

Deadline 6

Comments on any other information and submissions received at D5

Compulsory Acquisition- Land retention at Church Hanborough – Q2.5.5

I responded to the ExA's four-part question at D4 (REP4-071), and commented at D5 (REP5-115) that the Applicants had not even attempted to answer the four parts individually. They did not address the question: "...is there a compelling case for compulsory acquisition".

During the subsequent CAH1 the Applicants appeared to begin to contend that any reduction in the Order limits might endanger their BNG assurances. However so far as the northern section of field 2.115 referred to in Q.2.5.5 is concerned this is a relatively minute area, the removal of which should have no measurable effect on BNG claimed. If nevertheless the Applicant believes that there might be a measurable effect could not a corresponding adjustment be made to the BNG assessment ?

As currently drawn the Order Limit comes right up to our garden southern boundary wall. Both the Order Limit and the northern boundary of panels and fencing in field 2.115 should as an absolute minimum be moved further away from our home, and the Order Limit similarly. In my Nomination for locations for an ASI (REP2-121) I tried to show by photomontage how dominating the panels currently proposed would be.

Photomontages – Q.2.13.5

At REP5-005, page 27 the Applicant purports to respond to the OHA at REP4-074. The issue being raised relates to the openness of views when the proposed new deciduous hedging is not in leaf between October and April, and the need therefore to include photomontages in winter as well as in the summer at year 15. Yet again the Applicant makes little attempt to answer the question, and merely reasserts its 'experience and professional opinion' that the new hedgerows would render the effects as being not significant.

In my Relevant Representation (RR-0998) I went to some length to explain not only why further photomontages were necessary but also why the Applicant had failed to comply with the photomontage requirements of the Scoping Opinion as well as misleading the reader about what the Local Authorities had agreed. So far as I have been able to ascertain the Applicant has made no attempt to address these issues despite my having raised them a number of times since. (eg REP1-153, 154, 155; REP3-106; and REP5-115 in the context of Q2.13.14)

Also in the context of a lack of photomontages is an example of the Applicant's failure to offer any explanation as to why it says one thing and does another. This example is the assertion at APP-034, page 779 that it would keep off 'high ground'. I referred to this at REP1-155, para.6 but to no avail. The panels as still proposed would remain for example on

the high ground along the ridge between Burleigh Wood and Purwell Farm. These panels on high ground would have been shown if the Applicant had included viewpoint 24 in its selected photomontages. Despite repeated requests for this and others this has been ignored or perhaps deliberately avoided by the Applicant. Regarding viewpoint 24 this is said to have been reassessed by the Applicant. (REP-005 at page 12) but is still said to be 'not significant....due to the transient oblique nature of the view and the small proportion of the view that would be changed'. I have to wonder if anyone from the Applicants team has been to have a look for themselves. The viewpoint 24 photographs of winter and summer speak for themselves – a wide panorama across the Evenlode valley and up to the said ridge. (winter REP5-028 at Fig. 8.62 and summer REP5-029 at Fig 8.178)

Regarding the assertion that only a small proportion of the view at viewpoint 24 would be changed is hardly borne out by the Applicant's response about this viewpoint in paragraph 1.3.52 of REP5-038, which reads:

Seen though a gap in the hedgerow adjacent to the PRow, which is otherwise very well vegetated for its entire length to the south of Church Hanborough. There would be views in the immediate foreground and on rising ground across the Evenlode Valley of solar panels across majority of the view. At winter Year 1, although without leaf, existing layered vegetation would have limited screening effect due to the position of the view. Solar panels closest to the PRow would screen views to parts of the wider Project Site. There would be a Medium magnitude of impact to this fleeting view resulting in a Moderate significance of effect, which is not significant.

So the Applicants confirm that there would be views of panels both in the foreground and on the rising ground across the valley. The rising ground is the said ridge. That is 'high ground' where they said they would 'keep off'. It is unclear what is meant by 'existing layered vegetation would have limited screening effect'. And finally they suggest that the closest panels themselves would act as screens to the 'wider Project site' resulting in 'moderate significance of effect, which is not significant'. Are they really still trying to say that the first few lines of panels block (or screen) the views behind them and that that is acceptable mitigation ?