

Application by Mallard Pass Solar Farm Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Mallard Pass Solar Project.

Project refce: EN010127

Pam Orme

Unique ID ref: 20033527

D2 – Written Representation

At the outset I would like to register my concerns about this process – which is extremely hard for a normal householder to understand and follow. The documentation about the project is huge – and technical. So my concerns will have to be taken in the context that I'm no expert on this sort of review. Here they are:

1. Mallard Pass Solar Farm (MPSF) covers too large an area being nearly 4 times larger than any existing solar site in the country – and placed in the middle of the smallest county too!

2. The site is not flat – as is recommended for solar farms – it's undulating countryside. It may be a better description to use the plural Sites – as the area to be covered in solar panels is fitted around and in between farms, houses and other buildings, as well as being both sides of the railway line and river. Compulsory acquisitions are planned to fit it all in.

3. The destruction of excellent quality agricultural land at a time when we cannot produce enough food in the UK is unbelievably bizarre – and contradicts the Government Guidelines to protect Best and Most Versatile farmland from solar development.

And all because the storage facilities happen to be available at this location – or is it? See next point 4.

4. One of the main reasons for selecting the site is said to be the spare capacity at the Ryhall sub – station. However the sub-station does not have sufficient input power to support a battery system. That means that the MPSF will not be able to save the power it generates when not required by the Grid and so will waste power.

5. MPSF will have an adverse effect on the flora and fauna that has been developed over centuries & simply cannot be replaced by planting new trees or making artificial runs for wild animals. That's excluding the deer of course who, as they are not a protected species, will no doubt injure themselves trying to negotiate a way through the mass of panels etc.

6. Hundreds – if not thousands of 3.5-metre-high panels, 84 containers housing inverters/transformers and a 2-metre security fence with security lighting and cameras will turn our beautiful tranquil countryside into an industrial estate. A tragedy & an absolute eyesore.

7. It will bring huge traffic problems to our tiny roads and lanes. They are not suitable for the 54 – 2 way HGV lorry movements each day. Nor are they suitable for the increased traffic caused by up to 400 workers on site. We will have cyclists and horse riders being put at risk – along with young children accessing their schools.

8. Those 400 workers on site will virtually create another village – for 2 years at the very minimum – and the cars/vans & lorries they will be using will add to the traffic problems & risks.

9. But – just how much energy will be produced in practice? Given that reports show that solar panels are the least effective way to collect energy. And if they are deemed to be the preferred way forward – why doesn't the Government back the use of them and encourage manufacture of the panels in Great Britain – rather than having to rely on China to produce them & let a Canadian company, Canadian Solar, that is currently under investigation – manage the project?

10. The Government ceased the involvement of China in building Sizewell C and has banned the use of "Tik-Tok" on Government phones. The involvement of Companies such as Canadian Solar in the construction and operation of any part of the infrastructure of the UK represents a clear security risk.

11. Finally – MPSF would be of no benefit to the local community – indeed – just the opposite.