

**From:** Laura Clarkson  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2026 16:13  
**To:** Green Hill Solar  
**Subject:** Fw: EN010170 – Green Hill Solar Farm

Dear Secretary of State

**Re: Green Hill Solar Farm – EN010170**

I am writing as a resident of **Lavendon** to make my very strong objection to the proposed Green Hill Solar Farm clear.

I have followed this application because I am genuinely concerned about what this development will mean for the countryside around us and for those of us who live locally.

I appreciate that renewable energy is important and that we need to move away from fossil fuels. However, I do not believe that this means we should automatically accept enormous solar developments wherever a developer chooses to put them. There must be a balance, and I simply do not believe that Green Hill represents the right balance.

**This is not just a solar farm**

When you hear the words "solar farm", it is easy to imagine a few rows of panels in a field.

That is not what we are talking about here.

This is an enormous development covering around **1,200 hectares**, across several sites, with extensive infrastructure and battery storage as part of the proposal.

For those of us living in the surrounding villages, this isn't just something that exists on a planning document. It is going to change the landscape that we see and live alongside every day.

I am particularly concerned about the effect that a development of this scale will have on the local countryside and the character of the area.

I don't want to see our countryside gradually becoming an industrial landscape simply because solar energy is considered "green".

**Solar panels may produce green energy but putting them across an enormous area of beautiful countryside does not mean there is no environmental cost.**

**The landscape matters**

I am particularly unhappy about the visual impact of this proposal.

Quite simply, **I think it will be an eyesore.**

There seems to be a tendency in planning applications to talk about screening, planting and mitigation as though planting a few hedges or trees can somehow make a huge industrial installation disappear.

It doesn't.

The fields, open views and countryside that we have now will be replaced by vast areas of solar panels, fencing, access tracks, electrical equipment and associated infrastructure.

That is a huge change to the character of our local area.

I don't think people should have to accept that the countryside around their homes can be fundamentally changed for decades simply because the development is producing renewable electricity.

### **What concerns me about the scale**

I find the sheer scale of Green Hill particularly difficult to accept.

Once you start talking about hundreds of hectares, multiple sites and battery storage, this is no longer something that can reasonably be described as a minor change to the countryside.

It is an industrial-scale energy project.

And once it has been built, local people cannot simply decide that they don't like it and put the countryside back the way it was.

That is why I believe the decision needs to be made extremely carefully.

### **The information is almost impossible for ordinary people to follow**

There is another issue which I feel very strongly about.

I have tried to follow what is happening with this application, but the amount of information is overwhelming. There are enormous numbers of highly technical documents, reports, responses, appendices and cross-references.

I have to ask myself how an ordinary local resident is realistically expected to keep up with all of this.

Most people have jobs, families and their own lives to deal with. They don't have the time to spend days reading technical planning documents and trying to understand specialist terminology.

This worries me because I believe developments of this size can **effectively slip under the radar**.

It isn't necessarily because people don't care. It is because the process is so complicated that people can become overwhelmed and simply give up trying to understand it, me included.

The developer has professional advisers, consultants and specialists working on its behalf. Ordinary residents don't.

I therefore hope that the Secretary of State will not mistake the lack of thousands of detailed technical objections from members of the public for a lack of concern.

People may simply not have the time or expertise to engage with the process at that level.

### **The additional questions from the Secretary of State concern me**

I also find it significant that, after the examination, the Secretary of State has had to request further information on a number of issues.

In particular, I am concerned about the questions surrounding agricultural land, environmental impacts, the battery storage facility and the protected Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits.

These are not trivial matters.

The Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits is an important wildlife area, and the proposed battery storage element brings additional concerns about what could happen in the event of a serious fire or other incident.

I am not an environmental or battery safety expert, and I don't pretend to be.

But I do think it is perfectly reasonable for a local resident to ask:

**Why should we accept potentially serious risks to an important wildlife environment when the development is being proposed on such a massive scale?**

And if the answer is that the risks can be managed, I would like to know what evidence demonstrates that rather than simply being given assurances that they will be managed.

### **Agricultural land**

I am also uncomfortable with the amount of agricultural land that will be taken out of normal agricultural use.

I understand the argument that the land could eventually be returned to agriculture.

But "eventually" could mean decades.

We should not simply assume that land will be exactly the same after years of solar panels, infrastructure, access tracks and associated works.

Food production and good agricultural land are important too.

I don't think we should be covering huge areas of countryside with solar panels while simply assuming that the agricultural consequences can be dealt with later.

### **Please consider the local people who have to live with this**

Ultimately, I would ask the Secretary of State to step back from the hundreds of pages of technical documentation and consider what this proposal actually means to people living here.

For us, this isn't an abstract planning application.

It is **our countryside**.

It is the landscape around our villages, the open views, the fields and the character of the area we call home.

We are the people who will see this development every day if it goes ahead.

I fully support renewable energy in principle, but I do not support renewable energy **at any cost and in any location**.

There must be better ways of generating the renewable energy we need without industrialising such a huge area of our countryside.

I therefore ask you to give serious consideration to the local impact of this proposal and to the very real concerns of residents in Lavendon and the surrounding villages.

Please don't allow the complexity of the planning process, or the sheer volume of documents produced by the Applicant, to obscure the fundamental issue.

**Once this development is built, the countryside will be changed for decades.**

For that reason, and because I do not believe the benefits outweigh the environmental, landscape, agricultural and local impacts, I strongly urge the Secretary of State to **refuse development consent for the Green Hill Solar Farm.**

I would be grateful if my objection could be formally recorded and taken into account when the final decision is made.

Yours faithfully

Laura Clarkson

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Laura Clarkson.

Sent from Outlook for Mac