

Mallard Pass Solar Farm Written Representations

Submitted by: Helen L Woolley BSc (Hons) and Geoffrey W Woolley

Unique Reference nos. Helen Woolley MPSP-AFP156 Geoff Woolley MPSP-AFP155

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Background
3. The Proposed Mallard Pass Solar Farm
4. Site Selection and size
5. Mitigation
6. Landscape and Visual
7. Recreational Amenity
8. Residential and Amenity
9. Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
10. Noise and Disturbance
11. Section 44 of Planning Act
12. Temporary Compulsory Acquisition
13. Traffic Control Measures
14. Heritage
15. Community Benefit
16. Conclusion

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Earlier this year I submitted my relevant representation regarding the proposed Mallard Pass Solar Farm and have subsequently spoken at an Open floor hearing. In both of these submissions I have set out in summary my views and concerns regarding the application.
- 1.2. In this report I aim to set out in more detail how this scheme will affect us should it go ahead and explain in more detail why I have such strong objections to the scheme.

2. Background

- 2.1. I read Agricultural Science at the University of Nottingham and went on to have a long, very enjoyable and rewarding career working within the agriculture and land-based sector concluding when I chose to retire from full-time work in 2018.
- 2.2. The various roles I held throughout my career meant I worked closely with farmers, land-owners, land managers, rural businesses along with local, national and European policy makers and elected representatives across the wide spectrum of food, farming, environment and rural land use. This has given me a broad understanding of a wide range of policy areas which affect the farming, land-owning and rural sector and a detailed knowledge in some areas specific to the roles I held during my career.
- 2.3. My husband grew up in Collyweston, a village near Stamford, part of a farming family and after studying at college working initially with his father and uncle, he took over the farming business which he ran until making the decision to retire a few years ago the land, still owned by my husband and his family, is now let on an FBT.
- 2.4. I moved here in 1982 and we made this area our permanent home.
- 2.5. So given our background it will come as no surprise that my husband and I have a deep understanding, love and appreciation of the countryside, natural environment and rural life.

3. The Proposed Mallard Pass Solar Scheme

- 3.1. Since the proposed scheme was announced I have fully engaged with the process reading the many published documents, attended in person and virtual meetings. I have also done independent desk research, spoken to ex-colleagues and others with a better knowledge than I in this subject area to give me a wider context and clearer understanding of large-scale solar farms in general.
- 3.2. I believe that, whilst the points made in these representations are personal, they are informed, balanced, drawn from evidence and experience. In particular, they reflect the very

significant impact that this scheme will have on us and others in the community in which we live.

- 3.3. Never have I felt so strongly opposed to any local or national issue to be motivated to campaign – this is not nimbysism but a real and deep concern that the output of renewable energy generated by this proposed scheme cannot be justified in this location for the reasons the Mallard Pass Action Group, I and the many other residents who, I am sure will be responding as part of this NSIP process, will set out.
- 3.4. It was this concern that motivated me to attend an open community meeting to discuss the local community's views and response to the scheme. It was from this meeting that Mallard Pass Action Group was formed, I made the decision to volunteer and became an active member of the group.
- 3.5. **As a member of the group I have contributed to the Mallard Pass Action Group Written Representations and fully concur with its findings and conclusions. Whilst I will make occasional reference to the MPAG in this report I have consciously made the decision not repeat to much of the content of the report but in reading the comments I make here I ask readers to note that the views and opinions expressed in the MPAG are reflective of my views of this scheme.**
- 3.6. As a natural Scientist whose working and personal life is inextricably linked with the natural environment I recognise the need to address and mitigate the impacts of climate change, to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and reduce our carbon footprint.
- 3.7. I recognise that solar panels have a part to play in addressing this when sited on roof tops, where appropriate on brownfield, previously developed and contaminated land, and also in some of the many innovative ways solar technology has been deployed in the UK and many other countries for example on car park lots where a solar scheme effectively provides a roof over open car parking, along water ways and dykes in The Netherlands or small scale solar schemes where the energy production is used on site for example heating greenhouses & providing electricity for small business developments but as a principle, **I do not support the development of large utility-scale ground mounted solar PV schemes which:**
 - take significant productive agricultural land out of production for up to a generation.
 - dominate and change the rural landscape in which they are sited
 - have significant impact on both residential and recreational amenity
 - do not make a meaningful contribution to the governments net zero and biodiversity net gain targets
 - destroy much of what is valued by and provide no meaningful benefits for the communities living in and around the area in which such a scheme is located.

