

From: [Nick Mapstone](#)
To: [Tillbridge Solar Project](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]; [The 7000 Acres Action Group](#)
Subject: Tillbridge solar project
Date: 01 April 2025 20:07:46

Dear Mr Ely and Mr Simpson

Interested party reference 20048976

We are writing in response to the deadline 6 submission for the Tillbridge solar project.

We have previously written to you (October 2024) outlining our concerns about the Tillbridge solar project, and the impact that it will have on the life of our daughter, [REDACTED]. She has profound [REDACTED], and is [REDACTED]. Her clinicians have confirmed this and we have sent you the copies of their testimonies.

As we explained then, our solicitor and acoustics expert have been in intermittent discussion with Tillbridge Solar for many months. Nothing has been achieved. In our view, Tillbridge has made no meaningful concessions to mitigate our fundamental worries, and quite candidly has ignored them. As a general point, we are unconvinced that Tillbridge has discharged its duty to consider the impact of its development on vulnerable people in the area, particularly those with [REDACTED]. Throughout the consultation process, it seems to us that the developer's definition of the word consultation is 'a period of time'. No meaningful changes have been made to its original application.

There are also serious concerns over many important issues that have not been fully addressed by the developers' plans in our opinion. There is no doubt that this proposed development would transform a peaceful, rural area into an industrialised zone with all the concomitant disruption, noise and health and safety issues that such a large-scale industrial development entails. It will affect the entire vision-scape and visual character of the area, as well as its amenities and quality of life. Construction and maintenance will cause tremendous disruption and increase of transport in a relatively low traffic area. We believe that the local infrastructure will suffer severe pressure from this occurring during development and throughout the life of the project. There are no clear assurances about what will happen to the land that these solar panels and their associated support battery and electrical systems will be built on.

There are also severely worrying health concerns and safety implications that the developers' plans fail to address meaningfully. We have just seen on 28th March, fire crews battling a huge blaze at a solar industrial development in Preston, Gloucestershire. This development is 88 acres with 43,000 solar panels and is larger than 50 football pitches. However, it is still smaller than the combined acreage of all the individual industrial solar developments currently planned for this small corner of Lincolnshire. 43,000 panels were on fire and residents were told to stay inside and close all windows. This catastrophic environmental damage was caused by the ignition of lithium-ion batteries that transition into a thermal runaway. It is impossible to extinguish such fires

without specialised, licensed individuals who are allowed to deploy highly toxic controlled chemicals. After such events, it is likely that any agricultural land will be rendered toxic and be unable to return to agricultural use. This current peaceful and idyllic rural area will become brownfield, impossible to return to agricultural use and no doubt earmarked for housing development rather than food production once the industrial solar development is decommissioned.

We are being asked to live [REDACTED] from such an industrial array with fire and toxic hazard risk if this development goes ahead. This is untenable. We have also witnessed the consequences of a fire in an electricity substation serving Heathrow Airport. One of the sub stations scheduled to be built for this industrial development is, once again, [REDACTED]. These recent fires in solar complexes in Anglesey and Gloucestershire demonstrate the dangers of solar industrial developments to the physical health of residents in close proximity. This is an additional health risk to add to the damage to mental health and well-being that has already been caused, and which will continue for the duration of the scheme's existence, should planning approval be granted.

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Mapstone and Alison Wood

Dear Mr Ely and Mr Simpson

Interested party reference 20048976

I wrote to you on 21st October outlining our concerns about the Tillbridge solar project, and the impact that it will have on the life of our daughter, [REDACTED], who had profound [REDACTED], and who is [REDACTED].

My wife, Alison Wood, wishes to add the following point. She is concerned that the developers have given our (now former) solicitor access to her statement to the Planning Inspectorate written in response to requests from representations from interested parties. The developers sent it to the solicitor on 23rd October 2024 but no date is given on their attachment. She believes it would probably have been submitted in March 2024.

The solicitor has been trying to use this statement to put pressure upon us to agree to the developer's SOCG. The suggestion is that this document shows that my wife's position has moved from simply objecting to the principle of the solar farm on the planning merits to attempting to stop the development being built altogether. The claim is that this is now her main objective rather than being primarily concerned with protecting our daughter's interests in relation to her [REDACTED]. The consequent implication is that my wife is using these sensitivities to further this now alleged wider aim. We believe that this suggestion may have come from the developers since the solicitor only began to express this view immediately upon receiving a copy of my wife's statement from them. No further context was given on the copy of this attachment sent to my wife so we do not know what

this may have been when it was initially sent to the solicitor. We feel it is inappropriate to use her statement as leverage in this way during the inspection process. We fear that it could be used to undermine any statements and submissions she might make to the Inspectorate in the future.

To reiterate our main concern is to protect our daughter's interests by effectively reducing noise emissions from the development. We hope that you will look at these specific concerns as we have no common statement of agreement with the developer.

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Mapstone and Alison Wood