

From: [Antonia Georgiou](#)
To: [Tween Bridge](#)
Subject: Tween Bridge - Local Resident - Letter of Concern
Date: 05 May 2026 20:39:42

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

Antonia Georgiou

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

05/05/2026

To Whom It May Concern,

Formal Objection to the Proposed Tween Bridge Solar Project

I am writing to formally object to the above proposal and to raise serious concerns regarding both the process followed and the potential environmental impact of this development in the Doncaster area.

1. Failure of Adequate Notification and Meaningful Consultation

While I understand that certain forms of public notification—such as notices placed in local newspapers including the Doncaster Free Press—may meet minimum statutory requirements, I do not believe this approach alone constitutes effective or meaningful consultation for a development of this scale.

Relying primarily on newspaper notices is not a reliable way of ensuring that directly affected residents are properly informed. Many local residents do not regularly access local press, and such notices can easily be missed. For a project of this size and potential impact, more proactive and direct engagement should reasonably be expected.

In particular:

- I was not directly notified of the re-emergence of this project, despite having previously submitted a detailed objection and provided my contact details.
- There appears to have been no adequate effort to re-engage residents who had already expressed formal concerns.

- The lack of clear, direct communication has left residents unaware of key developments and consultation deadlines.

Taken together, this suggests that while minimum procedural steps may have been followed, the spirit and purpose of community consultation—to ensure informed and meaningful participation—has not been fulfilled.

This raises serious concerns about the fairness, transparency, and legitimacy of the consultation process.

* I previously submitted a detailed objection to this project and was subsequently informed that the proposal had been withdrawn. However, the project has since re-emerged without any direct notification to me, despite the developers holding my contact details.

* My original objection does not appear to have been carried forward or acknowledged in the current application, which raises concerns about transparency and procedural fairness.

2. Lack of Meaningful Engagement with Local Residents

At the initial consultation stage, residents were informed that site visits would be conducted to assess the proximity and impact of the development on nearby properties. To date:

* I am not aware of any visits being conducted within my postcode area.

This represents a clear failure to follow through on commitments made during the consultation process.

3. Insufficient Ecological Assessment

The proposed site is home to a wide range of wildlife, including but not limited to:

- * Lapwings, cranes, herons, and owls
- * Bats and dragonflies
- * Migratory geese
- * Mammals such as deer, rabbits, and hares

I have seen no convincing evidence that thorough, site-specific ecological surveys have been carried out to properly assess the impact on these species. Given the biodiversity present, this omission is deeply concerning and potentially contrary to environmental protection obligations.

I wrote in my original letter that I was willing to supply evidence of wildlife in my area but no contact was made and to this date there is no evidence to suggest any site-specific ecological surveys have been carried out in the DN8 area.

4. Environmental and Local Character Concerns

The development risks significantly altering the rural character of the area and disrupting established ecosystems. Large-scale solar installations can have cumulative impacts on:

- * Wildlife habitats and migration patterns
- * Landscape character
- * Local amenity and quality of life for residents

These impacts must be properly assessed and transparently communicated, which I do not believe has been done.

5. Barriers to Participation in the Current Consultation Process

I am also extremely concerned about the lack of clarity surrounding the requirement for an “interested party” reference number.

I have not been issued with such a reference number, nor has the process for obtaining one been clearly communicated. As a result, I now understand that there is a risk that my objection may not be formally considered at this stage.

This is both confusing and deeply frustrating. As a directly affected resident who has previously engaged with the consultation process in good faith, I believe it is unreasonable and unfair that procedural barriers may prevent my views from being taken into account.

At a minimum, I request clear guidance on:

- * What an “interested party” reference number is
- * How it is obtained
- * Why I have not been issued one despite prior engagement
- * How my objection will still be recorded and considered in its absence

6. Procedural Concerns at Current Consultation Stage

I understand that there is a new deadline for submissions at a higher-level consultation stage. However, the process and expectations at this stage have not

been clearly explained, making it difficult for residents to engage meaningfully.

