I object in the strongest possible way to the proposed Mallard Pass Solar farm.

It is an outrageous scheme which will blight the landscape of this region and the village of Essendine and the surrounding villages for many, many years to come.

Fundamentally, people choose to live in the countryside to enjoy the countryside. As a part of their enjoyment I, and I assume most people that live in the countryside like to see the colours of the fields change with the seasons.

People live in the countryside to enjoy peace and tranquillity, to enjoy bird song, to enjoy nature, to have quiet and beauty in their lives and to maintain their wellbeing. Life in these times is hard enough and does not need to be made harder.

With this these proposed huge solar arrays around Essendine and elsewhere on the landscapes of rural England, there will inevitably be a disastrous effect on the wildlife and the biodiversity. Despite what Mallard Pass say, the mitigation measures they propose will never replace or repair losses in footpaths enjoyed, views and vistas destroyed or animal habitats and wild areas. This, at a time when wildlife is being lost at an alarming rate, such eco-unfriendly projects increase the risk of species loss.

Over the seasons, as they change, the field colours will be lost and we will have to endure fields of blue instead of fields of green, brown and gold.

Every day, we will have to endure high security fences, security cameras and high intensity lighting turning night into day, turning beautiful landscapes into the appearance of prison camps. The effects on the wellbeing of all living things will be catastrophic.

The proposers plan mitigation to limit the detrimental effects of the installation. These mitigation schemes will take years to full fruition, in the meantime and even before the scheme construction starts, the plans will have been sold on to investors trying to balance their carbon books. Anecdotal evidence based on what has happened with previous schemes suggests this is likely to happen. That being the case, if the Mallard Pass proposal is given the go ahead, any mitigation schemes should have to be approved by the local councils and set in stone in the granting rights such that the Solar Farm owners and managers are duty bound to comply with and construct the agreed mitigation within agreed prescribed timelines.

The introduction of 500,000 solar panels to the landscape around the village has huge implications for flooding. The village already suffers flooding on an annual basis, understood to be primarily due to the actions of Anglian Water in the control of levels in Rutland Water. However, the run-off from the solar panels will generate a much greater inflow of water into the West Glen River, the small watercourse which runs to the North and East of the village. Such inflow will generate vast volumes of locally sourced water causing more regular and more severe flooding. The Norman church and Manorial earthworks and the businesses proximate to the river will be adversely affected on a more regular basis.

Equally as important, the project should not be allowed to go ahead because of the consequent gross waste of Best and Most Valuable agricultural land on which the whole scheme is planned to be sited. At time when food security is such a high-profile concern, this proposed scheme, and the inappropriate use of the land should not be permitted.

As a consequence of the use of agricultural land for installation of solar panels, the issue of food security becomes most important. The use of land for which the crops grown or used for food which

we eat will necessitate the import of equal amounts or more of equivalent products. Such imports will use modes of transport which are nett polluters such as shipping and heavy goods vehicles and/or a combination of both. Surely home-grown food supplies are a much more carbon efficient proposition.

I think that most people accept that there is a need for alternative energy supplies given the damaging emissions from coal fired and other non-eco-friendly power generating sources. However, the transference of land from growing food to the most inefficient means of power generation is nonsensical.

Given the available options for alternatives, solar generated energy is the least efficient. As I have stated in previous submissions to various bodies, the average efficiency of a solar array is taken by the government to be 10%. That means that 10% of the sunlight that hits the panel is converted into electricity. The UK averages about 1400 hours of sunshine a year. Solar panels will work on cloudy days but at a much-reduced efficiency.

The efficiency of solar arrays decreases year on year between 0.5 and 0.8%.

Over a year, there is an average of 12 hours/day daylight, more in summer and less in winter. That is, an average of 12 hours/day when the panels don't work. Zero efficient. At least with wind turbines, which have an average annual efficiency of between 30-45%, and up to 50% during peak wind times, they keep working in the 12 hours when solar panels are useless. Wind turbines are therefore a more efficient means of generating renewable energy. Additionally, they are much less impactful in aspects of biodiversity, agricultural land loss and the wellbeing of animal and human lives.

In the northern hemisphere the arrays are best located on South facing slopes. If one examines the topography of the land on which the Mallard Pass Solar planned arrays are to be sited, much of it is not South facing, indeed much of the slopes are North or Northwest facing. This will not only affect the overall efficiency of the arrays but will necessitate installation of the panels in such a way as to maximise a sub optimal location. Thereby creating additional potential visual impact. It is already stated that the panels could be as high as 3.3m tall.

Assuming completely optimal prevailing conditions. Such conditions exist on a limited number of days in the UK and therefore it is likely that the nett efficiency of Mallard pass will be less than 10%.

If we keep proposing and building these low efficiency systems, we are likely to end up with a Dystopian landscape where the lights for the general populous go out at night and on cold and wet days. The only people with light will be those that can afford generators because they prostituted themselves to reap the potential financial rewards of the Mallard Pass and other such lease agreements.

I advocate the use of solar panels, I have them on the roof of my house, and that's where they should be, on the roofs of houses and industrial buildings. Heaven knows, that may improve the look of much of the industrial buildings in Essendine.

The use of prime cereal growing land should not be used for solar arrays. Because of the low nett efficiency, solar panels should be installed on roofs and on land where arable or livestock farming is not possible. Such locations would not necessarily be compromised by the low nett efficiency of solar arrays.

The steam locomotive age ended because the machines were inefficient, polluting and generally slow. Modern machines with higher nett efficiencies took over.

We should avoid the steam age of electrical power generation and only use solar arrays where they have minimal impact on biodiversity, agricultural land use, human habitation, and human wellbeing. Mallard Pass Solar farm will be so inefficient it belongs in the steam age. It should NOT be given the go ahead.