



CORE DOCUMENT K.3.2

Planning appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/20/3244389

Cold Law, Stiddlehill Common, near Ridsdale, Ray Estate, Northumberland

Construction of a publicly accessible landmark, commissioned to
commemorate Queen Elizabeth II and the Commonwealth

Summary Landscape Proof of
Jean Jones MA BSc DipTP on behalf of
'Keep the Wannies Wild' (KTWW)

February 2021

1. The proposal relies on references to the Queen and Commonwealth but those are nebulous and cannot be secured through planning conditions. Looking objectively at the physical nature of the development will avoid being overcome by the weight of symbolism ascribed to it. There has been a sense of public revulsion that it purports to celebrate Her Majesty and Sir Charles Parsons but is, in fact, the opposite of what is known about their wishes.
2. The LVIA involved a large number of value judgements about matters of appearance and character which I strongly contest. National guidance accepts that there can be differing opinions about these matters and it is for the Inspector to come to a decision based on his own judgement following site inspections. He should, however, bear in mind the advice of GLVIA3 that there is no point in seeking ideas and views if it is actually too late for the scheme design to be modified.
3. I do not agree that the monument would sit well in the landscape. The wind turbines are not a major part of its context and in any case, they are temporary features. The impact from closer views, affecting recreational users over long durations, is more than enough to justify the refusal of planning permission. The monument and events associated with it would introduce additional noise and activity from people and vehicles which would damage the sense of remoteness and the tranquility of this rural area.
4. The local people and visitors are the 'receptors' of which the LVIA speaks. They are not theoretical but real. The substantial harm which they identify should carry greater weight than hypothetical judgements and unsubstantiated claims of beneficial effects.
5. There would be harm to the key landscape qualities of *open, relatively remote character* and *uninterrupted, sweeping moorland*. Context is all-important and, whatever the quality of the detailed design, the brief has made it inappropriate for this location. The associated activity would, once and for all, destroy the sense of tranquillity that residents and visitors currently value and which is an acknowledged part of the local landscape character. Nothing could be done to mitigate this impact, 'Ascendant' would be impossible to ignore and would be there in perpetuity.
6. The proposal would fail the tests set out at the beginning of my proof by conflicting with the relevant development plan policies, with the emerging local plan and with national policy in NPPF through significant harm to the character and appearance of the landscape. There are no material considerations outweighing this harm and the appeal should be dismissed.