

I strongly oppose the Mallard Pass Solar Farm application.

My concerns are summarised as follows:

1) Solar Farms are hugely inefficient

A 140 acre solar farm park is said to be capable of supplying electricity to 9,000 homes. One wind turbine in the north sea has capacity to supply 16,000 homes.

The UK government has already confirmed that offshore wind will produce more than enough electricity to power every home in the country by 2030.

2) Energy Production.

There are serious questions of the accuracy of forecasts contained in this application. Therefore the entire validity of the project is in serious doubt.

3) Solar Farms are not environmentally friendly.

4) Sheer Size of this proposed development.

The size of this proposed development is ridiculously large, and is 10 x the size of the largest one currently in the UK. It is larger than the town of Stamford, and has a perimeter of 25 miles.

5) Loss of Productive Agricultural Land.

The proposed development site is on good grade productive agricultural land and outstanding open countryside. Greenfield land is not suitable for an industrial scale solar development. How will this land be returned to agricultural farming afterwards?

6) BMV Land.

Government guidance is clear that energy projects should not be built on BMV land. The amount of BMV land included in this proposal is unacceptable & in clear breach of government guidance to developers.

7) BMV Testing.

Serious concerns remain over the accuracy of the testing methods used. These tests should be revisited & verified.

8) Decommissioning Concerns.

There is no detail about decommissioning. Is sufficient funding secure for this? Please do not be a party to creating a solar graveyard.

9) Visual Impact On Landscape Quality.

Half a million solar panels 3.3m high will industrialise our local countryside. The landscape will be changed forever. Located in and around a number of beautiful rural villages and 1 mile from historically- renowned Stamford- this development will bring unsightly inverters & transformers, intrusive cctv and unacceptably high boundary fences.

10) Loss of habitat, damage to biodiversity & disruption.

Why is 50% of the proposed site set aside for mitigation? The 2 year+ construction phase will disrupt, damage and destroy delicate biodiversity and habitats. These will take years to return, if at all. The developer's assessments have not adequately explored the impact on a range of species. Local bird experts fear some species have been missed altogether.

11) Increased Flood Risk.

There is a history of flooding in the area & existing flood risks. These have not been adequately considered in this application.

12) Loss of Social Amenity.

Public rights of way will be moved or closed during the prolonged construction period. There will be significant impact from this.

13) Traffic Impact.

This is frankly terrifying. There will be huge disruption & damage caused by so many large HGVs, the workers & construction traffic. There will be increased noise, pollution & damage to already vulnerable roads and verges & an enormous increase in risk to pedestrians - especially around Casterton - and also to cyclists and horse riders. Existing roads are already too narrow and will require widening & special traffic measure. Safety for the local schools & college will be a massive increase in risk & of huge concern.

14) Battery Storage safety concerns.

The proposed safety regulations are inadequate for the high-risk lithium-ion batteries.

15) Sourcing of Solar Panels.

16) Negative impact on many of our local Villages.

Nearby Essendine, Carlby, Braceborough, Greatford, Barholm, Uffington, Ryhall & Belmesthorpe will all register a huge negative impact, together with at least 10 more villages within a 3 mile radius. As will Stamford.

17) Huge Local Opposition.

1,042 consultation responses from a small rural community is a huge negative response. More than 2,400 signatures on a Parliamentary Petition, opposition from councils at every level & from local MPs.

Please take notice!

18) Poor Consultation.

The developers failed to engage in good faith with the local community and also Alicia Kearns, MP. Many locals feel they were treated by disdain by the developers who live out of the area and with priorities which lie elsewhere.

19) Misleading Summary of Consultation.

The Consultation summary submitted by the developers is inaccurate, misleading & contains false claims.

20) Compulsory Acquisitions.

The developers gave no warning of their intent to seek compulsory acquisition rights through Essendine & on Bourne Road. This was not made clear during the consultation period.

21) Windell Energy.

The financial record of Windell Energy raises serious concerns regarding their leadership team and its ability to construct a project of this magnitude.

Their record is of serious concern.

22) Mental Health, Recreation & Physical Health.

The unprecedented size of this proposal & the fundamental and lasting changes & increased risks it will have on the local communities & their landscapes will negatively impact on the mental & physical health and wellbeing of local residents.

23) Solar Panel Glare

The site is near Rutland Water, home to many rare bird species. Evidence shows that birds mistake solar panels for water, resulting in major disruption to their habitats. Likewise, glare from solar panels can increase risk to drivers in an area already suffering high levels of road accidents.

24) Carbon Benefit.

Serious questions remain regarding where the solar panels will be built - rather farcical given the sensitivity of this project. In China it is not uncommon for panels to be built using power generated by burning coal. When shipping half way around the world is included, together with the endless transport vehicles to be used in the 2 year construction process, will this project have a net-carbon benefit? Sounds extremely doubtful.

25) Local Economy & Business.

Many local businesses rely on the tourism draw of nature, and these will suffer. There are virtually no benefits for local residents & their communities, in contrast with the cynical claims made by the developer. They have not taken account of the population demographics and types of employment which characterise the area.

26) Clustering of development around sub-stations has disastrous consequences for the landscape & local community.

The cumulative effect intensifies the harm caused.

27) Solar panels dramatically alter the views of the countryside & key features which punctuate it - creating huge concern for immediate residential villages and a town such as Stamford, home to the Grade 2 Elizabethan Burghley House, Holywell Park, Greatford Hall & Uffington Park. Tourism & environmental impact will be negative for all of these and the character of heritage assets and the appreciation of them will be significantly harmed.