

To: Rt Hon Claire Coutinho MP
Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero
Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
1 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0ET

From: John Crampin
Farriers Barn, Farriers Way,
Carlby,
Stamford,
Lincs
PE9 4NG

15 April 2024

Dear Madam

Comments about the Mallard Pass Solar Project

Although I recognise the need for green energy, I am absolutely opposed to the Mallard Pass project. It is far too big for this small area of Southern Lincolnshire and Rutland to bare.

In recent months, travelling, by car, through many areas of England and Scotland, I have seen fields that have been converted to photovoltaic panels. They are an eyesore, but they are often set fairly low so that they can to some extent drop unseen below hedges. As the Mallard developers have insisted on setting the panels much higher than in other areas, their impact will not be avoided.

Nowhere, have I seen anything like the plan proposed for our local area. In terms of sheer scale, the Mallard Pass proposal is so much bigger than anything else that I have seen. This is not something that will pass by quickly as you drive past. This area would suffer extraordinary levels of visual vandalism, were consent for this development to be granted.

Often fields of panels are close to major roads and railways, and as such were perhaps already damaged. By naming their project after the 'Mallard,' Windel Energy are referencing both the "Mallard" locomotive and the railway that runs through this area. However, only a very small percentage of the panels will be alongside the East Coast mainline. I have never seen this mentioned in all the documents of this project. Perhaps the developers could be asked to produce a figure for the percentage of the panels which will be less than half a kilometre from the railway? I am convinced that this is very small.

Another observation from driving around our country, is the effect of widespread flooding. This is not a quick flood which soon disappears, this problem seems to have become very much worse very quickly. All over the country there are fields which have been under water for a considerable time. Water tables have risen to such an extent that long term flooding is much more of a problem, than ever before, leading to a situation where there will no doubt be a substantial loss of agricultural land. At a time when security of British food supply is increasingly important, losing more good agricultural land to become part of an industrial-style power station in addition to the problems caused by flooding seems perverse.

Lastly, I wish to highlight the way in which the countryside between towns and villages has an important effect on the health and mental well-being of the people who live here. There are two important aspects of this the visual environment in which the community goes about its daily life and the impact of the natural world, upon their lives. In this difficult world the effect of this is large. To cycle, ride, walk in the countryside, to seek solace in the birds, flowers and trees can be a tremendous relaxation. People cannot afford for you to throw this away.

In conclusion:

- I believe that The Government needs policies that indicate what is reasonable in terms of taking green fields for panels, when brown field sites are unused. (The industrial estates in Essendine do not have panels their roofs!)
- Your Government appears to favour policies that are 'proportionate'. The development of such a large industrial power plant, replacing good, arable farming land, swamping existing villages, and ruining English countryside is by no means 'proportionate'.
- The project should be rejected. There are many reasons only some of which I touched on here:

damage to the visual environment,
damage to the natural world,
effect on the local people,
loss of good agricultural land,
quality of the company aiming to develop this project,
effect on local roads,
the work to be done is going abroad,
some control is held abroad.

Yours faithfully

John Crampin

