

Public Document Pack



STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF INFORMAL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2021

Present: Cllrs Robin Cook (Chairman), John Worth (Vice-Chairman), Shane Bartlett, Dave Bolwell, Alex Brenton, Kelvin Clayton, Jean Dunseith, Mike Dyer, Sherry Jespersen (Left meeting at 12.30), Mary Penfold, Belinda Ridout and David Tooke

Also present: Cllr Brian Heatley and Cllr Kate Wheller and Cllr David Walsh

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Alastair Beaven (Definitive Map Technical Assistant), Anne Brown (Definitive Map Technical Officer), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Hilary Jordan (Service Manager for Spatial Planning), Anna Lee (Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement), Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Simon McFarlane (Area Lead Planning Officer, Gillingham), Carol McKay (Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer), Elaine Tibble (Senior Democratic Services Officer) and Gill Whitney (Technical Support Officer)

27. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

28. Public Participation

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are attached as an appendix to these minutes.

29. Application WD/D/19/003181, Land at, Higher Stockbridge Farm, Higher Stockbridge Farm, Stockbridge

This application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the committee meeting. The following members had attended the site visit:

Cllrs: Robin Cook, John Worth, Shane Bartlett, Dave Bolwell, Alex Brenton, Kelvin Clayton, Mary Penfold, Belinda Ridout and David Tooke.

Cllrs: Jean Dunseith, Mike Dyer, Sherry Jespersen did not attend the site visit and did not take part in the discussion or vote.

Cllr Penfold, as Ward Member elected to take part in the decision-making process as a member of the Strategic Planning Committee rather than address the meeting in the role of Ward Member,

The Planning Officer presented the report which proposed installation of a renewable energy scheme comprising ground mounted photovoltaic solar

arrays together with substation; transformer stations; access; internal access track; landscaping; biodiversity measures; security fencing; security measures; access gate; access improvement and ancillary infrastructure.

The application site was in an area of agricultural land with hedgerows and planting, there were no buildings on the site but there were several listed buildings on land nearby. The committee were shown slides with views from various points. In response to officer advice the applicants had reduced the size of the scheme by 20% however the Planning Officer suggested that this was not enough in the overall context.

The application proposed a substation, transformer station, control house and a security system with fencing.

The key planning issues were highlighted, and members were advised that the principle of approving applications should only be where the impacts of development were acceptable. In this case the application was recommended for refusal as it would be so visually intrusive the harm would outweigh the benefits. The public benefits of the development were not considered to outweigh the cumulative harm caused to the character of the valued landscape and its importance to the setting of heritage assets and their relationship with the rural landscape.

The Planning Technical Support Officer read the written representations; these are attached as appendix to these minutes.

The committee debated the application. They felt that the scheme was balanced on a knife edge, on one hand Dorset Council had declared a climate emergency which had to be balanced against the cumulative harm to the landscape and the heritage assets, plus the loss of recreational value.

The committee debated the level of harm, conserving the sense of rural tranquillity, noise and light pollution. In relation to what may be considered a suitable size for the application, the Applicant had stated that a smaller operation would not be viable. It was not known how many other sites in the Dorset Council area that might be suitable for a similar application. Members felt they had to balance the impact on the whole landscape whilst maintaining the need to put great weight on renewable energy.

Proposed by Cllr B Ridout, seconded by Cllr M Penfold

That the application be refused as the benefits did not outweigh the cumulative harm to the landscape and the heritage assets, plus the loss of recreational value in a pastoral landscape.

On being put to the vote the proposal was **LOST**.

Proposed by Cllr K Clayton, seconded by Cllr D Tooke

That the application be approved as the public benefits would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets and landscape. As per para 202 of the NPPF.

There was an adjournment from 11:47 – 12:00 to enable the Planning Officers to prepare planning conditions.

On returning the Planning Officer advised the committee of 12 conditions should the application be approved together with proposal for delegated powers to the Head of Planning to agree detailed wording with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

On being put to the vote the members were minded to approve the application with the 12 conditions and suggested delegations.

The Service Manager for Development Mgt & Enf confirmed that she had heard the full debate and the application would be determined in line with the committee's minded to decision.

Decision: that the application be delegated to the Head of Planning for approval in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and subject to the conditions outlined in the appendix to these minutes

30. **Application for the registration of a town or village green at Happy Island, Bridport**

This item was deferred to a later date due to unexpected circumstances concerning the case officer.

