

I object to the proposed Mallard Pass Solar Plant development. The scale of this project is unprecedented in the UK, and therefore the impact on the local area, the environment and the quality of life of residents is huge and unknown. The location of the solar plant appears to be illogical, as the existing infrastructure is completely inadequate, and much of the proposed site is on BMV agricultural land. Surely the selection of the site for a project of this scale should be done as part of a national strategy, choosing a location with minimal local disruption, on non-productive land, rather than as appears in this case to be due to the existence of a substation which will therefore save the developers money and maximise their profit? The consultation process has been inadequate and poorly carried out, including production of documents which are unclear and in some cases illegible. Local opposition to the scheme is immense, and so it should be. There is no benefit to the local area, and the disruption during the construction phase and the ongoing impact on the countryside is extensive. The alleged 'mitigation' is totally inadequate and there is little evidence of any 'ecological enhancements and opportunities for improved recreation access' as stated on the Mallard Pass documentation. The project will very likely affect property prices. If anyone involved in assessing this project were to drive around the local lanes they would realise the extent of the damage and disruption that the projected volume of traffic will cause, including one route passing a large secondary school. Apart from the impact on the people who live in the vicinity of this proposed development, there are other major factors which should lead to its rejection: accusations of human rights abuses in

(Redacted) supply chain, and substantial concern over the financial record of [Redacted] leadership team.