

**Application by Mallard Pass Solar Farm Limited for an Order Granting
Development Consent for the Mallard Pass Solar Project – project ref.
EN010127**

**Submission by Tony Orvis B.Sc Hons. (Botany)
IP 20035950**

OFH1 - Text of Oral Submission

My family moved to Essendine from Dorset when I started working for British Sugar in Peterborough.

Having lived in a village in a lovely part of the UK we wanted to live in an area as similar as possible - with plenty of opportunities to be in the countryside.

Thirty nine years later we still live in Essendine. It has provided everything that we wanted.

After working for British Sugar I changed companies a number of times. However, one factor that was common to all those changes was the desire to continue to live in Essendine.

We have immersed ourselves in rural life. I train and work gun-dogs on shoots, enjoy fly-fishing and know the local farms. My wife enjoys bird-watching and my grandson has worked on a farm in his school holidays. He is currently applying to University to be a vet.

You can imagine how shocked we were to receive what looked like yet another circular but was something deeply disturbing. Notification of a proposal to construct an industrial power plant surrounding Essendine and impacting on many other villages.

My immediate thought was on the potential change to our lives.

But I decided that I should learn about the development and solar energy to gain an informed view. I have spent many hours - months - doing just that.

This has led me to conclude that the proposal fails to meet the benefits claimed by the Applicant that it will adversely impact on the community and the way of life of the residents. It will certainly change my family's way of life.

Time prevents me from going into much more detail now, but I want to make four points.

Firstly, the location of the project is predicated solely on the spare capacity at the Rhyall sub-station and the profit opportunity afforded to the Applicant. The proposal fails in other aspects.

Secondly, during the consultation the Applicant specified the capacity of the development making much of how many houses it could supply.

No such specification is now being made by the Applicant.

But, nevertheless, whilst not specifying a capacity for the plant the Applicant continues to make detailed claims regarding its performance. This is not a logical, sustainable position.

A similar position applies to the life of the plant. How, for example, can the Applicant make any claims regarding, say, net-zero without giving the expected life of the plant. The answer is that they cannot.

Thirdly, there are no benefits for the local community, just the opposite.

For example, looking at the overall impact of the development even the Applicant states “Potential landscape effects derived from the Proposed Development could include effects on the local landscape character where the character of agricultural fields would change to that of a Solar Farm.”

My last point is on the undertakings given by the Applicant in the Supply Chain Plan. In particular those made in relation to China.

It is generally accepted that independent, verifiable audits of companies and manufacturing processes are not possible in China. Even the World Health Organisation failed when investigating the source of the Covid outbreak.

The undertakings made in the Supply Chain Plan are unattainable. Those thinking otherwise need a reality check. Given this, I would ask for this to be given particular attention by the Examiner.

I will leave my comments at that point for now and will develop them in detail with others, in my Written Representation.