

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 January 2024 17:42  
**To:** Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Objection to Application - S62A/22/0006

Dear sirs

**Objection to Application - S62A/22/0006 - Land at Berden Hall Farm, Dewes Green Road, Berden.**

I would like to object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- There would be negative effects on landscape and visual amenities. This is open countryside, and a number of public rights of way (PROWs) would be impacted including several very well-used footpaths.
- Consistency in planning decisions is important, and the refusal by the Planning Inspectorate to grant permission for Pelham Spring Solar Farm (PSSF), in close proximity to the Berden Hall Solar Farm site, is therefore a highly material consideration. The Planning Inspector, Mr Callum Parker, argued that PSSF would erode the agricultural landscape and constitute industrial infrastructure that would be present for c. 40 years, which is not temporary. The scheme would fail to preserve the setting of the listed buildings and other heritage assets, including the Crump scheduled ancient monument. Clearly, many of the factors which led to the refusal of Pelham Spring Solar Farm are also relevant to Berden Hall Solar Farm.
- The Powering Up Britain: Energy Security Plan states that the government seeks large scale ground-mount solar deployment across the UK, looking for development mainly **on brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land**. Wherever it references solar energy, the Plan focuses on Rooftop Solar, not Ground-Mounted Solar. There is also increased emphasis in the NPPF on ensuring that renewable energy is located at the point of consumption. Developers can already connect to the grid via the high voltage overhead cable network, so Statera's claim that solar developments need to be in the vicinity of the Pelham Sub Station is therefore erroneous.
- Recent planning decisions highlight the importance of a proper site selection exercise to identify poorest land. The Applicant, Statera, did not perform such an exercise when selecting the proposal site for a large-scale industrial-style development on land currently used for food production, which is contrary to ENV5 of the LP. They have therefore failed to produce "compelling evidence" to justify the selection of the Site

Regards

Kristian

Kristian Taylor  
[REDACTED]