7. Submission of Previous Objection

For completeness and to ensure that my concerns are fully understood, I am attaching a copy of my original objection submitted during the earlier consultation phase.

This document outlines in detail my initial concerns regarding the proposed Tween Bridge Solar Project. I request that it is formally accepted as part of my representation and given full consideration within the current application process, particularly in light of the fact that it does not appear to have been carried forward despite my prior submission.

Conclusion

Given the concerns outlined above—particularly regarding failures in consultation, lack of ecological assessment, and procedural inconsistencies—I strongly object to the proposed Tween Bridge Solar Project.

I respectfully request that:

- * The application be paused or rejected until proper consultation procedures are demonstrably followed
- * Comprehensive ecological surveys are conducted and made publicly available
- * All previous objections, including my own, are formally acknowledged and considered
- * Clear and accessible guidance is provided to residents on how to participate in the current consultation process
- * My objection is accepted and recorded regardless of whether an “interested party” reference number has been issued

I ask that this objection be formally recorded and taken into full consideration.

Yours faithfully,
Antonia Georgiou

The following is the original submission to Tween Bridge.

To Whomever It May Concern,

Subject: Formal objection to the Tween Bridge Solar and Battery Energy Storage Project.

I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed Tween Bridge development by RWE.

Firstly, I would like to let you know that we are not opposed to solar energy. In fact, we are in favour of renewable energy sources, and as a civilisation we are very behind in meeting our environmental targets for generating and relying on clean and renewable

energy sources.

It is of great comfort to know that the government of the UK is committed to increasing its capacity for renewable energy sources. I read that the UK has a huge target for meeting its renewable energy requirements with the goal set to target 100% electricity generation from clean energy sources by 2030, but it is currently set to miss this target by quite some way, according to data from Cornwall Insight.

While this is a commendable ambition, though, some might say, the rushed and high target, and the fact that these targets are already not being met, raises concern. We are worried that there is a requirement for the government to rush such energy schemes in favour of meeting targets but which overlook long term consequences.

One of the long term consequences that concern us is the significant loss of highly productive and high yielding agricultural land, of which there is currently much of within this proposed scheme. The land proposed for this scheme includes high grade agricultural soil that currently supports food production, indeed currently while I write this, land is being used to grow and harvest crops.

Removing this land from farming and food security is completely unjustifiable. We are strongly opposed to solar farms being erected on arable land, land that is, has been, or can be used as arable land and land that can be used for horticultural crops. We do not have confidence that this or a past government has taken into consideration the impact that will come from losing so much arable land. We therefore implore you to reconsider this proposal on such land. The immeasurable carbon saved by this project does not justify the destruction of the green belt and living eco systems.

As this is an industrial scale project proposed on a tranquil countryside landscape we feel it is wholly inappropriate for the location due to the environmental sensitivity of the site. This project would cover up to 4000 acres and it would convert open rural land into a massive industrial site. This is not an appropriate development for an arable location. Whilst we are not opposed to solar energy there are much more suitable brown fields or other sites for installing this type of energy scheme. For example, along railway lines, on top of warehouses or on top of the vast new number of homes that are due to be erected just off the M18/M180 which would not serve as a eyesore on the natural world and a dereliction of important agricultural land.

Whilst we strongly object to this project due to its desecration of arable land we realise that our objection carries no weight in the discussion as we are under the impression that this project will go ahead irregardless of our say and this arbitrary consultation. So the remaining portion of this objection focusses on mitigating the impact to the local community, should RWE care to allow locals, both human and animal, the right to be unaffected by the emotion strain and loss of amenity that is being threatened by this project. We are concerned that, if this proposed site gets passed, that green field sites will lose their farming status and we want these to be preserved. We insist that, should any solar farms be created, that all areas maintain their farming status and that this land never be allowed to be reclassified so that should this scheme end the land can be reclaimed as land of The Utilised Agricultural Area and still be owned by the original farmers for agricultural purposes.

