



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/W/24/3350852

Winslade Park, Clyst St. Mary, Exeter, Devon, EX5 1GD.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by P Quincey of Burrington Estates (Winslade Park) Limited against the decision of East Devon District Council (the LPA).
 - The application reference is 23/2506/MFUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a solar array with associated infrastructure, access and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a solar array with associated infrastructure, access and landscaping at Winslade Park, Clyst St. Mary, Exeter, Devon, EX5 1GD. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application reference 23/2506/MFUL and subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site lies within the settings of several listed buildings¹. These comprise the grade II* Winslade Park, the grade II listed Terrace Walk 133 metres south of Winslade Park and the grade II listed Parish Church of St. Mary.
3. The appellant has informed me that the precise location of the proposed substation has yet to be determined. I have therefore treated the location of this element of the proposal as being indicative only. If, as suggested by the appellant, this building was located on the opposite site of the Grindle Brook (on land not affected by flood risk), it would be outside the 'red line' application/appeal site area. In the event of this happening, a separate application would be necessary.
4. The appellant has confirmed that the minimum height of the proposed solar panels would be at least 300mm above the 1 in 100-year plus 85% climate change flood depth. This is shown on drawing ref. SGS-1006-DR-ML-01 that has been submitted in support of the appeal². The appellant has also informed me that consideration would be given to removing the artificially raised area of floodplain as recommended by the Environment Agency.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the benefits of the proposed development, including the generation of electricity from a renewable resource, would outweigh any adverse

¹ The provisions of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are engaged.

² In effect, this supersedes drawing ref. SGS-1003-DR-ML-01. The LPA has been afforded an opportunity of commenting upon this drawing. As the interests of no party is likely to be prejudiced, I have taken this drawing into account in determining the appeal.

impacts, having particular regard to the likely effects upon: the character and appearance of the area; the settings/significance of designated heritage assets and; intended public open space provision.

Reasons

Planning Policy

6. The development plan includes the East Devon Local Plan 2013 to 2031 (LP) and the Bishops Clyst Neighbourhood Plan³ (NP). The most important strategies / policies to the determination of this appeal are LP strategies 7 (countryside) and 39 (renewable energy projects) and policy EN9 (designated heritage assets).
7. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is an important material consideration that carries substantial weight in the determination of this appeal. Amongst other things, it states that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050⁴, including supporting renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. In determining such applications, significant weight should be given to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation. Elsewhere, the Framework sets out that proposals should conserve and enhance the historic environment and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
8. Whilst not planning policy, my attention has also been drawn to the LPA's Climate Change Action Plan 2020-2040. I understand that this is aimed at making the LPA a carbon neutral council by 2040. Amongst other things, it seeks to increase the amount of energy generated locally using renewable energy technologies and incorporating on-site renewable energy into new developments where possible.

Benefits

9. The proposed development is intended to provide 1.883MW of power/electricity (1,885,888 kWh energy/year) to the office/business premises at Winslade Park. This would provide 100% renewable power to these commercial premises, helping to make it a zero carbon/net zero business park. The appellant has calculated that this equates to 256.48 tonnes of carbon dioxide a year, or 5,901 tonnes of CO₂ over the 25 years duration of the proposed development. This would help meet the increased electricity demands⁵ from Winslade Park and reduce demand on the grid. The appellant has explained that the on-site demand for electricity at Winslade Park is expected to be met by the proposed solar array. Unlike many other solar arrays, the intention is not to export energy to the grid.
10. The proposal would help to tackle climate change and realise national and local objectives for transitioning to net zero, as well as contributing to meeting the need for renewable energy. It would reduce CO₂ emissions and by generating and using electricity locally, would also reduce reliance on the grid and dependency on other electricity generating power resources. In addition, the proposed development would assist in increasing the security of supply. These are important public benefits that carry substantial weight in the planning balance.

³ Only the northern part of the appeal site lies within the NP area.

⁴ Elsewhere, the Government has stated that in meeting net zero there is a need to dramatically increase the volume of energy supplied from low carbon sources.

⁵ I understand that following refurbishment works to the listed former mansion and office blocks, including removing reliance on gas, the electrical load has increased substantially and has placed a heavier load on the local grid.

