

**APPEAL PURSUANT TO SECTION 78 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY
PLANNING ACT 1990 IN RELATION TO
LAND 800 METRES SOUTH OF PARK HOUSE FARM, MERIDEN ROAD,
FILLONGLEY**

APPEAL REF: APP/R3705/W/24/3349391

LPA REF: PAP/2023/0071

**CLOSING SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF
NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

INTRODUCTION

1. It has been said that a city set on a hill cannot be hidden. Over the past couple of weeks, the Appellant has shown how difficult it is to try to develop a 61ha solar energy infrastructure development on one.
2. The topography of the site has provided a challenge that the Appellant has failed to overcome. The site extends across a hill with a ridgeline, which slopes down on all sides to surrounding land, which then rises again, creating an amphitheatre effect that invites views towards the site. This difficulty is compounded by the presence of numerous heritage assets in the vicinity of the site and the inevitable harm that would be caused.
3. The Appellant has failed to show that it would be able to screen effectively solar panels, substations, transformer stations, tracks/roads, parking, high security fencing and gates, and CCTV on the ten fields of rural Green Belt that make up this elevated site. The Council doubts that it would even be possible in this location.

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE

The site and its topography

4. The site comprises a hill between two river valleys, and a strip of land that rises to the west to Meriden Road. The two high points of c.145m AOD (147m and 149m)¹ form a shallow north to south orientated ridge, that drops to the stream valleys to the east and west.
5. This is shown well in the second photograph in Mr Simmons' Submission² and is further demonstrated by:
 - a. The 3D Basins and Sections Drawing;³
 - b. The contours on the OS mapping for the site, as can be seen in the Site Location Plan at Figure 1 of the Appellant's LVA, dated April 2024⁴;
 - c. The Topography Plan at Figure 5 of the Appellant's LVA;⁵
6. The proposed development would run along a domed horizon, including along the ridge of the hill, meaning that it would be highly visible from the east and the west, including from the amphitheatre of land that falls from the Coventry Road to the eastern edge of the site.
7. Notwithstanding the clear, objective, evidence for the topography of the site, the Appellant has appeared to shy away from it throughout the appeal. In his oral evidence, Mr Cook was reluctant to refer to the ridge on the site, preferring the term "lower high" ground before he eventually accepted there was a ridge.⁶ This reluctance gives an indication of the difficulty that the site poses.

¹ CD 1.1.

² ID 5.

³ CD 1.1.

⁴ CD 1.22.

⁵ CD 1.22.

⁶ Cook XX.

Visualisations

8. The Appellant's photomontage visualisations should be treated with caution for two reasons:
 - a. **First**, they show a distorted/flattened image;
 - b. **Second**, they were all taken when the vegetation is in full leaf.⁷
9. The reason that the visualisations show a distorted image is that they were taken with a 20mm ultra-wide-angle lens, rather than the 50mm lens recommended by the LI Visual Representation guidance.⁸ The use of the 20mm ultra wide-angle lens is noted in the detail on the bottom left-hand side of each image.
10. The effect is that the site appears to be distant in each visualisation and the central part of the image is compressed, making the landscape look flatter, and the hill less apparent. An indication of how the image is distorted can be seen by observing the degree markers at the bottom of each page. These are in ten-degree increments and become much closer across the centre of each image (compressed) and further apart (stretched) at the edges.
11. As to the decision to provide only images when the deciduous vegetation is in leaf, this is problematic as the images do not represent the worst case. That the viewer is left to imagine this scenario, is plainly unsatisfactory.
12. Mr Cook sought to downplay the obvious difficulties with the visualisations but accepted that they did "somewhat" distort the images to the benefit of the Appellant. He further agreed, as he had to, that the trees would be essentially transparent when leafless.⁹
13. While criticism was made of Ms Oxley's photographs, this was unfair. She did not present the photographs in her Proof as Accurate Visualisations as the Appellant did, and who was responsible for undertaking the LVIA. They were

⁷ CD 1.36.

⁸ CD 6.12, §1.15.

⁹ Cook XX.

simply taken with her mobile phone as an *aide memoire*, and they helped her to record the difference between ‘with leaves’ and ‘without leaves’ situations.

