

From: Stephen Tilley

Sent: Friday, September 11, 2026 12:31

To: Green Hill Solar

Cc: Stephen Tilley

Subject: Fw: Objection to Green hill solar project Near Grendon Northamptonshire

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]]. Learn why this is important at [REDACTED]

> Formal Objection to the Proposed Green Hill Solar > Farm and Battery Energy Storage Facility - Near > Grendon, Northamptonshire > My reasoned objection to the proposed solar farm and battery energy storage > development. It is not an objection to renewable energy in principle. Rather, it is an objection based on location, cumulative risk, impacts on residents, loss of countryside amenity, food security concerns, environmental implications and emergency response challenges. > 1. Loss of Agricultural Land and Food Production. > Productive agricultural land is a strategic national asset. Permanent or long-duration removal of farmland for industrial energy infrastructure reduces local food production capacity and changes the character of the rural landscape. National government statements have recognised the importance of protecting the best agricultural land while balancing renewable energy objectives. > 2. Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity > Although mitigation may be proposed, large scale solar and battery developments can fragment habitats, disturb nesting birds, affect foraging routes and alter established ecosystems during construction and operation. Construction activities, fencing, lighting and increased human activity may all adversely affect wildlife. > 3. Impact on Countryside Activities > The local countryside supports walking, cycling, horse riding, nature observation and Duke of Edinburgh training activities for young people . Industrialisation of open countryside reduces the sense of openness and tranquillity relied upon by residents, visitors, youth organisations and equestrian users. > 4. Flooding and Surface Water Run-Off > Ground disturbance, construction traffic and soil compaction can reduce natural infiltration. Research shows that runoff patterns are altered around solar panel arrays and require engineering controls to prevent localised water concentration. Local residents should not bear any increased flood risk whatsoever. We have had significant flooding in our area and we had to move out of our own home for over 12 months due to the impact of flooding, while repairs were completed. > 5. Construction Impacts > The construction phase could bring months of heavy goods vehicle movements, contractor traffic, dust, mud on roads, noise, vibration and disruption to residents and rural road users. Narrow local roads may not be suitable for sustained industrial-scale traffic. > 6. Battery Fire Risk and Emergency Response > The National Fire Chiefs Council recognises that lithium-ion battery systems can present fire risks associated with thermal runaway. Such fires may be difficult to extinguish, may last for extended periods and can generate smoke, gases and contaminated fire-water. Any proposal must demonstrate robust emergency access, water supplies, containment measures and evacuation protocols. > 7. Access During Emergencies and Poor Weather > The site appears dependent upon rural routes which may become more difficult to access during severe weather. Questions remain regarding how emergency services would gain rapid access during flooding, snow, storms or other disruptive events. > 8. Security and Critical Infrastructure Concerns > Large energy infrastructure may

become a target for criminal damage, vandalism, theft or hostile acts. Security proposals should be independently scrutinised and not assumed to eliminate risk. > 9. Visual Impact and Rural Character > The development would replace open countryside with industrial infrastructure including panels, fencing, CCTV, substations, battery compounds and access tracks. The effect on landscape character may be substantial and long-lasting. > 10. Balance of Benefits and Harm > While renewable energy generation contributes to decarbonisation and grid resilience, these benefits must be weighed against local environmental impacts, diminished landscape value, loss of agricultural use, construction disruption and residual operational risks. A development of this scale should not proceed unless it can clearly demonstrate that local harms are minimal and fully mitigated. Many thanks Stephen Tilley Local resident > Sent from my iPad