

# MALLARD PASS


## ACTION GROUP

*YES to solar, NO to Mallard Pass!*

### URGENT: Public Consultation 26<sup>th</sup> May - 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022

Mallard Pass Solar Farm is proposed to be located across 2,238 acres on agricultural land either side of the East Coast Main Line, surrounding Essendine and adjacent to Carlby, Braceborough, Greatford, Barholm, Uffington, Belmesthorpe and Ryhall.

Mallard Pass Action Group (MPAG) was set up in December following huge concerns from many local residents. The first consultation received nearly 1,000 responses - raising issues of the sheer scale, local ecology and wildlife, loss of agricultural land, traffic, landscape & visual impact, recreation & amenity, and increased flood risk.



## GET INVOLVED – WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT?

This is an NSIP (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project) which means the decision will be taken by the Secretary of State for BEIS, not your local council. This shows the huge importance and scale of this decision.

This is the only 'statutory' consultation in the process, and therefore the government's Planning Inspectorate and Mallard Pass both have to take account of public feedback.

It is still 8 times bigger than the largest solar farm in the UK and should not be using valuable, productive agricultural land. Solar belongs on rooftops and brownfield sites.

Ask yourself, do you trust this developer to look after local communities and the environment during the construction process and once in operation?

Don't forget if approved it will take 2 years to build and will be in place for a minimum of 40 years affecting future generations, not just yourselves.



- ▶ 906 Ha, (2,238 acres) total site
- ▶ 463 Ha (1,144 acres) solar panel area
- ▶ 350MW, government decision - not local councils
- ▶ 3.3m high solar panels, 2m fencing, CCTV/lighting
- ▶ 7 construction compounds and access points
- ▶ 100 x 200m primary substation, 12.5m high
- ▶ 2-year construction, max 400 staff at peak

## HAVE YOUR SAY

Step 1: Visit MPSF website for more detailed information at [www.mallardpassolar.co.uk](http://www.mallardpassolar.co.uk).

Step 2: Visit the action group website at [www.mallardpassactiongroup.com](http://www.mallardpassactiongroup.com) to find more information.

Step 3: Write & send your consultation response by email to [info@MallardPassSolar.co.uk](mailto:info@MallardPassSolar.co.uk). Your feedback must reach the developers by 4th August at the latest. Copy your MP, local councillors and MPAG, all details available on our website at [www.mallardpassactiongroup.com](http://www.mallardpassactiongroup.com).

### IMPORTANT:

- ▶ Even if you sent a response to the last consultation, you must respond again, this is the only statutory Public Consultation and is the only one that counts. All feedback will be consolidated and reviewed by the Planning Inspectorate who recommends to the government whether planning permission should be granted.
- ▶ If you have written an email/letter recently to your MP or local councillor, but not to MPSF, you need to send a copy or write again to MPSF, consultation responses must go to the developer.
- ▶ Do NOT fill in an MPSF Feedback form, as you can't copy in other interested stakeholders (as above).

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urge the Government to take into account the concerns of the petitioners and reject the proposed development of the 1,175-acre Mallard Pass solar plant on the Bedford and Lincolnshire borders.

The petition of residents of the United Kingdom.

Declares that the proposed Mallard Pass solar plant should be rejected, further that the inappropriate scale of this development would lead to irreparable damage to the community due to the loss of quality, productive agricultural land, the loss of the natural character of the countryside, being damage to backbones and the environment, damage to historical assets and identity, and the risk of a solar plant providing for forced labour in the developers' supply chain.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urge the Government to take into account the concerns of the petitioners and reject the proposed development of the 1,175-acre Mallard Pass solar plant on the Bedford and Lincolnshire borders.

And the petitioners request, etc.

Name <small>(Required by Parliament)</small>	Address incl Postcode <small>(Required by Parliament)</small>	Email <small>(If you want updates)</small>	Signature <small>(Required by Parliament)</small>

### Alicia Kearns MP paper petition

If you receive a copy of this paper petition through your door asking the government to reject this solar farm, please sign and pass around your friends and family. Any UK resident can sign it, and it is non-political.

It will be formally presented to the House of Commons late summer, and a response will be received within 2 months from the relevant department.

