

Dear National Planning Inspector

Opposition to Proposed Solar Park Development, Sub-Station & Battery Storage [BESS] Developments: Fosse Green Solar Park

I am writing to express my ongoing concern and opposition about the proposed Solar Park Development, Sub-Station and Battery Storage Developments within the context of more extensive proposed Solar Park developments including Fosse Green, in the Witham Valley to the west of Lincoln, Springwell, on Blankney Heath to the south of Lincoln, & Leoda adjacent to Brant Broughton and proposed connectivity corridors etc.

The planning decisions need to reflect the views of local communities and their strongly held concerns about the negative impact of these developments on agriculture, environment, biodiversity, and recreational amenities. It is also felt that due regard should be paid to BESS safety issues, the extent of foreign investment, the outflow of profits from the UK, and human rights concerns about production methods in China. An Executive Briefing is attached detailing a fuller list of concerns.

Despite the Government's commitment to its climate change agenda and green energy plans, we have yet to see these sorts of developments taking place within a National Strategic Energy Plan which identifies energy consumption requirements, energy production mix required to meet these including nuclear, wind and wave, solar, hydrogen, and other new technology initiatives. The most recent approvals of a number of very large solar developments by the Secretary of State without the context of a national plan that includes a future energy mix is hard to understand and leads us to the view that 'ad-hoc' and 'Klondike' style developments will continue to the detriment to local communities and food security, when there are alternatives available to be explored including, among other options 'brownfield sites', industrial, commercial & residential roof space, car parks and redundant military bases & power stations etc.

There have been a number of recently held Public Meetings in Cliff Villages which have focussed on, amongst other things, the proposed BESS developments in Navenby & Coleby, within the context of the wider Solar Park and associated facilities – it is estimated that over 1,000 people have been involved and attended these meetings with a significant majority taking strong opposition to the proposed developments.

The Planning Inspectorate is urged not to recommend these developments and the Secretary of State is urged likewise to reject this application, on the grounds of the communities sincerely held beliefs that this would prove highly detrimental as a result of the loss of good quality agricultural land, impacting on future food security, the environment, biodiversity, & recreational opportunities, safety and human rights issues, the exploration of alternatives, and the widescale industrialisation of rural landscapes.

In conclusion, there is no doubt that we need to adapt and develop a new energy mix – but not at any cost, not in any place and not by riding 'rough shod' over the views of local communities when there are alternatives that can achieve better solutions whilst protecting our food production and supply and maintaining our rural landscape.

Yours sincerely

Barry Earnshaw

Citizen of Coleby Parish

OPPOSITION TO SOLAR, SUB-STATION AND BESS DEVELOPMENTS - FOSSE GREEN SOLAR PARK

Email Letter to: National Planning Inspectorate

Dear National Planning Inspector

Opposition to Proposed Solar Park Development, Sub-Station & Battery Storage [BESS] Developments: Fosse Green Solar Park

I am writing to express my ongoing concern and opposition about the proposed Solar Park Development, Sub-Station and Battery Storage Developments within the context of more extensive proposed Solar Park developments including Fosse Green, in the Witham Valley to the west of Lincoln, Springwell, on Blankney Heath to the south of Lincoln, & Leoda adjacent to Brant Broughton and proposed connectivity corridors etc.

The planning decisions need to reflect the views of local communities and their strongly held concerns about the negative impact of these developments on agriculture, environment, biodiversity, and recreational amenities. It is also felt that due regard should be paid to BESS safety issues, the extent of foreign investment, the outflow of profits from the UK, and human rights concerns about production methods in China. An Executive Briefing is attached detailing a fuller list of concerns.

Despite the Government's commitment to its climate change agenda and green energy plans, we have yet to see these sorts of developments taking place within a **National Strategic Energy Plan** which identifies energy consumption requirements, energy production mix required to meet these including nuclear, wind and wave, solar, hydrogen, and other new technology initiatives. The most recent approvals of a number of very large solar developments by the Secretary of State without the context of a national plan that includes a future energy mix is hard to understand and leads us to the view that 'ad-hoc' and 'Klondike' style developments will continue to the detriment to local communities and food security, when there are alternatives available to be explored including, among other options 'brownfield sites', industrial, commercial & residential roof space, car parks and redundant military bases & power stations etc.

There have been a number of recently held Public Meetings in Cliff Villages which have focussed on, amongst other things, the proposed BESS developments in Navenby & Coleby, within the context of the wider Solar Park and associated facilities – it is estimated that over 1,000 people have been involved and attended these meetings with a significant majority taking strong opposition to the proposed developments.

The Planning Inspectorate is urged not to recommend these developments and the Secretary of State is urged likewise to reject this application, on the grounds of the communities sincerely held beliefs that this would prove highly detrimental as a result of the loss of good quality agricultural land, impacting on future food security, the environment, biodiversity, & recreational opportunities, safety and human rights issues, the exploration of alternatives, and the widescale industrialisation of rural landscapes.

In conclusion, there is no doubt that we need to adapt and develop a new energy mix – but not at any cost, not in any place and not by riding 'rough shod' over the views of local communities when there are alternatives that can achieve better solutions whilst protecting our food production and supply and maintaining our rural landscape.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Barry Earnshaw

Citizen of Coleby Parish

Contacts:

Email: [REDACTED]@zen.co.uk

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mob: [REDACTED]

Postal Address: [REDACTED]

**RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION – SOLAR PARKS, SUB-STATIONS AND BESS DEVELOPMENTS
NORTH KESTEVEN – 6 JUNE 2025**

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION: IMPACT OF SOLAR PARK, SUB-STATION AND BESS DEVELOPMENTS

Purpose – this paper captures the key issues in relation to these proposed developments and is provided for ease of reading and reference.

