisations in LVIA. Existing industrialisation (e.g., West Burton Power Station) should not justify further harm.

Landscape Impacts:

Project will industrialise open agricultural views, surrounding the village and neighbouring areas (e.g., South/North Wheatley, North Leverton).

Screening via hedgerows harms by closing historic open vistas (evident in ES photomontages, e.g., viewpoints 17B-D, 20B).

LVIA ignores cultural/historic elements like green lanes, field patterns, and Bassetlaw Pilgrim Trail.

Heritage & Archaeological Harm:

The site's rich history is inadequately assessed, including:

Sturton-le-Steeple: Epicentre of Pilgrim/Reformation story (figures like John Smyth, John Robinson); attracts US tourists; new £11k sculpture and trails promote heritage tourism.

Historic features: Roman road/settlement at Littleborough (early Christian baptisms by Paulinus, 627AD); lost medieval village at Habbleshthorpe (Baptist origins); West Burton Round (Shakespeare-referenced paleochannel, separatist preaching site).

Isolation amid former wetlands key to historic character; solar farm would destroy views, accessibility, and tourism appeal.

Loss of Best & Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land:

72% of site is Grade 2/3a farmland producing wheat, barley, etc.; permanent loss for 40 years is completely unacceptable and risks food security, jobs, and soil degradation (despite sheep grazing claims).

Farmland supports more employment than solar (2–5 jobs/100MW); references DEFRA/CPRE data on UK land loss.

Health & Wellbeing Detriments:

Loss of open countryside for walking; anxiety from over-industrialisation/info overload; farmer suicide risks from job loss; unknown health effects from residing near solar panels.

Unaddressed risks: flooding (area flood-prone; panels increase runoff), water contamination, fire.

Widens health inequalities; poor consultation erodes trust and breaches NPPF policy.

Scale/Alternatives: The Proposal will dominate our beautiful and historical rural character. Brownfield/lower-grade land should be priority; unfair burden vs. other counties (contra UK Solar Strategy).

Environment/Wildlife: Fragments habitats/corridors and loss of functionality linked land.

Wildlife impacts are inadequately mitigated.

Access/Flooding: Diverts/obscures footpaths; exacerbates local flooding.

Economic: Minimal local jobs/benefits; potential 10–12% house price drop.

Project lacks strategic justification, fairness, and balance.

I urge the ExA to reject this proposal and prioritise brownfield sites.