

Summary of Objection – Fosse Green Energy Planning Application (EN010154)

Submitted by: Michael Campbell (Interested Party Ref: [REDACTED])

Deadline: Examination Deadline 1 – 20 January 2026

Michael Campbell submits a formal objection to the Fosse Green Energy (FGE) solar and battery storage proposal, expanding on concerns raised at the examination hearing. He argues that the development would cause irreversible harm to the local environment, landscape, community wellbeing, agriculture, and economy, and that it fails to comply with national planning policy.

Key Objection Areas:

1. Location & Site Selection

- The applicant misrepresents National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-3.
- National policy prioritises:
 - Proximity to existing grid infrastructure.
 - Minimising new infrastructure.
 - Use of brownfield, industrial, contaminated, or previously developed land.
- The site was chosen opportunistically after being offered by local landowners, not through a national or policy-led site selection process.
- Only alternative sites in a small area of Lincolnshire were considered, inappropriate for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.
- Lincolnshire is already a net exporter of electricity.
- Clean Power 2030 and NESO reforms emphasise grid proximity and brownfield land, undermining FGE's justification.
- Government correspondence (Prime Minister's office and Treasury) reinforces brownfield-first policy and the need to justify agricultural land use, which the applicant has not done.

Conclusion: The site selection is non-compliant, opportunistic, and contrary to national guidance.

2. Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) NESO confirmed in December 2025 that BESS capacity is three times oversubscribed nationally, making this proposal unnecessary.

- The application lacks clarity on:
 - Whether BESS will be centralised or dispersed etc.
 - Grid connection status.
- Serious safety concerns are raised:
 - UK Health Security Agency and Fire Industry Association warnings about fire, vapour clouds, long-duration fires, and contaminated runoff.
- Dispersed BESS would increase land take and landscape harm.
- Accident rate assumptions are considered unrealistic.
- No clear national guidance exists on safe separation distances.

Requests:

- Withdraw the BESS element, or
 - Require clarification, evidence of grid connection, and a separate planning application for BESS.
-

3. Funding & Applicant Credibility

- Concerns about the applicant's financial robustness:
 - Apparent lack of capital, employees, and substance.
 - Complex debt-linked corporate structure extending internationally.

- The Planning Inspectorate has already questioned funding, a concern the submission supports.
-

4. Impact on Landscape & Visual Amenity

- Permanent transformation from open agricultural land to industrial landscape.
 - Construction impacts lasting 2–2.5 years, followed by decades of operational impacts.
 - Loss of open views, creation of “tunnelled” corridors, and loss of over 30 public footpaths.
 - Cumulative impact of multiple solar schemes across Lincolnshire is unacceptable.
 - Claims that land is “temporary use” are rejected; land will not realistically return to food production.
 - Negative impacts on agricultural employment and supply chains.
-

5. Impact on Tourism

- Tourism is the second-largest local economic sector.
 - Harm to:
 - Walking routes and caravan parks.
 - Visitors to Commonwealth War Graves and historic church sites.
 - The internationally recognised “Lost Village” music festival.
 - Industrialisation risks damaging the area’s visitor appeal and economy.
-

6. Traffic & Highways

- Increased HGV and worker traffic on narrow, unclassified rural roads.
 - Roads are unsuitable for heavy vehicles and already in poor condition.
 - Risks to safety, damage to verges and kerbs, and parking-related hazards in Thurlby.
 - Identified routes (e.g. Bassingham Road, Clay Lane) are considered wholly inappropriate.
-

7. Decommissioning & Panel Recycling

- Contradictory statements by the applicant regarding:
 - Uncertainty of future decommissioning.
 - Claims of quick and easy land restoration.
 - Lack of clarity on:
 - Decommissioning costs & funding mechanisms (in current values).
 - PV panels are nearing obsolescence and likely to be obsolete within 10–15 years.
 - Recycling claims are vague; future disposal likely to involve contaminated industrial waste.
 - Applicant has not demonstrated credible technical, financial, or logistical plans for end-of-life management.
-

Overall Conclusion

- The harms of the proposal significantly outweigh any benefits. The application fails to comply with national planning policy, particularly on site selection and land use.
- Agricultural land use has not been justified.
- Key details remain unclear or unsupported.
- The application should be **refused**.

Michael Campbell, interested party reference [REDACTED]

Submission, reference the Fosse Green Energy Planning Application – EN010154, for deadline 1 of the Planning Examination i.e. 20/01/2026.