In my view all of the above apply to the proposed Mallard Pass Solare Scheme.

4. Site selection and Scale

- 4.1. In assessing alternative sites Chapter 4 para 4.1.8 indicates that it does not consider NO development as an option because it would not deliver the proposed renewable energy which is required to meet the net zero targets. In taking this approach the applicant fails to fully consider the unintended consequences selection of this site, entirely situated on good quality agricultural land, compared to one that is situated for example on poorer quality land. This is to prioritise one important government policy area over another – energy security vs food security and neither does it provide a starting point from which to evaluate this choice of site against others does. Is that a thorough & balanced approach to decision making?
- 4.2. It is clear from all the information provided by the applicant (ES Chapter 4 Para 4.3.2 b.&c.) and by their own admission in webinars during the statutory consultation phase the primary driver for the choice of site location is the proximity to the Ryhall electricity sub-station.
- 4.3. Reading ES Chapter 4 it feels as if the decision on site location was made because of the availability the grid and the scheme plan retro-fitted and then justified. This leads me to conclude that the motive for site selection is convenience and profit driven.

- 4.4. At ES Chapter 4 para 4.3.2 bullet point (a) Lincolnshire is identified as a particularly suitable area for large scale solar, citing reasons why this is so, including:
- existence of large open areas of undeveloped land,
 - with a gentle undulating topography
 - and sparse settlement pattern.
- 4.5. Yet the site you propose has a rolling and undulating landscape, within close proximity to 8 villages, a number of isolated properties and the historic town of Stamford with the majority of the site in Rutland (528ha) not Lincolnshire (324ha).
- 4.6. **Making the case for solar farms in Lincolnshire is completely irrelevant to this proposal.**
- 4.7. Whilst the character area of the site is described it does not portray the true character of the area – this can really only be understood by site visits which I know the ExA will be undertaking.
- 4.8. The undulating topography and long open vistas very typical of the site are in sharp contrast to the flat lands more commonly associated with the county.
- 4.9. Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (draft NPS EN-3 2023, paras 3.10.13 – 3.10.16) gives guidance on ground mounted Solar PV projects. It states *“that in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land”*. It goes on to say that where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land (avoiding the use of “Best and Most Versatile (BMV)” agricultural land where possible.
- 4.10. The site selected is entirely on greenfield land, in this case high quality, productive agricultural land which includes significant BMV land, this is a finite resource and diminishing resource (Defra Food Security Report 2021). As mentioned above site selection must take full account of both the benefits of the proposed scheme and the significant consequences of what will be lost should this site be selected.
- 4.11. **This scheme would seem contrary to the guidance of draft NPS EN-3 2023 and does not take into account relevant elements of Defra’s Food Security Report.**

5. Mitigation

- 5.1. A site requiring 50% of mitigation does not suggest a site well-chosen.
- 5.2. The definition of mitigation is “.....the action of reducing the severity, seriousness, or painfulness of something” so effectively about making something less awful and this proposal is awful.
- 5.3. Throughout the DCO papers the word is used endlessly reflecting just how significant the adverse impact of this proposal is not only on the visual and landscape aspect but also availability of land for food production, the natural environment, and the communities who live within and adjacent to the area of the scheme.
- 5.4. **That the whole site covers 852 ha yet the developed area which will actually generate electricity is to be approximately 426ha with the remaining half (426ha) being used for mitigation must raise questions on the suitability of the site.**
- 5.5. It is acknowledged that some of the mitigation area could remain in arable farming but the primary purpose for mitigation is to provide residential set back and is a clear acknowledgement that solar panels on BMV land is unacceptable. Yet despite this

acknowledgement there is still BMV in the solar area. This is contrary to the guidance in EN3-2023

