

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
6 Land at Fernwood	Local Resident	02.09.21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Muntjac and Fallow deer are seen regularly in Fernwood and surrounding fields - There is little opportunity for east west movement of deer 	<p>The ecological implications of the proposal have been previously assessed and these comments do not materially affect the previous assessments particularly noting that the site is allocated for development.</p>
6 Land at Fernwood	Applicant	02.09.21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Email correspondence regarding the conditions as drafted in the agenda print - Condition 25 (management company brochure) no longer required given that the drafted Section 106 relies on the open space being taken on by the Council / Parish Council - Condition 35 (works to Goldstraw Lane / B6326 roundabout) refers to commencement of Barratts / DWH scheme so also no longer relevant 	<p>Officers agree that condition 25 is no longer required and can be removed from the recommendation.</p> <p>In respect to condition 35, having reviewed the Barratts/DWH conditions, the works are not required until occupation of the 100th dwelling and given that this trigger has not yet been hit it would not be appropriate to remove the condition altogether. It is however considered more reasonable for the wording to read:</p> <p><i>In the event that no more than 100 dwellings are occupied as approved under planning application LPA reference 14/00465/OUTM, and unless an alternative scheme has been approved in writing and thereafter completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, before occupation of the 630th dwelling approved under this permission, improvements to the Goldstraw Lane/B6326 roundabout shall be delivered and made available to traffic as illustrated by drawing 14106/038 (or</i></p>

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
				<p><i>through a subsequent revised drawing agreed by the LPA).</i></p> <p><i>Reason: In the interest of highway safety and capacity.</i></p>
7 Halloughton Planning Appeal	Local Residents (3)	26.08.21 31.08.21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed amendments to their original application are materially negligible and very minimal. - Reducing the size of the solar farm by one field - this will not have any impact on the 266 acres they propose. - They also say they are considering more planting on the footpath to the south of the area allocated to mitigate visual impact – they do not specify what measures they are proposing to address this? - The small triangle of land near Thorney Abbey/Oxton Road will be designated a rewilding patch – this area was not designated originally as having panels in any case so it does not constitute a change - Whilst I am in favour of renewable energy sites I feel there must be much more appropriate sites than the proposed land. - Clearly the removal of a small area of solar panels is expedient for the applicant in view of the discovery that a footpath runs across the area that would complicate infrastructure and bring additional construction cost. It will have minimal mitigation against the overall impact on the conservation area of Halloughton village with its architectural and cultural heritage still interrupted by not only the construction traffic but the glare and acoustic disturbance if the neighbouring fields were covered in solar glass, effectively industrialising this special landscape. 	Noted. No officer response required.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The screening will take a considerable time to grow up – in my experience of planting hedges and saplings this would be at a minimum of 10 years, and in winter the deciduous screening will be impaired due to leaf fall, particularly because of the undulating ground. The area is not short of abundant hedging and trees so there would not be a huge difference to the wildlife profile of the area.- The designation of a 're-wilded' patch of north-facing steep slope (unsuitable for agriculture or solar panels) appears to me a cynical use of a current trend that is specifically and properly used to connote the active intervention to collaborate with nature with the aim of improving biodiversity. When used to describe fantastic projects such as the official rewilding of Knepp estate in Sussex, this has involved the introduction of herbivores such as wild ponies and highland cattle, the planting of particular species that are attractive to butterflies, moths and other creatures, and careful interventions that help to manage the fauna and flora to re-establish itself. In this case, there is no indication that such activities will be undertaken, and in effect it appears simply to mean that the area of current scrub will continue to be derelict.- A small area - the field on the Southwell side of Halloughton - will now have no solar panels; this will make very little difference to the chaos of construction traffic on a narrow lane that is the only thoroughfare into the conservation area of Halloughton. Given the overall scale of the scheme, removing a small number of panels makes minimal difference to my objection that the scale is not appropriate to this rural area characterised by its peace and beauty.	