31. **Application for a definitive map and statement order to add a footpath from Sunnyside Road to Ryland's Lane, Wyke Regis, Weymouth**

The Definitive Map Technical Officer advised that there was no documentary evidence to say the footpath had been available prior to the building of the school in the 1950s. The number of people who responded to say they used the old route (prior to 2005) had been low and of low frequency despite the stated reasons for use being mainly for accessing the Doctor's surgery, health centre, library and shops. It was not considered that the number of users constituted the 'general public' in such a densely populated area or that the use was sufficiently frequent to have come to the attention of the landowner, given the high number of visitors and pupils accessing the school.

Witnesses using the new route (since 2005) had seen signs on the route stating that the path was not a right of way but the public were welcome to use it. Consequently, it was believed that public rights to use the new route had not been acquired because use of the route since 2005 had been with permission.

The Officer recommendation was to refuse the application as the available evidence on balance didn't show that a right of way existed.

The Definitive Map Assistant read the written representation, attached as an appendix to these minutes and Cllr Brian Heatley, Ward Member, addressed

the committee. He raised two points, firstly the security of the school site, secondly, there was an alternative footpath that joined Rylands Lane. The report had set out in great detail that there was very little evidence to support the footpath and that was the view of all three Ward Members.

The Definitive Map Technical Officer addressed a number of points made in the applicant's representation.

Members felt that the report made is very clear that the path was not greatly used and in a built-up area more users would be expected if the path was of importance to the general public. It was considered that the signposting was conclusive, this was not a public footpath, there was also concerns regarding school security.

Proposed by Cllr S Bartlett, seconded by Cllr J Worth.

On being put to the vote the committee's "minded to" decision was to unanimously support the recommendation to refuse the application.

Decision:

The Service Manager for Spatial Planning confirmed that she had heard the full debate and the application would be refused in line with the committee's minded to decision.

32. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

33. Exempt Business

There was no exempt business.

**Appendix - Written representations
Decision List 22 Nov 22**

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.55 pm

Chairman

.....

REPRESENTATIONS FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MONDAY 22 November 2021

1. WD/D/19/003181, Land at Higher Stockbridge Farm, Higher Stockbridge Farm, Stockbridge

OBJECTIONS

OBJECTION FROM Mr Michael Gates

The proposed development covers a considerable area of small fields in one of the few unspoilt Dorset clay vales. This valley runs south from the small village of Lillington in a landscape of considerable beauty that is virtually unchanged since Thomas Hardy's time providing a marvellous setting for a number of heritage assets including the Grade 1 church in Lillington.

My family have lived at [REDACTED], set just south of the development, for nearly thirty years. We have loved exploring the footpaths and bridleways in the vicinity with their stunning views over the vale, west towards Winyards Gap and south to the Batcombe ridge in the Dorset AONB. We watch other walkers and equestrians on nearby bridleway and footpaths also taking enjoyment from the landscape. The development would cover a significant area of the valley floor and would be visible from the many rights of way around and across the proposed site including the Macmillan Way.

The proposed tree planting to screen the development is quite inadequate to shield it from users of the bridleway next to our house and it will also be visible a very short distance away from our home and a number of our rooms.

We are concerned that the proposed development will blight this attractive landscape for future generations. How confident can we be that Voltalia and any future owners will be willing or even able to reinstate the land to its present condition.

The benefits of the proposal are outweighed by the adverse impact this would on the landscape, heritage assets and amenity value of the area. We believe the proposal should be rejected as it fails to meet a number of Dorset Planning Policies.

Objection from Mr Pinney – Knights PLC

This is the wrong time to approve this application when technology and policy are changing rapidly.

- With 5 amendments to the application since 2019 and despite public rebuttals and corrections, the application still contains contradictions and errors on size, value, visibility, tourism and management practices. The Applicant's capability to plan and deliver such a large project effectively and sympathetically is in doubt.
- Voltalia is untrustworthy: its responses to public concerns are disingenuous, it:
 - o denies risks of contamination on decommissioning
 - o defies OFWAT on predicted rainfall figures and potential for flooding
 - o claims to restore the area to farmland

There is no contingency or risk planning and it has no experience of site restoration.

There are no pledges, covenants or guarantees to prevent Voltalia causing downstream floods and leaving a contaminated brownfield site to DCC.