If this scheme goes ahead, I object particularly to zones D1, D8 and D9 on the **attached map** as the open flat nature of the land makes this development highly visible and intrusive, it will destroy natural views and this area, in particular, is residential. The people owning the land of the proposed solar farms do not actually live here and it is unfair to change the nature and the landscape in which we have chosen to live in for tranquility, peace and in order to be surrounded by and be a part of nature. The residents in this area have purchased their properties in orders to live among and to preserve nature. This project will cause a great deal of stress to the residents as we will lose so much of what we love about living here. My family walk regularly, and I personally spend most mornings running outside, an activity I do for my mental health and to help cope with anxiety, up the lanes between D1, D8, D9 and D4. I see deer, pheasants, barn owls, ducks, swans, rabbits, hares and many more wondrous creatures. My mum loves listening to the incredible variety of birds living and feeding in the area. We will lose this enjoyable part of our life. This project will be a visual blight and an attack on our shared landscape. We feel that this area of the project demonstrates an exploitation of residents and a not consultation. We urge you to remove zones D1, D8, D9 and D4 from the proposed scheme should this project go ahead. I have felt a hugely heavy weight in my chest since hearing of the news of this solar farm, how it will engulf our house on 3 sides, how it will obscure the idyllic views to the dairy cows fields to the east, how it will serve as a 4 metre high fence enclosing us, and I am terrified. My morning runs serve as an escape to euphoria, to see and be within nature is a powerful health healer. But imagining being trapped within rows of solar panels frightens me. I ask that zones D1, D8, D9 and D4 be removed from the scheme should this project go ahead.

This project is proposing to install solar panels on the fields to the north, east and south of our tranquil and idyllic home but this scheme will infringe our quality of life and the reason we love living here. Furthermore, it is against the law to be fenced in by conifers for reasons of shading and encroachment, when they are over 2 metres in height and also if they infringe the right to light, so it would be highly intrusive and inappropriate leading to loss of our quality of life to be fenced in by 4 metre high solar panels due to this proposed scheme. Again, should this scheme go ahead we insist that zones D1, D8 and D9 be removed from the scheme so our quality of life does not diminish.

Another concern we have is the noise pollution from a solar farm so close to residences. Despite the continual improving on inverter design and transformers to reduce noise emissions there is still much research to suggest that solar farms on this scale will generate noise pollution for the residents. We propose that, should this scheme go ahead, zones D1, D8, D9 and D4 instead be better used as a buffer zone, an area of refuge for wildlife, as they are an unsuitable area for solar panels so close to residents. Providing these buffer zones will not only benefit the residents, it will also benefit the wildlife by serving as a habitat for them with the view to encouraging and increasing biodiversity.

An even greater concern to us is the fire risk. While the risk of a solar panel catching fire is low, it is not zero. Though RWE feels they can be so cavalier with our property we certainly do not feel the same. We do not want such a disaster to occur so close to our property, or even the increase in the potential risk of such an occurrence to be forced upon us. No one has an emotional attachment to a solar panel but humans have that attachment to our homes, and there are no words to describe how devastated we would be at the destruction of our home, of our little world, the safe haven that we have built, it would be utter emotional turmoil. And so we, again, insist that zones D1, D8, D9 and D4 removed from the plans should this scheme go ahead.

Then, there is the potential flood risk that these panels cause. Should this scheme go ahead zone D1 causes a hugely significant flood risk to our property. Proposed zone D1 to the north and east of our property is of great concern as these fields lead directly onto our property boundary and they are all on significantly higher ground than our property. Due to the height of all this land around us, the angle of the proposed solar panels towards our property and the decrease in vegetation directly under each solar panel this proposed zone presents a highly dangerous risk to flooding to our property. So again we insist that for this reason and should

this scheme go ahead that zone D1 be removed from this scheme.

Areas D1, D8, D9, D13 and D14 all lie near Thorne and Hatfield Moores which is home to sensitive wet land bird species and other bio diversity. The scale and disturbance of this project will cause irreparable ecological damage, including disruption of breeding and migratory behaviour., should this scheme go ahead.

