

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 January 2024 21:08
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to the Stratterra re application for Berden Hall Solar Farm (S62A/22/0006)

Dear Planning Team ,

I am writing to object in the strongest terms, to the re application for the establishment of the Berden Hall Solar Farm . Having been applied for and having its faulty approval quashed for irrefutable concerns. It is simply unreasonable for the proposer to try to suggest that these may be overcome with a modified plan.

The plans present an appalling loss of 177 acres of farmland out of food production for at least 40 years (which defies a definition of temporary). - 72% of the proposal Site is Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. In addition:

The proposed development would take The proposal is for alien, large-scale, industrial-style development in an area of open countryside where there has been no equivalent development to date and would cause harm to The Crump ringwork, a scheduled ancient monument, St Nicholas Church Berden, a Grade I listed building and Berden Hall, a Grade II* listed building

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, /. The scheme would fail to preserve the setting of the listed buildings. Clearly, many of the factors which led to the refusal of Pelham Spring Solar Farm are also relevant to Berden Hall Solar Farm

The revised proposals are contrary to Policy S7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (LP) which (broadly) states that planning permission will only be given where a development is needed in a particular location, is appropriate and protects and enhances the landscape character. The proposals are also contrary to para 174 (now 180) of the NPPF for similar reasons

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

Strattera's claim that solar developments need to be in the vicinity of the Pelham Sub Station is therefore erroneous

For these and the original, fundamental reasons for objecting to this plan and its wide reaching impact, I ask that the planning decision be one of firm rejection

Roger Conen

██████████

██████████████████