From:	[redacted]
To:	DevelopmentControl
Cc:	Aaron Sands
Subject:	RE: Subject: Late Representation – Application 25/00652/FUL Agenda Item 3a – DMC 18 August 2025 Land East of Billing Brook and North and South of Peterborough Road, Haddon
Date:	12 August 2025 16:26:11

Dear Sirs,

Once again, we need to bring emphasis and attention to the misleading Wessex's PR claims regarding this proposal.

Wessex keep talking of "being able to export 25 MW" which is straightforwardly misleading. The 25 MW is nominal per hour full-plant capacity, which assumes maximum output under maximum benign conditions- perfect full sun, perfect alignment of the panels etc, and so is is completely inaccurate.

The reality is that solar panels do not see perfect conditions at all - they don't work at all at night, direct sunlight is intermittent, and sun angle, timings and power are very low in winter [the exact time that electrical power is under maximum demand].
This is actually demonstrated by Wessex's own figures. The claimed 25MW per hour, if multiplied by the number of hours in the year, would amount to 219,000MW for the full year.
However, Wessex's very own actual claimed output per annum, from their own documentation, is 28,400 MW which is 13% of the total theoretical 25MW/hour, and works out as being equivalent to 3.24 MW per hour of a full year - a long way from 25MW !!

Further, actual solar power generated across the UK in 2024 was 14,364,000 MW, so Wessex's project at Haddon would add just 0.197% to the total electricity output coming from solar installations in 2024. – less than two tenths of one percent….

The same approach applies to the number of homes that can be supplied, claimed by Wessex at 7,600 households. That is simply the Wessex claimed annual output of 28,400 MW divided by average annual usage of electrical power for a medium size house – nothing more than that. In fact, the intermittency of solar power means that 'per household' is not a real situation – it is just a comfortable PR claim….

The actual Wessex figure of 28,400 MW production should also be seen against the annual UK usage of electrical power, which stands (for 2024) at 319 Terawatts which is 319 MILLION MW. So Wessex's own claims are to add 28,400 MW to this – that is to say i.e. 0.008% - one eight thousandth's of additional electrical power capacity.

Summary:

- The claimed output of the solar farm, at 25MW per hour is a misleading PR-related figures - Wessex's own detailed statistics show that the actual hourly output across the year is 3.24 MW per hour - one seventh of the claimed figure.

- The annual Haddon electrical output, in MW, according to Wessex's own stated annual production figure of 28,400 MW, represents capacity addition of less than two hundredths of the current UK installed capacity of solar power, and an infinitesimal increase in total UK electrical production capacity

- The proposed Haddon plant will not materially affect the national provision of solar power, but it will negatively affect the lives and amenities of local people; destroy farmland; wreck the landscape permanently; and cause massive problems during construction; and bring dangers to aviation.

- The sole driver of the Haddon proposal is to increase the wealth of the

developers and the landowner, regardless of local damage, and without any material national benefit.

- One of the key claims of the proposers is that solar power will be cheaper for domestic users than current electrical charges [the highest in Europe and the developed world]. That claim too is untrue - the profitability of the Haddon plant will depend entirely on Government- guaranteed sales prices for electricity, and those prices are already higher than current domestic pricing. So Haddon solar farm will not only cause all the damage listed in the very many objections, but will also help drive further rises in domestic energy costs, and in public subsidies funded by the taxpayer.

For all the above reasons, plus the huge number of other detailed objections, the refusals for the Haddon solar plant should be reconfirmed, and the project should not go ahead.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]
Elton Resident