14. The Inspector will recall that the problem with the Appellant’s visualisations was raised in the CMC. Notwithstanding this, the Appellant persisted with images that it knew did not comply with the relevant guidance and which were not only misleading but distorted the images in favour of its own case.
15. Fortunately, the far less well-resourced Rule 6 Party provided its own visualisations. These do comply with the LI guidance, and they provide a far more reliable and faithful indication of the appearance of the proposed development in the landscape.¹⁰
16. Another image produced by the Appellant which is unhelpful is its Approximate Visual Image Envelope, produced as part of the original LVA at Figure 6.¹¹ This is hand drawn and understates visibility, especially to the north-west and south-east.
17. More helpful are the Appellant’s two ZTVs. The **first** is the Appellant’s Bare Earth ZTV included as Appendix 9 to Mr Cook’s Proof.¹² This is useful, though it does not take account of trees that filter views when in leaf. It indicates the areas of:
 - a. Effects on the landscape character of the site and the area to the east and west – broadly the yellow areas on the ZTV – which were measured by Ms Oxley to be c.5-6 square km;
 - b. Visual effects across the site itself, including the footpath (M294/1) that traverses it, running from Fillongley, adjacent to the Ring and Bailey, a Scheduled Monument, and south to the Meriden Road;
 - c. Visual effects from the east – Coventry Way (M298/1), the path running south from Fillongley (M294a/1), the fields in the amphitheatre of land that

¹⁰ CDs 9.11 and 9.12.

¹¹ CD 1.22.

¹² CD 9.3.

are informally walked and farmed in this area, the communities along the Coventry Road (B4098) including Far Parks;

- d. Visual effects from the west – Meriden Road (B4102), Green End Road, the communities comprising Park House, Home Farm, Fillongley Mount (three properties here and others scattered along this road), White House Farm, paths in this area (M289/1 and M289a/1), and gateways off the roads in the area allowing views for road users.
 - e. Other wider views, for example at Tipper’s Hill, that will be of less concern for the Inspector.
18. The **second** is the Appellant’s later “with trees” ZTV included as Appendix 2 to Mr Cook’s Rebuttal Proof.¹³ This uses LiDAR data which indicates the canopy spread for all trees over 3m in height and is more helpful for high summer views than for winter, early spring, or late autumn views, when the deciduous trees are not in full leaf. It shows the main areas of visibility to the east and west of the site in yellow, though as noted in discussions, it may also be possible to see beneath the tree canopies. While there are further yellow areas to the north, these are a greater distance from the site, so are of less importance.
19. It is unusual to spend so much inquiry time discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the visualisations produced by an Appellant, or indeed to have to point out the weaknesses.
20. Why the Appellant decided to leave itself open to such criticism is unclear. This may help to understand, though, how it came to under report the landscape and visual effects of the proposal, effects which were summarised by the Council in the Board Report presented to members.¹⁴

¹³ CD 13.10.

¹⁴ CD 2.2.

Landscape effects

21. The proposed development would have an effect not only on the site itself, but on the surrounding landscape too, particularly to the east and west. Ms Oxley summarised them in her Proof at Table 3.1.¹⁵
22. In terms of the wider topography, there would be containment by much more distant higher ground – as can be seen on the Topography Plan at Fig.5 of the original LVA – but there is a lack of containment more locally.¹⁶
23. The reason that the effects will not be contained more locally is that the site falls to lower stream valleys to either side. This means that views from outside the site are readily available, which will in turn influence the experience of landscape character from outside the site.
24. When walking west along Coventry Way, through a natural amphitheatre with panoramic views across the site, the development would cause a change that would significantly alter the whole area across which this part of the public footpath traverses. The Coventry Way is important given it is a promoted long-distance route, so effects on this should be given more weight.
25. Similarly, to the west, there would be a significant change in the way that the landscape character as well as views, both static and sequential, would be perceived. This includes from Meriden Road, Green End Road and the areas of the properties along it, including Manor House Farm, Park House Farm and White House Farm (all Grade II as noted above).
26. More generally, the siting of the proposed development across an elevated hill and ridgeline would exacerbate the harm that would otherwise be caused by such a large industrial development. The land is widely visible locally as the site faces outwards to all sides. And the harm would be experienced by users of footpath

¹⁵ CD 13.5, pp39-43.

¹⁶ CD 1.22.

