

Fosse Green Energy (FGE) Examination.

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

Deadline: Examination Deadline 4 – 31st March 2026

Introduction:

I need to ask for some help and guidance from the Examining Authority. In this round of examination following the Open Floor Hearing there has only been a short period of time, during which I believe that the applicant has submitted between some 2,000 and 4,000 pages of material. It is an impossible task for “amateurs”, individuals and people with lives to live to be able to exercise our democratic right – and responsibility – in evaluating this volume of material. It does seem that this is a deliberate ploy to “swamp” the situation with such a volume of material and prevent proper scrutiny of their proposal and plans.

What can be done/accommodated to enable some appropriate understanding and scrutiny of the applicant’s volume of materials? Can appropriate submissions be made further forward in the examining process?

Comment:

I do have two brief comments that I do wish to submit at this point, but would like to be able to return to these at a later juncture in the process.

1. Site Selection:

- 1.1 The applicant seems to have adopted the old tactic of answering a question that was not actually asked. This relates to the South Wales versus Lincolnshire location question and the “National” aspect. What I have, and am, challenging is the supposed “Location Survey” which does not identify, evaluate and reject any locations either in South Wales or elsewhere in England, but happens to select an obscure site in Lincolnshire. I am not challenging the position relating to the planning requirements for a “National Survey” but the applicant’s quality, and genuineness, of their supposed professional “Survey”. There is no explanation as to how the applicant – based in South Wales – did not evaluate any sites in that location, especially with its favourable characteristics, nor any in England before “Magically” arriving in this location near Lincoln. Basically I do not believe that a planning requirements’ based survey was conducted.
- 1.2 The applicant makes much of the site suitability due to the supposed grid connect at Navenby. This is not accepted. It is well known locally that the applicant was invited into the area by a landowner who wanted out of farming. The key planning consideration is that in this original location choice the supposed connection to the National Grid was to be at Whisby. Where the current floating solar project at Whisby is having a connection to the National Grid. It is understood that NESO rejected the plan to have the FGE project connected at Whisby. This all completely undermines and negates the comments that this site was chosen through a professional, planning requirements’ based survey and had the feasibility of a grid connection at Navenby. The concept of a Navenby substation did not exist when the applicant was in the first discussions with the relevant local landowner.
- 1.3 My understanding is that for a site to be “suitable” in planning consideration and thereby obviate the need for national, regional or just wider location evaluation, it should be brownfield, etc land AND have an available grid connection. This original site choice fails on all these points.

2. Battery Storage:

- 2.1 The opaque position here is seemingly typical of the lack of quality and detail in this application. I do not believe that the applicant’s Environmental Impact Statement adequately evaluates and addresses the impact of BOTH the options now being tabled.

2.2 Is this a genuine position of retaining flexibility, or just trying to keep as many options (not assessed) open as is possible. Why the lack of clarity? Is the applicant not good enough to know what works best in their project? Is it to do with making the project more attractive to potential buyers?

Conclusion:

Nothing from the applicant has done anything to improve the perception of their evasiveness, opacity and minimal credibility.