

RECEIVED

MAR 24 2023

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

From: Robert Hickman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2023 10:35 AM
To: PSC Comments
Subject: 2022-00115 - Thoroughbred Solar, LLC

3/24/2023

Re: 2022-00115 - Thoroughbred Solar, LLC cc: Hart County Judge Magistrate

To Whom It May Concern:

The purpose of my letter is to further object to Thoroughbred Solar's Motion for Deviation of Set Back requirements and ask that you deny said request.

In Thoroughbred Solar's (TS) Motion for Deviation of SetBack Requirement, they are asking you to find "that the facility is designed to and, as located, would meet the goals of KRS 224.10-280" "at a distance closer than [statutorily prescribed]." I pray you deny said request and find favor in the following argument.

I am going to present a common sense argument. I am not an expert, I hold no advanced degree, my observations and recommendations may, or may not have a valid legal basis. I find it just as easy to suggest that they may, as TS finds in simply suggesting that areas they have identified as arguably having met the statutory definition of "residential neighborhood" do not. Bologna. They do, even if I say so myself.

I dispute the areas drawn and shown by TS to be residential neighborhood 1, 2, and 3. It seems to me that quite a few properties were left out which may meet the statutory definition. I highly recommend that the PSC cause a proper evaluation and study of the matter. The cost of that study should be born by TS, and managed by the commission. In my opinion, it should be chalked full of local professional opinion with a bulk of those opinions being registered by the legal and real estate communities.

Which brings me to TS's assertion that the goal of the identified statutes can be met by your over riding the rights of the nearby property owners and finding in favor of their motion. Bologna. It can not. Currently, and praying to prevail hereafter, the nearby neighbors have a right under the law to having this installation set back 2000 feet. What is the goal of that law. Or any other law for that matter. I suggest that it may be to protect the adjacent properties from any hazard or risk or incursion. Be that light, water, air, traffic, or what ever. Why do adjacent property owners need these protections? Quite simply, because without them, the value of their interests stand subject to diminishment due to no fault of their own. It certainly is not the excersing by the powerful at the cost of the less so. I have in previous objection critically called into question the contribution TS and their consultant Cohn Reznick have offered in this regard.

In summary, I ask that you deny the TS motion for deviation. I ask that because they have neither established fact or expressed truth in their arguments asking you to over ride existing law. I ask that you maintain that denial until such time that TS has done their homework which in my opinion can only be done by their withdrawing this motion, engaging with the commission upon the commissions order for an independent LOCAL professional study and input. Further, in my opinion, they could approach their

do want to insure my neighbors are cared for and properly protected under the law.

Sincerely,

Robert O. Hickman

Respectfully,
Robert Hickman
5201 LeGrande Highway
Hardyville
ky
42746
[REDACTED]

Received though Public Comments page - psc.ky.gov