M294/1 across the site, and the Coventry Way (M298/1) and footpath M294a/1 to the east of the site.

27. Until the inquiry, the Appellant claimed that effects would be contained, by which it meant that they would extend only across the site. However, under cross examination, Mr Cook conceded that the effects would extend to the local environs, including the amphitheatre that drops to the east and which is traversed by the Coventry Way.
28. Finally, the topography of the site itself would be changed by the introduction of flat development platforms for banded transformer and sub stations across a sloping site. The development would not be contained within strong boundaries, because of the extension of the site over a shallow, domed hill/ridge top which forms one of the horizons to local views.

Visual effects

29. Ms Oxley's conclusions on visual effects are set out in her Table 3.2 at pp 51 to 59 of her Proof. She visited the site in autumn and in winter to consider both best case and worst-case scenarios.
30. There is a general tendency of the Appellant to fail to recognise either the extent/magnitude or even the existence of negative visual effects. For instance, no notable effects at Park House Farm have been detected, the effects on Coventry Way have been understated, and the effects on Far Parks, as well as on residential properties along Green End Road and off Meriden Road, have been omitted.
31. The Coventry Way (M298/1) is of particular importance given that it is a promoted long-distance route which is used by visitors as well as local people. The route of the Coventry Way is shown with green diamonds on the Bare Earth ZTV included as Appendix 9 to Mr Cook's Proof.¹⁷ It runs from north-east to south-west across this page, crossing the motorway on a bridge at the south-east

¹⁷ CD 9.3.

corner of the site. Effects upon it are therefore more important than those upon local paths alone.

32. Viewpoint 13 represents a location on this route.¹⁸ As discussed above, this image is distorted. In reality, the hill that forms the site is much more apparent from this location. And it is continuously observable as people walk south-west down the path towards the site.
33. Another view of the Coventry Way is provided by Viewpoint 7.¹⁹
34. The Appellant has further neglected to detect visibility from houses along Coventry Road and at Far Parks. Prior to the site visit on the first day of the inquiry, Ms Oxley did not know for certain whether it would be possible to see the site clearly from the garden and ground floor of these properties, as well as from upper levels, as she had not previously entered private gardens. However, she confirmed that this was the case.²⁰
35. In relation to Viewpoint 9, on Meriden Road and near to the location of Park Farm, Fillongley Mount, the junction with Green End Road, Mr Cook said that was only thinking about fast moving road users in vehicles, though he later accepted that there were horses too.²¹
36. This explains why he concluded that there would be a negligible magnitude and no impact from that location, even though there is a wide-open view of the site and why Ms Oxley considered that there would be an important visual effect from this area. The proposed development would affect the community living in the vicinity, as well as workers at the farm, and road users including walkers and cyclists.

¹⁸ CD 1.36, p.19.

¹⁹ CD 1.36, p.10.

²⁰ Oxley XIC.

²¹ Cook XX.

37. Ms Oxley explained in her evidence that, while there was no residential amenity objection, the views of people in communities in and around their homes and on paths and roads were relevant and that they should be considered.²²

Mitigation

38. Vegetation is typically planted as transplants or whips, trees of around 1-3 years old which are around 30cm to 1m high, and spindly in form. After around 15 years they are usually expected to have reached around 7.5-8m in height. They tend to remain relatively static for some time before they start to grow more effectively, although this depends on the conditions and how well they are looked after. It will be many years however before screening or filtering of views by maturing vegetation becomes more effective. The applicant does not seem to have considered the time it takes for vegetation to grow, or the seasonality of effects.
39. However, there is a yet more fundamental problem. The topographical nature of the site means that effective mitigation is not possible. It is a poor site where visibility cannot be effectively reduced.
40. When standing on the hill at the top of the site, the Inspector will have seen the areas of landscape, and the visual receptors (people) that will see the solar development extending around her.
41. These include properties along Coventry Road (including Far Parks), the amphitheatre of land traversed by people using the Coventry Way, the community and road users at Park House, Fillongley Mount, and White House Farms off Meriden Road, and the community and road users along Green End Road to the north-west. There is generally less visibility from the south direction due to mature vegetation along the motorway.

²² Oxley XX.

