

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

**Submission by Sue Holloway – unique ID ref. 20036112**

**Deadline 2: Summary of  
Written Representation  
June 15<sup>th</sup> 2023**

## 1 Background

As co-author of the Mallard Pass Acton Group (MPAG) Written Representation, my personal submission here outlines my principal beliefs and impacts pertinent to myself.

## 2 Principle beliefs

- 2.1 *Land Use and BMV.* Sacrificing all productive agricultural land to generate energy from ground mounted solar panels makes no sense when both are of equal importance to the UK. There are alternative renewable sources and other ways of delivering solar energy on brownfield sites and on rooftops which offer a better solution.
- 2.2 *Carbon credentials.* Whilst motivated to hit Net Zero, we should not assume any renewable development is necessarily fully green. The total actual lifetime CO<sub>2</sub> reduction from the grid for this project is lower than the lifetime CO<sub>2</sub> of the facility. The MPAG Written Representation explains this in more detail.
- 2.3 *Biodiversity.* It is my belief there is a role for biodiversity benefits to sit alongside arable food production at the same time. The latter should not be displaced and replaced with solar panels when there are more suitable land usage options on brownfield sites or much lower grade land.
- 2.4 *The environment.* Unless a solar installation can be sensitively and discreetly placed it potentially creates more harm than benefit.
- 2.5 *Sense of place and community.* Places are about people, and people are about communities, if you take away components of the relationship such as the countryside amenity and the landscape, the whole relationship breaks down and the benefits are lost.

## 3 Personal impacts

- 3.1 *Scale & location.* The sheer scale of the proposed development cannot be sensitively located and suitably mitigated to be acceptable.
- 3.2 *Landscape and visual.* The Applicant focuses totally on screening as a solution to mitigate the impact of the solar panels and associated infrastructure. There are limitations in the screening due to topography and land ownership, and some of the proposed solutions are deemed inappropriate.

- 3.3 *Residential amenity.* The character of the landscape is particularly open and undulating across the NE section of the site. The landscape will be transformed to an industrial-scape, hugely impacting residential amenity. No amount of screening, particularly in the autumn/winter months will reduce the impact.
- 3.4 *Recreational amenity.* Every day I drive, walk, cycle or ride down Carlby road that sense of well-being and freedom of being in the open countryside will completely disappear, there will be no pleasure in using the PRoWs.
- 3.5 *Construction effects.* The relentless construction activity 6 days a week, 12 hours a day for 2 years will place an enormous toll on residents like myself with respect to noise, dust, vibration and light pollution. Closure and disruption of PRoWs and numerous street works will also takes its toll on everyday life and recreation.
- 3.6 *Compulsory acquisition.* There seems an over application of the compulsory acquisition rights by the Applicant who feels it is necessary to impose control over green infrastructure adjacent to residential properties with the objective of screening any possible view.

#### 4 **Conclusion.**

As a resident the impact on me and my property is huge if this solar plant were to go ahead. Whilst undoubtedly it can produce renewable energy for the grid, I truly believe there are more effective less damaging alternatives to reach the renewable energy goals as already outlined in full in MPAG's Written Representation. Both food and energy production are equally important and one should not be sacrificed to deliver the other.