

Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council - Interested Party Ref: [REDACTED]
Fosse Green Energy (FGE) – Deadline 7

1. PROWs

Thorpe on the Hill (TOTH) Parish Council (PC) notes the responses provided by the applicant in REP6-030. This simply repeats the reference to REP5A-038 which TOTH PC responded to in its Deadline 6 submission.

2. Summary

Local Groups and Parish Councils are often characterised as NIMBYs whose sole motivation is an outdated form of protectionism to preserve their locality in its current form despite the evidence demonstrating centuries of development which have led to its current embodiment.

This is not the case in TOTH where the PC and local residents largely accept the logic and imperatives of climate change and so were early adopters of technology and processes to mitigate impacts.

So, the PC are not implacably opposed to Solar Farms or energy generated by photovoltaic systems. The PC simply, and strongly, believes that these systems should be designed and located in the most suitable locations with an overriding priority given to roofs, industrial centres, and brownfield sites etc.

The complete absence of an overarching national strategy and an almost complete failure by successive governments to take timely action in the past, has led to a scramble to install solar farms in high concentrations in areas that do not represent the best overall balance for the future needs of the country, nor do they offer the best value for money in a distorted market.

Thorpe on the Hill will be subject to the highest concentration of solar development within the entire Fosse Green Energy scheme for no better reason than it is in the interests of landowners to cash in on an irresistible financial opportunity.

Worst still, the project purports to be in the National Interest, and villagers like those in Thorpe, should recognise that it is for the greater good. Moreover, the Applicant tells us he can be trusted to deliver an excellent scheme of the highest possible quality.

However, in the event that the scheme is approved, precedent suggests it will be sold immediately to another party. If we estimate that the costs of developing the scheme to be in the region of £10M and used Mallard Pass as an example, it would not be unreasonable to expect FGE to be sold for well in excess of £250M. The point that is missed here is who pays for this outrageous level of profit, and the answer is of course the consumer, because

that is the way the whole system operates in its current form. These factors are the real drivers of this development.

As the Examination process reaches its conclusion, the PC would again like to remind the Applicant and the Examinees that it acted on behalf of residents because 76% of them voiced their opposition to the development. They engaged fully with the consultation and examination processes and largely feel that their contributions made very little difference.

Lastly, when reviewing the democratically endorsed Neighbourhood Plan for the village it is difficult to see any evidence to suggest that it played any useful role in informing decisions or improving the design. The Applicant would no doubt point to the climate emergency and the importance afforded to NSIP projects, but a Neighbourhood Plan of almost worthless utility will be a huge disappointment to residents who will potentially feel let down by the democratic process



Chair TOTH PC

09/06/26