

Date: 15th June 2023
Re: Written Representation (Mallard Pass Solar Farm)
Name: Clare Alliston
Address: [REDACTED] NU
Email: [REDACTED]

I am a local resident to the proposed Mallard Pass Solar Farm (MPSF) and I strongly oppose the plans for the following reasons:

1) The site for the Mallard Pass Solar Farm will convert thousands of acres of local valuable arable land into grass land with solar panels.

The government has produced 'best most versatile' land guidelines to protect quality arable land for food productivity, to protect local crops and promote British produce. The percentage of BMV land covered by the proposed solar farm is not acceptable.

This particular site has produced tonnes of quality grain for many years which enters our food chain, either used for food products which are consumed or used as grain to feed animals which are then consumed.

Mallard Pass Solar Farm will be in situ for several decades. The loss of grain over one year is significant, but over the proposed 40 years is colossal. The impact of MPSF on this site would lead to irreversible changes to the productivity of this land.

2) Allowing massive solar farms will set a precedent for other developments nationwide and threaten British food production

Housing MPSF on quality arable land will set a precedent for further massive solar developments across the country, threatening British food production and the associated industries nationwide. This in turn will impact the cost of food to the consumer, lead to increased dependency on foreign markets to meet the shortfall of grain, and increase the 'environmental' cost of importing grain.

3) Irreversible impact to our local area

I have chosen to live in a rural area, as have many of the local residents. I am a regular user of the public footpaths, bridleways, and local roads that pass through the area of the proposed MPSF. I exercise outdoors, often with my children, to improve my mental wellbeing and benefit from the beautiful agricultural countryside and associated wildlife.

I strongly oppose the high security perimeter fencing, the visual distortion of the land plastered with solar panels, and the cameras, lighting and containers that will be associated with the MPSF site. The MPSF will distort the local area for decades to come.

MPSF will also cause profound damage to our local ecology and to the local wildlife. Their habitat is set to change forever, the existing hedgerows and farming boundaries will no longer exist, and movement within their habitat will be constrained by the perimeter fence surrounding the panels.

4) MPSF will cause significant disruption to our local area; to the country villages, and local towns, with a surge in through traffic (many heavy goods) and construction work over a two year period.

More vehicles will create increased risk of danger and increased noise for the local residents, the road users (many runners / cyclists) and increased damage to country roads. Noise pollution will also increase with the installation process, and ongoing maintenance of the MPSF will cause ongoing traffic / noise. The sheer scale of this project, and the long-lived disruption for local residents, is unacceptable.

I have two children who use the roads crossing the proposed MPSF site, either walking to catch their bus to school or cycling on the roads. If MPSF goes ahead, they will need to stop cycling locally and they will need to be escorted to the bus stop to ensure that they are safe.

5) Questionable lifespan of solar panels and environmental costs involved with their disposal

Despite claims from MPSF that panels will be in situ for 40 years, I question the longevity of the panels given that their productivity will start to reduce after approximately 15 years.

With advancements in technology, it is likely to be more cost effective to replace the older solar panels with more updated versions. This will mean a high level of ongoing maintenance and disruption to local residents.

At this stage, there are huge recycling challenges associated with redundant solar panels. MPSF will add to the significant volume of scrap solar panels, referred to as the 'eco disaster waiting to happen.'

6) Canadian Solar has been accused of links to forced labour in China and found guilty of tariff dodging by the US

The company proposing the MPSF has a history of malpractice.