

**From:** [Marc Williams](#)  
**To:** [Tillbridge Solar Project](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Tillbridge  
**Date:** 30 March 2025 19:50:08

---

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

## Formal Objection to Tillbridge Solar Project

To Planning Inspector

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Tillbridge Solar development in rural Lincolnshire. This project poses significant risks to the health and well-being of the local community and raises serious concerns regarding environmental impact, transparency, and long-term financial responsibility. The cumulative negative effects of this proposal far outweigh its perceived benefits, and it should not be approved.

### 1. Adverse Impact on Health and Well-being

The proposed industrialisation of this rural landscape will have **detrimental consequences** for the local community. The loss of **visual amenity** will significantly impact residents' mental well-being, as this countryside setting is integral to daily activities such as walking, running, and cycling. The tranquillity of the area is essential to the health of those who live here.

Additionally, the noise pollution generated **both during construction and operation** will be deeply disruptive. Persistent **construction noise, drilling, and operational sounds** have been well-documented to cause stress, sleep disturbances, and other long-term health issues. The World Health Organization (WHO) has recognized the serious health implications of prolonged exposure to noise pollution.

### 2. Failure to Conduct a Proper Health Impact Assessment (HIA)

Despite the scale of this project, the applicant has failed to provide a **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)** that meets planning standards. An **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is not a substitute for an HIA**, as it does not adequately address **the specific health implications for this community**.

Furthermore, the applicant has avoided scrutiny regarding their **so-called "Health Expert"** during hearings, and there is no clear verification of this individual's qualifications. Transparency on this matter is **essential**, and the planning authority must insist on full disclosure of the expert's credentials and methodology.

### 3. Lack of Justification and Energy Security Concerns

This project does not present a **pressing necessity** for UK energy security. The intermittent

nature of solar energy, combined with land-intensive infrastructure, does not ensure a stable supply of power. It is crucial that planning decisions prioritize **strategic energy security** rather than approving projects that offer minimal benefits while causing **irreversible harm** to local communities.

#### **4. Decommissioning Risks and Financial Accountability**

There is a glaring **lack of clarity** regarding who will bear the costs of decommissioning once the project reaches the end of its lifecycle. This responsibility **must not** fall on the **council, taxpayers, or government**. Similar projects elsewhere have shown that financial provisions often prove inadequate after just a few years, leaving communities burdened with the consequences.

I urge the planning authority to demand a **clear, legally binding decommissioning plan** that guarantees financial security **before** any approval is granted. This should include a **dedicated decommissioning fund**, independently managed and reviewed periodically to ensure its adequacy.

#### **Conclusion**

The cumulative impact of this proposal on the **health, environment, and financial stability** of the local community is severe and cannot be overlooked. Given the **failure to conduct a proper HIA, the lack of transparency, the unjustified necessity of the project, and the unanswered decommissioning concerns**, I strongly urge the planning authority to **reject this application**.

Sincerely,  
Marc Williams

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Marc Williams.