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

This is a further formal objection to this application and confirmation and expansion of my submission at the recent hearing.

I wish to address the following:-

1. Location & Site Selection
2. Battery Storage
3. Funding
4. Impact on Landscape
5. Impact on Tourism
6. Traffic & Highways.
7. De-commissioning and panel recycling

Introduction:

I, and my family, live in the Hamlet of Thurlby, near Lincoln. We face with being surrounded, and impacted, by between half and three-quarters of a million industrial solar panels, many thousands of storage batteries plus associated equipment, security infrastructure plus completely inappropriate and destructive HGV, and other, traffic invasion. This would result in the consequent, irreversible destruction of our environment and the way we live our lives.

The nature and character of our environment is not something theoretical, notional or valueless. I spend numerous hours – virtually every day – out walking with my dog, typically covering between 5 and 9 kilometres per day. This is very important to my health and well being. This will be destroyed if this proposed project is implemented. Please note that I am not alone in this regard, there are many, many people in this area who also will similarly be disadvantaged and their health and wellbeing seriously degraded. The proposed loss of in excess of 30 public footpaths is totally unacceptable as is the “tunnelling” effect of the created corridors and the loss of our open landscape.

1. Location & Site Selection:

It is believed that Fosse Green Energy (FGE) misrepresents National Policy in this regard when they state “*the proposed location is suitable and aligns with national policy, including EN-1 and EN-3.*”

The first key point is that of “Proximity to Infrastructure” and that EN-1 and EN-3 both emphasise that sites should:

- Be reasonably close to grid connection points (substations, transmission lines).
- To choose sites that can achieve a grid connection to an existing electricity substation with capacity.
- Minimise the need for extensive new infrastructure, especially long grid connections.
- Support efficient delivery and operation of the energy system.
- **That Grid accessibility is a material locational consideration.**

The second key point is that of “Land Use”. National Policy (NPS EN-3 -reference Paras 2.10.21, 2.10.23, 2.10.17) prioritises the use of brownfield, previously developed, contaminated and industrial land for solar projects.

- There are numerous and various alternative locations which would have emerged from a proper, professional site selection process across the UK. This is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and should be taking a National perspective on appropriate sites which are compliant with the National Policy.
- As of January 2026, there are approximately **29,977 hectares** (roughly 74,000 acres) of available **Brownfield land across England**. It is estimated that this accounts for approximately 8.7% to 9% of all land in England. Further, Brownfield is considered a "constantly renewing resource"; the number of available sites increased by about **16%** between 2023 and 2024 as more land in town centres and industrial areas became redundant.
- The FGE Site Selection Report (Para 2.3.1, Appendix A, document APP-185) clearly states that the site was selected as the result of an approach from local landowners. It was not selected following a search for sites that would utilise the types of land that NPS EN-3 prioritises for solar deployment (brownfield, previously developed, contaminated and industrial land) or sites that could achieve a connection to the existing grid infrastructure, as also prioritised by NPS EN-3. The Site Selection Report only considers alternative sites within a small area of Lincolnshire, indeed North Kesteven for a National project.
- The proposed justification by FGE for this application is founded upon the National requirement to develop “green energy resources” rather than a North Kesteven, or even a Lincolnshire, requirement.
- Please note that Lincolnshire is viewed as a net exporter of electricity to the rest of the UK due to having an oversupply of electricity for local Lincolnshire requirements.

The Clean Power 2030 Initiative further contradicts and undermines FGE’s site selection. This initiative emphasises strategic site selection for energy infrastructure, with key conditions and criteria used for selecting site locations highlighting:-

- Proximity to existing grid infrastructure,
- Brownfield land — previously developed and now disused — is explicitly preferred for clean energy infrastructure due to faster permitting and community acceptance.

Please note that NESO, in its November 2025 reform of the National grid connections pipeline, has stated that compliance with the **The Clean Power 2030 Initiative**, will be a major decision making factor in the selection of which projects gain grid connection status. This applies to both BESS and Solar projects.

