



# SOUTHWELL CIVIC SOCIETY

Planning Secretary: Mike Struggles, 4 Lees Field, Southwell, Nottinghamshire. NG25 0LJ  
Telephone: 01636 815320 email: m.struggles@btopenworld.com

Newark and Sherwood District Council,  
Castle House,  
Great North Road  
Newark,  
Notts., NG24 1BY

9<sup>th</sup> August 2020

## Consultation.

<b>Application:</b>	20/01242/FULM
<b>Location:</b>	Land North of Halloughton, Southwell
<b>Proposal:</b>	Construction of a solar farm and battery stations together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.
<b>Applicant:</b>	JBM Solar Projects 6 Ltd.
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Honor Whitfield
<b>Our Comments:</b>	We <b>object</b> to this application.

Whilst few people would argue with the need for green energy, we strongly object to this particular application for the following reasons:

- **Site Selection**

The applicant has failed to adequately show that its search for this site was rational. There should be a full evaluation of and comparison with alternative sites in the District. Sites for housing development were selected following a robust methodology as detailed in the Allocations and Development DPD and we should expect no less for solar farms. This is not an outline application but a full planning application for a major development on 107 hectares of unspoilt, elevated, undulating countryside which does not meet the Solar Industry's own criteria for the selection of sites which are that *'Ground Mounted Solar PV projects over 50kWp, should ideally utilise previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land, industrial land or agricultural land preferably of classification 3b, 4 and 5. Land selected should aim to avoid affecting the visual aspect of landscapes, maintain the natural beauty and should be predominantly flat, well screened by hedges, tree lines, etc. and not cause undue impact to nearby domestic properties or roads'*.

At 49.99MW, this proposal is a thousand times the 50kWp trigger referred to above.

## Southwell Civic Society - Continuation

- **Inadequate Public Consultation**

The public consultation has been a token, box-ticking exercise. There was no opportunity for a public meeting due to Covid-19 despite numerous requests for a delay from many people who were consulted.

There are many factual errors in the application documents and several consultees are still waiting for responses to their questions.

Amendments to the initial proposal following consultation were minimal. Comparison with the consultation process for the DPD and Southwell Area Plan illustrates this inadequacy.

- **Landscape Impact**

It is difficult to exaggerate the dominance of the countryside around Southwell that a 100 hectare, 3 metre high 'sea of metal' would have. The applicant's LVIA may confirm that there are proposals to 'help comply with' the relevant policies but they fail and do not protect and enhance local landscape features.

The Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility map illustrates the extent of views affected and screening by deciduous vegetation will only be effective for half the year.

It is important that those making a decision on this application have made a site visit. Natural England's response was based on an examination of the plans submitted and their response states only that they consider the proposal would '*not have a significant adverse effect on statutorily protected sites or landscapes*'. It does not comment on the adverse effect on this non-protected landscape.

- **Flooding**

The Lead Local Flood Authority's response of 'no objection' is qualified by several conditions and states that '*A detailed surface water management plan is required to ensure that the development is in accordance with NPPF and local planning policies. It should be ensured that all major developments have sufficient surface water management, are not at increased risk of flooding and do not increase flood risk off-site.*'

Past experience with developments in Southwell has demonstrated that this detailed plan is required at the application stage, enabling public and independent expert scrutiny, otherwise there can be no confidence that the conditions can and will be met.

- **Heritage Impact**

Despite objections from several consultees the chosen access point is still alongside the Grade 2 listed church and opposite Grade2\* listed Manor Farm.

The proposed development would destroy the whole character of Halloughton Conservation Area, have a severe impact on views over Southwell Conservation Area and on the unspoilt countryside around Westhorpe Conservation Area.

The archaeological survey is inadequate. The limitations of the type of geophysical survey carried out are widely recognised and there is other evidence of potential archaeology on the site.

- **Amenity Impact**

The development site is crossed by a number of public footpaths and bridleways as confirmed by the Rights of Way Officer, whose 'no objection' subject to conditions is based on the requirement that they should '*remain open, unobstructed and be kept on their legal*

## Southwell Civic Society - Continuation

*alignment at all times.* However, if the development were to go ahead the people of Southwell and the many visitors to the area enjoying paths that link up to the Robin Hood Way would find this a greatly devalued experience. At a height of 3m (10ft), 1 m higher than a permitted domestic fence, the arrays of thousands of solar panels together with their associated security fencing and infrastructure would create an alien industrial feature in place of some of the most attractive countryside in Nottinghamshire.

- **Community Impact**

Whilst this project may provide benefits to the wider community in more sustainable energy and financial gain to the land owner and developer it is difficult to see any direct benefits to Halloughton village or its inhabitants.

Its impact would be in marked contrast to community energy projects which unite communities, providing income to locals while protecting their environment and heritage.

- **Ecological Impact**

The application fails to meet the requirements of SNP policy E3 (Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity) or policy E4 (Public Rights of Way and Wildlife Corridors) particularly in relation to the need for wild life corridors and buffer margins.

The ecological assessment report, produced from a desk based study and just one day of field survey in January, fails to identify the existing biodiversity threatened.

- **Loss of Agricultural Land**

Food production is as necessary for human survival as the reduction of global warming. Most of the proposed development site is currently either cultivated or used for grazing and should continue for the production of food rather than green energy which can be done on poorer quality land. The application erroneously classifies this agricultural land as Grade 4 when it is classified as 3 by Defra and all local farmers.

Michael Struggles  
Planning Secretary