

Submission to Mallard Pass Planning  
From Dave Bryant, IP No. 20034750  
19.10 on 15/06/2023

I have set out below my main concerns and objections to the proposal to build a vast solar power station across over 2000 acres of agricultural land in the heart of a rural area, adjacent to the historic and beautiful stone-built town of Stamford:

1. The scale of the development.

Greater than 2000 acres of countryside taken over by industrial power generation equipment and associated fencing and lighting will have a huge impact on residents across a much larger area, as they travel through a solar power station instead of attractive agricultural countryside on their way to and from work and leisure locations. This will probably cover the largest area of any power station site in the UK - 5 times bigger in area than Hinkley Point C nuclear plant but by comparison producing only a tiny proportion of the power output.

2. Loss of agricultural land.

Increasingly the value of agricultural land in enabling our national food supply to be in our own control is being recognised. Government guidelines are clear that energy projects should not be built on best and most versatile land. Despite this, 41% of the proposed site is BMV and the rest is graded 3B. This land will be lost to agriculture for at least 40 years and probably much longer, with no guarantee that de-commissioning and returning the land to agricultural use will be funded at the end of the useful life of the power station.

3. The loss of biodiversity and potential damage to the local environment.

The impact of this power station development, if it goes ahead, will be massive and will very probably last beyond the lifespan of most local residents.

4. Traffic.

In the middle of a rural landscape and adjacent to the ancient town of Stamford, there is no road infrastructure to support the building or ongoing support of this vast power generating station. This will create serious safety problems as well as major inconvenience for residents across a much larger area than the proposed generating plant.

5. Negative health impact on local population of 30,000+ people.

This area with its narrow lanes, paths and bridleways provides recreation for many walkers, horse riders, cyclists. and horse-drawn carriage drivers. The physical and mental health benefits of taking this recreation in the fresh air and attractive countryside are huge and increasingly recognised. Providing questionable opportunities for walking routes through the power station is no alternative and will be adversely affected by the constant low level noise created as well as the disastrous visual impact.

6. Substation

A major reason for choosing this location appears to be the commercial benefit of using "spare" capacity in the existing substation at Ryhall. This capacity was presumably built for a reason and at the time given planning consent for that purpose, whatever it was. What has

changed so that this capacity is no longer needed? Will using the capacity for this power station result in a need to build more substation capacity in the future to support whatever it was actually built for?

#### 7. Human rights.

Links to Uyghur forced labour by the primary developer [Redacted], who have had shipments seized by the US Government. It is quite unacceptable that plant from these shameful sources should be installed in the UK.

I am also concerned by [Redacted] links in their supply chains and through their board members to the companies [Redacted] and [Redacted], both of which have been sanctioned by the United States Commerce Department. The financial record of [Redacted] owners is concerning. What confidence is there that this construction site will not be left half built if [Redacted] hit financial problems.

(NB Why have the details of the developers that I included in my original submission been redacted? They are the developers and suppliers applying for this permission and I don't understand why they need to be protected from open and transparent communication of information that is in the public domain. Please contact me and explain the reasoning behind this redaction.)

#### 8. Inadequate government power generation and distribution strategy.

There is no clear, robust government strategy to guide the appropriate development of the right mix of power generation capacity across the country nor to ensure it is delivered effectively against a strategy, if one existed. This strategy also needs to be in place to guide the appropriate development of the national grid to support the distribution from what needs to be carefully planned provision of an appropriate mix of generation technologies built in strategically appropriate locations. The strategy, such as it exists, is to largely leave absolutely critical decisions to the market which is driven by relatively short term financial considerations and opportunities, not by the national need. To approve this application in the face of massive local objections when there is no clarity on what its role is in delivering the power supply the country will need, would be grossly irresponsible.

#### 9. National security.

With the probability that much of the plant and its supporting technology will be supplied from China, what consideration has been given to ensuring that this element of our national infrastructure will not be vulnerable to foreign cyber-attacks in a fast-changing international political situation? The national power supply is too critical to leave this to chance. The impact of the war in Ukraine on energy supplies should provide all the knowledge we need of how security of supply through unforeseen future international developments can impact everything about our lives.

#### 10. Potential loss of submissions due to unreliable IT infrastructure provided by the Planning Inspectorate.

I tried to submit this on the NI web site at 19.00 on 15/6/2023 and the system returned the following message:

Sorry, the service is unavailable.

You will be able to use the service later. Your answers have not been saved.

We are working hard to restore the service as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, please contact the case team:

[NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Telephone: 0303 444 5000

I continued all evening to try to submit but constantly received the same message. I know others have had the same problem leading up to earlier deadlines and I expect that many submissions may not have been made because of this. This is very concerning and detracts from the quality of the investigation. I would suggest that an assumption should be made that more objections would have been received if the IT structure was appropriately reliable.

Why has the infrastructure not been built to save inputs continuously if it can't be made reliable? I have had to rewrite my entire submission.