

**From:** [Trish](#)  
**To:** [Stonestreet Green Solar Project](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Interested Party 20049777 Comments on responses Stone Street Green Solar  
**Date:** 17 September 2025 21:05:02

---

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Sir,

I am writing to comments on two points which remain unanswered regarding the Stone Street Green Solar application.

1) The consolidation of BESS units completely encircling my property ([REDACTED]) will result in continuous noise levels deemed damaging to health according to WHO figures. Despite being raised throughout the process, this concern remains unaddressed by the Applicant. They Applicant has presented unrealistic noise calculations which do not allow for the topography of the site or the cumulative effect of over 50 units within a few hundred metres of my home.

2) The fire risk. My home recently suffered a serious house fire. This was not as a result of an “electrical vehicle” as is quoted in the application. It was a regular house fire, destroying most of the property. The fire brigade were unable to control the fire due to insufficient water availability in the area. It took over 16 hours for the fire to be put out and another 12 hours damping down. In the process, the water system for Aldington and three surrounding villages was exhausted. The Farm pond was pumped dry, six engines and two water tankers attended. On top of this the road was closed to allow erection of a water storage tank, to which engines ran back and forth continuously for 12 hours to keep filled. The local fire fighters were particularly concerned as there were three domestic energy storage batteries in the cellar of the house; had these caught fire we were told that there fire would have to be left to burn out and anyone close by evacuated due to toxic gasses. If this is the situation for a simple house fire with potential involvement of three domestic batteries, how can the fire risk posed by over 100 commercial batteries be adequately managed in the same location? Even with the addition of water towers (upon which there was no consultation) these towers are not capable of providing a fraction of the water required to manage a fire in a single BESS unit let alone over 50 such units. The serious danger to life that such fires pose due to toxic gas release has also not been addressed by the applicant. This is a rural community and these fires burn for days; the loss of local wildlife, farm animals, pets and people would be catastrophic.

The Applicant purports that by spreading BESS units across the development the fire risk is minimised. This is simply wrong; the actual reason for spreading the batteries out is simply more economic to have them as close as possible to the solar panels. By doing so approximately 10% more energy (profit) can be made.

I ask that to protect the health of those living close by, the Secretary of State refuses the Applicant permission to construct this solar power plant in its current form at this location.

Regards

Dr Trish Bromley BVMS MRCVS MTOPRA