

## Response to the Applicant's Written Representation [REP2-082]

This submission responds to the Applicant's reply to my Written Representation [REP1-127] and builds on concerns already raised.

### Applicant's Internal Ref: WR44

I raised concerns that the Applicant has neglected to take on board my family's key views and site-specific impacts when visiting our home and hearing our concerns.

The Applicant directed me to Appendix F of [REP1-077] as part of their response.

However, my property is not shown there. I was only able to locate it in [REDACTED], see end of this document.

On reviewing the information presented in that drawing, I must highlight the following issues:

- **Principal views not correctly identified** – The Applicant records our principal views as only North and South. In reality, they are also to the east and far reaching due to the openness of the location. The angles of view marked on the drawing are not representative of what was discussed during the site visit.
- **Misleading commentary** – The drawing states “*Views to the south are limited.*” This is not correct. From our property we can clearly see far to the south, across the Sustrans route and over to Moor Lane, South Clifton.
- **“Part exchange” mitigation** – The Applicant notes “*Land to the north-east was extended in response to feedback.*” What has not been explained is that this extension was offset by removing mitigation land further west, much closer to our property, where panels have now been added. This was not an overall increase in mitigation. Furthermore, no land was removed to the south-east, despite my request, even though this is one of our principal views.
- **Misrepresentation of existing trees** – The Applicant shows our property surrounded by trees. While there are trees to the south of our garden, many are deciduous with a high trunk before the canopy begins. They do not block views, which remain open across the wider landscape.

### Other Properties on Sheet 15

On reviewing *Mill Farm Cottage* and *Moor Barn Farm*, I question the robustness of the Applicant's approach to design principles and mitigation:

- **Mill Farm Cottage** – The Applicant identifies principal views to the south and east. I have visited Mill Farm Cottage and spoken with the residents. Their true principal views are to the north (rear), north-west, south (front), and south-west. They specifically confirmed they do not have a principal view to the east. Despite

this, the Applicant did not visit the property, even though I advised them the residents would be open to a site visit.

- **Moor Barn Farm** – This property does not appear to have been recognised as a dwelling at all; it is not recorded as visited or not. While some mitigation is shown, the area left free of panels to the east appears to coincide with an underground National Grid electricity cable. There are no identified principal views for this property, despite it clearly having both windows and a garden.

The Applicant's identification of principal views and associated mitigation is inconsistent, inaccurate, and in some cases misleading. Properties have been excluded from visits despite residents being willing to engage, and some dwellings are not properly recognised at all. Mitigation appears to be determined by convenience and engineering constraints (such as underground cables) rather than a genuine consideration of residents' amenity.

I do not consider the Applicant to have fully taken into consideration the visual and residential amenity impact on my residence, when we have explained the outside space is used as much as the indoor space. The whole East side of our home which is used daily has been ignored and key principle views are going to be lost behind a sea of panels 3.8m high interspersed with 6m high PCS units.