As regards the National Policy in this matter, I wish to draw attention to a quote contained in a letter from the **Minister for Net Zero and Energy Security written on behalf of the Prime Minister** – to myself in March 2025 (Appendix No 1.). It says:-

“All solar projects are subject to a rigorous planning process, in which the views and interests of local communities are considered. Planning guidance makes clear that, wherever possible developers should utilise brownfield, industrial, contaminated, or previously developed land. Where the development of agricultural land is shown to be necessary, lower-quality land should be preferred to higher-quality land. The Government recognises that England has limited land, with demands on it growing, including for vital clean energy infrastructure. The Government will introduce a Land Use Framework to consider how we balance competing demands and transform how we use land. The Framework will work hand-in-hand with the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP). The SSEP will assess and identify the optimal locations, quantities and types of energy infrastructure required for generation and storage, as well as relevant hydrogen assets, across a range of plausible futures, to meet our future energy demand with the clean, affordable and secure supply that we need”.

I do not believe that the applicant is compliant with the above Planning Guidance.

A further endorsement of this policy is contained in a letter written by the **Financial Secretary to the Treasury, written on behalf of the Chancellor Of The Exchequer in September 2025. (Appendix No 2.)**

Please see the following quote:

*“The precise location of solar farms is a matter for developers. However, we are aware that one of the factors which shape these choices is the **availability of local grid capacity**, including in areas near former large-scale power stations. Planning guidance makes clear that, wherever possible, developers should utilise brownfield, industrial, contaminated, or previously developed land. Where the development of agricultural land is shown to be necessary, lower-quality land should be preferred to higher-quality land.*

I do not believe that the applicant has proven that the use of agricultural land is “necessary”. In their case it is purely opportunistic and driven by the “lowest cost” approach that seems to pervade so much of this application.

In summary, I contend that an appropriate Site Selection process for an application for renewable energy installations – especially solar – should be conducted in line with National Policy and on a National Perspective rather than exclusively in a small, focussed section of “offered up” land in North Kesteven, Lincolnshire.

2. Battery Energy Storage System (BESS):

The recent National Energy System Operator’s (NESO) announcement, of 8th December 2025, recognised that the position on achieving the UK government’s target capacity had reached a status of being three times oversubscribed in actual and development pipeline capacity. Consequently, the proposed BESS in this application is surplus to national need and should be withdrawn from the application.

Further the lack of detail about what the applicant is actually proposing, both undermines one’s ability to comprehend what we might be facing, and curtails one’s ability to properly comment. Consequently, my comments are restricted to the following.

- If the applicant is not withdrawing the BESS element of this project:-
 - We request that the Inspectorate require the applicant to urgently clarify what is actually being planned e.g. centralised or dispersed?
 - We request that the Inspectorate require the applicant to urgently **evidence** the grid connection status.

Regardless of the lack of detail provided by the application, there are serious, founded concerns regarding BESS safety.

- We would like to draw the Inspectorate’s attention to the advice from the UK Health Security Agency, 9th October 2025, to NKDC, which raises serious and well-documented concerns regarding the safety of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS).
- Further, I would like to draw attention to the following quote from “The Fire Industry Association” published on 27th May 2025.

“A senior fire officer has called for greater authority to enforce safety standards at battery energy storage systems (BESS), as concerns over fire risks mount. BESS facilities store renewable energy, often from wind and solar farms, using thousands of lithium-ion batteries housed in shipping-style containers. This stored energy can then be released into the grid during times of high demand. However, the scale and nature of these installations are raising red flags among fire services.

Henry Griffin, Suffolk's Deputy Chief Fire Officer, described BESS sites as an "emerging risk" and acknowledged growing concern within local communities.

"There can be complications with vapour clouds and fires will last a long time," Mr Griffin said. "It is an emerging risk for us and we are alive to it."

- If the proposal is to distribute multiple BESS "compounds" across the site, this significantly increases the land area affected and exacerbates the adverse impact on the landscape.
- Whether the units are clustered or dispersed, the applicant's reliance on an overly optimistic accident rate is not credible. In particular, the assertion that a fire would not spread to adjacent units and that contaminated fire-fighting water would not enter local watercourses is unsupported by real-world evidence.
- I contend that planning permission should not be granted until clearer and more stringent national guidance is in place regarding minimum safe separation distances between BESS installations.
- Given the distinct and substantial safety risks involved, the BESS element should be the subject of a separate planning application and assessed independently from the associated solar development.
- I believe that the applicant portrayed a complacent attitude to this very real emerging position at the examination meeting.