Our house is visited yearly by swifts and house martins with up to 30 nests per year and these birds return annually and reproduce several times a season. They rely on the wet fields that surround our house, in order to produce their homes and collect food. Also, the fields around us are an biannual collection point for thousands of migratory geese when arriving and preparing for the winter. We have sparrow hawks, barn owls and little owls that live on our premises, these birds hover over the land to catch their prey. Under the solar panels their prey will be easily sheltered so all these birds will loose their feeding grounds, regardless of whether the scheme puts up 100 bird boxes. Birds can create nests but they can't magic food in to existence.

Our area is also home to bats. A year ago conducted a bat report, which cost substantial amounts of money, and that had to take place across a prolonged period of time in order to be accurate. Through this report we found out that bats live in our barn and feed from the surrounding fields at dusk. We have, again, seen that this scheme will supply bat boxes to house the bats in this area but with the extreme change in landscape these animals will greatly struggle to maintain access to food sources under solar panels. Bats are a protected species and we know they live and feed in our area. We can provide this report to contribute to the evidence being compiled by RWE, most of which we understand, is yet to take place. We know that very little to no research has not been carried out on the wildlife in our surrounding fields as no vehicles or persons have been seen in our area. And, like we say, accurate research must be carried out over a prolonged period of time to be accurate. We have lived here for over 25years, have extensive knowledge of the nature here, and can provide time stamped and photographic evidence proving the habits of a great number of creatures in fields D1, D8, D9 and D4 including bats, owls, lapwings and other protected species.

Most of the 4000 acres proposed by this scheme are home to numerous wild deer. While we recognise that this scheme has no desire to protect wild deer we do ask that, as a minimum, the deer's undestroyed habits remain accessible to them, and that they are not forced into roads in our area. For one, the roads in our area are already incredibly unsafe, a combination of heavy load lorries, motorway diversions, and high speed vehicles on country style roads, evidence of which I am sure are accessible from local police reports. Only this week (approx 1st May) a large lorry overturned, for which there was police presence, I should add that this accident was not due to deer in the road. Deer are killed weekly in peek season on our roads, have you ever seen a baby deer smushed into a road? I will never get the images out of my head. For an area with an already high car accident rate we strongly think that pushing deer into these roads would increase serious accidents which would be an irresponsible cause and effect of this scheme. For the safety of the deer and for human life we insist that deer routes be made through proposed solar sections, rather than relying on the deer having to go round them and therefore being pushed into roads. So, should this scheme go ahead, we propose that rather than each section being fenced off all the way round, a safe pathway route is created through a solar field connecting numerous adjacent sections thereby providing a network of safe paths for the deer to escape through, rather than being disrupted and relying on diversions via roads. I know of numerous routes that the deer rely on to safely travel though the fields in our area and am more than happy to provide evidence so that RWE can create safe paths for these animals to access their ever decreasing breeding and feeding grounds should this scheme go ahead. Also, we insist that during any potential construction of this scheme that deer must be protected during breeding seasons and that calf's left alone while their mothers are away hunting must not be disturbed, work must cease immediately and the workforce must be moved far away till the calf has matured.

Our close area is also home to many more wildlife like rabbits, hares, pheasants, partridges, skylarks, barn owls, swifts, house martins, greenfinch, woodpeckers, lapwings, mistle thrush and yellow wagtail many of which are on the red list of bird concern. All of these species we have in our area, we have either photo or audio evidence of all these species in the fields D1, D8 and D9. And they have also been observed in D4, D5, D12, D13 and D14. Due to the protected status of these birds this scheme should not be permitted to continue. Erecting solar panels on top of houses is of no consequence to this wildlife and we implore you to reconsider erecting this scheme on the natural world.

Also, we insist that no trees be felled or bushes killed in preparation of or during this scheme should it go ahead. And also it is imperative that no dykes be filled or removed in preparation of or during the life of this project, should the scheme go ahead, due to the significant flood risk of this area.