- Voltalia's application is based upon obsolete policy; the Country's current emphasis is more on the preservation of land as carbon sinks in their natural environment, than generating solar power.

- o At point 9 of The Government's 10 point plan published 19/10/2021, The PM states: "We will safeguard our cherished landscapes... protect our natural environment safeguarding these areas for future generations.... protecting and improving 30% of UK land by 2030".

- o Energy and Climate Minister Greg Hands said, "a £500m package of support at COP26 will help protect millions of hectares of land, boosting rural communities".

- o Chris Loder, our MP has declared his hope this application is rejected to prevent the desecration of a part of the cultural and historic fabric of Dorset.

- o Support for solar has reduced since 2016 when the Government cut subsidies for renewable UK energy projects until 2025.

- Considered in isolation the merits of this application are unconvincing. Taken in conjunction with the damaging to our local cultural heritage.

- o No effort has been made in some other 9 sites in the locality, this application is the largest, most visible and most areas of greatest consumption: no solar panels appear on any new roofs in the 400 acre development at Poundbury, or Thornford, Yetminster and Sherborne.

- o Solar energy is seasonal, contributing only 4% of UK's total (less than wind and biomass).

The committee must reconcile the perceived gains against the risks, detriments and lost cultural heritage.

Given the lack of confidence in Voltalia delivering a beneficial long term gain; the changes in policy and priority, and the imbalance of benefits between rural Dorset being the provider of ethical power for urban consumers, the Committee should refuse the application. Not to do so would be condemning 147 acres to environmental uncertainty in the hands of outsiders with little or no accountability to those in, local to or visiting Wessex.

Objection from Mark Ashley Miller

This industrial solar park will have a significant detrimental impact on land designated as "ancient farmland with specific historic character".

The harmful effects of building the park are enhanced due to its size and valley location. They will far outweigh the benefits of producing solar power.

There are many more sites of industrial or post industrial land within a few miles of Higher Stockbridge Farm which are more fitting for renewable energy developments.

If approved, the Dorset Council would be responsible for "trashing" the beautiful local environment and this is not what the people who you represent wish for.

Please oppose this application.

Objection from Kevin Waterfall

“The overall concern with this project proposal is that it is contrary to the objectives of the majority of stakeholders impacted. If renewable energy by Solar PV is to form part of our future developments then it needs to enhance society and not degrade the natural and social environment or people's enjoyment of it.

People want to boost production and usage of renewable energy in appropriate locations and this installation in this location fails to do this in relation to its impact on wildlife and the local ecology.

2021 UK government plans now emphasise the role of natural carbon sinks, protection and enhancement of rural land use instead of large scale solar farms.

This project would be in contravention of local Dorset and national planning legislation. It would be contrary to Policies ENV 1, ENV 4, ENV 10 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and paragraphs 174 & 199-203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) thus the principle of development of the scheme is also contrary to Local Plan policy COM 11.

If the land was to be enhanced for wildlife and environmental measures then there would be linkage of existing areas of woodland and natural wetland development would involve the watercourses through it.

Voltalia fails to recognise the value of the site, playing down environmental and wildlife benefits. It plays down the quality of the land, trees, and agricultural practices plus failing to record the full variety of birds and mammals on the site.

By their own admission Voltalia build, but have minimal operating experience of solar farms.

Therefore in order to protect our wildlife, prevent further loss and enhance our natural environment this project must be rejected.”

The Sherborne and District Society (CPRE) strongly objects to this planning application on the grounds that it poses unacceptable harm to the landscape, the setting of heritage assets and the amenity value of this important part of the Blackmore Vale.

CPRE Sherborne welcomes the excellent and thorough Case Officer's report and trusts that the Strategic Planning Committee concurs with the recommendation that the application should be refused.

Mr R Hartley

On behalf of the Sherborne and District Society (CPRE)

=====

SUPPORT REPRESENTATIONS

Support from Peter Roberts

I passionately support this application. As the recent COP26 highlighted we are in an international battle to safeguard the world we live in for future generations. This development will play a part in this journey and it is crucial that we support it. The application is detailed and has been ongoing for a significant period of time and no doubt cost to the developer. The statement of community involvement clearly shows how they have listened and adapted based on constructive input from the community.