6. Landscape and Visual impact

- 6.1. The Independent report commissioned by the MPAG and submitted as part of its WR presents a comprehensive report with clear conclusions as to the Landscape and Visual impact of this scheme. In the Executive Summary para 1.7 the author comments that “**the proposed development would give rise to significant adverse effects on the landscape character of both the site and the wider landscapes, and almost certainly, on views at viewpoints lying several kilometres from the site. It would also significantly adversely affect people’s health and wellbeing, and the quality of their lives.**”
- 6.2. Given the independent report provides a very comprehensive and impartial assessment of the Landscape and Visual Impact of this report I do not propose to make extensive comments on the overall Landscape and Visual impact. I will however comment on a number of specific issues regarding both recreational and residential amenity.

7. Recreational Amenity

7.1. PRoW

7.1.1. Many people choose to exercise by going to the gym or local sports facilities. My equivalent of a gym is walking in the countryside using the network of public rights of way and country roads. I walk the dogs every day, often twice a day for anything from 40 mins to 2 hours enjoying the fresh air and tranquillity of the open countryside. And, from the number of people I meet I am not alone in enjoying this experience.

7.1.2. Walking through an industrialised landscape with fencing, CCTV (even if this is for only small sections of the route) and the noise generated by the installation most certainly does not offer the same experience. The WR from the MPAG shows the many well used recreational routes that cross the site.

7.2. Visual Receptor Groups (VRG)

7.2.1. VRG 3 is described at table 6-1 as: *VRG covering Carlby Village and surroundings to the North of the solar PV site including:*

- *Residents, pedestrians and motorists passing through or living within Carlby:*
- *Motorists on the High St between Carlby and the railway underpass*

7.2.2. The only VP on the High St is VP16 which does not truly represent the visual impact of the scheme on High St and does not take account of the fact that the majority of motorists who if travelling along that route will be doing so to join the cross roads at the junction of High St and B1176. PV Arrays will be clearly see on this route particularly when travelling towards the crossroads. This is a route we and many others use regularly when travelling East via Bourne, Market Deeping and Peterborough

7.2.3. VRG 10 is described at table 6-1 as :

- *Visual Receptor groups to the north-west of the solar PV site including: Motorists using a limited section of the B1176 between Ryhall and Aunby and Motorists and pedestrians using a section of Holywell Rd between Essendine and Holywell.*

7.2.4. ‘Holywell Rd’ is assumed to be the narrow lane off the A6121 in Essendine, which joins the High St running from Carlby to the crossroads at the junction with the B1176 which then travels west to Holywell beyond the crossroads.

7.2.5. This description ignores the huge numbers of cyclists who use both of the routes with Barbers Hill (B1176) in both directions being a particularly well used stretch of road as it offers a tough hill climb to riders. The area is frequently used for competitive cycling

events with the pull up to the top of Barbers Hill often being the finish line. Figure 1 shows a picture of competitive cyclists congregating outside our home immediately after the finish line circa 50m north of Barbers Hill House on the B1176 during an event held in April 2023.

Figure 1. Competitive cyclists after a race April 2023



The road is also used by horse riders and pedestrians using the restricted by-way (Care/3/1) which meets the B1176 near the ford. I frequently walk along the B1176 to join this by-way sometimes for a linear walk other times a circular walk picking up the Holywell Rd at the point the restricted by way ends and returning home.

The visual receptors who include cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians will get a different perspective of the solar arrays to that described for motorists on both the B1176 and the Holywell Rd with panels clearly visible on parts of the routes described.

