

Address: 32 Greenfield Crescent Huddersfield WF4 4WA

### About the application

Application number: 2021/62/93644/E	
What is the application for?:	Erection and operation of grid-connected solar photovoltaic farm, with ancillary
Address of the site or building:	Low Farm, Wakefield Road, Flockton, Huddersfield, WF4 4BB
Postcode:	BN18 0AG

### User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No

This very large (210 acre) development should not be permitted - such a huge development has significant visual impact and completely changes the character of the area from rural to industrial.

There will be a significant loss of habitat for Skylarks and Lapwings - both of which are resident in the planned development site.

The A642 is well known as an accident prone route (as witnessed by the number of speed cameras along it and the signs advising the same) - having 210 acres of highly reflective panels adjacent to the A642 with the low sun in Spring and Autumn means it is highly likely that pedestrians, riders and drivers could be blinded leading to an accident. If the developer is planning on installing high fencing to obscure the panels from the road then this would look totally out of place in what is beautiful farmland.

There are many footpaths and bridleways right besides this planned development - the views from these footpaths will be ruined and it is highly likely that walkers, horse rider and cyclists could be blinded by reflections from the panels.

The flood risk of the are has been ignored by the developers, adding 210 acres of solar panels means that the ground beneath the panels won't be able to absorb the rainwater as it did previously. Instead the rain water being spread over the whole area it is now forced to the perimeter of the panels where the land will become saturated causing it to run off much quicker leading to flooding of Bristfield Beck and Smithy Brook as well as the properties along Wood Lane and Thronhill Road and other lower lying properties.

The benefits of the scheme in CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction, whilst laudable are not achievable as the developers have completely ignored the CO<sub>2</sub> produced in the manufacturing of the panels, the installation and maintenance as well as the end of life disposal. The whole life environmental impact needs to be included - as an example 11.5 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> is produced for every 1 tonne of aluminium manufactured - A solar panel lasts ~30 years (not the 35-40 as detailed in the proposal). At the end of its life cycle, it has to be treated as a special waste. Numerous elements compose a solar panel, including toxic substances such as copper, lead, gallium, selenium, indium, cadmium and tellurium. The separation and recovery of these metals is not an easy process.

Because the developers have chosen to maximise their opportunity for development and extend their facility right up to the edge of the properties and roads - high security fencing will be required, and not deer fencing. This high security fencing will have a further detrimental visual impact on the landscape visual amenity