

**23/03207/REF | Erection of an up to 30 MW Solar PV Array, comprising ground mounted solar PV panels, vehicular access, internal access tracks, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including security fencing, CCTV, client storage containers and grid connection infrastructure, including substation buildings and off-site cabling | Proposed Solar Farm To The West Of Berrington Shrewsbury Shropshire**

I am a local resident who has lived for more than 30 years midway between Berrington and Cantlop, and will be heavily impacted by the proposed development. My property borders both the east and west fields which are proposed for the solar development, and at its closest my garden is only 30 metres from the eastern field. If this proposal goes ahead, then in order to access my property I will have to travel, no matter whether by car, bicycle or on foot, for approximately 500 metres through the centre of the solar farm, with the panels looming up to six metres above me, along with the 2.5 metre high security fencing, approximately seven CCTV cameras, and associated lights and warning signs. It will be extremely overbearing. I have also been informed by the planners that my family and I will be subject to noise impact from the solar farm, not only during its construction, but also during its operation for the next 40 years, which is not as the developers would have us believe, a temporary period of time, but actually one to two generations.

People come here because they enjoy the beauty and tranquility of the countryside, in particular they enjoy walking the several local circular walks on public rights of way, permissive paths, bridal ways and lanes which exist here. All of these will be negatively visually impacted by this proposed development, affecting those significant numbers of members of the public who enjoy walking, riding, cycling, birdwatching, and fishing here. The presence of the solar farm will seriously detract from their enjoyment.

I fail to understand why the planners have selected this particular raised, sloping, highly visible, exposed site, when there appear to be a number of more suitable sites in the neighbouring area. It is not clear if these alternative sites also consist principally of grade 1 and 2 farmland as they have not been properly surveyed, but they most certainly do not have the benefit of a reservoir for summer irrigation. However they do appear to benefit in many cases from a simple connection to the national grid. We already have a well placed solar farm a quarter of a mile away and another two approximately two miles distant, all three of which are much more sympathetically sited on poorer quality land.

We need renewable energy, but not at the expense of food production in these increasingly uncertain times. This is a poorly thought out, ill-presented development in the wrong place. We should reflect on a recent statement from The Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, which noted that the government's own estimates suggest that there are 250,000 hectares of south facing commercial roof space across the country, an area bigger than London and Manchester combined. We should be using commercial and domestic roofs, carparks and car canopies to site solar panels, not highly productive farmland. An added benefit is that it is significantly quicker and cheaper to site solar panels on roofs rather than ground mounted displays in farmland. This appeal should be dismissed.

D.H.King, March 2024