11. The proposal would also deliver some landscape and ecological benefits. These include: the creation of a new hedgerow along the western boundary of the site; the creation of a wildflower meadow beneath the solar panels; the creation of a new wetland habitat by excavating the partially infilled ditch along the western boundary of the site and; the provision of bird, bat and dormouse boxes. The proposal accords with the thrust of NP policies BiC01 and BiC02. These environmental benefits would also be in the public interest. I shall afford them moderate weight in the planning balance.
12. During the construction phase, the proposal would also help support the construction industry and, in so doing, would deliver some limited economic benefits. This can be given some limited weight in the planning balance.

Character and Appearance

13. This 3.01 ha appeal site lies within the open countryside. It comprises parkland/meadow to the south east of Winslade Park and forms part of a larger area of parkland around this listed building. The site is bounded by the Grindle Brook to the north, with woodland⁶ to the south and east. The western boundary is defined by a drainage ditch (partially infilled). The A376 runs to the south and west of the site. There is a public footpath to the north and east.
14. The appeal site lies within the 'Lowland Plains' landscape character type (LCT), as defined within the Devon County Character Assessment. The key characteristics of this LCT include level to gently sloping or rolling plain, mixed farmland with other land uses, regular or irregular medium to large scale field pattern, variable woodland pattern, roadside hedges, variable highway network from sparse to major roads and long views variable in quality. Comprising part of an area of low lying parkland meadow, I consider that the appeal site has a sensitive character.
15. During my visit, I noted the public views of parts of the site. In the main, these are limited to views from a section of the A376, the footpath through the woodland to the east of the site and those from the terrace walk along the northern bank of the Grindle Brook. Notwithstanding that the views from the main road are essentially glimpsed views from generally fast moving traffic, when seen from the public realm, the appeal site forms part of the attractive rural surrounds to Winslade Park.
16. The proposed solar array would occupy approximately 2.1 ha of the appeal site. The solar panels would be mounted on 'light-weight' piles and would be arranged in south facing rows. The maximum height⁷ of the panels would be 2.904m. The perimeter of the site would be enclosed and secured by a 2m high deer fence with an access gate at the northern end of the site. Seven 3m high poles would be erected to hold the CCTV cameras. A substation building⁸ would also be provided to serve the development, the precise location of which has yet to be determined⁹.
17. As noted above, landscape planting would also be undertaken as part of the development. This would include creating a tree and shrub bund along the western boundary using material excavated from the partially infilled drainage ditch, planting mixed native hedgerow species along the eastern boundary of the

⁶ This is the subject of an Area Tree Preservation Order that was confirmed in 1975.

⁷ This includes allowance for the 100 year flood scenario plus 85% for climate change.

⁸ Approximately 30m².

⁹ The indicative location is at the northern end of the site where higher levels of flood water/risk could be expected and in close proximity to the listed Terrace Walk. This is unlikely to be the most suitable location and I note that the appellant is exploring the possibility of locating it on the other side of Grindle Brook on land not affected by flood risk. It could be sited within the appeal site.

site and planting specimen trees and clumps to the west to screen the development from the A376.

18. Whilst thoughtful consideration has been given to the proposed landscape planting, the proposed solar array, perimeter fence and CCTV cameras/poles would markedly change the character of the appeal site. The naturalistic qualities of the site would be replaced by a utilitarian type of development with regimented rows of manufactured panels and supporting metal frames. A section of historic parkland would also, in effect, be severed from the remainder of the parkland to the west. Although the proposal would not harm any of the key characteristics of this LCT, it would contrast awkwardly with the parkland to the west and erode the unspoilt countryside qualities of the site.
19. Some of the rows of proposed solar panels would be seen from the public realm. However, seeing a development does not in itself amount to a harmful impact and in glimpsed views from the A376, the development would appear in association with existing development at Winslade Park. From this main road, the visual impact of the development would be a minor detracting element within this part of the countryside. When seen from the public footpath through the woodland to the east of the site and Grindle Brook to the north, the solar arrays would be in the foreground of views across the historic parkland. The development would detract from the quality of these views and the appearance of the landscape.
20. The harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified above weighs against granting planning permission and creates a 'tension'¹⁰ with LP Strategy 7. However, the development would be reversible and the adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would be very localised and limited to a period of twenty-five years. Although this is a lengthy period of time, the development would not have a lasting impact upon the qualities of the local environment. I attach moderate weight to this harmful impact.

