

Claire Coutinho
Secretary of State for Energy and Net Zero
c/o Alicia Kearns MP,
House of Commons.
SW1A 0AA

29th January 2024

Re: Objection to Mallard Pass Development

Dear Ms Coutinho

As an affected resident I object to the proposed Solar Development Plan, known as 'Mallard Pass Solar Farm'.

I have a number of objections to the proposed Mallard Pass Solar Farm Development and I would also like to raise a number of points for consideration.

1) Location and scale of the development

- a. The proposed development covers a huge area of 906 hectares, which is approximately equivalent to 1700 football fields, and would be an industrial scale facility in what is currently a rural community of rolling countryside. The original justification for this is primarily based on the location of the substation at Ryhall, which was installed to support the electrification of the East Coast Railway. However the latest proposals now indicate that a new substation at a different location will need to be built to support the scale of the development.
- b. The development will fundamentally and permanently change the enjoyment of the countryside by humans and extensive wildlife in the area. Attempts to mitigate the damage caused during and after the construction work will take decades to only partially cover up the impact of the landscape.
- c. The Proposal claims that the access to the proposed site is good. This is not true. While the A1 is close by, the roads between the A1 and the site are narrow, twisting A and B roads some of which pass local schools. They will not be adequate for the scale of construction traffic which will be necessary.
- d. It does not appear that alternative locations have been adequately considered during the consultation but would cause significantly lower environmental impact.
 - i. The East Coast Main line is 393 miles long and has land either side which if developed could provide adequate land for solar development without further impacting the surrounding land. In theory it would only take 32m either side of the entire track to provide the same area in Hectares.
 - ii. Lincolnshire has many disused or partially disused RAF bases, some of which have substations, albeit of lower rating than Ryhall, which could be utilised. Such "brownfield development" would have much less impact than the proposed development.

15 Greatford Gardens
Greatford,
PE5 4JY

Claire Coutinho
Secretary of State for Energy and Net Zero
c/o Alicia Kearns MP
House of Commons
SW2A 0AA

28th January 2024

Re: Objection to Mallard Pass Development

Dear Ms Coutinho

As an affected resident I object to the proposed Solar Development Plan known as 'Mallard Pass Solar Farm'.

I have a number of objections to the proposed Mallard Pass Solar Farm Development and I would also like to raise a number of points for consideration.

1) Location and scale of the development

- a. The proposed 1,275 panel covers a large area of 9.1 hectares which is approximately equivalent to 1700 football fields, and would be an industrial scale facility in what is currently a rural community of rolling countryside. The original justification for this is primarily based on the location of the substation at Ryhall, which was installed to support the electrification of the East Coast Railway. However, the latest proposals now indicate that a new substation at a different location will need to be built to support the scale of the development.
- b. The development will fundamentally and permanently change the enjoyment of the countryside by humans and extensive wildlife in the area. Attempts to mitigate the damage caused during and after the construction work will take decades to only partially cover up the impact of the landscape.
- c. The proposal claims that the access to the proposed site is good. This is not true. While the A1 is close by, the road between the A1 and the site is narrow, twisting and A and B roads some of which pass local schools. There will not be adequate for the scale of construction traffic which will be necessary.
- d. It does not appear that alternative locations have been adequately considered during the consultation but would cause significantly lower environmental impact.
 - i. The East Coast Main line is 393 miles long and has land on both sides which if developed could provide adequate land for solar development without further impacting the surrounding land. In theory it would only take 32M on the side of the entire track to provide the same area in hectares.
 - ii. The solar farm has many hills and partially disused RAF bases, some of which have substations, west of lower than Ryhall, which could be utilised. Such "brownfield development" would have much less impact than the proposed development.

2) Flood Risk

- a. I have lived in Greatford for nearly 30 years and the area surrounding Greatford Gardens has been flooded a number of times. The last flood was on 3rd January 2024 when nearly 30% of the properties in Greatford were flooded. Ariel photos enclosed.
- b. The idea that covering 463 hectares with impermeable solar panels will not impact the ability of the land surrounding our village to absorb water is extremely difficult to comprehend. It is reasonable to assume that this will increase the flood risk in Greatford.
- c. The Consultation thus far has not adequately explained how this will be managed and the theoretical modelling in the environmental report does not pass the "reasonableness test" passed on decades of living in the area.
- d. The Environment Agency have said that they do not fully understand the cause of the flood on 3rd January 2024 and as a result are undertaking a Section 19 investigation under the Flood and Water Management Act. Any previous theoretical modelling of the Flood risk from the Development should be reviewed in the light of this Investigation and it would be extremely unwise to proceed until this is completed.

