

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tillbridge Solar Project](#)
Subject: Tillbridge Solar Written Response
Date: 14 November 2024 13:29:20

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

For two days I've tried numerous times to post my written comments on the above project and the function has not been available. Please find below my comments.

Regards J Allan

My objections to this proposal fall under the following categories- Food security, energy security, safety, health and wellbeing and net zero. Whilst I understand the need to decarbonise our economy it must not be to the detriment of our economy, living standards and national security,

We already import more than 50% of the UK's food and therefore this would seem to be an inefficient use of good quality agricultural crop growing land. There is huge demand for land, not least for housing, industry, roads and infrastructure, re forestation, and use of the countryside for rest and recreation.

Solar power is very inefficient in the UK due to our climate and geography. Typically we achieve only 11% of the nameplate capacity of any given proposal, therefore the developers' claims are always vastly overstated. Solar provides its best returns at the times where energy is least required eg on a cloud free sunny day, rather than the icy cold winter evenings when it produces nothing. Surely it would be better to utilise the roofs of warehouses, factories, and homes to locate solar panels rather than the scarce land resources.

In an attempt to balance out the low efficiency of solar battery farms are being proposed. The technology of these is still developing and the current standard is enabling storage of only around 2 hours, this is totally unsatisfactory as it's a long time between Summer and Winter. Unless the developers propose to use them as a revenue stream by loading them at low production cost periods and selling it back to the grid at a profit during peak demand. Lithium batteries are known to suffer from 'thermal runaway', this occurs when a battery is faulty and will cause a major fire. As the proposed battery farms house the batteries in close proximity, if a fire were to occur it could get very big very quickly. The only way to deal with a lithium fire is to douse the area with huge volumes of water. As far as I can tell, the developer hasn't explained where this volume of water will come from. Then there is the issue of contamination as dangerous chemicals pollute the water as it disperses, potentially polluting the land and the surrounding area.

The local Parish council has held meetings to gauge support for the developments and it is clear there is little if any support. In addition circa 23 Parish councils and the 7000 acres group have confirmed their objections to the proposals including three other adjacent proposals in close proximity. If these proposals go ahead it will be against the wishes of the residents. Locals will be deprived of the amenities of the countryside and the industrialisation of the area will have a huge

impact on peoples lives. In addition during the installation phases when all the projects could be running more or less concurrently there will be a huge impact on roads and traffic, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of metres of hedgerows that are being destroyed and hundreds of trees felled, changing the entire character of the countryside. The cumulative effect of all four local proposals going ahead will be massive. As far as I am aware there has been no involvement with health professionals or experts to understand the health and mental wellbeing of those affected. There are 30 villages impacted by the four main proposals and they are all within a relatively small area. If it all goes ahead I won't be able to drive anywhere without being faced with four metre high solar panels.

Lastly, we seem as a nation to be pushing for decarbonisation at a rate that will inevitably result in major costs to consumers for energy and heat pumps, not to mention the massive costs of delivering the energy to major conurbations via pylons and cables, and the technology isn't necessarily adequate for this country. There are also many reports of changes to diet and rationing of power at peak times. This is totally unsatisfactory from an economic, financial, national security and individual freedoms and liberties. If we do not have a resilient energy system we will be heading back to the dark ages. The current plans do not fill me with confidence. Small modular reactors providing stable energy on demand seem to me to be the answer to maintaining a sustainable energy flow. The charge to net zero is unnecessarily fast and the country cannot afford it. We are already paying more for energy than all our major competitors. It doesn't seem likely to me that solar adds very much to the whole energy balance. I cannot see how this is a good development for our country's food and energy security, and it's certainly not good for the residents who will be severely affected.