

# Springwell Solar Action Group (SSAG)

## Response to the Fosse Green Application

Reference: [REDACTED]

Good afternoon,

We are representing the Springwell Solar Action Group.

Our group has worked closely with the Cliff Villages Action Group and with resident groups from surrounding villages that will all be directly impacted by this application. We are wholly opposed to the industrialisation of the Lincolnshire countryside proposed under the Fosse Green scheme.

Whilst we acknowledge that there has been minor adjustments to the project, the development remains colossal in scale. It would fundamentally transform a beautiful, quiet rural environment into an industrial power plant. Community feedback has been consistently ignored throughout this process.

	<b>Parish Total Acres (Hectares)</b>	<b>Fosse Green Acres (Hectares)</b>	<b>% of Parish land taken</b>
Thorpe on the Hil	1820 (737)	862 (349)	47%
Aubourn & Haddington	2110 (854)	554 (224)	26%
Thurlby	1840 (745)	378 (153)	20.5 %
Witham St Hughes	1025 (415)	18 (7)	1.75%
Norton Disney	2305 (933)	7 (3)	0.3%
Bassingham	3015 (1221)	826 (334)	27%
Boothby Graffoe	2000 (810)	334 (135)	17%
Coleby	2500 (1012)	153 (62)	6%
Navenby	2110 (854)	229 (93)	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>18725 (7581)</b>	<b>3361 (1360)</b>	

## Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

The site is surrounded by high-grade, fertile agricultural land. Under no circumstances should the Government, energy speculators, or landowners be permitted to destroy decades of successful farming in the name of Net Zero.

Over the last 18 months it has become increasingly clear that current Net Zero targets are unachievable under the present approach and are already causing measurable harm to the UK's economic output and standard of living. There are sensible and balanced alternatives to increase energy production, including:

- Solar on rooftops and brownfield sites
- Offshore wind

- Small Modular Nuclear Reactors (SMRs)

As a community, we embrace sensible and proportionate change. This scheme is neither sensible nor proportionate. It is fundamentally designed to:

- A. Tick a climate change compliance box
- B. Generate significant financial gain for the landowner
- C. Provide guaranteed income for the applicant or future owners through increasingly questionable subsidy mechanisms

None of these outcomes benefits British consumers. Electricity prices continue to rise, and there are serious questions about whether schemes of this nature deliver any meaningful or efficient contribution towards Net Zero.

There are significant concerns with the whole process of Site Selection and Policy Conflict. The applicant misrepresents national policy when claiming alignment with NPS EN 1 and EN 3.

Both policies prioritise:

- Proximity to existing grid infrastructure
- Minimising new grid construction
- Use of brownfield, previously developed, and industrial land

The applicant's own Site Selection Report confirms the site was chosen because it was offered by local landowners, not because it complied with national policy priorities.

As of January 2026, there are approximately 29,977 hectares of available brownfield land across England—around 8.7–9% of total land area. Why has this developer simply looked at this location to provide a solution that is classed as a national infrastructure project? They should be compelled to conduct a national site search. Furthermore the amount of land being consumed for this reckless project should not be classed as a NSIP. Even on the applicants own optimistic calculations they claim it could only provide power for a maximum of 110,000 homes. This is not a National Significant number.

The Clean Power 2030 Initiative reinforces the importance of strategic, brownfield led site selection and directly contradicts this application. There is currently no Grid Connection.

Fosse Green, like Springwell Solar, currently has no confirmed grid connection. Consent cannot reasonably be granted for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project that relies on a separate, unconsented substation application.

There are also serious concerns that energy generated would not serve UK consumers but instead be exported via interconnectors. This project will not reduce electricity bills.

## **1. Cumulative Effects**

We are deeply concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple energy projects currently under consideration across North Kesteven and wider Lincolnshire.

Taken together, these developments will result in the loss of thousands of acres of prime farmland, permanently transforming the county into an industrial landscape. Many of these applications cannot even guarantee the outputs they claim to deliver.

