

To whom it may concern.

I am emailing to raise my official objection to the Mallard Pass solar farm, which is proposed for a vast swathe of farmland across our area. I am sure you have received numerous letters akin to this one, but I wanted to reiterate some of the areas of concern once again, so you are fully aware of the potential issues it may create.

Firstly, the pure size of this development is beyond comprehension and I don't believe it will have registered with many SKDC residents yet. It wasn't until I sat down and listened to views at a local meeting that I understood just how much precious farmland, wildlife habitat and countryside this proposes to 'swallow'.

How is it that we can struggle to add a small extension to our homes and yet we can happily apply for a space four times the size of Hyde Park to be built on with unsightly and damaging infrastructure; infrastructure that has a relatively short lifespan and that will take two years to build. I'd be interested to see the true carbon footprint of that work across the entire supply chain as I suspect it doesn't net out as well as it may be spun to suggest.

Secondly this is being built within the rain catchment area of a river that regularly floods. Only last year we had two occasions where many homes were threatened by floodwater and garages were inundated. Again, we would never be allowed to build a single home in a place that might impact flood risk, so why 2,000 acres of solar panels, which have been 'proven' to affect rainwater runoff in historic studies. This is of huge concern to villages such as Greatford and Essendine. We then have such things as loss of valuable arable farmland at a time when we are supposed to be taking back control of our food supply. Our food security has to be number one priority.

How can we possibly support such a proposal when there are dozens of these being applied for right across the country? Is anyone actually looking at this as a nationally coordinated energy plan and therefore its collective impact as it simply appears at present that any farmer that fancies cashing in can apply? The 'environmental' argument wears thin and is simply greenwashing; a thinly veiled attempt to push through a highly lucrative planning proposal that is simply about profiteering from an apparent weakness in the planning process.

And that's before, of course, we get to the loss of habitat, bridleway access and general aesthetic impact on the countryside we all love. Or the fact that we are suggesting that key national infrastructure is owned by businesses that are owned by Chinese interests.

The links to China and forced labour as well as the financial record of Windel Energy make this abhorrent.

Communication has also been weak at best. Not turning up to local meetings tells the community everything it needs to know about intentions and interest here. You'll seemingly do the absolute minimum to tick the box. This, however, is our home and way of life. We will not see it damaged by profiteering.

To summarise, please record my response as a strong objection to this proposal and its greenwashing PR.