- 7.3. View point 14 is poorly chosen on the brow of the hill as you come up Barbers Hill from the north heading south. This is not the highest point as you come over the hill the visual impact of the solar site becomes more visible to all road users as you travel south with the site most visible on the B1176 at the entrances to Barbers Hill House and Farm.
- 7.4. There are views across fields 4 and 3 from both routes and of field 1 as you travel across the top of Barbers Hill on the B1176 and again as you pass the entrance the BOAT at Pickworth Drift (E123).
- 7.5. It is my perception that PV arrays may also be seen on field 5 as you approach and travel across the crossroads in both directions at the bottom of Barbers Hill and fields 6,9 & 12 as you continue your journey along the B1176.
- 7.6. Travelling from Essendine to Holywell Rd will take road users of all types past field 11 and then pick up the views of the PV site on High St and onwards towards Holywell after the crossroads.
- 7.7. In Table 6-1 the sensitivity for visual receptor group 10 has a Sensitivity of High-Medium, is identified as being adverse and yet has a low magnitude and slight residual effect judged to be not significant. How can this be so?

8. Residential Amenity

8.1. Why we live here!

8.1.1. After living for several years in the villages of Ryhall and Easton on the Hill, we moved to Barbers Hill having decided we wished to live in a deeply rural location surrounded by open fields within an attractive, interesting landscape which changes with the seasons.

8.1.2. Our property sited in an open rural landscape creates a feeling of space, is not overlooked has a garden which offers flexibility to grow fruit and vegetables and a relaxing space to enjoy and in which to entertain.

8.1.3. The topography and our location on top of Barbers Hill, with outlooks to the south, west and North has long uninterrupted open views of the landscape in all three directions. Looking from upper floor rooms we can see a distance of 2 miles to the west this can also be seen at ground floor level depending on hedge leaf cover and density of the hedge with is currently sparse in places. Looking south we can see to Ryhall Heath Farm, with longer distances to the SW and across to Essendine village to the SE.

8.1.4. It offers peace and tranquillity, which provided a great antidote to my hectic work life as I commuted daily to London for last 8 years of my working life. Despite being a roadside property, with the main east coastline not too far away and the pylons which stand tall as they cross the area none of this detracts significantly from the beauty of the landscape.

8.1.5. There is an abundance of wildlife to be seen all able to move freely and unhindered, Kites flying and whistling above as they hunt for food, owls grazing the verges at dusk, deer graze in fields surrounding the house, plenty of brown hares and foxes can be spotted as they cross the fields, with sky larks and other birds frequently seen in good numbers in the surrounding fields.

8.1.6. With little or no light pollution we get dark starry nights and amazing sunsets looking west and will often be joined by bats in the garden as dusk descends in the summer months.

It is our view that there will be significant and adverse change to our Residential Amenity should this scheme go ahead.

8.2. Impact on Barbers Hill House Residential Amenity

8.2.1. Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual report the impact on VRG 10 is described in Para 6.5. which states:

- *The proposed development would be Medium Scale, permanent in duration and Limited in extent resulting in a low magnitude of change and Slight (not significant) and Adverse effects during operation year 1. It then goes onto say By year 15 the effects would reduce to Minimal (Not Significant) and Adverse*

8.2.2. Further more in table 17-1 in Chapter 17 describes the Operational effects to Kesteven Uplands within the order limits (this includes Barbers Hill) year 1 and 15 are described as:

- *Significance of Potential: Major Adverse yr1 and Major-moderate adverse yr 15 Significant*

After mitigation they are described as:

- *Significance of residual Effect: Major Adverse Significant yr1 Major-moderate adverse significant (year 15)*

8.2.3. I agree with the year 1 assessment and would suggest that similar would also apply at year 15. This demonstrates that the topography of the site is such that despite mitigation the scheme cannot be effectively screened.

8.2.4. In appendix 6.4 Table 1. The Potential Visual Effect of the proposed scheme on Barbers Hill House is described as *The Solar PV Site would be located approximately 185m to the west of the property within Field 4. The existing hedgerow along the B1176 and internal field hedgerow further west would be retained and managed to provide enhanced screening. Views from upper storeys of the main house would be possible but views from the annex buildings (note: we do not have any annex buildings please see para ?) are likely to be limited. Glimpses of PV Arrays in Field 4 maybe possible but middle distance views east and south would remain.*

8.2.5. The distance of 185m to the Solar PV site agrees with my measurements and we consider that the close proximity of PV arrays to our dwelling is entirely unreasonable and their impact adversely significant.