Weight given to landscape and visual effects

42. Ms Oxley explained that the moderate effects that she detected were both significant and important.²³ She explained that the only reason that they were not at the highest end of the scale (major) was that the proposal was not for a larger development such as a power station. This careful calibration of effects should not be taken to mean that every solar development of these scale should be acceptable.

Site selection

43. The evidence provided by Ms Oxley has demonstrated the unsuitability of the site for the development of the Appellant's proposal.

44. There was no obligation on the Appellant to carry out a site selection exercise. Notwithstanding this, the Inspector will be aware that Appellants often do carry out such an exercise in order to show the suitability of the site for the development proposed.

45. Mr Cook said that he had done this in his head, but had not discussed it with his clients.²⁴ Mr Bainbridge said he discussed it in his office recently, but seems to have only informally considered three sites promoted by the same landowner.²⁵

46. In circumstances where the Council and others have placed so much emphasis on the unsuitability of the site for the proposed development, it does seem odd that the Appellant did not want to satisfy everyone that this was the most suitable site in the locality by carrying out a rigorous selection exercise.

²³ Oxley XX.

²⁴ Cook XX.

²⁵ Bainbridge XX.

Conclusion on character and appearance

47. In its evidence on character and appearance, the Appellant has consistently downplayed or omitted landscape and visual effects and the visualisations it provided are both misleading and distorting.
48. The principal problem the Appellant faces is, though, more fundamental. The topography of the site poses a considerable challenge, which the Appellant has failed to meet.

HERITAGE

49. The site is surrounded by several designated and undesignated heritage assets. Inevitably the proposed development would cause heritage harm.
50. The harm to the various assets is set out in section 7 of Mr Weekes Proof. In summary, the Council has assessed harm as follows:
 - a. Fillongley Conservation Area: **less than substantial harm;**
 - b. 12th Century Ringwork (Scheduled Ancient Monument): **limited harm.**
51. Overall, the harm is assessed as being at the level of less than substantial harm for the purposes of §215 of the NPPF. The Council accepts that the public benefits would outweigh the harm to heritage assets.
52. Notwithstanding this, the harm will still need to be weighed in the planning balance and the Inspector will be aware of her statutory duty to place “great weight” on the harm when doing so pursuant to s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

BMV LAND

53. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment in numerous ways, including recognising the wider benefits of BMV land.
54. The Appellant recognises that 96.2% of the site comprises BMV. However, the Council accepts that in the circumstances, the use of the BMV land would not be contrary to policy or cause direct harm.

PLANNING BALANCE

Development plan

55. The statutory development plan comprises the North Warwickshire Local Plan 2021²⁶ and the Fillongley Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2034²⁷.
56. There is no dispute that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan. The harm to the plan is set out in section 10 of Mr Weekes Proof, pp58 to 69 and is summarised below.

Development plan policies

Policy LP1: Sustainable Development

57. Policy LP1 is an overarching sustainability policy. It requires that development proposals comply with each of several specified criteria. It further requires that development should protect the existing rights of way network and where possible contribute to its expansion and management.
58. The proposed development is contrary to the requirement that development proposals must “integrate appropriately with the natural and historic environment protecting and enhancing [the] rights of way network where appropriate”. As discussed above, the proposed development does not integrate with the natural

²⁶ CD 4.1.

²⁷ CD 4.2.

environment, or the historic environment and it does not protect the quality of the public footpath M294 that traverses the site.

59. Further there is, even on the Appellant's case, harm to heritage assets which is contrary to the requirement that proposals "sustain, conserve and enhance the historic environment".
60. There is **moderate conflict** with the policy.

Policy LP3: Green Belt

61. This proposal seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. It states that inappropriate should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
62. The Council accepts that there is **no conflict** with this policy.

Policy LP14: Landscape

63. Policy LP 14 requires that within the relevant landscape character areas "development should look to conserve, enhance and where appropriate, restore landscape character as well as promote a resilient, functional landscape able to adapt to climate change".
64. As additional hedgerows would be provided on site which would reinstate the original grain of field pattern, the Council accepts that there is **no conflict** with the policy.

Policy LP15: Historic Environment

65. Policy LP15 is concerned with conserving and enhancing where possible the historic environment and the contribution it makes to the character, identity and distinctiveness of the area. It is aligned with Section 16 of the NPPF.
66. As described above, the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the identified heritage assets which would be outweighed by the public benefits.
67. There is **limited conflict** with the policy.