I am expecting to become a father for the first time in early 2022. I would be proud to show my child how we as a local community are engaging in the climate crisis positively and dealing with the inconveniences this causes.

Support from **Poppy Maltby, Head of Cities and Regions, Regens**

Regen carried out a Dorset Low Carbon Energy Map and Evidence Base review for Dorset LEP in May 2021. Please see: <https://www.dorsetlep.co.uk/news-article/opportunities-to-unlock-dorset-s-net-zero-potential>. We wanted to take this opportunity to ensure the planning committee is aware of the evidence from that work and the relevance to consideration of applications for solar PV developments.

The work indicated that a net zero compatible strategy would see installed solar PV capacity in Dorset tripling from the current 480 MW to c.1.5 GW by 2050. This would entail an additional 200 MW within the next 8 years. Since then the UK government has, in line with the focus at COP26 on keeping the rise in global temperatures below 1.5%, committed to achieving a net zero power system by 2035. This will require an even faster rate of growth of renewable power generation than was envisaged at the time of this work being completed. Action in this decade is crucial.

In the context of the very significant increase required in renewable energy capacity to address the climate emergency and meet the UK legally binding commitment to net zero it is clearly important that the benefits of proposed solar PV project in reducing the carbon emissions are given very significant weight in the planning process.

As Dorset Council have themselves acknowledged in their Climate and Ecological Emergency strategy “Every degree matters” and “Time is short”.

It also states that “Every opportunity to utilise renewable energy to meet current demand needs to be taken and large-scale deployment projects need to be developed.” And acknowledges that “Dorset County’s [renewable energy] capacity needs to increase by a factor of eight.” See: <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/renewable-energy-technical-paper>

In addition there needs to be an appreciation within the planning committee of the availability of land to meet these net zero goals in Dorset. I’ve copied below a map which summarises the areas technically available for large scale solar PV within Dorset which are already very constrained by the ANOBs. The available areas of low agricultural land grade, availability of electricity infrastructure and are outside ANOB areas are highlighted in yellow. These present an extremely important solar PV resource for Dorset and include the land around High Stockbridge Farm.

Finally, I would also stress that considerable opportunity for inward investment and job creation in Dorset through the solar PV industry. The report highlights that as well as diversifying farm income and improving biodiversity, an additional 200 MW of installed solar PV would create £200m of investment and the potential for c. 200 jobs.

Support Gareth Roberts – Pegasus Group

I represent the applicant, Voltalia UK Ltd, on planning matters. Having reviewed the Committee Report, I make the following points over the scheme's planning merits and balance.

The proposal is for a 35MW ground mounted solar, equating to the annual energy consumption of c. 10,605 households and an annual CO₂ displacement of c. 20,000 tonnes.

This should carry significant weight as required by national policy.

The proposal is wholly consistent with the Government's policies in meeting the challenge

of climate change and energy security. As with Voltalia's scheme at Spetisbury, local businesses will be contracted for labour, materials etc.

Landscape

The local landscape's capacity to accommodate a large solar park is established through Decision Notice WD/D/15/001841, which expired in 2019. The unimplemented permission

was located 1km south of Higher Stockbridge.

The site is located within an undesignated countryside and doesn't form the setting to the

AONB, it falls on the lowest tier in the hierarchy introduced by NPPF para 175. The local landscape is not covered by any non-statutory landscape designation. The scheme was reduced in its physical footprint as part of the iterative design process, omitting parts of the site that were judged to be more visible. Any landscape character or visual effects would be localised and largely limited to the immediate environs. Some community respondents withdrew their objection following re-consultation.

Heritage

A review has been made by a second heritage consultant at Pegasus Group, informed by site visits to the Listed Lower Stockbridge Barn and Farmhouse, St Anthony's Convent and

associated elements in the Italian Gardens. The proposals would not be visible from these

assets, nor co-visible in views where their significance can be appreciated. Any views from

the Water Tower (which has solar panels within its grounds) will be distant and partially screened by vegetation. The positioning of the scheme in the wider surrounds of these heritage assets will not harm their heritage significance through changes in setting. The scheme accords with all heritage law, policy and guidance.

Other Matters

It is enough for the proposal to accord with the development plan as a whole. It does not have to accord with each policy therein. Officer's Report confirms development is acceptable for biodiversity, highway safety, PRoW, drainage, archaeology and residential amenity. It also occupies poor quality agricultural land.

