

EN-010127 Mallard Pass Solar Farm

Deadline 10 - Closing Summary Statement

John Hughes ref ID 20036141

The saying goes a 'one picture is worth a thousand words' but also natural light has a big impact on the effect of that picture. Mallard Pass Solar Farm are using viewpoints biased in their favour along with topography, vegetation and a lack of seasonal representation to imply their project will have minimal visual impact on the environment and that the mitigated planting will hide the structure they intend to place in what is currently open countryside. In their response to me in (REP8a-014) they lie distorting the facts of what they presented to the public at the outset of this project. Their studies have been office based with no true wire line drawings presented to show the true impact it will have their photomontages represent one day in the year, the people of villages and communities live here 365 days of the year and will have to endure what is proposed.

I submitted REP1-034 following Open Floor Hearing 1 on the 17th May 2022 in relation to the visual impact, REP2-172/173 asking for wire line drawings to reflect the true visual impact and stating nothing should be built in fields 26, 18 or 19, as well as who selected and approved the viewpoints being used for the representation as they are biased in the applicants favour.

I submitted REP2-174 on the social economic factors noting the project has no social or economic benefit for the village, county or UK industry in the long term and that the applicant will most likely sell the lease and not take responsibility for what is being proposed.

I submitted REP4-065 in relation to the lack of detail in relation to the proposed on site substation and still no firm design detail is available, how can the DCO be evaluated and assessed when such a critical piece of design data to enable the function of the solar farm and its visual effect on local landscape is missing, REP05-058 MPSF in their response to Glen Crescent and Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is all based on PV arrays and not the substation which is an even taller structure and more intrusive on the landscape, no assessment on the internal visual effect of the development has been carried out for 9 Glen Crescent which will probably be the closest residency to it why? Is it because everything I've submitted was ignored.

Below is a winter photo from the lounge looking over field 26, 18 & 19 on February 5th 2022, note the state of the deciduous trees the mitigated planting will be effective with the seasonal change.

At the very beginning of this project I asked if the dismantled railway line (vegetation on horizon) could be used as the visual boundary for those properties west of the ECML and the adamant answer from MPSF was No! I've asked if the PV Arrays can be removed from field 18 and they responded with a lie saying they had mitigated the issue by removing them from field 26.

I've tried to work with the applicant from the start however nothing for has changed in regards to the points I've previously raised, they present data missing key facts or quoting data that do not true, they present what they want to reflect and people to see not the true outcome that reflects the true damage visually and mentally to the community that the project will have 365days of the year.



I believe the DCO for MPSF should not be consented due to the poor quality and low standards in representation of the presented data and that the proposal was carried out from behind a desk with little to no appreciation of the location or community for the proposed development.

John Hughes