8.2.6. The picture at figure 2 is included to give a perspective and provide context of the views from our property and how our residential amenity will be impacted. Figure 2 shows 2 views the top one taken from our office window looking west over what will be part of the solar farm. Field 4, the field beyond the second hedge is clearly visible (with hedges in full leaf) and the lower picture taken on Christmas day from a ground floor reception room showing a glorious sunset and even with the light from the sunset field 4 still visible and demonstrates how clearly visible the field is without full leaf cover.

8.3. I therefore dispute that glimpses of PV arrays in field 4 maybe possible and propose that the arrays will be visible all year and that during the months when the hedges are not in full leaf they will be clearly visible from ground and upper floor levels. Due to topography, mitigation will not provide an effective screening particularly from upper floor rooms. Our property is also identified as being susceptible to Glint and Glare particularly the upper floor west facing rooms – again not expected to be significant but as one of these 2 rooms is used as an office and is used during the day I would ask in evaluating the effects on us this is taken into account.

8.4. Figure 2 Outlook west from Barbers Hill House upper photo taken on 6/6/2023, lower photo taken on 25/12/2022



- 8.5. I agree that the middle-distance views to the South East and South will indeed remain and will offer views of PV arrays in fields 1, and 3 and possibly 2 due south/southwest and parts of fields 5,6,7,8 &10 looking southeast towards Essendine. Figure 3 shows the view SE from our garden.
- 8.6. The topography of the land and the position of our home mean mitigation will never hide the PV arrays from view.**

Figure 3 looking South East towards Essendine



9.1. Residential Visual Amenity Assessment

9.1.1. I also draw your attention to Table 1 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment which is inaccurate. It identifies our property Barbers Hill House and provides a baseline description. However this is not entirely accurate and suggests that the applicant has not recognised that on the site there are two private dwellings Barbers Hill House, which is our roadside detached two storey home with two single storey garages. With a second property Barbers Hill Farm accessed by another driveway behind. This is a two storey barn conversion with two large single storey annexes plus two single storey garages.

9.1.2. The applicant has both properties correctly identified in the Book of References and the arrangements and boundaries of both properties were explained when we were asked to complete the Land Interest Questionnaire. Both properties are also registered separately with the Land Registry.

9.1.3. To clarify the principal aspect of our home is west to the front and has north and south windows and gardens. We have no east facing aspect.

9.1.4. What the residential amenity evaluation also fails to recognise is the multi-occupancy of the sites known as Barbers Hill Farm and Lodge Farm and so the number of residents and visitors affected is greater than it may seem from the Book of Reference.

9.1.5. In addition to the owners of Barbers Hill Farm there are residents living independently in the separate annexes within the curtilage of Barbers Hill Farm. In addition, Lodge Farm also located on Barbers Hill with a south perspective has multiple occupancy with a single storey dwelling used until recently by an elderly family member and a number of holiday lets.

9.2. In addition to the impact on residential amenity of the PV panels in field 4 the proposed location of a secondary compound more or less directly opposite our property will further adversely affect our residential amenity during the construction and decommissioning phases. It is difficult to understand why this secondary compound is required when there are 2 secondary compounds proposed just 0.5 miles south on the B1176. Both fields 3 & 4 have roadside gates on the Holywell Rd. This poses a question as to why a further compound and new gateway are required on the B1176 outside the properties of Barbers Hill. The close proximity to a SSSI on the verge maybe?

9.3. I note from Figure 3.1: Extents of Order Limits, Solar PV Site, Mitigation and Enhancement Areas and Potential Highway Works that the Solar PV site has been significantly amended in the area surrounding Essendine to give more residential setback. Given extensive

roadworks, proximity of a SSSI and the impact of siting PV arrays in field 4 on the residents who live in close proximity to this field: namely Barbers Hill House, Barbers Hill Farm, Lodge Farm and Vale Farm if the Examiner is minded to recommend approval of the scheme I would respectfully ask him and the Applicant to consider if PV panels sited in field 4 and possibly field 3 are appropriate at all.