The connection point to the electricity grid is within the application site, thus no grid connection disruption to the local community. There are no brownfield sites available for the development. Development provides significant biodiversity net gain. It will add to the organic matter in the soil and assist in alleviating climate change and flooding.

Any further delay in delivering renewables would only mean more radical intervention in the future.

Yours sincerely

Kelly Clutterbuck
UK Development Manager, Voltalia

The solar development at Higher Stockbridge supports the transition to a low carbon future as part of an international effort to combat climate change and will provide a decentralised, clean, renewable and sustainable form of electricity generation. The benefits brought by the anticipated CO₂ displacement of the project plus biodiversity enhancements and regional economic benefits are significant.

Voltalia UK is committed to working with and supporting the local community.

Following two delegated approvals in Dorset (South Farm and Clifton Farm) Voltalia has proven this commitment by funding and completing improvements at Spetisbury Primary School, provided funding for Parish Council initiatives and is continuing to engage with the community at the South Farm site.

The Committee Report states that 'detailed landscape and conservation advice was not sought'.

This statement is incorrect. The pre-application advice was issued following a site visit undertaken by the Council's Case Officer and the Council's former Specialist Service Team Leader, a qualified landscape architect. To summarise, the Council considered that the layout of the proposed site, the surrounding landform and topography **would** make it a favourable location for solar.

The submitted Design and Access Statement identifies how the initial scheme was reduced prior to submission to reflect pre-application and community consultation advice. The pre-application advice was based on a larger scheme in comparison to the layout that is being presented to the Strategy Committee and the development footprint has further reduced by 20% during this determination period.

A key requirement with renewable energy development is identifying an electrical network with sufficient capacity to accommodate the exported power and it is for this reason that developers are driven to specific geographical areas. Voltalia has reduced the scheme as far as practicable.

Given the recent announcements at COP26 and current climate change emergency, the need for new renewable energy is even more pressing. The Climate & Ecological Emergency Strategy published by Dorset Council in July 2020 identifies how Dorset needs to play its part by generating 100% of its own energy demand and projects that Dorset will need around 4GW of solar generation.

The target represents a significant local challenge and emphasises the significant weight that should be placed **in favour** of this development. It is notable that Dorset did not achieve its own 2020 target of providing 7.5% of total energy from renewables. There was a shortfall of around 292GWh.

This project is strategically important for Dorset.

2. Application for a definitive map and statement modification order to add a footpath from Sunnyside Road to Ryland's Lane, Wyke Regis, Weymouth

Dear Mr Matthew Piles & The Strategic Planning Committee

I am requesting these words be listened and considered very carefully for this application. I have read through the summary. A lot of questions were asked, and yet I was not contacted for clarification on any of my points.

My evidence comes from being a resident at [REDACTED] for most of my life. I am [REDACTED] years and [REDACTED] months. The footpath through the school was never contested, until the few years before the

application (which arose from the gates being locked). I refer to point 6.1: "...the School had no intention of dedicating a right of way. However there is no evidence that this was communicated to the public". The school literally locked the gates one day. The public were trying to use the route as usual, which was now suddenly locked.

Living next to the footpath, the gates were not locked from 1986 through to 2011, (only attempted to be locked from 2005 onwards). I spent many weekend days (the school not open as weekend) learning to ride my bike, rollerskating, walking to the Fairview park to meet friends. Heading to the shops on Portland Road. This all spans over 20 years, and I was never challenged when using the route (I refer to point 6.3, where the school claim challenges were made in 2011). The access was not blocked either, I had straight access through open gates.

The confusion of my evidence: I am not planning officer. I am a member of the public who is amongst the witnesses who provided you their information. I beg that it be considered that a lot of the people who submitted their evidence, a few are of the much older generation, and an abrupt phone call is not sufficient to take evidence from when asking further questions. I had complaint of such a phone call. Had I been asked to do so, I would of happily gathered any missing signatures from the people who happened to forget to sign their signature.

Here are my points:

Point 7.11: I would have appreciated consultation and not presumption on this document. To make allegations that I had doctored the document is not basis for making a definitive decision. Consultation with myself would have given information for further investigation of the official documents.

