

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 12 June 2019 21:46

**To:** Cleve Hill Solar Park <[CleveHillSolarPark@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:CleveHillSolarPark@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Cleve Hill Solar Park EN010085 Ref 20018862

Dear Madam or Sir,

Following my initial report on the objection for the abovementioned development on the 11<sup>th</sup> June 2019, I have now realised that I have not allowed for a summary, as the objections exceed 1500 words. I would like to apologise for this oversight and would like to reiterate that I am quite new to these procedural requirements for planning purposes.

However, I have now produced a summary which is less than 10% of the word of my original submission and would envisage that my addendum summary can be read in conjunction to my original objection report, dated 11/06/2019.

Yours sincerely

Bruno Erasin, BSc, PhD

Cleve Hill Case Team  
1/18 Eagle Wing  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

12<sup>th</sup> June 2019

Ref: 20018862

Cleve Hill Solar Park – Soil and agricultural Use Classification– Objections - Addendum Summary

Dear Madam or Sir,

Following submission of my objections in relation to ‘Cleve Hill Solar Park – Soil and agricultural Use Classification’, dated 11<sup>th</sup> June 2019, I have now noted that I should have included a short summary, as it exceeds 1500 words. Apologise for this oversight, but I am quite new to this type of procedural matters.

I would like to submit the following summary of my objections, which should be read as addendum to my previous submission of my objections, dated 11<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

The summary of my objections in relation to the soil and agricultural use classification is as follows:

- The Cleve Hill Solar Park SALU 2017 report does not follow and meet the standards of assessment detailed in the ALC MAFF 1988 guidelines;
- The field survey is ‘biased’ in relation to being undertaken at the time of year following an extremely wet February 2017 followed by two weeks of rainfall during the duration of the field survey at the beginning of March 2017;
- Incomplete data has been presented in the report submitted to The Planning Inspectorate;
- Some assessment criteria to determine Wetness Class for two observation locations have been incorrectly interpreted;
- A large number of observation points have been entirely incorrectly interpreted based on the presence of naturally calcareous clay soils;
- No quantitative data (as defined by the MAFF 1988 guidelines) has been presented in the report demonstrating that the soils at the site are water logged for the duration of more than 91-180 days ‘for most years’ i.e Wetness Class III;
- The Soil Survey Handbook 1979, which forms part of the MAFF 1988 guidelines details that single observations at one particular time are speculative and very subjective and also details that soil profiles should not normally be allocated to Class II, III and IV using a single survey at one particular time.
- The gradient of land was identified in the Cleve Hill Solar Park SALUQ 2017 report as a limiting factor, but no actual data was presented to corroborate this statement, and in fact the only

on-site data presented in the Cleve Hill Solar Park SALUQ 2017 report and compared to MAFF 1998 guideline indicates that land with slopes less than 7° are considered Grade 1, Grade 2 or Subgrade 3a land.

- Re-evaluation of the Wetness Class across the site, based on actual and local metrological data and considering that a large part of the land has naturally calcareous soils, it is my opinion that over 75% of the land at Cleve Hill Farm can be graded as Grade 2 (very good agricultural land) and Subgrade 3a (good agricultural land) in accordance with MAFF 1988 guidelines.