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is more screening on the footpath to the south of the area allocated - no amount of screening will cover the fact that the landscape is wholly unsuitable because the panels will be 10ft high and the ground is undulating and thus they will be visible from a considerable distance in the vicinity. In addition screening will take more than a decade to grow to any robust height and thus for the rest of my lifetime the screening will make no difference. - There is a small triangle of land near Thorney Abbey/Oxton Rd which would be officially designated as a small rewilding patch. This area borders my farm and I can say that it has been left as derelict scrubland for many years, at least a decade. Is this what is meant by 're-wilding' and does it have any meaningful definition in law? If so, how will it be managed and by whom, and to what standards? My feeling is that the land will simply continue to be left uncared for and uncultivated as it has for so long, including the continuing spread of weeds such as ragwort over the hedging border to my arable farmland. 	
7 Halloughton Planning Appeal	VIA East Midlands Landscape Consultants	27.08.21	<p><u>Discussion of changes to the scale of visual effect as a result of Amendments 1 – 4:</u></p> <p>Amendment 1 - An amendment has been made by the applicant between the Revision L and Revision M of the Site Layout and Planting Proposals plan. This removes an area of solar panels and associated infrastructure from a central field within the proposed development. This amendment has been made by the applicant to reduce the visual effects upon receptors at the western extent of Halloughton and users of the Public Right of Way Halloughton Bridleway 3 and pull the development back from the Halloughton Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The comments of VIA are noted and reflect verbal discussions referred to in the committee report.</p> <p>Officers note VIA accept that the amendments proposed will lead to some reduction in the scale of visual effect of the proposed development (particularly on viewpoints 14 and 15 which previously had a major adverse scale of visual effect as a result of the proposed development until</p>

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>The EMD Team accept that the removal of this area of panels in the central area of the Proposed Development will be beneficial in reducing the visual effects upon residential receptors at the western extent of Halloughton and users of PRow Halloughton Bridleway 3 which lies to the south west of the village of Halloughton. It will reduce the magnitude of change at the construction stage in particular for Viewpoint 12 which may reduce the major scale of effect at the construction stage.</p> <p>Amendment 2 - An amendment has been made by the applicant between the Revision L and Revision M of the Site Layout and Planting Proposals plan. A belt of new trees are proposed within an existing hedgerow which encloses a section of the proposed site boundary to the southwest. These trees would be a mix of native standard trees which would aid in filtering and obscuring views of the proposals from locations on PRow Southwell Footpath 42 to the southwest of the Site.</p> <p>The EMD Team accept that the strengthening of this hedgeline in the central area of the Proposed Development will be beneficial in reducing the visual impact from PRow Southwell Footpath 42 of the proposals to the north east of this PRow.</p> <p>Amendment 3 - An amendment has been made by the applicant between the Revision L and Revision M of the Site Layout and Planting Proposals plan. A new hedgerow is proposed along the northern extent of the proposed built form, adjacent to the proposed security fencing. The hedgerow would be comprised of a mix of native hedgerow shrubs and semi mature native trees and over time would aid in restricting and heavily filtering views of the proposals from locations along PRow Southwell Footpath 43.</p>	<p>year 1 (or Year 15 in the case of viewpoint 15)). However, it is also noted that due to the scale of visual effects identified by the applicant, and the scale of landscape effect (which remain as their previous conclusion) that they remain unsupportive of the proposal due to the overall landscape and visual impacts and harm of the development. In this context Officers remain of the view that, in summarising the overall level of harm, the degree to which the amended scheme would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside would continue to merit significant weight in the planning balance.</p>

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>The EMD Team accept that adding this hedgeline with semi mature trees in the northern area of the Proposed Development will be beneficial in reducing the visual impact on PRow Southwell Footpath 43. The visual impact on Viewpoint 14 - PRow footpath Southwell 43 looking south, is currently assessed as a major adverse scale of effect until year 1; and from Viewpoint 15 - PRow footpath Southwell 43 looking south, as a major adverse scale of effect until year 10. Therefore, any reduction in the scale of effect is welcomed. However, this hedgeline planting will completely change the nature of the current view of walkers on the PRow, with the topography sweeping up to a low ridge to the south. This view will be closed off to the walker, although there will still be views of the proposed solar panels at field entrances.</p> <p>Amendment 4 - An amendment has been made by the applicant between the Revision L and Revision M of the Site Layout and Planting Proposals plan. The proposed solar panels and security fencing have been pulled back from the north eastern corner of the field located to the east of New Radley Farm. Removing the proposal from this corner will enable an area of existing re-wilding to continue to establish.</p> <p>The EMD Team accept this proposal for a rewilding area which will contribute to biodiversity net gain of the proposed scheme and will also have some benefit in reducing views of the site as above on PRow Southwell Footpath 43 in this area.</p>	