Settings of Designated Heritage Assets

21. Winslade Park is a substantial mansion (now in use as a restaurant and bar) that was built by Edward Cotsford, MP and High Sheriff of Devon, in the early 19th century. The heritage interest (significance) of this Georgian country house is primarily derived from its special architectural and historic qualities. These include its hipped slate roof, rectangular plan form, three storeys and basement, large axial stacks, sash windows, symmetrical, 5-bay north front with central portico, symmetrical 5-bay south front and host of internal features such as its domed lantern with garlands in the style of Robert Adam. To further emphasise the grandeur of this neo-Palladian designed building, it was set within an attractive parkland setting that includes the appeal site. This setting emphasises the prestige and dominance of Winslade Park and contributes to its historic interest.
22. However, over time, there have been significant changes to the setting. These include a housing estate to the north, as well as the sizeable office blocks¹¹ and car parks to the south and west that were constructed during the 1970s to the design of Powell Moya and Partners¹². As a consequence, the area of parkland

¹⁰ In my experience, all solar farms within the countryside, with perhaps the exception of the very smallest, result in some adverse landscape and visual impact. Such 'tension' therefore is to be reasonably expected in meeting local objectives for increasing the amount of energy generated locally using renewable energy technologies.

¹¹ There is a glazed link between the listed building and one of the office blocks (known as Winslade House).

¹² This development won the RIBA Architecture Award for the South West Region in 1979.

that comprises the appeal site is now hidden in views from Winslade Park. When standing on the site, only a very small section of the uppermost part of the listed building can be discerned above the office blocks. From here, the site makes little meaningful contribution to the significance of this designated heritage asset. To the south west and from a small ridge¹³ of farmland to the south of the A376, part of the appeal site can be seen in filtered views towards Winslade Park. The site makes a very small contribution to the parkland setting of this listed building.

23. The significance of the Parish Church of St. Mary, which is possibly 13th and 15th century in origin, is also primarily derived from its special architectural and historic qualities. This includes its west tower with a battlemented parapet. With the construction of Winslade Park and the 1970s office blocks alongside, the setting of this listed building has also experienced profound changes over the years. In effect, the church is now surrounded by development. The top of the church tower can be seen from parts of the appeal site, as well as from the ridge of farmland to the south west. The site forms a minor part of the wider countryside setting to the church and, to a limited extent, assists in affording an appreciation of the historic rural landscape setting to this parish church. It makes a very small contribution to the significance of this listed building.
24. The grade II listed early 19th century terrace walk extends to 120 metres along the north bank of the Grindle Brook. The significance of this designated heritage is primarily derived from its historic function as an ornamental walk to Winslade Park. The office development to the north largely severs this walk from the grade II* listed former mansion. However, views to the south over the Grindle Brook and across the parkland (including the appeal site) remain, although in part these are now filtered by the bankside vegetation. Over time, there have been changes to these views, including the construction of the A376 and a petrol filling station. Nevertheless, the parkland setting with views to the countryside beyond assist in affording an appreciation and understanding of the historic function and delight of this ornamental walk. The appeal site makes a small contribution to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
25. The change in character of the appeal that I have identified above and the impact of the proposed development upon views of the site from Grindle Brook and the woodland to the east, would erode the historic landscape setting of the Parish Church of St. Mary and, more particularly, the historic parkland setting and delightful experience that was intended from the listed terrace walk. For parts of the year and until the proposed landscape planting established, the solar arrays would also be evident in views of Winslade Park and the listed church from the ridge of land to the south east of the A376. At a distance, solar panels can sometimes convey the impression of a body of water and as such, would not be an unduly conspicuous feature in this lowland river setting. Nevertheless, in these more distant views, the proposal would, to a limited extent, intrude into the parkland setting of Winslade Park and the listed church. There would be some 'tension' with LP Strategy 49.
26. In the context of the Framework, the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance/historic landscape setting of Winslade Park, the Church of St. Mary and the listed terrace walk. If there was a sliding scale within this category of harm, the impact of the proposal would be towards the

¹³ Not publicly accessible.

lower end in respect of Winslade Park and the church, and towards the middle in respect of the terrace walk. Less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets does not equate to a less than substantial planning objection.

