

As mentioned in my earlier submissions the solar arrays proposed will lie in a dual plane. This was confirmed by representatives of the appellant at a site meeting. Whilst the appellants application refers to the arrays facing south, they will in fact face not only south but, dependent on topography, also either to the east or the west. Consequently any comments on glint and glare will have been based upon incorrect information as the spread of glint/ glare will be wider than suggested. This will also affect visual impact.

Of more concern; the appellants drainage report refers to research carried out by Cook and McCuen 2013 as the basis for the appellants assertions as to the flood risk. However the aforesaid research was based upon the premise the arrays would discharge rainfall equally along the whole of the bottom edge of the arrays. As mentioned the arrays proposed will be dual plane and therefore rainfall will not discharge evenly along the whole of the bottom edge but will discharge mainly from the lowest corner. This will produce a stream of greater quantity and force which is likely to result in quicker runoff as channels are likely to be formed by increased erosion. Consequently the assertions by the appellant as to the flood risk are fundamentally flawed and also do not take into account extended periods of very dry or very wet weather when the ground will not act as a "sponge".

---

The site to which the proposal relates is an example of characteristic North Warwickshire countryside in the Green Belt. It includes a well-used public footpath, whose closure would be a major amenity loss.

It also has considerable historical significance as a former part of the Coventry Priory estate, and it preserves significant features relating to this period of its history

What is proposed is in effect an industrial site, absolutely inappropriate to this rural setting. It would be totally out of scale for its setting, overwhelming the conservation area of Fillongley, which exists to protect the special architectural and historic interest of the village.

The proposal is entirely unsuitable for the site and the rejection of the application should be upheld.