3) Security of Site

- a. I have worked in the Security Industry for over 20 years and have some expertise in securing solar farms with Electronic Security Equipment.
- b. The Solar panels, the cabling that connects them and the auxiliary equipment includes large quantities of valuable materials. As such the sites will be at high risk of theft both in construction and after completion. Due to the topography of the site and the multiple different areas providing adequate security will be difficult.
- c. The proposed fencing will be an eyesore, and any planting planned will take decades to cover them and is also unlikely to be high enough to prevent theft. I am therefore concerned that these will be heightened in future making the current proposal worse.
- d. The proposed plan also includes a large number of video surveillance cameras. These alone will not be sufficient to protect a site of this scale which is in effect a large number of smaller areas. Therefore again I expect these measures to be supplemented in future.
- e. The information provided regarding during the consultation is inadequate and further details need to be provided.
- f. In light of this the solar farm is likely to look more like a huge prison camp rather than an undamaged agricultural area.

4) Effectiveness of Solar Panels

- a. Solar Panels are approximately 15% efficient whereas wind turbines are approximately 50% efficient
- b. Wind turbines generate power throughout the day and night whereas solar panels only generate electricity during day light.
- c. Deployment of Wind turbines is significantly outstripping the use of solar in commercial facilities in the USA
- d. Since Mallard Pass Solar Farm is proposed by a Canadian Solar, a Company involved in the production and deployment of solar panels, adequate consideration has not been given to alternative technologies to provide renewable power.

5) Independence of UK Energy supply and Limited Contribution to UK PLC

- a. Canadian Solar use Chinese Producers in its supply chain.
- b. Canadian Solar was established by a Chinese citizen who went to Canada to Study. Chinese Citizens do not easily move overseas and set up independent companies. However the links between Canadian Solar and the Chinese Government are not

3) Flood Risk

- a. I have lived in Greatford for nearly 30 years and the area surrounding Greatford Gardens has been flooded a number of times. The last flood was on 31st January 2024 when nearly 30% of the properties in Greatford were flooded. Aerial photos enclosed show the area that covering 427 hectares with impermeable solar panels will not impact the ability of the land surrounding our village to absorb water is extremely difficult to comprehend. It is reasonable to assume that this will increase the flood risk in Greatford.
- b. The Consultation that has not a majority explained how this will be managed and the theoretical modelling in the environmental report does not assess the "responsibility test" passed on decades of living in the area.
- c. The Environment Agency have said that they do not fully understand the cause of the flood on 31st January 2024 and as a result are undertaking a Section 19 investigation under the Flood and Water Management Act. Any previous theoretical modelling of the Flood risk from the Government should be reviewed in the light of this investigation and it would be extremely unwise to proceed until this is completed.

3) Security of Site

- a. I have worked in the Security industry for over 30 years and have some expertise in securing solar farms with Electric Security Equipment.
- b. The solar panels, the cabling that connects them and the auxiliary equipment includes large quantities of valuable materials. As such the site will be at high risk of theft both in construction and after completion. Due to the topography of the site and the multiple different areas providing adequate security will be difficult.
- c. The proposed fencing will be an eyesore, and any planting planned will take decades to grow. They are also unlikely to be high enough to prevent theft. I am therefore concerned that the fence will be ineffective in the long term and will be a net negative worse.
- d. The proposed plan also includes a large number of video surveillance cameras. These also will not be sufficient to protect a site of this scale which is in effect a large number of smaller sites. Therefore I expect these measures to be supplemented in future.
- e. The information provided regarding the consultation is inadequate and further details need to be provided.
- f. In light of the solar farm is likely to look more like a huge prison camp rather than an unmanaged agricultural site.

4) Effectiveness of Solar Panels

- a. Solar Panels are approximately 15% efficient whereas wind turbines are approximately 70% efficient.
- b. Wind turbines generate power throughout the day and night whereas solar panels only generate electricity during day light.
- c. Deployment of Wind turbines is significantly outstripping the use of solar in commercial facilities in the USA.
- d. Since Mallard Farm is proposed by a Canadian Solar's Company involved in the production and deployment of solar panels, adequate consideration has not been given to alternative technologies to provide renewable power.

5) Independence of the Energy Supply and Limited Control over the UK PLC

- a. Canadian Solar is a Chinese producer in its supply chain.
- b. Canadian Solar was established by a Chinese citizen who went to Canada to study. Chinese citizens do not easily move overseas and set up independent companies. However the link between Canadian Solar and the Chinese Government is not

clear but need to be clarified to ensure that the UK energy supply remains independent from foreign powers (ref European dependence on Russian Gas)

- c. The Financiers behind Windell Energy and Canadian Solar are not clear.
- d. The only contribution to UK PLC from this development will be the power generated and the employment during construction.
- e. Large scale developments of this nature should also aim to have an accelerator effect on UK economy.
- f. The financial aspects of this project and the ownership structure of the Proposers need to be clarified.

Yours Faithfully

Mr Jeremy F Hockham

GREATFORD 3RD JAN 2024



PROS. M. I. 000 199 305

GREATFORD 3RD JAN 2024



1-508-111-211-00011111