

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 Michael Williams

Address: Top Oast, Little Cheveney Farm Sheephurst Lane, Marden Tonbridge, Kent TN12 9NX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Objection letter

Planning Application Reference 22/501335 FULL

Site address: Land North of Little Cheveney Farm, Sheephurst Lane, Marden, Kent

Statkraft have not made any effort to address the many inaccuracies highlighted by local residents in the original submitted planning application. They have failed to communicate and engage with local residents.

Statkraft confirm none of their studies and impact assessments were conducted close to the grade 2 listed residential properties within Little Cheveney Farm. As a result they have excluded those residents who live on Little Cheveney or near the farm who will be most affected by the installation. How can these findings be regarded as accurate, fair and acceptable by the Planning committee?

The applicants fail to properly address concerns about the sheer scale of the proposed solar farm, the noise and glare issues, the amount and duration of construction traffic and the impact on birds and wildlife.

I was very concerned about how dismissive Statkraft were about incorrectly submitted solar panel specifications (regarding size and height of panels). The consequences of glint and glare and the visual impact are major concerns and I would suggest these inaccuracies are sufficient grounds to question any data submitted by the applicants and reject all related reports, supporting documentation and findings. I would therefore challenge the accuracy of this planning application which should be declined.

The latest suggested vegetation screening for my property (which will take at least 10 years to grow) includes private land not owned by the farm. My previous objection letter dated 30/06/22 highlighted private land which was incorrectly included in the application and once again the applicants continue to include land which is not owned by the farm.

Solar farms do not need to be close to pylons as claimed by Statkraft, (I refer to the Great Wilbraham Solar Farm). This is good agricultural land which has been successfully farmed for decades and with the current global situation should continue to be prioritised for national food security.

How can MBC accept an application which ignores and fails to address the concerns of those residents most affected.

This planning application will not benefit the community and will not deliver local jobs and reduced energy costs for local people. It will only financially benefit Statkraft and the farmer.

I request that this poorly presented and inaccurate planning application is rejected by the MBC Planning committee.

I object to this planning application.