

I wish to object to the whole principle of Mallard Pass on the sheer size of the proposals, the destruction of the countryside and the way the whole scheme has been presented.

My concern is that is going to be effectively an industrial project, from which the current flora and fauna will have difficulty in surviving. Especially during construction and once fenced in, the various sites will not provide free movement of deer, hares, rabbits badgers etc.

The destruction will also obliterate the current countryside pathways, enjoyed by many people. Whilst promises are made by the proposer, a few picnic tables surrounded by solar panels is no compensation.

The current farmland is needed for agriculture, we see already issues of global shortages. Where is the sense in destroying our valuable assets.

I am a Fellow of the institution of Structural Engineers and have carried many assessments for placing solar panels on buildings. Only in rare circumstances where buildings are substandard is strengthening required. The better option is to install on warehouse roofs, shopping centres, domestic and carparks as well as brownfield sites. Other countries, particularly Spain concentrate on shopping centre carparks for panels

The cost of such an exercise would be much less and the power output would be evenly distributed on the grid. A governmental approach should be considered before mass destruction of the valuable countryside.

The proposals do not address the pollution aspect of mallard pass. Noise and light not only during construction but thereafter from the inverters and security. The visual intrusion will be seen for miles and desecrate the land from Uffington to beyond Carby

Solar panels of such a magnitude are not really beneficial without battery storage. These were in the first proposals and removed when questioned.

I am afraid after 50 years of professional experience involved in large projects I am sceptical of the developer. Once work has started it is relatively easy to make amendments and would be difficult to stop.

Our MP is writing questioning the commercial aspects of this project. We must not forget that this project is purely for commercial gain, not for local people, not for the UK but principally for organisations with links with China.

We see how Chinese work in other countries, even our PM questions their ethics. We must take this to high governmental levels to investigate the ties with China to stop the project before we are destroyed.

There are better alternatives which must be pursued, not destruction of the countryside

JohnGoodliffe BSc .C Eng . FIStructE .MICE