Submission ID: 17233

I strongly oppose the Mallard Pass Solar Farm application.
Concerns:
1. Solar farms are hugely inefficient:
- By comparison with off-shore wind, solar farms are hugely inefficient. A 140 acre solar park is said to be capable of supplying electricity to about 9,000 homes. One wind turbine in the North Sea has the capacity to power 16,000 homes. In terms of efficiency rating i.e. the amount of power exported to the grid, solar's rating is between 11 and 15% whereas for off-shore wind the figure is 50%+. On one day last year it has been reported that 78% of the UK's electricity came from off-shore wind. 'The Government has confirmed that offshore wind will produce more than enough electricity to power every home in the country by 2030, based on current electricity usage.' Build Back Greener (Oct 2020)
2. Energy Production: There are questions over the accuracy of the forecasts for the amount of energy the project is likely to produce. If the estimates are inaccurate, the whole thesis behind the supposed benefits of the project is in question.
3. Solar Farms are not environmentally friendly.
4. Sheer size of development: If constructed it would be an industrial sized solar farm, the largest solar farm in the UK to date. 2,105 acre site equivalent to 1,300 football pitches and 10 times larger than the largest solar farm currently in the UK. Larger in area than Stamford. Almost 4.2 miles from one end to the other, with a perimeter stretching over 25 miles in entirety.
5. Loss of productive agricultural land: Proposed building area is on high grade quality agricultural land and outstanding open countryside. Greenfield land is not a suitable location for the proposed industrial scale solar plant. Will the land be returned to agricultural farming afterwards? Unlikely.
6. BMV Land: Government guidance is clear that energy projects should not be built on BMV land. The level of BMV land on this site is unacceptable and in clear breach of Government guidance to developers.
7. BMV Testing: There are concerns over the accuracy of the testing methods used to determine the quality of the land across the site. These tests should be revisited and verified.
8. Decommissioning concerns: Will the funding be secure for decommissioning? If not there could be a solar graveyard left behind with unknown environmental and wildlife impact and hazards.
9. Visual Impact on landscape quality: The countryside is industrialised by the development of large-scale solar farms. Continuous rows of glass panels mounted up to 3.3m high will completely alter landscape character. Located adjacent to many local villages and less than 1 mile from Stamford. Boundaries will be changed by 2m high security fencing, security lighting to 3.5m and the intrusion of CCTV. Unsightly inverters and transformers will add significant and constant noise.
10. Loss of habitat, damage to biodiversity and disruption: Why do the developers need to set aside 50% of the total site for mitigation? The construction process will take up to 2 years and it will inevitably disrupt and damage delicate bio-diversity and habitats through construction traffic, new tracks being built, drilling etc. The plants and wildlife may take years to return, if at all. The area is home to a plethora of wildlife, particularly rare wild bird species. The assessments taken by the developers have not properly explored the impact this development would have on these rare species. Local bird experts have raised concerns that some species have been missed altogether.
11. Increased flood risk: There are existing flood risks and a flooding history in the area that has not been adequately considered in this application.
12. Loss of social amenity: e.g. Public rights of way are likely to be moved or closed during construction which will have a significant impact.
13. Traffic impact – Huge disruption and damage will be caused by HGVs and workers construction traffic coming through local villages for the 2 year construction phase. This will create added noise, pollution and damage to roads, verges and risk for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. It is likely to disturb bio-diversity too. Roads will be too narrow and will require road widening and special traffic measures. Presence of schools is a big safety concern.
14. Battery storage safety concerns: Faults can occur in the lithium-ion batteries and their storage. Safety regulations are inadequate.
15. [redacted]
16. Negative impact on many villages nearby including Essendine, Carlby, Braceborough, Greatford, Barholm, Uffington, Ryhall and Belmesthorpe. It affects at least another 10 villages within a 3 mile radius, as well as being under 1 miles from Stamford.
17. Huge local opposition: 1,042 consultation responses from a small rural community highlight the level of opposition. There are also over 2,400 signatures for a Parliamentary Petition against the development so far.
18. Poor consultation: Developers failed to engage in good faith with the community or Alicia Kearns, Member of Parliament.
19. Misleading Consultation Summary: The consultation summary submitted by the developers in their application is inaccurate in several areas, including misleading and false claims.
20. Compulsory Acquisitions: The intent of the developers to request compulsory acquisition rights, not least on Bourne Rd, was not made clear during the consultation period.
21. Windell Energy: There are substantial concerns over the financial record of Windell Energy's leadership team and their suitability to construct a project of this magnitude.
22. Recreation, Mental Health, Physical Health: The unprecedented size of this development and the fundamental changes to the landscape and communities affected will negatively impact the Mental and Physical health of residents. This has not been fully considered.
23.Residents affected by epilepsy or related seizures could be at greater risk of a fit or seizure due to the reflection of the light reflection from the sola panels particularly during the summer sun and dappled effect the light shining through the trees would make.This could force sufferers to be unable to drive themselves for fear of a fit and therefore imprison not only that person but possibly the whole family to the confines of their home or relience on public transport and the cost and inconvenience of all that entails. The visual darkness of the whole area could affect the mental well-being of those who are suffering mental health, depression etc issues, as being able to access the beauty and colour of the countryside is proven

to enhance the lives of many sufferers.
24. Solar Panel Glare: The site is near Rutland Water, home to many rare bird species. Evidence shows that birds can mistake solar panels for water, resulting in major disruption to their habitats. Likewise, glare from solar panels can represent a risk to drivers in an area already suffering a high level of road accidents.
24. Carbon Benefit: There are questions over where the panels will be built and with what energy. In China for example it is not uncommon for panels to be built using power generated by burning coal. When shipping is considered, will this project actually have a net-carbon benefit?
25. Local Economy and Business: Local businesses reliant on the tourism draw of nature will suffer. The benefits the applicant claim the community will enjoy do not take account of the population demographics and types of employment that characterise the area.
26. Clustering of development around sub-stations has disastrous consequences for the landscape and local amenity. The cumulative effect intensifies the harm caused.
27. Solar panels dramatically alter views of the countryside and the key features that punctuate it – huge concern for immediate residential villages and towns including Stamford, home of the historic Elizabethan ‘Burghley House’ (Grade II) and Holywell Hall Park, Greatford Hall and Uffington Park, (tourism and environmental impacts). The character of heritage assets and appreciation of them will be significantly harmed.