

SUBMISSION FOR DEADLINE 7

PROJECT: Tween Bridge Solar Farm (Examination Ref: EN010148)

FROM: [REDACTED] Raymond Everatt Lindley

INTERESTED PARTY REF: [REDACTED]

AFFECTED PLOTS: [REDACTED]

CATEGORY: Comments on any further information received by Deadline 6.

Purpose of this Submission

1. This statement provides my formal comments on the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 (which itself was submitted at Deadline 6) **[document 8.28]** and specifically the responses provided by the Applicant in Table 8 of that document.

Route Selection and Engagement

2. Notwithstanding the Applicant's comments regarding the route selection, my position remains that it has not satisfactorily addressed the consultation concerns (or lack of consultation) given the omission of providing details of the A-B route to those representing me. As such, there was a clear failure to communicate the final iteration of the project with those representing me to allow time for full and proper consideration of the A-B route ahead of the Order being submitted for Examination.
3. Accordingly, I was denied the opportunity to put forward concerns regarding the route chosen. Had I been given this opportunity it may have impacted the Applicant's route selection or indeed may have resulted in consideration of a variation of Route A-B, which would have a lesser impact on my land and agricultural operations. To suggest this is now all too late and or would cost the Applicant more money is completely unsatisfactory. Commercial cost-saving for a private developer does not justify stripping a private landowner of property rights. As I have previously noted the Applicant is simply shifting engineering difficulties away from public highways and placing the disruption and impact onto my land, which as detailed in this representation, is in no way limited impact.
4. Further, there is no consideration to the location of my subterranean electricity cable, which runs through route A-B, and will therefore be impacted. The Applicant has not sought to address the concerns I have raised in this regard.

Land Referencing Failure

5. The Applicant continues to deny any deficiency within the Book of Reference. However, as I have previously set out, the telecommunications mast on my land is not owned or operated by BT, as the Applicant has set out to date.
6. Therefore, the approach the Applicant has taken in assuming that a lack of engagement from BT is because they are adequately protected is a complete fallacy. As I have previously detailed BT has not engaged simply because they do not own the asset and are therefore not affected. Yet, as the actual freeholder, I have been ignored in this regard. Due to this failure of diligent inquiry I have been entirely denied my statutory right to be consulted on the structural, physical and operational risks to my private structure.
7. It is noted that an updated Book of Reference is to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 8. It will be interesting to see if the issues around the telecommunications mast are addressed in this, notwithstanding the Applicant's inability to confirm during the Examination that an error has been made.

Ongoing Negotiations and Human Rights Implications

8. The Applicant comments several times that they would prefer to reach a voluntary agreement and that negotiations are ongoing to resolve specific issues of concern. However, as previously noted in my Deadline 6 submission, the terms for a voluntary easement that are being put forward by the Applicant remain such that they would result in a significant detriment to myself and my ability to develop the family agricultural business in the future, that is, if they can even be satisfied in the first place, given the terms upon which the Applicant has proposed.
9. Notwithstanding my concerns of the terms of which the Applicant is offering to negotiate upon, these attempts to negotiate are being made very late in the Examination process. No attempts to acquire the rights, sought under the Order, by voluntary agreement were made prior to the submission of the Order for Examination.
10. Overall, this very limited meaningful engagement is contrary to guidance in the use of compulsory purchase powers.

11. Furthermore, the powers sought in the Order are excessive and are therefore not reasonable or proportionate, as such the Order is not fully compliant with legislation on Human Rights.

Dated: 28.09.2026

■ Vivian Lindley on the behalf of ■ Raymond Lindley