Policy LP17: Green Infrastructure

68. Policy LP17 seeks to identify, maintain and enhance Green Infrastructure assets. There are no relevant assets, but the proposed development retains existing hedges and trees and augments them. This is proposed to be achieved through conditions and by means of the s.106 agreement.
69. There is **no conflict** with the policy.

Policy LP29: Development Considerations

70. This policy seeks to meet the needs of current residents and businesses without compromising the ability of future generations to ensure the same quality of life. It sets out seventeen points with which developments are expected to comply.
71. Many of the points are not relevant to the proposed development
72. There is **limited conflict** with the policy.

Policy LP30: Built Form

73. Policy LP30 requires that all development, in terms of its layout, form, and density, respects and reflects the existing pattern, character, and appearance of its setting. Development should conform to certain criteria, including (a):
- “a) ensure that all elements of the proposal are well related to each other and harmonise with both the immediate setting and wider surroundings”.
74. While the design integration is limited by the necessary appearance and form of the proposed development, the scale of the development, the introduction of regular linear features to an irregular field pattern and the change to the landscape setting means that the proposal does not harmonise with its wider setting.
75. There is therefore conflict with criterion (a) and, given the scale of the conflict, **moderate conflict** with the policy overall.

Policy LP33: Water and Flood Risk Management

76. Policy LP33 seeks to ensure development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and states that opportunities to reduce flood risk should be taken. As the proposed development is considered not to cause any flood risk, and the additional ponds offer betterment, there is **no conflict** with the policy.

Policy LP35: Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency

77. Policy LP35 states, *inter alia*, that:

“Renewable energy projects will be supported where they respect the capacity and sensitivity of the landscape and communities to accommodate them. In particular, they will be assessed on their individual and cumulative impact on landscape quality, sites or features of natural importance, sites or buildings of historic or cultural importance, residential amenity and the local economy.”

78. The proposed development does not respect the capacity and sensitivity of the landscape and communities to accommodate it. In particular, the topography of the site means that the proposal cannot be screened effectively and consequently cannot be assimilated appropriately.
79. There is **significant conflict** with this policy.

FNP01: Built Environment

80. Policy FNP01 provides: “Development proposals where possible should ensure the designs of new buildings (including extensions) do not cause a detrimental change to the overall character of the village, the rural landscape of the parish and the setting of the Church through [specified criteria]”.
81. As with Policy LP30, it does not specifically address renewable energy schemes, but the same principles can be applied.
82. The proposed development would have a particular impact on the landscape setting of the parish, specifically the southern part of it, and it would be visible

from areas to the north of the parish. While the proposal is for a temporary development, 40-years is still a significant period.

83. There is **significant conflict** with the policy.

FNP02: Natural Environment

84. Policy FPN02 requires that: “Development proposals should wherever possible should seek to enhance and conserve the Natural Environment.” Proposals will be supported where they meet specified requirements.

85. The provision of a 61ha renewable energy scheme on elevated land that is readily visible from the surrounding area, and which has a massive influence on the setting of the area is plainly contrary to the purpose of the policy.

86. There is **significant conflict** with the policy.

FNP03: Flooding

87. This policy echoes the aims of Policy LP33 and there is **no conflict** for similar reasons.

Conclusion on the development plan

88. The most important policies are:
- a. LP1: Sustainable Development (**moderate conflict**)
 - b. LP3: Green Belt (**no conflict**)
 - c. LP14: Landscape (**no conflict**)
 - d. LP30: Built Form (**moderate conflict**)
 - e. LP35: Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (**significant conflict**)
 - f. FNP01: Built Environment (**significant conflict**)
 - g. FNP02: Natural Environment (**significant conflict**).

89. There is therefore significant or moderate conflict with no fewer than five development plan policies, all of which are among the most important policies for determining the application. There is further limited conflict with two others (heritage) policies.
90. The proposed development is clearly contrary to the development plan when read as a whole.

