

[REDACTED]
Project Name: Tween Bridge Solar Farm

Planning Reference: EN010148

Interested Party Reference Number: [REDACTED]

Affected Persons: [REDACTED] (Son and Authorised Representative)

Affected Plot Number: [8/6]

Subject: Formal Submission for Deadline 2: Response to ExQ1 (Q4.0.9) APP-019

Dear Case Team / Examining Authority

I am writing to formally lodge my Written Representation regarding the proposed Tween Bridge Solar Farm. This submission provides evidence of a clear and sustained failure by the Applicant (RWE Renewables / FGP Surveyors) to engage in consistent, transparent, and fair voluntary consultation.

The Applicant is legally required to demonstrate that compulsory acquisition powers are a last resort and that genuine, reasonable negotiations have been exhausted. The chronological timeline below demonstrates that the Applicant's erratic proposals, missed appointments, short deadlines, and disregard for authorised contact protocols fall entirely short of this standard.

Factual Timeline of Consultation Failures:

22 March 2024: Initial correspondence received via email from [REDACTED]. RWE proposed cable locations and land use for grass seeding mitigation, offering £28,500 per annum (CPI index-linked) over a 40-year term (See attached Doc1).

July 2024: Site meeting held at Crow Trees with [REDACTED] to discuss three proposed cable routes.

The [REDACTED] family explicitly detailed that the land features an under-drainage system every 22 yards running into the central ditch.

It was explained that two routes would severely damage surrounding farmed land. Route C-D (4-7) was identified as the shortest and least damaging.

The family highlighted a mobile mast they own in the field of Route A-B (2-3) which already contains underground electrical cabling.

At this meeting, [REDACTED] expressly withdrew the original grass seed mitigation proposal.

19 September 2024: [REDACTED] phoned [REDACTED] to state RWE had reversed its position and now proposed placing solar panels on the land.

9 October 2024: Email received confirming the solar panel offer (See attached Doc2). No formal legal documents accompanied this fundamental change.

14 October 2024: Email sent to [REDACTED] explaining that the email we received only contained basic terms and we had received no formal paperwork.

28 October 2024: Formal documentation provided following my request on 14.10.2024. The document provided was a generic template (See attached Template Doc). RWE imposed an unreasonable and inadequate two week window for a final decision.

Given that the majority landowners had been given up to 2 years (from November 2022) to consider the solar panel terms, the family sought financial advice. This was critical due to the Autumn Budget 2024 changes to Inheritance Tax (IHT) and Business Property Relief (BPR).

14 November 2024: Email sent to [REDACTED] explaining we required longer than two weeks to gather detailed information before reaching an informed decision.

January 2025: Doncaster Chartered Accountants were commissioned by the family to provide a financial assessment report.

16 February 2025: Email sent to [REDACTED] to book a phone meeting to discuss contract terms, which was confirmed for 18 February 2025.

18 February 2025: [REDACTED] failed to attend the scheduled meeting.

20 February 2025: [REDACTED] sent a follow-up email seeking clarification on terms. The family raised critical concerns regarding agricultural sheds and yards being included in the orange survey area, as RWE required no rights there. This concern was completely ignored. The only response received was regarding solicitor fees.

March 2025: [REDACTED] phoned [REDACTED] to declare RWE had reversed its position yet again and no longer required solar panels on the land.

August – October 2025: Despite emails confirming [REDACTED] was authorised to act for his elderly father, Mr [REDACTED], FGP Surveyors bypassed [REDACTED]. They sent legal correspondence requesting agreement for cable routes A-B or C-D directly to [REDACTED].

October 2025: [REDACTED] discovered the bypassed paperwork and phoned FGP Surveyors. [REDACTED] was unavailable. [REDACTED] reiterated that he was the authorised primary point of contact. This instruction was completely disregarded.

3 March 2026: After months of silence, a letter was sent to the [REDACTED] (See attached FGP Surveyors). This letter referenced the autumn 2025 documents but omitted option C-D—the shortest, least disruptive route previously validated by [REDACTED] (Doc1). It remains entirely unclarified when or why RWE retracted option C-D. It is also noted that the email communication chain with RWE omits my input on certain dates from the ongoing email thread, creating an inaccurate record of my participation. I am able to provide the original emails I sent, including the full header and timestamp alongside the subsequent thread where I was removed.

Conclusion and Formal Requests.

The sequence of events details a pattern of shifting demands, changing what is on offer, failing to address site-specific agricultural impacts (drainage and yards), and targeting an elderly landowner while ignoring his designated representative. This does not constitute fair or meaningful negotiation.

Consequently, we respectfully request that the Examining Authority:

Refuse or Suspend Compulsory Acquisition Powers over our land plots until the Applicant engages in a transparent, consistent negotiation process.

Compel the Applicant to clarify why the least disruptive route (C-D) was unilaterally retracted.

Yours faithfully,

