

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cleve Hill Solar Park](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Cleve Hill Solar Park - Deadline 7 Submission from Faversham and Oare Heritage Harbour Group
Date: 13 November 2019 10:06:22
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam

It is disappointing that the Applicant has not, to date, responded to many of the comments and issues raised, including those of the Faversham and Oare Heritage Harbour Group, as part of submissions for Deadline 6. Even if the Applicant now does so within the next few hours, this will leave insufficient time for third parties to respond in time for Deadline 7. Consequently, we are compelled to make our Deadline 7 submission only on the basis of the Applicant's responses up to the time of this email. Our Deadline 7 submission is attached.

Please would you confirm receipt in due course.

Regards

David Pollock

David Pollock
Vice Chairman, Faversham & Oare Heritage Harbour Group

From: [Planning Inspectorate](#)
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2019 2:45 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Updates for Cleve Hill Solar Park

EN010085: Cleve Hill Solar Park Updates

Hi David Pollock,

The Examining Authority has exercised its discretion to accept an [Additional Submission](#) from the Applicant relating to the access route. This has been added to the [Examination Library](#).

See [project page](#) for more information.

You are receiving this email because you are subscribed to project updates.

You can unsubscribe from these updates anytime by clicking [unsubscribe](#) or copy and paste the link below into your browser.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/email-unsubscription.php/?email=pollock@clara.co.uk&project=EN010085&code=fc56fceac721e1b42d69712e99c1590f>

Note: This email is sent from <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>. Do not reply to this email as it is not monitored.

Faversham & Oare Heritage Harbour Group

National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6PN

13 November 2019

SENT BY EMAIL TO: CleveHillSolarPark@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Sir or Madam

**Application by Cleve Hill Solar Park Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Cleve Hill Solar Park Project
Faversham and Oare Heritage Harbour Group (FOHHG) submission for Deadline 7**

We write further to our written submission for Deadline 6, as well as to all our earlier submissions, both written and verbal.

The Applicant has made no response, so far, to our Deadline 6 submission, which therefore stands as written. This refers to all our earlier submissions. For ease of reference, these are summarised as follows:

Our original, provisional, assessment was that there would be a significant and unacceptable visual impact from the proposed development on the existing valued shoreline, landscape and environmental setting, as viewed from afloat in the Swale and in Faversham and Oare Creeks .

This would have an adverse effect on the attractiveness of the Swale and Faversham and Oare Creeks both to local users and particularly to craft visiting the Faversham and Oare Heritage Harbour from other areas. Equally, this visual impact would have the same effect for walkers, bird watchers and visitors in general to Faversham and Oare and their environment, not to mention those more directly affected. The FOHHG therefore also expresses support for the submissions made, in the wider context, by Swale BC, Faversham TC, The Faversham Society, The Faversham Creek Trust, Mr Chris Lowe and Dr Tim Ingram, amongst others. Many of their issues raised would also have significant adverse impacts on the aspirations of the FOHHG.

We had suggested to the Applicant, from the outset, that the specific visual impacts could be unequivocally assessed by provision, by the Applicant, of empirical data on existing ground and building levels across the whole development site and its significant context, in comparison with those of the proposed structures. We accepted that this might disprove our own assessment but that, without the data and analyses requested, we could not withdraw our original assessment.

The Applicant stated that, in their view, their assessments already provided a sufficient basis for comparisons to be made. Subsequently they did provide some further data, but this was not empirical and could not enable the comparisons we had requested to be made.

As in our written submission for Deadline 6, we wonder why the Applicant appears still to be reluctant to provide the information or analyses we have requested.

Regards

David Pollock

David Pollock
Vice Chairman, Faversham & Oare Heritage Harbour Group