Other material considerations

91. The Inspector has been provided with an updated agreed table of benefits and harms to enable comparison of the respective positions of the parties.²⁸
92. There is agreement between the Council and the Appellant on several issues. The following provides a summary of areas where there is disagreement in relation to benefits:
 - a. **Good design/efficient use of land (Appellant: Significant / Council: Limited):** The Council does not accept that the design is particularly good. While there are positive aspects, such as the retention and reinforcement of hedgerows, the design overall is not considered to be of a high standard. The Appellant has chosen to position solar panels over both the east and west slopes of the site and across the ridge with the effect that they will be highly visible. The proposed landscape is woefully short in terms of adequately mitigating this harm;
 - b. **Biodiversity (Appellant Substantial (Sig) / Council Moderate):** The Council's weight affects the BNG that would be achieved on the site (63% increase in habitat units and 26% increase hedgerows). In an appeal decision determining an appeal at Honiley (APP/T3725/V/23/3332671)²⁹, dated 23 July 2024, significant weight was afforded by the Secretary of State where there was a 135% increase in habitat units and a 10.6% increase in hedgerows. The BNG offered by the present appeal falls significantly short of that and moderate weight is appropriate, reflecting the weight

²⁸ ID 18.

²⁹ CD 7.29.

afforded by other Inspectors (e.g. an appeal decision determining an appeal at Lullington (APP/F1040/W/22/3313316)) at DL 50);³⁰

- c. **Air quality (Appellant Moderate / Council Very Limited):** The proposed development in and of itself will not improve air quality. The delivery of renewable energy, and the compensating effect on the need for energy to be delivered from older energy generators which are not clean, would be replaced. Mr Weekes accepted that overall the provision of clean energy offers health benefits in a generalised way and that air quality should be given some positive weight, but that it should be very limited weight;³¹

- d. **Economic development (Appellant Significant / Council Limited):** The economic benefits attributable to the proposed development have not been explicitly justified. Information placed forward by the Appellant relates to the whole renewable energy sector, and only within the Rebuttal Statement of Mr Bainbridge has there been any attempt to provide an indication of employment or financial benefits from the proposal. The significant financial contributions alluded to are redefined to provide £101,184 per annum for business rates, an amount which Mr Weekes did not accept should be afforded significant weight.³² Moreover, the suggested 347 full time equivalent jobs that would be supported across the supply chain is not accepted as being a defensible figure. Associated indirect employment is significantly below this, with no clear evidence trail on how an accurate and robust expectation for associated job creation can be linked to this proposal. Overall, it is reasonable to afford limited weight to economic development;

- e. **Farm diversification (Appellant Moderate / Council Limited):** The proposal will enable the co-existence of agricultural uses and energy generation. The lack of flexibility to the agricultural use of the land results

³⁰ CD 7.79.

³¹ Weekes XX.

³² Weekes XX.

in the dual use only being recognised as a limited benefit as overall as it constrains the existing use during the lifetime of the development.

93. As to harms, the following again summarises areas of disagreement:
- a. **Landscape and visual (Appellant Moderate / Council Significant):** This difference reflects the different positions taken by the parties as discussed above;
 - b. **Heritage (Appellant Moderate / Council Limited):** the lesser weight afforded by the Council affects the heritage assessment undertaken;
 - c. **Permanence/Remediability: (Appellant Moderate / Council none/limited):** The 40-year time frame, whilst not indefinite, represents a significant period. Many of those present at the inquiry could not hope to witness the expiry of the permission and more than two generations of children would live with the energy infrastructure as a constant backdrop to their childhood in the area.
94. In terms of carrying out the balance it is identified that there are a number of benefits and harms. It is a planning judgment, but one where the extent of landscape and visual harms, reflecting the extent of viewpoints affected, including the important Coventry Way and the area this covers, is considered a significant negative against the proposal. The carrying out of any planning balance requires the exercise of planning judgment and it is not simply a question of totting up benefits and harms. This would risk comparing apples against pears.
95. Thus, in the particular circumstances of this appeal, the extent of the particular harm that would be caused means that planning permission should be refused. The Appellant proposes the wrong development in the wrong location.

CONCLUSION

96. While the Council is supportive of renewable energy proposals, including those for solar energy, it cannot support this proposed development in this location. The Appellant is quite simply promoting the wrong development in the wrong place.
97. The Inspector is respectfully invited to dismiss the appeal and to refuse planning permission.

Howard Leithead

17 April 2025

No5 Chambers
London • Birmingham • Bristol
Tel: 0207 420 7568
Email: hle@no5.com