

# **Application by Mallard Pass Solar Farm Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Mallard Pass Solar Project – project ref. EN010127**

**Tony Orvis B.Sc Hons. (Botany)  
Unique ID ref. 200335950**

## **ExQ1 - Responses to ExA's First Written Questions**

**Q1.2.6** The Applicant has made an arithmetical mistake in calculating the output of the development. In ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Climate Change the Applicant correctly states that the calculation for the output is 350MW capacity x 8760 hours/year x 10% plant load factor. The Applicant calculates the result as 350,000MWh. The correct number is 306,600MWh.

The corrected, lower, output has a direct impact on value of the development in meeting the net zero commitments of the Government. Taking the value for lifecycle emissions used by the Applicant of 48kgCO<sub>2</sub>eq/MWh and the corrected output of MPSF, including panel degradation, the savings would be 1.25m teCO<sub>2</sub>. Significantly lower the 1.9m teCO<sub>2</sub> claimed by the Applicant. A higher, more realistic lifecycle emission for MPSF of 72kgCO<sub>2</sub>eq/MWh would reduce the lifecycle saving 0.96m teCO<sub>2</sub>

**Q7.0.6** To my knowledge only one farm, Manor Farm, has previously farmed sheep. This ceased around thirty years ago. All of the land was converted to arable crop production. The buildings used for lambing were converted into dwellings.

There is no provision in the Application for the infrastructure required to farm sheep; buildings, handling pens, water systems and so on. The large blocks of solar panels would also have to be divided and fenced for rotational grazing.

There are no examples of sheep being kept on large solar farms. All of the examples are on very small solar installations.

Grazing in spring and autumn would impact negatively on wild flowering plants, nectar and seed production and ground nesting birds. In any event a commercial sheep flock would need a grass seed mix which could be managed for maximum growth.

The Applicant proposes a stocking rate comparable to that for organically raised sheep, but meat produced would not command the organic price premium, making the proposed stocking rate uneconomic.

Producing forage, hay, silage or haylage would be impossible. The Applicant does not give the proposed distance between the arrays but states that at a minimum they will be two metres apart “to minimise effects of shadowing and to ensure optimal efficiency.” Although that is the minimum it is highly unlikely that the distance between the arrays will be great enough to accommodate forage harvesters.

If MPSF could farm sheep, and all other proposed solar farms were to do likewise, where would the extra sheep meat be marketed? The UK is self sufficient in sheep meat?

**Q10.04** The Applicant cannot possibly commit that its suppliers will adhere to an ethical procurement policy, properly monitored and enforced, when its major shareholder Canadian Solar has consistently resisted calls for its own operation to be subject to audit.

In any event, even if Canadian Solar agreed for its operations and suppliers in China to be audited, it is widely accepted that it is impossible for audits to be conducted properly and without interference in China. Any statements relating to, or findings from, such audits cannot be relied on. To believe anything other than this is to defy reality.