

## Swithenbank, Arne

**From:** Weaver, Robert  
**Sent:** 25 February 2015 10:57  
**To:** Swithenbank, Arne  
**Subject:** Fwd: Objection to Planning Application SMD/2014/0432  
**Attachments:** Moneystone Solar Farm Objection.doc; ATT00001.htm

Not sure if you have this Arne,  
Regards  
Rob

Robert Weaver  
Head of Regulatory Services  
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, High Peak Borough Council.  
01538 395400 ext 4080

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** JOHN STEELE  
**Date:** 24 February 2015 19:08:40 GMT  
**To:** "Ahmad, Mahfooz (CLLR)" <[Mahfooz.Ahmad@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Mahfooz.Ahmad@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Bowen, Michael (CLLR)" <[Michael.Bowen@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Michael.Bowen@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Bull, Julie (CLLR)" <[Julie.Bull@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Julie.Bull@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Davies, Jim (CLLR)" <[Jim.Davies@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Jim.Davies@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Ellis, Stephen (CLLR)" <[Stephen.Ellis@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Stephen.Ellis@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Fisher, John (CLLR)" <[John.Fisher@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:John.Fisher@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Hails, Jason (CLLR)" <[Jason.Hails@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Jason.Hails@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Locker Ronald (CLLR)" <[ronald.locker@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:ronald.locker@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Lovatt, Margaret (CLLR)" <[Margaret.Lovatt@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Margaret.Lovatt@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Malyon, Linda (CLLR)" <[Linda.Malyon@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Linda.Malyon@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Plant, Robert (CLLR)" <[Robert.Plant@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Plant@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Roberts, Paul (CLLR)" <[Paul.Roberts@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Roberts@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "Worthington, Michael (CLLR)" <[Michael.Worthington@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Michael.Worthington@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>, "josephine.clewes@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk" <[josephine.clewes@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:josephine.clewes@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** "Weaver, Robert" <[Robert.Weaver@highpeak.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Weaver@highpeak.gov.uk)>, "Larner, Dai" <[Dai.Larner@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk](mailto:Dai.Larner@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Objection to Planning Application SMD/2014/0432  
**Reply-To:** JOHN STEELE

Dear Councillors

I am sending you this late submission directly, I have already today hand delivered a paper copy to SMDC for Mr Swithenbank and have a receipt.

This is a late submission because 5 important documents only appeared on the website at the end of last week, not enough time to study them even yet. A number of e-mail exchanges with the applicant and Staffordshire County Council have only been found in the file today, they are not available on the website, and have not yet been adequately scrutinised but what I can see does not accord with the blithe statement that SCC has withdrawn its holding objections which can be found in the Case Officer's report.

As you will remember this application was deferred last November for this very lack of ecological and landscape detail. Is it not very strange that having had a further 3 months the

application is not even now ready for coherent deliberation on issues which were clearly identified as lacking in November? I, for one, smell a rat.

Mr Swithenbank may seek to re-assure you that all is well on Thursday, it most certainly is not. Just count the number of conditions that he and even the applicant ask to be imposed were the application to succeed. This is planning being made up as it goes along, not at all the careful deliberation that this beautiful and tranquil part of the Churnet Valley deserves.

Please refuse this application on both procedural and planning grounds which you will find in the attachment.

Yours very sincerely

John Steele

The Hazles  
Hollins Lane  
Kingsley  
ST102EP

24th February 2015

---

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

If this has come to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this email from your system. The Council may be required to disclose this email or any response to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000

<http://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk>

---

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

If this has come to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this email from your system. The Council may be required to disclose this email or any response to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000

<http://www.highpeak.gov.uk>



To Mr Arne Swithenbank  
Planning Officer  
SMDC

AS HOK 25/2/15

Objection to Planning Application SMD/2014/0432 Moneystone Solar Farm

### **Procedural Objections.**

1. The Committee deferred its determination of this application at its meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2014 to enable additional information to be obtained addressing the outstanding objection from Staffordshire County Council. In your addendum report which has only come into public view from last Friday the 20<sup>th</sup> February you state that the Staffordshire County Council Objections on Landscape and Biodiversity have been lifted subject to conditions. Without these documents being made available to the public, and indeed the Planning Applications Committee Members, we have no way of judging if they should be addressed fully by the applicant BEFORE approval. Sadly experience tells us that once approval is given the conditions are conveniently forgotten.

