

Submission to Planning Inspectorate Re Fosse Green Energy Ltd - EN010154

Re Open Floor Hearing 1 - 11 March 2026

Carl Koenen – IP No: [REDACTED] - Resident of Thorpe on the Hill

1. In my submission to the ExA in response to the January Issue Specific Hearing 1 I stated that I am **opposed** to the proposed Fosse Green Energy solar development planned for the land between the Parishes of: Thorpe on the Hill, Aubourn & Haddington, Thurlby, Witham St Hughes, Norton Disney, Bassingham, Boothby Graffoe, Coleby and Navenby.
2. This opposition is based on a belief that solar panels for energy production on the scale proposed belong not on rural farmland but on industrial roofs. An overriding concern is the scale of the project and as a resident of Thorpe on the Hill our parish will see 75% of our land area given over to Fosse Green's development plans in the event that the project comes to construction. **During ISH1 the applicant confirmed that the total area of solar panel developments, less cable corridor and areas for associated BESS, across all the development sites would amount to 1136 acres (460 hectares). With the area of Thorpe on the Hill having 862 acres (349 hectares) of development this means that 75% of the total Fosse Green development would be found within the parish boundary of Thorpe on the Hill.**
3. I believe the scale of this proposed development is too extreme. The above figures aside taking the four most badly affected parishes will see the following percentage of their land area taken over by solar panels and associated areas and infrastructure: Thorpe on the Hill 47%, Bassingham 27%, Aubourn & Haddington 26% and Thurlby 20.5%. These figures have been arrived up by analyzing the data provided in APP022 Book of Reference and APP 007 Land Plans.
4. At a recent Community Liaison meeting with the Applicant's team, they stated that the expected life time of the panels would be 30-40 years. Bearing in mind the proposal is to see our rural fields covered by these panels for 60 years this suggests that all panels would require being replaced prior to the development reaching its 60th year. So effectively we are not looking at one solar development but two. Presumably replacement will be managed over a period of years requiring the associated disruption from engineering traffic to replace the non-efficient panels. This will have a negative impact on all the communities within the proposed developed area. This particular point was covered by other speakers so

I will not go into further detail here. But the Applicant's plans to have a level of overplanting of arrays at 1.59 has been repeatedly exposed as excessive.

5. There seems to be a total lack of understanding by the Applicant of how communities feel about these proposals. I note that the ExA in their written questions and request for information issued on the 27th February 2026 question number LV 2.03 to the Applicant has quite rightly picked up on their assertion that solar panels are perceived differently by different individuals *"...some will perceive them as unwanted, industrial and urbanizing; others will see them as important, sensitive, rural and even agricultural. When solar farms were first introduced to our landscapes they would have seemed alien. However, the prevalence of these features within the countryside, a function of nearly 20 years of construction and operation, requires recognition that solar farms have become a more commonplace landscape character type, much in the same way we acknowledge golf courses or greenhouses / polytunnels. Furthermore, it has been recognized that beyond a certain distance, solar arrays lose definition and assume a 'washed-over' appearance. As a result, solar farms are perceived as blocks of faded colour within an established agricultural landscape..."* This is taken from para 3.3 of Appendix 7-D of the ES (Environmental Statement) (Detailed Heritage Asset Assessment [APP – 127]).
6. It will be interesting to read the Applicant's response in being able to identify the evidential basis underpinning the above quotation as requested by the ExA. Both NKDC and LCC have been asked by the ExA if they agree with the views expressed. I am not sure how the Applicant could genuinely believe that such a remark as above could possibly help improve how the communities would react given that they will be so negatively affected by the Fosse Green proposals.
7. In reality this is a proposal based on the initiative of a few wealthy land owners that Windel Energy have jumped upon. In the event that planning approval is granted there is little likelihood that Windel Energy will see the plans through to operation in the same way as the Mallard Pass application which was sold on.
8. Lincolnshire has been singled out as an easy touch for multiple unwanted solar developments all of which impact on rural communities and the nation's food security.

SOLAR ON ROOFS NOT ON FARMLAND