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>Summary – Amendments 1 - 4</p> <p>It is accepted by the EMD Team that the applicant has reduced the scale of visual effect of the proposed development on viewpoints where the scale was previously major adverse, by either removing solar panels from the areas detailed above, or by strengthening vegetation in hedge lines along the Public Rights of Way which cross the site. Nevertheless visual effects remain, either as views of the proposed development and its infrastructure, or in the fact that currently existing views will be closed off by the planting or strengthening of existing hedgelines to obscure views of the development; this is particularly the case for PRow Southwell footpath 43, represented by viewpoints 14 and 15.</p> <p><u>Summary of scale of landscape effect</u></p> <p>To summarise the scale of landscape effects remain as detailed in the previous comments: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A moderate adverse scale of landscape effect on landcover of the proposed site for the 40 year lifetime of the scheme. This remains unchanged. • A major adverse scale of landscape effect on the character of Policy Zones 37, 38 and 39 for the 40 year lifetime of scheme is also described. This remains unchanged. <p>Taking the above into account the EMD Team still consider that there are long term impacts on the 'land cover' element of the landscape, and long term impacts on the landscape character of</p>	

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>the site area, it is accepted that these effects will diminish with distance from the site. As stated in our previous comments harm has been identified to the setting of Halloughton Conservation Area and the listed buildings contained within the area, in the comments of Oliver Scott – Conservation Officer of NSDC.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The EMD Team welcome the reduction in area of panels shown on drawing reference P18 -2917 Revision M and the additional and amended planting shown, and accept that these changes will lead to some reduction in the scale of visual effect of the proposed development particularly on viewpoints 14 and 15 which previously had a major adverse scale of visual effect as a result of the proposed development until year 1 (or Year 15 in the case of viewpoint 15) However, due to the scale of visual effects identified by the applicant, and the scale of landscape effect which remain as our previous comments, the EMD Team still do not support the proposals for the construction of a solar farm and battery stations together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.</p>	
7 Halloughton Planning Appeal	The Thornton Society	29.08.21	<p>There is nothing in the minor amendments which addresses the material concerns of the Thoroton Society.</p> <p>The effect on the historic landscape would not be ameliorated by the proposed amendments. Tree planting is always welcome but the area is already blessed with mature and long-standing trees and hedgerows: the excellent hedges provide food and shelter for a wealth of birds and other wildlife, wildlife which</p>	Noted. No officer response required.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7 September 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>would be disrupted by the introduction of industrial infrastructure.</p> <p>The access point is not proposed to be altered which is within the Conservation Area and close to Listed Buildings. Consideration of the plans provided by Pegasus to illustrate the “minor amendments” do indeed amply illustrate the incredibly excessive and wholly negative affect this proposal would have on the Conservation village of Halloughton and on its historic landscape.</p> <p>The minor amendments proposed are risible, as nearly all the other correspondents to the appeal process have indicated. It is to be hoped that the appeal will be dismissed.</p>	
7 Halloughton Planning Appeal	Southwell Town Council	06.09.21	<p>Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01242/FULM Land North Of Halloughton amendments and agreed by majority to strongly object to this application for the following reasons in addition to the previously submitted objections: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of one field has no significant change on the impact development will have on the area. Overall the surface area covered by the development is approximately 40-50% of the area of Southwell, and this makes it of industrial proportions and unsuitable for a rural area. • The rewilding from the Northeast corner will only replace the natural area which is wild already, and has been for many years. • Because of the shading of the sunlight and rain, the reinstatement of the land after 40 years will take a long time to get the land back to good quality. 	Noted. No officer response required.