

15<sup>th</sup> April 2024

Claire Coutinho MP Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero House of Commons LONDON SW1A 0AA

## Ref: Mallard Pass Solar Farm Interested Party Number: 20036398

Dear Claire

I wrote to you in late January 2024 to express my profound and deep objections to the Mallard Pass Solar Farm proposal.

I write again after your request on 2<sup>nd</sup> April for feedback to the responses from the Applicant, LCC and RCC.

Having read all of the documentation available, I am struck by the number of gaps that remain in the application despite the months and months available to prepare the application and the months since the application was submitted.

Their lackadaisical approach to our local roads and the route of the cables and the subsequent impact on people's houses is arrogant and completely disrespects the process and fundamentally the very people that the process is designed to protect, namely the local residents.

I fear their unprofessional and unprepared approach betrays the manner in which they would build and maintain the development should it ever be approved.

## **Highways Side Agreements**

We rely on usable roads for everything we do. The rural location of my home means all deliveries and collections require a vehicle. The emergency services, bus network, waste collections, etc all need accessible roads.

The roads are already busy so the additional construction traffic will overwhelm the local network rendering it unusable for periods of the day.

I read that RCC consider there to be "fundamental issues" that require "significant amendments" to overcome. It is very concerning that despite many months of planning the Applicant and the RCC and LCC are so far from an agreement.

Until there is an agreement on such a basic requirement as roads that is satisfactory for all parties, it would be profoundly wrong to approve the application.

## **Community Benefit Payment (CBP)**

It was utterly inappropriate for a CBP to be mentioned in the Applicant's response to your queries.

In fact, by mentioning the CBP, the Applicant, in my opinion, reveals their deep anxiety over being able to fully answer the matters you raise.

There is no sum that could come close to compensating us for the impact the proposed development would have on our lives and the local communities and to offer an arbitrary annual payment is an insult.

In summary, I would urge you to see beyond the Applicant's responses and consider why these significant gaps remain unanswered after so long.

Competent, local authorities cite "fundamental issues" to overcome yet the Applicant chooses to distract attention with the lure of a compensation payment.

The Applicant should be held to account in a time-bound manner but the manner of their conduct provides ample warning of what everyone can expect going forwards.

Yours sincerely



David Alliston