10. Noise and disturbance

- 10.1. As I have explained our home is a quiet tranquil place to live. We have a major concern that this will change – during operation we expect that there will be noise from both the tracker panels should they be used and inverters. Given the quietness we currently enjoy any noise will be intrusive.
- 10.2. We are both largely retired and so at home for a significant amount of time compared to when we were in fulltime employment. Any work we now do whether paid or voluntary is home based and we have a fully equipped office facing west looking out across field 4.
- 10.3. The prevailing wind from the south-west which is strong as it blows up Barbers Hill, locally known by some as 'windy ridge', will mean that noise from many parts of the site could be an issue impacting our everyday lives and destroying the tranquillity we currently enjoy. I am a keen gardener and spend significant time outdoors in the garden and walking the many PRow locally.
- 10.4. That we will be surrounded by this noise constantly causes us real angst. The impact of constant background noise was highlighted recently by the work to upgrade the main power line undertaken in summer 2022. The power line runs across land opposite our house within the order limits for the scheme. Noise from the whipping of slack wires whilst they were working on the overhead cables and from the CCTV and security protecting the site was constant for weeks and extremely irritating – the only saving grace was we know this was temporary – noise from the Solar Farm won't be and there is no doubt it will affect our mental health & well-being. That it maybe within the EIA regulations will be little consolation to those of us directly affected.
- 10.5. In addition with a secondary compound very close to our home we anticipate significant noise during the construction phase both from the work within the compound itself and the construction of the site itself.
- 10.6. The proposed working hours of 7am to 7pm 6 days per week are completely unreasonable and unacceptable to all those so close to the site. The experience of the work on the pylons mentioned earlier gives firsthand experience of what to expect. We were able to clearly hear conversations between workers, sometimes using language I would not choose to listen too. The construction and in particular driving in palings will be a much noisier task than the work to replace the overhead lines.
- 10.7. For me this reinforces why this site with its network of rural villages and dwellings settlements so close to the PV site is so unsuitable.

11. Section 44 of the Planning Act

- 11.1. In early summer 2022 my husband and I received a letter dated 18 May 2022 as we had been identified as persons with an interest in the land affected by MPSF (Cat 1/2) and were each asked to complete a Land Interest Questionnaire. This caused concern as the land in question was not included in scheme on the map issued in November 2021 and was land immediately surrounding our house leading us to assume the site boundary maybe changed. Extremely concerned by this I contacted both Ardent & Mallard Pass by telephone and email, who provided generic reassurance that the net was cast wide for the survey but despite being very close to the start of the consultation period would not release the proposed site map or give absolute reassurances in writing that this land was not to be included – poor resident management which caused unnecessary concerns.

- 11.2. Subsequently the consultation documents were released, and it became clear that our property and land immediately around the house was not in the scheme which begs the question why the LIQ was issued as it was clearly never to be included – a question which was not directly answered despite my asking but I think became clearer when the extent of temporary compulsory acquisition explained in detail – why was not the applicant not more open when questioned?
- 11.3. We also received a letter date 23 May 2023 identifying us as having a land interest these letters raised a question in our mind of Category 3 under Section 44 of the Planning Act. As a high sensitivity receptor, we believed we clearly fell into this category too but received no notification to this effect. Becoming aware that other residents with properties similarly described had received a letter advising them of this and how they should respond I contacted the Mallard Pass team and Ardent and spoke to a representative at the consultation event at Stamford Town Hall during the Statutory Consultation period to clarify this point. After much discussion and exchange of emails I have subsequently received a Category 3 letter but only because I made my case and pretty much insisted – this is surely not right and shows inconsistency and maybe some unfairness in the process.
- 11.4. The copies of email correspondence can be made available.

