

Tillbridge Solar OFH1 16th October 2024

Here we are again. The 4th NSIP project to roll through West Lindsey in a year. The 4th! We should have none.

Unfortunately, I am submitting this written representation having been denied the opportunity to speak due to the fact that the Hearing was held during the day. Many residents are in the same regrettable position.

I would urge the Inspectorate to allow an evening hearing so that residents can address the ExA and developers to express their thoughts about this site. Families and their descendants, who will be living here surrounded by black panels suffering the consequences for at least 60 years. People who were born or moved to live in the countryside - not a generating station.

I am not a NIMBY (I have my own solar/battery system and yes I have to buy electricity in the winter).

I am not an OBSTRUCTIONIST

I am not a DELAYER

– solar should be on factory roofs, over carparks, mandated on all new buildings. Not the farce of using up farmland.

I am not frightened of change to my rural community, but I want there to be a rural community.

I AM disillusioned; I do not trust that this process is fair and unbiased.

I AM resigned that no matter this site cannot produce the output that it specifies, it cannot do what the developers promise, this solar site will go ahead. The examination process is not fit for purpose especially when after a long inquiry a determination and recommendation can be so easily overridden by a government minister.

This is a reflection of the bias being inflicted upon UK citizens all in the name of Net Zero. The biggest lie. The outsourcing of emissions, the delegating of responsibility to other countries and inflicting this on other citizens of the world.

Through-out the NSIP process followed by the 3 previous solar sites, 2 of which are now consented (it is a waiting game for the 3rd) there was the mention of sheep as a serious option to keep the grass short. Tillbridge Solar, to give their land agent his due, are the only developer to not try and take this as a serious option; stopping this particular waste of time re grazing as a co-located agricultural activity is welcomed. There is little, if any, agricultural value on a solar site.

This flight of fancy, this waste of valuable agricultural land – no matter the semantics of 3A or 3B – the crop yield is the only measure which should be used. I would suggest that in order to stop inadvertent under-reporting of any yield (and the subsequent unintended consequence of land devaluation should any parcels become subject to CPO) there should be corroboration of yields over the past 20 – 30 years by HGCA (Home-Grown Cereals Authority).

Will the main purpose of any electricity produced be to charge the batteries? Batteries which will then be used at peak demand, the most expensive time of the day, for discharge?

During the summer months there will be curtailment. Being paid to not export. During the winter not enough to charge the batteries, using other power generators to charge them up, gas or nuclear (wind if its blowing) but always using the battery power at the expensive time of day. Got to hand it to the developers – win, win as a concept of maximisation.

This is not Net Zero. This is anything but. This is not about reducing emissions but about how much money will be made.

The emissions from mining the basic ore and minerals are not adequately detailed. The manufacture of the panels is questionable at the very least regarding the human process involved, given that Tribus and Canadian Solar (renamed Recurrent) are behind the development. The shipping of the panels, installation, maintenance – these all have emissions attached. This is not a clean start. It is most definitely not a clean finish. The off-shoring of manufacture is deliberate. The off-shoring of emissions is shameful.

This project, along with the adjacent 3 sites, will not bring down electricity bills. How can it?

Community benefits are proposed for this site, but only this site. Why? Will all the villages blighted by all 4 of the projects be supported by this 'benefit'? Will this be set into the dDCO?

Why does Tillbridge feel the need to propose a community benefit scheme when Gate Burton, Cottam and West Burton all decided it was not necessary? The size of the Tillbridge scheme? The detriment of cumulative impact? Is it a bribe under the name of mitigation?

The residents, along with the rest of the UK, will be paying the capital/operating costs along with profits for this and all developers (or subsequent investors) until they go bankrupt and we are left with a 'grey' site (who knew there were so many colours land could be categorised as) for decommissioning!

I am fed up with the 0.5% gobbledegook misrepresented calculation of land allocation. The 4 schemes are actually 9% of the total land of West Lindsey, this will be much higher as a % if arable land only is taken into consideration as well as the smaller solar sites now going through the planning process (Luminous energy and Barker Farm Solar let alone the additional BESS sites). What is the actual % of available land which will be taken out of production in West Lindsey?

How much more food/feed will have to be imported? Has the additional importation costs and emissions been calculated? More off-shoring of responsibility.

This is a theme running through all the processes, let some other country take the hit regarding the emissions and manufacturing, the UK is clean – disgraceful.

Closing our own generating plants - lets import. Laying long cables to other countries (do they not need their electricity?)

Rely on other countries to do the dirty business of producing power and infrastructure?

Here, in West Lindsey, where there are open fields interspersed with hedging and trees, many single-track roads and green lanes, successful agriculture, we are going to become a black hole. A black hole with glint and glare, EMF, screaming inverters and fans, batteries, shimmering, thermal updrafts caused by the millions of panels, disruption of construction and maintenance (especially when all the panels reach their end of life and need replacing at the same time - almost another construction process) the micro-climate will be considerably different to the one we know. A rural fridge for the surrounding towns? Not for much longer. More like a bonfire waiting to happen.

The wildlife is in for yet more annihilation. Where are the deer/hares (other wildlife is available but too many to list) going to be funnelled? Into the roads? Their habitat will be destroyed.

Will the dDCO be explicit as per Gate Burton which states that there should be no additional type of generation (e.g. turbines) added to the site during its lifetime. Any additional capacity of any description must be made through a separate planning application.

The concurrent spectre of all these projects happening at the same time, at any time is complete and utter destruction.

There must be a tipping point for blight in one small area. I think we have more than reached that point.

There are no winners in this folly, this vanity project. The lies of Net Zero. This is not about producing 'clean' electricity but the opportunity for business to offset their emissions. That is not a reduction. Cleve Hill is an example of offsetting emissions instead of reducing them.

Need is set out in EN1, or is it? A lot is about wind and hydro (water battery – who comes up with these terms?) solar does not get significant individual mention.

This site is not essential. There are other sites which are already producing electricity but not yet connected to the grid.

The insult to bill payers that developers are being paid for their electricity even though it is not being used.

This nothing to do with saving the planet or 'green' electricity. It is an investment opportunity playing into EN1 - This is and always will be about money.

Welcome to West Lindsey. Welcome to hell.