Lincolnshire relies heavily on agriculture and tourism. Approval of these projects will have devastating consequences for both sectors, impacting farming, allied rural trades, local employment, and training pathways. We also host a further education college that provides young people with a route into agriculture—a sector now being systematically destroyed by this reckless rush to Net Zero.

## **2. Landscape and Visual Impact**

We live in a stunning landscape, rich in wildlife and widely enjoyed by walkers, cyclists, runners, and horse riders through routes such as the Steeples and Stepping Out walks.

Approval of this scheme would send a clear message that local people, wildlife, and wellbeing do not matter. There is no reasonable assessment that can conclude this development will not have a devastating visual and landscape impact.

Photomontages presented by the applicant rely on hedgerow screening without acknowledging that hedges take up to 10 years to establish. Notably, no equivalent visualisations are provided for the BESS compounds—raising concerns over deliberate omission.

The area supports migrating birds that rely on open countryside for feeding and breeding. There is clear evidence that birds mistake solar panels for water, resulting in fatalities. This, combined with fencing, CCTV, constant inverter noise, light pollution, and habitat loss, will severely damage biodiversity and community wellbeing.

## **Long-Term Responsibility and Land Restoration**

There are significant and unanswered questions surrounding the future of the land.

Windel Energy and Recurrent Energy—more accurately described as Canadian Solar subsidiaries—are not farmers. It is highly unlikely they will own this development long-term. The probability is that the scheme will be sold on at substantial profit.

- Who will be responsible for land restoration in 60 years?
- Why is a 60-year consent being sought at all?
- What verifiable evidence exists to support claims that no long-term damage will be done to the soil?

The applicant has repeatedly claimed that the land will be returned to farming in its original condition. If that is genuinely the case, this must be written into the DCO, with a binding

requirement for restoration to Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, with zero contamination. A clear enforcement and financial penalty mechanism must also be included.

## **Environmental Contamination Risks**

We may be naïve, but we are not stupid. This proposal risks turning thousands of acres of high-quality farmland into a permanent brownfield industrial complex. There is significant concern around contamination from PFAS and heavy metals leaching from panels, cables, and associated infrastructure, compounded by the risks posed by Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS).

It is deeply concerning in 2026 to face the prospect of Lincolnshire farmland being covered with solar panels manufactured in China, potentially linked to Uyghur forced labour.

The applicants should be required to publish a fully transparent supply chain, including panel and battery manufacturers. It is known that equivalent developers have sourced from companies such as [REDACTED].

No equipment should be permitted if linked in any way to modern-day slavery. If consent is granted, the DCO must include explicit requirements for supply-chain transparency and, where possible, local sourcing—including UK-produced steel.

## **Battery Storage and Risk**

BESS failures are not hypothetical. Incidents at Moss Landing (USA), Statera Energy (Essex), and Carnegie Road (Liverpool) demonstrate the real dangers.

Industry experts acknowledge that BESS incidents are likely—the unknown variable is their scale. Risks include fire, toxic smoke, chemical leakage, groundwater contamination, and heavy metals such as lithium, cobalt, nickel, and manganese entering ecosystems.

The applicant is putting all the risk on the local community and the local emergency services. There is no liabilities on the applicant. Who will be responsible for remediation?

Expecting communities to simply “trust” developers is wholly unreasonable. History—from Grenfell to Bhopal to PFAS contamination in the USA—shows that large corporations often fail, with communities bearing the consequences.

Why has this applicant and all other applicants not provided any visuals of what BESS facilities will look like? Once again they are not portraying an honest view on how this development will impact the visual aspect for the local community.

## **Conclusion**

Our communities have worked tirelessly for several years to oppose these solar industrial factories. We have the support of the majority of Lincolnshire MPs, the Mayor of Lincolnshire, and the leadership of Lincolnshire County Council.

Once the corporations and landowners have taken their profits and moved on, it will be local people who live with the permanent consequences.

We urge the Planning Inspectorate to **reject the Fosse Green application.**