12. Temporary Compulsory Acquisition Rights

- 12.1. As mentioned above I did receive the letter from the applicant dated 23 May 2023 explaining their understanding of my land interests and inviting us to participate in the consultation process. I did respond to this consultation but had not appreciated the full extent of the temporary compulsory powers being sought and the numbers of residents impacted.
- 12.2. The applicant has further explained the extent of the powers being sought in their response to my comment on this issue in my Relevant Representations and the comments made by Mr Fox at the OFH in May.
- 12.3. However I have emailed the applicant as I wish to seek absolute assurances that the grass verge and the concrete apron which we have laid at the access to our drive from the highway will not be impacted by their temporary acquisition powers should these be approved. At the time of writing I had not had a response to my email.

13. Traffic control measures

- 13.1. The size of the proposed development is such that the massive increase in HGV's and site workers traffic will put significant pressure on the road network particularly during the build and decommissioning phases. This will adversely impact all road users with an inevitable increase in the risk of road traffic accidents. There are already local concerns regarding quarry lorries and this development will further exacerbate the problem.
- 13.2. Living in such a rural area reliance on a car is inevitable with multiple car journeys everyday.
- 13.3. The extensive traffic control measures and closures being sought particularly during construction will therefore significantly impact our ability to move easily around the area and cause huge disruption to our daily lives. For the vast majority of our journeys we turn left from our gateway and depending on our destination we will then take one of the routes from the crossroads. Any road closure will result in a significant diversion which take significant time and increase both use of fossil fuel and our fuel bill.
- 13.4. In how much detail have the impacts of these road closures on residents been assessed? We have not been asked to provide any information on how we use either the road network or the many PRoW that cross the area. The applicant seems to rely on traffic surveys which show the volume of traffic but not the frequency of road use by those who reside in the area.

13.5. As a result of lockdown and for our convenience we have many regular deliveries as like others we make extensive use of online shopping and of course have a royal mail delivery daily. All of this will be disrupted with the potential for deliveries not to be made if the diversions are too long and unclear.

14. Heritage

14.1. Across the site there are many heritage properties many listed and some which are not. Collectively they form an intrinsic part of the landscape.

14.2. It is also well recognised that landscape setting is an intrinsic part of the heritage asset and if the landscape surrounding the heritage asset is changed, in this case covered in PV panels, the value of the heritage asset is lost.

14.3. When planning permission is given for the development of, for example redundant farm buildings to bring them back into new use the consent will normally require the building to retain its integrity and original look in order, that the area in which it sits and the wider landscape retains its look and feel. The same consideration should be given when proposing to cover a landscape in solar panels and their impact on heritage buildings whether listed or not.

14.4. I propose that the siting of solar panels in this area will damage many heritage assets in this way.

15. Community Benefit

15.1. The scheme offers no true and meaningful benefit to residents and communities apart from some new permissive rights of way through a newly created industrial landscape with information boards. Whilst new permissive rights of way to create circular routes in an unspoiled landscape would be valued, within a network of PRow where PV arrays are visible they lose their value. Proposed information boards are more appropriate in a Country Park not along PRow in what should be, and currently is, a deeply rural area of open countryside. That as residents we are being offered nothing meaningful is disappointing at the very least.

16. Conclusion

16.1. I conclude that the Mallard Pass Solar Farm if approved:

- as a utility-scale solar scheme will industrialise a deeply rural landscape
- because of its unprecedented size and scale a robust SWOT analysis of it true will not be possible.
- it will have a dramatic and adverse impact on the landscape in which it is located
- takes high value BMV and other productive agricultural land from production impacting UK Food Security
- is an inefficient provider of renewable energy given energy output relative to the land required
- will have an immeasurable adverse impact on the people and communities who live in the area and the many who use the area for recreation.

I therefore reconfirm that I am totally opposed to Mallard Pass Solar Farm

It is hard to put into words the emotions I feel now at the prospect of what we and the communities living here could lose, with ownership of properties that are blighted, the awfulness of our daily lives whilst the scheme is built and dread for what we may see when we look from our windows and walk within and travel through an industrial landscape. This is and will continue to take its toll on the health and well-being of those living in this wonderful corner of England.