

The Secretary of State

Department for Energy Security & Net Zero

Ref: EN010127, Mallard Pass Planning Consultation

Dear Sir,

I have followed the application process for this Solar plant since we were first informed about it in 2021.

I am a local resident and Director of two local businesses in the service sector which have global perspectives and earn foreign currency for the UK. I have been very fortunate to have lived continuously in Ryhall for 39 years. I am also a Chartered Engineer. While attending the first presentation meeting back in 2021 it was apparent that the applicants were not genuine and their representatives were incoherent and could not answer simple questions. For example, I was told the output of the plant would be continuous 40 GW. When I pointed out that the sun does not shine during the night they were considerably embarrassed. I immediately become an interested party and joined the Mallard Pass Action Group as it was obvious the only objective of the project was to generate profit for the applicant and their investors. There was no attempt to disguise that their intention was to destroy our local community with little or no consideration of the impact their proposal would make on local residents and the landscape. It was made clear that there was no benefit to the local population other than significant loss of amenities and the high probability of enduring considerable stress during the construction phase. Of course, they could not possibly comment on the impact this facility would have on local house prices. I have attended the hearings in Peterborough in 2023 and attended many parish council meetings on this issue. The responses to questions were never straightforward and had many caveats so trying to understand the possible impact was extremely difficult.

It is no surprise then that there is no response to key questions which you asked last month. It is deceitful for these responses not to be made as residents and other interested parties have no or minimal time to give a considered response.

So in replying to your request of 2nd April 2024 for comment on the specific responses to your enquiries I am extremely concerned that there has been no resolution of the issue concerning the cable crossing of the East Coast Main Line. This lack of definition on the project construction is a continuing theme during the three-year development of this project. It appears that the applicant wishes to have total freedom to do whatever they want with the land defined in this application. Similarly, the side agreements with RCC and LCC should have been resolved months ago for a project of this size. The responses (or lack of them) from the applicant demonstrates the high risk that the applicant is not capable of meeting any of the proposed output/objectives. A professional organisation would have reached agreement months ago. Allowing this application to proceed is not in the best interest of this country as this countryside in Rutland will become a brownfield site in perpetuity, permanently reducing

much needed food production with the only beneficiary being the applicant exploiting the current climate situation when other actions should be mandated.

For example, there are still buildings being constructed which are not insulated efficiently and with no mandatory requirement to fit solar panels where applicable.

During construction there will be inevitable delays in my staff travelling to the office which is also of significant concern to the efficiency of my business which earns much needed foreign currency for the UK.

I hope you will recognise that this application has serious faults regarding the integrity of the developer and should therefore be rejected.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Davies

Local Resident and Chartered Engineer

IP number 20034535