We want nature to thrive in our area should any of the proposed scheme go ahead. What we don't want is to be left out of the work even after the erection of any potential solar panels. We want to be able to contribute to the encouragement of nature in our area. What is the benefit otherwise to our area and our community? With this in mind, we want members of the local community to be not just considered but hired to maintain hedgerows, bee hives, sheep and any other wildlife or habitats that are to be erected due to this scheme should it go ahead. The Doncaster Beekeepers Association are knowledge and dedicated to looking after bee hives and should be RWE's first option for maintaining and profiting from any bee hives erected in potential solar panel areas. This would provide jobs in our local community which RWE at presentations have implied they are keen to encourage.

We want members of our local community to be hired and made responsible for planting horticultural life, such as wildflowers and hedgerows, within and around the solar farm frames, and members of our community must also be hired to maintain this life. This will provide jobs to the people in our area and support our community and our local economy for the duration of the solar scheme. With this in mind, every person in our area must be contact to be made aware of such opportunities so that our local people can be hired for these ongoing paid positions.

Our community feel that the consultation progress has been inadequate. Not all households have received notification of this project, which is wholly unacceptable for a project of this size and impact. Many locals still remain unaware of the scale of this project or the implication of it. And public consultations have simply been a formality where people have been told what is going to happen and not being clearly informed that they can object to this. It is a huge flaw in the consultation process as also the majority of people don't read local newspapers. And anyone that is aware of this scheme strongly feel that this scheme cannot be stopped by there objections and therefore they do not feel there is any point in making any objections or even providing any feedback at all. And then those who make objections are concerned that their objections will not be considered, as the importance of the objection lies with RWE and the government and not with the community. While, no doubt, RWE worked long and hard on their presentations and documents in the hope of educating the local community on this scheme, the vastness of this scheme only causes our small community to feel discouraged and downtrodden by a large corporation obviously intent on ruining our lifestyle. Furthermore, the contact phone number provided on the RWE website has never been answered anytime I've called it, which is woefully inadequate.


Finally, his proposed scheme site is currently set to cost the government and therefore the tax payer £192 million over the 40 year life of this project. This £192 million whilst being marketed as a benefit to the landowners is actually a cost to the tax payer and a [REDACTED] to the farmers to not farm food, and it is totally understandable why farmers will take this huge payoff rather than farm crops from which they only make a fraction of this sum and have to expend a great deal of labour. This money would be better spent reimbursing communities for their cost of living expenses, paying for locals to buy electric cars, as offering 10 free charging ports doesn't mean anything to people who can't afford an electric vehicle, and generally supporting UK citizens and businesses and institutions. This scheme offers no guarantee that bill payers will see any reduction in amenities bills and, with whatever best natured intent, the profits made during the production of renewable energy will be distributed to shareholders and CEOs of energy firms over and above offering affordable energy costs to consumers.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. We greatly hope that our local voices will be heard and our objections acted upon.

In summary

1. We object to this scheme's use of arable land over use of brown fields, railway lines, warehouse rooftop space or other building tops such as residential buildings
2. We object to zones D1, D8, D9 and D4 in particular due to loss of lifestyle for residents in a highly residential area, should this scheme go ahead
3. We want better protection for current wildlife, such as safe pathways through solar fields for deer, should the scheme go ahead
4. We want guaranteed jobs for members of our local community, such as beekeepers and horticultural maintenance workers on the site, should the scheme go ahead
5. We object to the reclassification of any land utilised during this scheme and insist it maintains its origin agricultural status and ownership, should the scheme go ahead
6. We object to the cost of this project to the taxpayer should the scheme go ahead
7. Should this scheme go ahead, we want greater guaranteed advantages to the members of the community within the consultation zone who will be affected, over and above the free charging of (non-existent) electric vehicles

Yours sincerely
Antonia Georgiou

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Formal objection letter (this letter) submitted to info@tweenbridgesolar.co.uk at 1pm on Thursday 08/05/2025.

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)