

Comments for Planning Application 22/501335/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/501335/FULL

Address: Land North Of Little Cheveney Farm Sheephurst Lane Marden Kent

Proposal: Installation of a renewable energy led generating station comprising of ground-mounted solar arrays, associated electricity generation infrastructure and other ancillary equipment comprising of storage containers, access tracks, fencing, gates and CCTV together with the creation of woodland and biodiversity enhancements.

Case Officer: Marion Geary

Customer Details

Name: Mr Malcolm Bryant

Address: Le Cerisier, Goudhurst Road, Marden Tonbridge, Kent TN12 9JY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am objecting to the proposed solar farm for a number of reasons:-

We, as a country, should be energy self sufficient as far as possible and, therefore, available funds should be directed to sources which will provide a consistent and reliable supply of energy. Solar energy has been heavily subsidised and solar panels cost an exorbitant amount to build for relatively little reliable output. When this scheme was first mooted I received a circular from the company involved outlining the scheme and promising to answer any queries which people might have. I raised the question of how much the scheme would cost, how much was the Government subsidy, what was the anticipated energy output and the cost of it and how long was the expected life of the panels themselves given the problems involved in recycling solar panels. I never received a reply. I think I can see why now.

As regards the proposed site, it appears to be only marginally less in size to Marden itself even allowing for the recent housing developments! As far as I can tell, the site is on the way to Tunbridge Wells and Paddock Wood and therefore the additional traffic and inevitable road closures during the construction phase will put a huge amount of additional pressure on our country roads, especially during school runs and commuting times and I would guess a considerable decrease in air quality due to the inevitable stop/start caused by the additional construction traffic. Our local roads are just not built for the inevitable heavy construction traffic.

We are told that it is likely that the site is temporary and that it will be reversed after 37 years. What a waste of money for so little, if any, benefit. What will replace the presumed gap in our

energy needs when the site closes? How will the solar panels be recycled?

The proposed site is mainly situated on farmland. Again we are told that we must be as self sufficient in food production as possible and yet it is proposed to build the solar farm on good quality food producing farmland. Why?

I cannot see any reason why this proposed development should go ahead.

Malcolm Bryant