2. Why is it that from the deferral in November no new documentation appeared on the /0432 website page until a sudden rush of 5 new postings appeared on the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> of February 2015. What didn't you want us to have the time to consider properly in these documents? I object in the strongest terms that given a four month delay the documents are made available too late for proper examination.

3. On the layout received 11th February 2015 the detail of the panels remains as in drawing SBC1000/17/03 showing that the angle of inclination of the panels is 25 degrees from the horizontal. As previously there is to be a single HV Sub-station and Switchgear cabin just off the west edge of the southern panel area (Area E) measuring 12m x 4m x 2.5m high as shown in drawing SBC1000/17/06. Each developed area of panels would also have its own hub of plant cabins on a reduced scale compared with the original application occupying an area approximately 15m x 4m and approximately 3m high.

***The applicant requests that the final construction details of this apparatus be made the subject of a controlling condition.*** In these circumstances I would again expect this condition to be discharged before an application is granted, not afterwards.

### **Planning Objections.**

1. This application cannot be considered independently to the Moneystone Leisure Park SMD/2014/0682 as it is entirely contained within the Leisure Park boundaries. Natural England in their report to /0682 say that biological diversity and ecological issues are completely connected and propose a methodology and advice on how the issues should be studied together.

2. The application fails in its relation to the SMDC Core Strategy SS7 in that it does not by it's size and design meet the criteria "...be of a scale and nature and of a high standard of design which conserves and enhances the heritage, landscape and biodiversity of the area..." "The consideration of landscape character will be paramount in all development proposals in order to protect and conserve locally distinctive qualities and sense of place and to maximise opportunities for restoring, strengthening and enhancing distinctive landscape features".

The application must be considered in relation to the quarry having been restored according to the SCC plan as a "Greenfield Site. This massive industrial installation would be visible from many parts of Whiston Parish and from many locations on the south side of the valley.



In your report on page 6.6 the Trees and Woodlands Officer makes a statement *that "...the darker and more recessive colouring of the panel arrays.. ...compared to the current bright patches of silica sand would lead to a generally low visual impact..."* **Of course this is inadmissible as the comparison can only be made to the restored status.**

3. The details of the installation are strangely lacking in terms of the number of panels, their type and efficiency, and the complete absence of climatic data for the area. This leads to the conclusion that you are not in position to verify the size and form of the proposal in relation to its stated power generation capability. Without this certainty the application is not ready for scrutiny.

4. It is no accident that very few solar parks exist in latitudes north of the Wash because regardless of the manufacturers rating the relative angle of the sun is such that only a minimum period of time exists per day even in summer when the full output can be realised. Only by expensive and unsustainable subsidy is this project viable

Solar energy is often quoted as free energy and as its name implies this is derived from the sun, but of course is limited to the times when the sun is shining.

The free energy concept is a complete misnomer, the panels have to be manufactured, the mounting frames have to be manufactured, the foundations have to be provided, the cabling and electrical infrastructure has to be provided and housed, security fencing, remote monitoring and CCTV are also required in the name of security.....The list goes on

All these items have to be transported and assembled on the prepared site, plus of course the new commitments to ongoing site restoration and maintenance.

ALL these items consume energy and count against the any energy actually produced, and coincidentally make a mockery of the quoted CO2 saved.

5. The cumulative effect of Solar energy on the landscape is not just the Hectares for the panels and ancillary equipment, but the necessity of having other sources of power when the sun doesn't shine, like all night (especially in wintertime), when it is overcast, when the panels are dirty and when the panels are degraded by age. One such example is Diesel generation, an example of this has just been validated at SMDC

<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=73734>

The above STOR policy is not an acceptable solution to the limitations of wind or solar power which cannot be stored. Does SMDC really expect its population to live cheek by jowl with all this useless equipment which provides the most expensive electricity to be found?

6. The local residents are particularly incensed that a restoration project was negotiated and documented by SCC and the current owners are seeking to bypass and ignore this binding agreement and replace it with a visual monstrosity. .

Yours truly

John Steele

The Hazles  
Hollins Lane  
Kingsley ST102EP

24<sup>th</sup> February 2015