3. Funding:

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference EN010154 Application Document Reference EN010154/APP/4.2

There is considerable concern arising from the financial nature, and lack of corporate substance of the applicant and its corporate connections. There appears to be just a trail of debt, no capital and an absence of employees, extending from FGE through its connections to Canadian Solar Projects Ltd in the UK and then internationally to the Netherlands and Canada.

I note that the Inspectorate in its letter, EN010154 Date: 22 August 2025, queried the Funding position of the applicant – I support this challenge.

4. Impact on Landscape – Visual Impact

The visual impact of this area will change irretrievably from open fields to an industrial landscape. Lincolnshire has an age-old agricultural foundation which surrounds isolated dwellings and hamlets such as ours. It is not only the solar panels that will impact the landscape, but the construction of the project, traffic, noise, pollution for at least two to two and a half years. There is then the ongoing maintenance, lighting, high hedges forming a 'tunnel' effect. Forty to sixty years is hardly 'temporary' and in reality the land will never be able to be returned to growing crops thus impacting on our food security. Jobs will have been lost in all sectors connected with agriculture, including haulage companies, seed and fertiliser suppliers and the extensive supply chain which is dependent on the countryside for their livelihood. The cumulative impact of the many schemes in Lincolnshire should be taken into account as they will have an unacceptable impact on the character of the landscape.

5. Impact on Tourism:

The visual impact will also be felt on the tourism industry in this area as this is the second largest economy after agriculture. There are walking routes and caravan parks within the proposed site around Thurlby and as mentioned previously, visitors come from all around the Country and the World to walk, stay on the caravan parks and remember those in the Commonwealth War Graves and other military graves in the grounds of our historic Church. Additionally, the immediate area is host to what has become an internationally recognised and visited music festival – The Lost Village. This is a significant social and economic event for our area which will be at risk if this industrialisation of our community proceeds.

6. Traffic and Highways:

Another main issue of concern is the traffic that will be generated around our hamlet. The routing of HGVs through Thurlby is potentially dangerous. These are unclassified roads, in some places barely wide enough for two cars to pass, and two HGVs trying to pass on the narrow roads destroys verges and kerbs. The roads are hardly fit for purpose as it is and the extra input of HGVs, additional vehicles for workers and continued maintenance is not acceptable in this area. Vehicles are frequently parked on Bassingham Road in Thurlby which can create a traffic hazard and make access for large vehicles more dangerous. Clay Lane, another road identified as a 'suitable' route is also very narrow, potholed and has no passing places, hardly suitable for existing traffic and definitely not suitable for heavy vehicles.

7. De-commissioning & Panel Recycling:

As regards the former point above, I was confused (easily done!) at the examination hearing by the applicant when discussing this aspect commenting how this was so far in the future and such an unknown that they were unable to provide much detail. Then at a later session, when being pushed about food security, stating how easy and quickly the solar installations could be removed and the land speedily producing crops again. I ask that the Examination requires that the applicant clarify the position about de-commissioning and – in current day values – the planned costs.

As regards panel recycling, I believe that the applicant is being disingenuous. These types of PV panels are in the obsolescent stage of their product lifecycle and will be obsolete within 10 to (maximum) 15 years. No-one will be producing this type of PV solar panel, in 40 let alone 60 years. Solar technology is already moving to film substrates. So the position is left with "materials' recovery". The applicant's position on this is very vague, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. Just wishing/hoping that a solution to a very real problem will emerge sometime in the future does not seem good enough. They would be inflicting a very significant contaminated materials' disposal situation on the area and they need to prove that they have costed, funded and technical plans to clean up this very significant future industrial waste problem.

Conclusion:

- I do not believe that this application provides benefits which outweigh its many disadvantages.
- I do not believe that the applicant has complied with National Planning Policy in numerous regards and with special reference to the Site Location and an associated survey exercise.
- I do not believe that the applicant has justified the use of any agricultural land.
- I do not believe that the applicant has provided appropriate and accurate details on many matters e.g. what is proposed to go where, how will it be maintained and how will it be de-commissioned.
- **I do believe that this application should be turned down.**

Please note that I endorse and support the submissions from both Thurlby Parish and The Cliff Villages Solar Action Group.

Michael Campbell

Reference [REDACTED]

Appendix No 1.



Letter from Minister for Energy Security and Net Zero P1.pdf



Letter from Minister for Energy Security and Net Zero P2.pdf

Appendix No 2.



Letter from Financial Sec to Treasury P1.pdf



Letter from Financial Sec to Treasury P2.pdf