

Mallard Pass Solar Farm Proposal

I do recognise the need for alternative, environmentally friendly energy solutions but vehemently oppose this Planning Proposal for a multitude of reasons, some of which are detailed below.

I consider the summary included in your proposal encapsulates your approach to this development

'....., the availability of significant capacity at the National Grid Ryhall Substation without the need for upgrading was the primary driver in identifying a site in this part of Lincolnshire.'.

Agreed Mallard Pass is not a charity and therefore needs to make a profit, but this should not be at the expense of the local community, environment, or food supply. You state, all energy captured will go into the National Grid for consumption across the country. So, even if I was in agreement to this proposal there is no direct 'energy' recompense for the local area to counter the destruction of the existing countryside and environment. The enhancements to the local community you detail are negligible and 'potential', and Mallard Pass gives no surety for these to be delivered. There is still so much of this proposal which remains 'in development', this is potentially all part of the process, but the limited engagement with the local community does not instil confidence it will be to the good, but just monetarily beneficial for Mallard Pass stakeholders.

My previous letter raised concerns regarding ability and accountability of Windel Energy Ltd and Canadian Solar Inc to deliver a project of this magnitude with limited proven experience as a joint company remains. There is nothing to substantiate your robust management of the entire CADMID cycle, just assumptions. Will Mallard Pass actually see this project thru' to 'disposal'? Or will the project be sold on to another party and agreements, mitigations, potential deliverables just evaporate?

To affect the 'primary driver' Mallard Pass will spend circa 24 months transporting materials/ equipment onto Site utilising country roads which are not suitable, (narrow and undulating) for this type and volume of traffic. Your proposal includes a 'traffic survey' but I understand this was undertaken over a small time period and when Covid 19 restrictions were in place. So, I question how representative it is of the local road usage? Drawing from experience it will be inevitable other road users will avoid the roads used by your HGVs which will then be dispersed onto the local roads which increases to other road users – pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. How will this be managed and what provisions are in place to 'mend' the roads from the damage caused by this excessive traffic on our country roads?

In terms of horse riders your proposal indicates no consideration on how you will manage the recent Highway code requirements of wide and slow 10 mph and 2m. The Uffington Road is regularly used by riders, navigate from the limited bridleways available in the area, this is a narrow lane, with limited safe passing places for just cars, to meet/pass just one HGV delivers a risk even for the most traffic safe horse.

Consequently, I challenge your statement 'It is considered that as there are minimal desire lines across Uffington Lane and fewer receptors to impact and cause any perceived changes in Fear and Intimidation. On that basis, any potential change in **Fear and Intimidation on Uffington Lane** would be non-significant.' I can assure you my Fear and Intimidation will be extremely high and I cannot quantify the impact on my mental health this will create over a 2-year period.

I also object to the fact it is intended to use Grade 2 and 3 agricultural lands for this development. In the current climate the focus should be to ensure security of a UK based food chain. Solar panels should be placed on roofs and not impact on farming land and the environment. It is difficult to understand how your proposal is considered environmentally friendly, when it will be fencing off land that deer roam wild and free on. Creating corridors, you are expecting animals to migrate along, when they previously had their own well-worn pathways and then have an expectation, they will use a 'man-made' door way. The carbon footprint of shipping in the solar panels from China(?) is reprehensible. How can this be good for the planet and there remains a real concern of the Chinese 'labour' which may produce these panels.

To reiterate, my objections are considerable, and not fully expressed in this objection letter. In summary, agricultural land should be used for farming, ensuring sufficient food production. The environment should be managed to provide protection to our flora, fauna and wildlife, with recognition of the relationship of this to food production. In terms of 'green' energy IF solar panels, are the solution these should go on roofs, dispersed across the countryside and deliver clean energy directly to the consumer. I notice this was not a consideration on your alternative proposals, perhaps one to consider.

R Finch