*Please return to:*

Office of Alicia Kearns MP, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA.

 [facebook.com/groups/mallardpassactiongroup](https://facebook.com/groups/mallardpassactiongroup)

You can also contact us at [mallardpassactiongroup@gmail.com](mailto:mallardpassactiongroup@gmail.com)

This view is taken from a popular Public Footpath and is of just one of the many fields that will be covered by unsightly solar panels, unless we stop this - WE MUST ACT NOW!

# WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES?

<p>Site size, performance &amp; location</p>	<p>The total site has increased by 23Ha to 906Ha (2,238 acres) to allow for highway changes for HGV and abnormal roads, creating greater potential for environmental damage and disruption.</p> <p>The solar panel area has decreased by 106Ha (263 acres), but can apparently still deliver the same 350MW quoted at Stage 1 of the Consultation. How can this be possible?</p> <p>The site was selected predominantly for its easy access to the grid, which currently has available capacity. How do we know the solar area won't be expanded at a later date?</p>
<p>Battery storage</p>	<p>Battery storage is key in helping achieve net zero, but it is a huge safety risk and concern for residents. MPSF has omitted it from the development "at this time". Why, will it be added later through the 'back door'?</p>
<p>Landscape &amp; visual effects</p>	<p>"Landscape and visual effects considered to be of major/moderate significance" cite MPSF. Can you imagine how solar panels up to 3.3m high, 2m security fencing, 1320 CCTV cameras at 3.5m high, security lighting, 84 containers housing inverters/transformers, will change the character and visual appearance of our area for at least the next 40 years. It will take 15 years before many areas can be effectively screened from the impact.</p>
<p>Loss of agricultural land</p>	<p>The government policy is clear that ground mounted solar should use previously developed land, contaminated land, industrial land and agricultural land of grade 3b, 4 and 5, not Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. The selected solar panel area MPSF is proposing to use is 53% BMV land. The latest Government Food Strategy Policy paper June 2022 clearly wants to maintain agricultural production, not reduce it, particularly in the light of recent activities with Russia/Ukraine war and subsequent global impacts on food shortages and prices.</p>
<p>Bio-diversity and loss of habitat</p>	<p>Mitigation is the "action of reducing the severity, seriousness, or painfulness of something". Mentioned 32 times in the Main Consultation document, what does this say about the impact on the area? MPSF clearly highlight the many adverse environmental impacts that will occur during the construction phase and subsequent decommissioning, stressing they will do their best to avoid them. Is it only possible to repair and achieve 10% bio-diversity net gain by their proposed setting-aside huge areas of productive land?</p>
<p>Traffic &amp; transport</p>	<p>Disruption, traffic, environmental damage, dust, road safety and potential accident issues for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers for 2 years; up to 400 workers on site; main hours working 7-7 Mon-Sat; 54+ 2 way HGV movements per day; 3 major road routes assigned affecting local villages &amp; Stamford; 1 main construction compound and 6 secondary compounds and access points all affecting local roads. Does this concern you?</p>
<p>Recreational amenity</p>	<p>Some public rights of way will be closed or diverted during construction. 3 new permissive paths totalling 2.9 miles and some picnic benches will be provided. Will that compensate for the loss of pleasure experienced by residents walking, riding or cycling existing routes?</p>
<p>Construction</p>	<p>Piling of solar panel mounting structures up to 2.5m deep will be noisy and very dusty during construction. The primary substation will have tonal noise higher than that experienced at night-time, affecting some residents.</p>
<p>Flooding</p>	<p>Additional flood risk caused by surface water run-off from the panels, the impact has still not been properly considered on areas downstream outside of the site e.g. Greatford. The West Glen River new permissive path and Wet Woodland area will probably be impassable in winter as that area easily floods.</p>
<p>Archaeology &amp; heritage</p>	<p>"Archaeological remains dating to the prehistoric period are in abundance within the Solar PV site and its surrounding area" It is yet to be determined if all areas can be built on. "The proposed development would change the character of land parcels lying within the wider and peripheral setting of several listed buildings".</p>
<p>Human rights concerns</p>	<p>Reported evidence of Uyghur forced labour used in the supply chain of Canadian Solar, the primary developer of MPSF.</p>