The impact of energy generation from fossil fuels on climate change is fully accepted and the consequent need for renewable green energy sources is fully recognised.

But, not at any cost, and not in any place, if it rides roughshod over the view of local communities & our countryside.

If we were objecting to a solar farm & associated facilities of about 250 acres, well away from dwellings, you could accuse us of Nimbyism but, here, we are objecting to at least 3 Solar Parks, covering c.10,000 acres and associated facilities such as Sub-Station & Battery Storage [BESS] facilities that will fundamentally alter the character of our countryside. The sheer scale of these developments will ruin the well-loved rural landscape of vast swathes of our county – and lose valuable farmland. It is not Nimbyism to object to a major degradation of the landscape for miles around your home leading to an **industrialised landscape**.

These are the main issues of our concern.

1. This development is not taking place within a **National Strategic Energy Plan** which identifies energy consumption requirements, energy production mix required to meet these including nuclear, wind and wave, solar, hydrogen, other new technology initiatives etc.
2. **We do not believe that Alternatives to solar sites** including brownfield land and commercial and domestic dwellings roofs have been fully considered, along with redundant military sites.
3. **There will be a Loss of Agricultural Land** – the latest Government Food Strategy Policy paper June 2022 clearly wants to maintain agricultural production, not reduce it, particularly in the light of recent activities with the Russia/Ukraine war and subsequent global impacts on food shortages and prices.
4. **There will be very detrimental Landscape and Visual Effects** – Effectively, Industrialisation of the Landscape: can you imagine how solar panels 3.3m high, 2m security fencing, CCTV cameras at 3.5m high, security lighting, containers housing inverters/transformers, battery storage and sub-station kit will change the character and visual appearance of our area for at least the next 40 years?
5. **Bio-diversity will suffer and there will be a Loss of Habitat** - transitory animals will have their traditional routes blocked and may be diverted onto roads; bird and bat deaths will be common as they mistake the glass for water; the land will be degraded with little potential for biodiversity as half of it will be in permanent shadow and rain water run-off will create set channels with impeded drainage.
6. **Recreational Amenity will be damaged and degraded**– some public rights of way will be closed or diverted during construction – others wending their way through seas of glass – what will compensate for the loss of the pleasure experienced by residents and others walking, riding or cycling existing routes?
7. **There are concerns for Archaeology and Heritage** – these developments are adjacent to some important archaeological and heritage sites dating back to Roman times – will there be an impact assessment on this and other heritage areas including impact on listed buildings within the area?
8. **Battery Storage close to habitation is an unknown and unacceptable risk** - are we heading for another national building regulation scandal? There will be thousands of enormous Li-ion batteries littering the Lincolnshire countryside. What will be the future viability of the many proposed solar parks if even one of these batteries suffers a run-away and endangers human life?

**RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION – SOLAR PARKS, SUB-STATIONS AND BESS DEVELOPMENTS
NORTH KESTEVEN – 6 JUNE 2025**

9. **There is concern for Flooding – there will be** additional flood risk caused by surface water run-off from panels and contributing to potential flooding of adjacent land and diversion into the Rivers Witham & Brant and other water courses.
10. **Traffic and Transport will be badly affected** – there will be disruption, traffic, environmental damage, dust, road safety and potential accident issues for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers for up to 2 years during construction phase, significant HGV movements and road crossings including the A607, A17 & A46.
11. **Construction will add to traffic disruption** – piling of solar panel mounting structures will be noisy and very dusty & there will be potential noise pollution from sub-stations & BESS facilities – main construction compound and secondary compounds with significant numbers of workers.
12. **There are Human Rights Concerns** – reported evidence of Uyghur forced labour used in the supply chain in China – at the very least why not include the development of these components in a UK Industrial Strategy?
13. **We should not be even considering a Monopoly Supply** - relying on China for the supply of solar panels is a potential security risk. Is it wise for the UK to allow China to manufacture a key component of our power infrastructure thereby gaining access to otherwise confidential data and information – adjacent to sensitive military bases including RAF Waddington and RAF Digby?
14. **Efficiency** - The net capacity factor is the ratio of actual electrical energy output, over a given period, to the theoretical maximum electrical energy output over that period. In terms of net capacity, solar farms are much less effective than offshore wind power. In 2021, a Department of Energy and Climate Change report quoted the capacity factor of offshore Wind Power at 37.4% and Photovoltaic Power at 10%. Solar power is also far more suited to hot countries where peak demand is for summer air-conditioning. The developers, in a presentation to NKDC, quoted battery storage as approximately 2 hours of production. So, how much power will Solar Parks contribute on a cold winter night, 2 hours after sunset, as demand in the UK peaks?

Conclusions

15. There is no doubt that we need to adapt and develop a new energy mix – but not at any cost and not in any place and there are alternatives that can achieve this whilst protecting our food production and supply and maintaining our rural landscape in more cost efficient and effective ways.
16. A nationally planned approach is the way forward rather than this speculative ‘Gold-Rush/Klondike’ style approach we are presently experiencing.

These comments are from Barry Earnshaw, a Citizen of Coleby Parish – contact details are below.

[REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]@zen.co.uk; Tel: [REDACTED]; Mob: [REDACTED]

Ref: BE:V4 – 28/03/2025