

From: richard.haynes888@btinternet.com
Subject: RE: Proximity of 2 solar developments query
Date: 9 June 2023 at 11:28
To: Graham Doyle grahamdoyle60@gmail.com, Stop Battles Solar stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com
Cc: Jan Owen HCG jan@hamconservationgroup.co.uk, Solar Campaign Alliance SolarCampaignAlliance@groups.outlook.com, Solar campaign alliance 2 sca2@groups.outlook.com



Graham,

Just as a quick follow-up to Stop Battles Solar (who were challenging one of the worst cases of cumulative effect) another appeal decision which might be useful was Sawston Solar Park (APP/W0530/W/15/3012014 and APP/W0530/W/15/3013863) where it was established that the availability of a grid connection is not a material consideration for the purposes of determining a planning application.

Richard

From: Graham Doyle <grahamdoyle60@gmail.com>
Sent: 09 June 2023 11:06
To: Stop Battles Solar <stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com>
Cc: Jan Owen HCG <jan@hamconservationgroup.co.uk>; Solar Campaign Alliance <SolarCampaignAlliance@groups.outlook.com>; Solar campaign alliance 2 <sca2@groups.outlook.com>; richard.haynes888@btinternet.com
Subject: Re: Proximity of 2 solar developments query

Many thanks for your comments everyone. All very useful and any other thoughts are welcome!

Regards
Graham

On Fri, 9 Jun 2023 at 10:59, Stop Battles Solar <stopbattlessolarfarm@gmail.com> wrote:

There is a useful Appeal decision on this point (attached). See SoS comments:

'He agrees with the Inspector that the two sites in combination would have a substantial adverse effect on the openness of the landscape to the south of Sutton St James, resulting in considerable cumulative landscape harm (IR75). He further agrees, for the reasons given at IR76, that the development in combination to the Fendyke Farm site would also result in additional cumulative visual harm'.

The Inspector comments at IR 75 & 76:

"IR75 The site lies close to the larger approved Fendyke Farm solar farm and would be seen in combination with it [34][57]. The combined area of the two sites is in excess of 30ha. The Fendyke Farm site is partially screened being immediately north of trees around the deer farm. The appeal proposal would extend solar development into countryside that is more open. The two sites in combination would have a substantial adverse effect on the openness of the landscape to the south of the village of Sutton St James resulting in considerable cumulative landscape harm"

||||| .

IR76 In terms of visual impact the appeal site is open and exposed from all sides. On my site visit I found that from a radius of about a kilometre the development would be prominent and intrusive when viewed from locations which include the property at Smiths Farm, the road network and the Bad Gate bridleway. From the south the panel arrays would be likely to appear on the skyline. Even after the new hedgerows mature the loss of openness would detract from the quality of these views. From Broad Gate the Fendyke Farm site would be seen to the north-west and would result in additional cumulative visual harm”.

I have attached maps of each of the sites although you really need to plot them on a single OS map.

On Fri, Jun 9, 2023 at 10:27AM <richard.haynes888@btinternet.com> wrote:

Graham,

Jan is correct, the question of cumulative impact is usually assessed on the basis of intervisibility. There is an argument however that if on a decent walk around the District you are likely to come across more than one of these things then there is cumulative harm related to the 'kinetic view' (i.e. your experience as you move through the countryside). Sadly, because of the location of sub-stations and grid connection availability there are far too many cases of solar farm clustering.

Richard (CPRE Essex)

From: Jan Owen HCG <jan@hamconservationgroup.co.uk>

Sent: 09 June 2023 09:26

To: Graham Doyle <grahamdoyle60@gmail.com>; Solar Campaign Alliance <SolarCampaignAlliance@groups.outlook.com>; Solar campaign alliance 2 <sca2@groups.outlook.com>

Subject: Re: Proximity of 2 solar developments query

Good morning Graham

My understanding is that the intervisibility can lead to unacceptable cumulative impact on the landscape. As far as I know, there's no limit regarding proximity per se – it's a question of balancing the harm/industrialisation of the landscape against the purported benefits of the scheme.

Best wishes

Jan Owen
Ham Conservation Group

From: Graham Doyle <grahamdoyle60@gmail.com>

Date: Friday, 9 June 2023 at 07:56

To: Solar Campaign Alliance

<SolarCampaignAlliance@groups.outlook.com>, Solar campaign alliance 2 <sca2@groups.outlook.com>

Subject: Proximity of 2 solar developments query

Good morning all.

Here at the Save Ash Level campaign in Kent we are still awaiting submission of Statkraft's 49MW application to the local authority.

Meanwhile and less than 250 metres from the above site, another totally separate application is imminent for a 3.5MW solar array to supply a hydroponic salad crop production development. This latter array will not be connected back to the national grid.

Can anyone confirm the planning implications of these two developments in terms of their proximity to one another and is such proximity permissible under planning laws?

Many thanks

Graham Doyle

Save Ash Level Campaign Group