

**From:** [Cheryl Peel](#)  
**To:** [Planning Services](#)  
**Subject:** FUL/2021/0015  
**Date:** 24 January 2022 09:24:12

---

**WARNING:** External email, think before you click!

**RE: BA/2021/0279/CCP Aldeby Landfill Site**

Dear Nick,

Thank you for consulting the Broads Authority on the amendments and apologies for the delay in responding to you. Below are our comments:

The amended proposals include;

- Cutting back panels from the west and north [highest elevation] to pull away from the skyline,
- Reduction in panel height from 2.6m above ground level to 2.0m,
- A hedgerow with trees has been added across the northern boundary of the site, and tree planting to thicken the existing hedgerow along the southern boundary.
- 

The revised Landscape strategy now shows the proposed tree and shrub belts required for restoration of the landfill site. Also, the 19/11/21 Response to Reg25 Letter provides confirmation *All the planting that overlaps with the restoration plan planting which is proposed around the perimeter of the Solar Park would be implemented as part of this Development, following construction of the solar park.* This helps to overcome concern that the long-term duration would delay implementation of the restoration scheme for the landfill site. These are all improvements on the previous scheme.

A set of photomontages of the development from a viewpoint on Angles Way to the south of the site (917m from site, near Castle Marsh) have been provided. These show views of the current baseline, the proposals with planting after 1 year and 15 years. These are particularly useful in assessing visual effects from the river and Broads area. The photography was taken on an overcast day last November, with tree canopies largely still in leaf. In winter the screening provided by existing trees and vegetation would be less effective. Also, on sunny days the panels could be more visible due to glint and glare.

The 15 year photomontage shows a significant surface area of the array would be visible. The height of existing mature trees along southern boundary hedgerow would only screen the proposed panels on the lower part of the valley slope with a significant proportion of panels above the canopy clearly visible. It is unlikely that this element of proposed tree planting after 15 years would reach full maturity and height or provide significant additional screening within this timescale. After 15 years trees and hedgerow would be visible along the skyline, which would be softened. The previous concern that the panels would break the skyline have largely been addressed, although the photomontages show that panels would still be close up against the skyline in places. Given how visible the panel

array appears, we would suggest that it could also be visible from other sensitive locations within the BA area.

Unfortunately the site is on the most elevated part of the landform in the area and overlooks the river valley to the south. The Landscape baseline is a valley-side location which is largely grassed and would also have been planted with trees and hedgerow had the landfill restoration been implemented. The proposals would essentially replace this with an extensive engineered structure which would cause adverse visual effects on a landscape of high sensitivity with sensitive visual receptors; river users, users of Angles Way. Although the efforts of the applicants to reduce the adverse effects of the proposals are appreciated, it is felt that the mitigation and proposed Landscape strategy are not likely to reduce these effects sufficiently. We would suggest that to address the visibility of the panel array on the upper slopes of the valley side consideration could be given to moving the array to other parts of the site with lower visibility from the Broads Area.

In summary, although amendments have been made and Landscape mitigation is proposed, these are not considered likely to fully mitigate adverse visual effects on the Broads. Taking into account the amendments, clarification of the Landscape strategy and mitigation, the development would have adverse impacts on the landscape character and setting of the Broads and we still object to the proposal.

Kind regards

Cheryl Peel

**Cheryl Peel MA MRTPI**  
**Senior Planning Officer**  
**Broads Authority**

**01603 756030**  
**07786 026978**

[cheryl.peel@broads-authority.gov.uk](mailto:cheryl.peel@broads-authority.gov.uk)

*Please note: I work part-time and my usual working days are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday & Friday.*



[broads-authority.gov.uk](http://broads-authority.gov.uk)

[visitthebroads.co.uk](http://visitthebroads.co.uk)

[watermillsandmarshes.org.uk](http://watermillsandmarshes.org.uk)

[northsearegion.eu/canape](http://northsearegion.eu/canape)

---

If you have received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. This email may contain confidential information and may be legally privileged or prohibited from disclosure and unauthorised use. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or rely on it.

As email is not a 100% secure communications medium we advise you to check that messages and attachments are virus-free before opening them. We cannot accept liability for any damage that you sustain as a result of software viruses. We reserve the right to read and monitor any email or attachment entering or leaving our systems without prior notice. Opinions expressed in this email are not necessarily endorsed by the Broads Authority unless otherwise specifically stated.

---

Scanned by iCritical.