Point 7.14: As above, discussion with myself on any questions to relevance would have revealed the desired evidence of my direction with this document. A very distinct memory in fact, that when crossing the grass area, there was a raised manhole/drain, which has now since been removed (possibly when the new hall was built?). This might not seem relevant, but it back up my use of having used the route (I in fact fell over this in the 80s, so it is a very prominent memory).

7.22 & 7.23: There is confusion over this, as the pathway was always used. No means ever stopped use. Users were never told use was to stop using it. No communication ever happened to tell the public to stop using. Sign I have memory of, were brief signage that had decayed over years from lack of maintenance, Forgive me being confused by suddenly being confronted by a gate that suddenly appeared locked. It was a pathway always used, with never any doubt over use, until now.

8.2 Analysis of the evidence under Section 31, Highways Act 1980:

Use of the path was never brought into question.

I used the path, as well as others, interruption for 20 years.

Use was never of secrecy and without permission

Use must be by public at large...please look at the Portland Road Tesco's. It is too close because of takings being down. I am positive that the closure of the footpath has contributed to this (alternative routes not as safe as this one, so this side of Wyke could not access it to shop freely).

Please can the police reports be requested. There has never been evidence of the public being those responsible for the alleged drugs, I can, however, confirm that school pupils like to smoke weed the other side of my garden fence at break times (it can be smelt).

7.31 Other submissions concerned matters of convenience, desirability and security and did not contain any evidence which can be taken into consideration.

Safeguarding. Students can be regularly seen climbing the locked gate at Rylands Lane. There is no safety being considered. Students have never had to climb the gates to get home, until recent years while this case is ongoing. I can vouch for being a student allowed home at lunchtimes during my attendance, when the gates were never locked. The current situation leaves the school open to injury claims. Student safety is definitely not being considered.

5.17 Officer comment:

If use were with permission, the duration of use is of no relevance. The dates when gates on the route were locked seem to be unclear.

A sign reading "Not a right of way but you are welcome to walk through" would be sufficient to prevent acquisition of public rights, but the fact that the sign was only seen by one person during the time this route was laid out makes its presence open to question".

The sign appears in point B1, as photographed in 2005. What is there to question

Strategic Planning Committee 22 November 2021 Decisions List

Application Reference: WD/D/19/003181

Application Site: LAND AT, HIGHER STOCKBRIDGE FARM, HIGHER STOCKBRIDGE FARM, STOCKBRIDGE

Proposal: Installation of a renewable energy scheme comprising ground mounted photovoltaic solar arrays together with substation; transformer stations; access; internal access track; landscaping; biodiversity measures; security fencing; security measures; access gate; access improvement and ancillary infrastructure

Recommendation

That the Committee would be minded to delegate to the Head of Planning to refuse the application for the reason as follows:

1) The proposed development by reason of its location, appearance and scale would harm the character of the valued landscape, part of its importance is its setting to the heritage assets and therefore the cumulative harmful effect on the landscape and its importance to the setting of the assets would be contrary to Policies ENV 1, ENV 4, ENV 10 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and paragraphs 174 & 199-203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) thus the principle of development of the scheme is also contrary to Local Plan policy COM 11.

And recommends that the Head of Planning determines the application accordingly.

Decision: that the application be delegated to the Head of Planning for approval in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman subject to the following conditions.

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and details:

Location Plan, Ref - P17-2603_01 SHEET NO: ___ REV: _ I,
Dated 23/05/2019 General Implementation Plan Ref -
DV_LV_101_04_03, Dated 25/01/2021 Mounting Structure,
Ref - HIS01_DV_CS_604_01, Dated 05/12/2019
Fence Details, Ref - HIS01_DV_CS_103_00,
Dated 02/04/2019 Gate Details, Ref -
SFT01_DV_CS_105_00, Dated 11/01/2019

Control House Details, Ref - SFT01_DV_CS_603_00,
Dated 11/01/2019 Substation Details, Ref - EPC-035-E-
SS-01, Dated 05/04/2019
Transformer Centre Connection Details, Ref - SFT01_DV_HV_120_00,
Dated 11/01/2019 Overall Electrical Site Layout – Elevations, Ref -
E18420/L002, Rev A, Dated 08/03/19 Pathway Details, Ref -
SFT01_DV_CS_205_00, Dated 11/01/2019
Weather Station Layout, Ref - HIS01_DV_MON_401_00, Dated
02/04/2019 Security Pole System Layout, Ref -
HIS01_DV_SEC_410_00, Dated 14/04/2019

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. This permission is limited to a period of 35 years from the date of first export to the grid. Notice shall be given within 14 days in writing to the Local Planning Authority of the date when electricity shall first be exported to the grid by the development hereby permitted. Thereafter, the development (including all ancillary equipment and buildings) hereby permitted shall be removed in its entirety and the land restored to its former condition within 35 years and six months of the date of first export to the grid, or if the development fails to generate electricity for 12 consecutive months, whichever is the sooner. The land shall be restored in accordance with a scheme of decommissioning works and land restoration (including timescales) pursuant to condition 4 of this consent.

