

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 21 March 2023 01:30  
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Objection to Solar Farm on Land East of Pelham substation, Maggots End Manuden -  
Application number: S62A/2022/0011

I am writing to object to the application to construct a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar arrays together with (among other things) battery storage, inverter cabins, a substation, fencing and CCTV cameras on land near Pelham Substation Maggots End Road Manuden CM23 1BJ

- My name is Henrietta Patrick Beal, and I live at [REDACTED]

The reasons for my objection are:

Section 16 of the NPPF is concerned with 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'. It identifies heritage assets as 'an irreplaceable resource' and notes that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that where development proposals are likely to affect a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justifications.

Low Carbon's consultants conclude that the solar farm will give rise to no harm to the heritage significance of the Scheduled monument at The Crump, the Grade II Listed and former barn (now room) adjoining to north-west, the Grade II Listed Brick House, and the Grade II Listed Rose Garth.

It is surprising that the consultants conclude that the Brick House is best appreciated from its associated garden plot, particularly the front garden from where the main northern elevation can be experienced and understood. The consultants have not seen the building from the rear nor have they experienced the contribution made to the adjoining land which abuts Pump Spring. The views from the Eastern window of the Brick House will be significantly impacted by the solar farm if it is constructed. There are no views from the house and the picture at Plate 29 does not give any indication as to the impact.

The main views from Rosegarth are to the front of the building looking across the fields which now form part of the site. Plate 31: purports to show “ the deliberate planting of trees on the opposite side of the road which will result in less clear views between the site and the asset during the summer months”. This is not correct and the photo illustrates that most of the views are open. Despite the fact that the views from Rosegarth will be completely altered and the Consultants accept that there is “intervisibility between the land within the site and Rosegarth”, the consultant concludes that these are not key views and the land within the site is not considered to contribute to the heritage significance of the asset. This makes no sense at all.

Elsewhere it is claimed that the ground floor views from Rose Garth would be interrupted by the roadside vegetation that forms the foreground to their eastward aspect. This is not correct – the current views are uninterrupted. The statement that “the magnitude of change for the residents of Rose Garth would be low at Year 1” and that the effects are likely

to diminish as the site's boundary vegetation matures further" are fanciful.

It is accepted that Battles Hall, including the moated site, was under the ownership of Nicholas Calvert Esquire and the occupancy of Charles Brand who also owned and occupied a number of land parcels within the site. However, the consultants conclude that there will be less than substantial harm at the lower end of the spectrum to the heritage significance of the Grade II Listed Battles Hall, the Grade II Listed Dovecote and the Grade II Listed Cartlodge, with regards to setting.

This seems to be extraordinary conclusion given the close connection between the buildings and the land.

Low Carbon suggest that the majority of the land on the site is Grade 2 agricultural land. Over 81% of the site has been classified by Low Carbon as "best and most versatile" agricultural land.

The Agricultural assessment is unreliable, because it does not reflect the actual site which is the subject of the planning application. This is productive farm land which should be used for farming.

UK currently import more than 40 per cent of our food, and recent threats by countries to ban exports of vaccinations have highlighted the threat that similar bans could be imposed on food if countries are themselves short of supplies in the future.

It is predicted that we will need to produce 56 per cent more food by 2050 due to increasing populations. We have not increased food production by 56 per cent in the last 30 years, and if we continue

to build on best and most fertile farmland we have no hope of achieving it in the next 30 years either. This land must continue to be used for much needed food production.

Henrietta Patrick Beal