

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

Submission by Sue Holloway – unique ID ref. 20036112

Deadline 1 - Written Submission on the OFH2 on 17th May.

Hi,

My name is Sue Holloway. Some of you will already have heard me speak earlier today on behalf of Mallard Pass Action Group. Apologies for those having to listen to me more than once today, but I am now speaking on behalf of myself tonight. The more technical areas on the Principal issues list I will be covering in my Written Representation due to limited time tonight, but I want to share an honest perspective, if you will allow, of the personal impacts. Everyone affected by this development is an individual, not a number or faceless name.

I would like to think I represent a fairly typical resident from a rural community. I embrace every aspect of living in the countryside and in a green environment, whether it is the wildlife, the changing seasons, the fresh air and exercise, the harvest, the community activity and support, the peace and quiet and well-being it brings me. I have a dog, I religiously walk every day, I cycle, I horse ride, I try and maintain a garden and small equestrian holding, I volunteer for several charities in the local community.

I have lived in the local area for over 25 years so feel I know the area and people pretty well. Underpinning everything I do, think and feel is about my love for the outdoors and the environment. So now faced with the prospect of a solar plant just across the road in field 36 where I can see solar panels up to 1.5 miles across to field 18, the site of the new substation and 2 miles across the railway line directly south, is quite overwhelming. The rapeseed this year has been particularly helpful confirming the distance views and exactly what fields I can see.

At stage 1 consultation I was told my property was inside the site order limits, it was a mistake, but extremely alarming. I still had to wait another 6 months to Stage 2 consultation to find out my property was not going to be just 15m from the solar panels but with some additional setback, albeit nowhere near enough to compensate the damage to the landscape and visual impact.

Walking the dog will be a question of where can I go that will avoid seeing a sea of solar panels. The same can be said of cycling, I will be forced to choose different routes to avoid the industrial-scape. Riding is a whole new ball game, I have no idea how different horses will respond to the sight of the infrastructure surrounding them on a bridledways like BRaW/1/1, and any noise emitted from the solar stations carried by the wind. Every time I leave the house or get in the car I won't be able to avoid seeing solar panels.

The assessments for recreational and residential amenity, and landscape and visual don't take into account any form of sequential experience wherever you are, whatever activity you are doing. Everything has been judged on specific points, move 20m further on and the impact is completely

different. All these points needed to be viewed in a sequential way to give any context. Due to the sheer scale of the site, I and many local residents will never be able to escape the effects, it will permeate every aspect of our day.

Mitigation, the saviour, a word used over 80 times in the stage 2 consultation document, I hate to think how many times in the 216 application documents, does not solve all the issues, in fact it can and will make them worse in many cases. The proposed screening will either be ineffective due to the topography and time it takes to mature, or it will completely change the character of the landscape in a negative way. The long distance views will never disappear and shouldn't disappear, despite the attempt to screen off every aspect of the proposed development.

Assessing a national infrastructure planning application, in particular, present challenges due to the sheer scale. Most of the assessments are desk based as a starting point and carried out from a location not necessarily in any proximity to the site. Despite survey work being undertaken, there is not sufficient depth or local knowledge overlaid to validate the findings. I am not an expert but as a local person I can spot the shortfalls in many of the assessments or in the way in which the information is being presented. My thirst for knowledge and doing the right thing drives me to ask many questions and challenge the data often through others more knowledgeable than myself. I simply don't concur with the Applicant's conclusion in Chapter 17 (Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation) that "Following the implementation of additional mitigation, significant adverse effects are only anticipated in relation to landscape and Visual". In my view this is an oversimplification and complete underestimation of the full effects of the proposed development and I will attempt to demonstrate this through my Written Representation.