

This planning application is inappropriate and should be denied because:

1. The proposed development will change the use of land from largely agricultural use to being occupied by concrete, glass and steel structures producing electricity at the lowest efficiency (11% expected in the UK climate) of all the possible sources of renewable energy.
2. It is not clear in the application at what point in the expected 40 year working life of the proposed facility the benefit in terms of carbon efficiency will be realised. There is no statement of the cost of manufacture and installation of the infrastructure regarding the amount of carbon dioxide that would be released to enable transport and construction of the components before any benefit is obtained.
3. It does not make any business sense to permit a development where the equipment/technology and its technical performance is not guaranteed at the start of the project (clause 1.6.1 in the Covering letter).
3. There is insufficient justification for the mitigation measures proposed. It is unnecessary to destroy wildlife and adversely affect biodiversity in this location when there are many other appropriate locations available. E.g disused airfields, brownfield locations.
4. Focus should be on improving insulation in factories, homes and offices rather than implementing a scheme with uncertain benefit.
5. I have significant concerns about the safety and welfare of the community during construction of such a structure.
6. I also have concern about the visual impact on the local landscape would be caused by this proposal and the damage this causes to mental health and well being.
7. In addition the statements/assertions in 6.1 "The need for the proposed development" (Document Ref: EN010127/APP/4.1 Rev PO [Mallard Pass Cover letter for Statement of Needs \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)) are not fully supported by any scientific data or evidence that this proposal in this location has any benefit which can be justified. No mention of improving insulation simply comments about the proposal is the fastest way to achieve net zero irrespective of the cost to environment , well being and health.
8. There is no guarantee that electricity prices will be reduced if this development is granted. Simply an Implied statement.
9. In order for the developers to recover their massive expenditure the price of electricity needs to remain high. There is no incentive for them to reduce the price of selling electricity to the national grid.
10. The term "super-competitive" is meaningless unless context and data are presented.