

From: Shena MacDonald [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2025 17:07
To: Green Hill Solar <greenhill@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Relevant Representation by Shena Howell FBC187B59 (P&C)

Dear Inspectorate,

I would like to raise the issue of The Waendel Walk. Wellingborough is the only town to host such an International Event, and it's the only event in the UK to be a member of the IML. It has been in existence for 44 years and attracts more than 3000 visitors each year from around the Globe benefitting many local businesses. The walks take place over a weekend and the Saturday walks will be SEVERELY COMPROMISED if the planned development works were to go ahead, particularly in the Countryside between Easton Maudit and Grendon and Bozeat and Grendon.

Looking at the routes, clearly it is the Saturday that will be impacted the most by the development both during the construction and operational phases. (The construction phase lasting for 24 months, the operational phase 60 years).

I have attempted to draw your attention to the areas that are negatively impacted and that you may wish to seek mitigation for. I have attached 3 pages from the applicants Land plan revision A, and the master plan for site F Easton Maudit to Grendon, so you can clearly see the areas of potential conflict. I have also attached the Waendel Walk maps from Saturday 2025 to facilitate your understanding. Please note the detail of these maps is sensitive so I have marked as P&C as requested by the Town Council.

The red route on map 5 starting from the well trodden route across the open fields from Bozeat to Grendon, will, as plans stand currently, pass **through** solar installations in fields FF18/FF19/FF11 and the corner of FF10. This is also the sight line from the Grade I Church of St Mary Bozeat to the Grade II* Church of St Mary Grendon!

The applicant has stated that the corridors around the PRowS will be secured with high fencing, CCTV cameras and measure some 30m wide (after planting), this will clearly not lend itself to International walkers admiring our open rolling fields and hedgerows.

In addition, The riverside part of the route to the West of the hump back bridge by White Mills Marina will also pass through what is currently identified as a very wide area of cable trenching? together with the bridge itself being identified as the main HGV route for Grendon BESS development (Working 6 days a week, including Saturdays for 24 months). The route will be further impacted by the proposed 50m wide cable trench route running North to South cutting across the Doddington Road adjacent to Brimshill spinney and Glebe Farm.

The yellow route outlined on map 6 will also be adversely affected by the proposed 50m wide cable trench route running North to South cutting across the Doddington Road adjacent to Brimshill spinney and Glebe Farm.

In addition, the route along Station Road Grendon towards the EB bends and hump back bridge by the Marina will be marred by the 50m wide cable trenching route, destruction of hedgerows along the road and construction traffic 6 days a week for 24 months..

The route then passes the hump back bridge mentioned previously and before it enters Station Road Earls Barton side has to cross the 50m wide cable route once more.

The blue route map 4 is the least impacted, but again will be impacted by the proposed 50m wide cable trench route running North to South cutting across the Doddington Road adjacent

to Brimshill spinney.and Glebe Farm. In addition, the bottom of Mill Lane to the North of the A45, will again need to cross the 50m wide cable trenching.

I would ask the Inspectorate to again question the applicant about whether further mitigation can take place to prevent such harm to both the landscape and the Waendel Walk.

Regards

Shena Howell

[REDACTED]

I wish to make a relevant representation regarding the BESS proposals (or rather lack of), by the applicant.

Re. Green Hill Solar Farm – Appendix 16.2 BESS Fire Emissions Modelling May 2025 APP-167

Within this document, the applicant claims that any potential fire would be relatively short-term.

“Given a potential BESS fire would be a relatively short-term incident, “

I challenge this assumption based upon the single unit fire in Essex in February which burned for 24 hours, The Liverpool fire (only 20MW), which burned for 59 hours, Moss Landing California Jan '25 which burned for 7 days, and led to the evacuation of 1500 people and a major lawsuit. The fire then reignited some 3 weeks after it was thought to have been extinguished and burned for an additional 2 days. NONE of these examples (and there are many more), I would term as “relatively short term”

In the same report, the applicant includes much information about plume modelling, but no detail with regards to particulates. (Most of which would be toxic to human health and the environment).

“Each of the modelled ten BESS fire locations have been modelled as an area source so that plume rise was factored into the model (the model does not allow for plume rise for volume sources). The area source dimensions have been based on the dimensions of one BESS enclosure (605.8cm wide and 259.1cm long).”

This clearly under represents the dangers of a thermal runaway incident which potentially occurs when several hundred BESS enclosures are placed in close proximity, as the plans currently assume. Modelling just one container is clearly unrepresentative.

The lack of technical detail surrounding the proposed batteries is woeful particularly as much MUST already be known eg.

“The test fire was conducted using Large Format Prismatic (LFP) lithium iron phosphate battery modules; each module comprised 52 cells and each rack comprises eight modules, which is the same proposed battery set-up for the Scheme “

I was under the impression that the applicant had not decided on ANY details about the batteries, their set-up for the scheme, their MWh, (amount of energy stored), their composition, their size, their density (how far apart each unit), etc.

Q. How can the applicant therefore claim the modelling is accurate?

Q. Why won't the applicant confirm the MWh they have modelled their business plans upon?

Q. What about the particulates which would be expelled? That's where the greatest danger lies.

Q. Why has the applicant only looked at fallout within a 1km radius when the experience from other fires is that the particulates travel significantly further than 1km?

Q. What is the lead time to order 500mw of BESS given the proposal is planned to commence works in 2027? When will the applicant need to decide upon the specification of BESS?

It is widely accepted the BESS units will need replacing every 8-10 years i.e. they will need replacing 7 or 8 times during the lifetime of the proposal.

Q. Why is there no risk assessment for the BESS decommissioning and replacement periods during the scheme operation period of 60 years?

BESS units do run the risk of ignition. Large quantities of BESS run a higher risk of thermal runaway, if/when they do catch fire and the particulates expelled into the atmosphere are incredibly dangerous and toxic.

The proposed Grendon BESS is only 201/238 metres away from the nearest residential dwellings and only 800m from Grendon, a village of some 550 souls and a Primary School.

BESS installations should NEVER be in close proximity to residential dwellings – why take the risk?