

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tillbridge Solar Project](#)
Subject: Error message when trying to send a comment in time for the next deadline - IP20049910
Date: 13 November 2024 16:33:50

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sirs

I have emailed you about receiving an error message that blocks me from making a comment via the usual website link. I can give my IP number and email address etc but when I try and submit my comment I get a message saying the request is blocked. I have given the error code in the email I sent to you yesterday. As the deadline is approaching and I have not received a reply I am submitting my comments by email.

Please acknowledge receipt.

I was not able to attend the OFH due to the timetabling having no consideration of residents who work. Can the time, and not just the date, of the proposed OFH2 on 13th January please be publicized as soon as possible, to give sufficient notice for people to try and be free. I have read many of the written transcripts of representations made at OFH 1, and also the written representations of those who, like me, were prevented from attending. The number of people who have expressed their concern over such a wide range of effects of large scale industrialization of our local area by covering farmland with solar panels and related structures, and their informed comments, will hopefully at least be read by the examiners and given weight in assessing the Application's merits. No-one can deny that the cumulative impact of all the local passed and proposed large scale solar farms (and the individual BESS applications now starting to be made directly to WLDC as they are outside National planning parameters) needs to be addressed. It is beyond belief that every report the applicant has paid to be prepared in support of this application, seems to say that the effect of every single aspect will be 'negligible'. Someone sitting at a desk, in an office many miles away, employed by a PR company, the applicant or an investor, who has never visited the area or walked down some of the local tracks or looked at the views, or driven down the single track roads etc – may be able to manipulate data and statistics to give the impression that sacrificing a few hundred fields in a sparsely populated corner of Lincolnshire is an acceptable way to pay [REDACTED] Net Zero aims of the UK. Those of us who live in the midst of these landscape-transforming [REDACTED] projects see many impacts that are significant. I agree wholeheartedly with the comments of the farmers, archaeologists, parents, land owners, 7000 acres, and other local residents who have put forward compelling arguments against

this project – on top of the others - based on their personal experience. I work as a [REDACTED], also working in [REDACTED]. I have a regular client base of well over 100 local residents – and have frequent discussions about the impact of the cumulative projects on their lives. I would like the applicant to provide up to date, relevant, locally researched information on the REAL potential cumulative effects of these projects on the physical and mental health of the local population. Taking into account all of the aspects of the construction process (which will span a number of years) as well as the ongoing operation of the projects.

Sadly, those of us who have made representations in all of the examination processes so far, are beginning to feel that there is no point in spending hours reading hundreds of pages of documents, asking questions that never get answered, taking time off work to make oral representations – the examiners seemingly ignore what we say, and recommend that the applications are passed, which the current Secretary of State has already shown himself more than willing to do. The applicant knows that we can't afford to seek judicial review of a decision to pass the projects – all we can do is hope that we finally have examiners who will push the applicant to answer all our questions, and see that the (mental, physical, emotional, financial and environmental) health of this part of the nation and those who live in it, is more important than the wealth of those from other [REDACTED]. Because this is NOT really about the provision of truly green energy. If it was, applicants would be more believable if they were looking at rooftops and brownfield sites – not productive farmland in an area where thousands of acres have already been earmarked for solar farms and their related structures.