Reason: To ensure that the impacts of the development exist only for the lifetime of the development.

4. Not later than 12 months before planned decommissioning of the development hereby approved a scheme for decommissioning and the restoration of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall make provision for the removal of the solar arrays and the associated above ground structures, equipment and foundations. The scheme shall include the management and timing of any works; a traffic management plan; an environmental management plan including measures to protect wildlife and habitat; identification of access routes; restoration measures; and a programme of implementation. Thereafter, re-instatement shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the impacts of the development exist only for the lifetime of the development.

5. The development hereby approved shall proceed only in accordance with the details set out in the Clarkson & Woods Construction Environmental Management Plan dated April 2021.

Reason: In the interests of ecology and species protected by law.

6. Prior to the commencement of development or the installation of any solar arrays a final hard and soft landscaping and tree/hedgerow planting scheme

must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved soft landscaping scheme and tree/hedgerow planting shall be implemented in full during the first available planting season (November – March) immediately following commencement of the development. In the five year period following the substantial completion of the development any trees, shrubs or hedges that are removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority or which die or become (in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority) seriously diseased or damaged, shall be replaced as soon as reasonably practical and not later than the end of the first available planting season, with specimens of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping shall be implemented prior to any generation of electricity from the site.

Reason: To mitigate any adverse impacts upon the local landscape character and to provide local community benefits.

7. All existing trees and hedges shown on the approved Tree Protection Plan Ref - BHA_488_03, dated 15/02/2021 that are to be retained shall be fully safeguarded and protected from damage during the course of site works and building operations and in accordance with the details held within the Barton Hyett Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Ref - V.2867, dated December 2019.

Reason: To ensure that trees and hedges to be retained are adequately protected and in the interests of visual amenity.

8. The development hereby approved shall proceed only in accordance with the details set out in the Pegasus Group Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan, Ref P17-2603, dated December 2019.

Reason: to minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network.

9. The development hereby approved shall proceed only in accordance with the details set out in the Clarkson & Woods Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, dated April 2021. The site shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved mitigation and enhancement proposals.

Reason: In the interests of ecology and species protected by law.

10. The development hereby approved shall proceed only in accordance with the details set out in the Clive Onions Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, dated 01 March 2021. Thereafter, the scheme shall be managed and maintained for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate facilities are provided in the interests of flooding and pollution.

11. Prior to the construction and installation of the gates, fences, substation

buildings, control house, transformer centres, CCTV equipment and weather station poles within the site, details of the external paint colour finish of each of these boundary treatments/buildings/equipment/apparatus shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved finish for the buildings and equipment shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

12. No external lighting shall be erected on the site unless details of the proposed lighting have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity, ecology and dark skies.

Informatives:

1. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and
- as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

- The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.
- The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

2. Informative: All works or structures that offer an obstruction to flow within a channel with the status of Ordinary Watercourse, such as cable crossings achieved via trenching or installation of culverted crossings for access, will require prior Land Drainage Consent from Dorset Council's Flood Risk Management function, as relevant Lead Local Flood Authority, in accordance with s23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.
3. Informative: The applicant is advised that the granting of planning permission does not override the need for existing rights of way affected by the development to be kept open and unobstructed until the statutory procedures authorising closure or diversion have been completed. Developments, in so far as it affects a right of way should not be started until the necessary order for the diversion has come into effect.

Application Reference: T516

Application Site: Sunnyside Road to Rylands Lane, Wyke Regis, Weymouth

Proposal: Application for a definitive map and statement modification order to add a footpath from Sunnyside Road to Ryland's Lane, Wyke Regis, Weymouth

Recommendation: That the application be refused.

Decision: Refused.

This page is intentionally left blank