27. Great weight should be given to an asset's conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. In this instance, the development would be reversible and the less than substantial harm would ensue for a limited period of time. In the case of Winslade Park, it is also part of a package of measures to remove the reliance on gas, improve the energy efficiency of this listed building¹⁴ and meet energy needs on site. I note that having explored other options¹⁵ for renewable energy schemes, the appellant considered the appeal proposal to be likely to have the least harmful impact upon the significance of designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, I attach high weight to the less than substantial harm that I have identified above. As set out within the Framework, this harm must be weighed with the public benefits of the development.

Public Open Space Provision

28. I have been informed that the appeal site forms part of a larger site that has planning permission for a major mixed-use development. This includes the provision of up to 94 dwellings (ref. 20/1001/MOUT)¹⁶. The appeal site lies within 'Zone K' on the approved site plan for this major development. This is an area intended to comprise accessible parkland for residents, visitors and employees of Winslade Park. Potential walking routes were identified through part of the appeal site with links to the Grindle Brook¹⁷ and the adjoining woodland. I understand that details for the provision and management of 'Zone K' has yet to be submitted to and agreed with the LPA.
29. I note the LPA's concerns that the proposed incursion into part of 'Zone K' would reduce the amenity of future residents and the wider community. However, 'Zone K' is an extensive area¹⁸ and even with the appeal scheme, plentiful accessible parkland with potential links to the Grindle Brook would remain available so as to help meet the recreational/leisure needs of future residents of Winslade Park and those in the wider surroundings. I also note that elsewhere within the Winslade Park estate there is open space and sports pitch provision, as well as a proposed Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play.
30. I concur with the appellant's assessment that the proposed development would not have any substantive impact on the provision of accessible parkland such that it would adversely affect the amenities of occupiers of the site or residents. The proposal would not conflict with the provisions of LP Policy D1.

Planning Balance

31. When all of the above are weighed together, I find that the public benefits of the proposed development would outweigh the adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area and the less than substantial harm to the significance / settings of the designated heritage assets. I note that a similar finding was reached by the LPA's planning officer. The proposal accords with the provisions of

¹⁴ Guidance by Historic England recognises that listed buildings also now have a part to play to helping to tackle climate change.

¹⁵ Roof mounted panels (which, in themselves, would detract from the significance of the listed building) were ruled out as there is insufficient roof space and hardsurfaced areas are required for other purposes to ensure the efficient functioning of the business.

¹⁶ Reserved matters have been granted for 38 dwellings (ref. 21/2235/MRES) and 40 apartments (ref. 21/2217/MRES).

¹⁷ I understand that restoration works are intended to Terrace Walk with pedestrian crossings over the Grindle Brook.

¹⁸ The appellant has calculated that it is 16.7 ha in size.

LP Strategy 39, LP policy EN9 and the development plan when read as a whole. It also accords with the overall provisions of the Framework.

Other Matters

32. The appeal site lies within Flood Zones 3a [high flood risk] and 3(b) [functional floodplain]¹⁹. I note that having considered the appellant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), between them the LPA and the Environment Agency were content that the proposal passed the sequential and exception tests provided for within the Framework and would not increase the risk of flooding. There is no cogent evidence before me to warrant taking a contrary stance. There would be no conflict with LP policies EN21 or EN22. If the artificially raised area of floodplain was removed, the proposal has the potential to deliver a land drainage benefit.
33. The development would take place on land identified as grade 3b under the Agricultural Land Classification. It would not involve the loss of best and most versatile land. Moreover, the proposed soil management under the solar panels would be likely to improve the health/structure of the soil.
34. I note the findings of some other Inspectors in respect of renewable energy schemes elsewhere²⁰ that have been drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the circumstances of these other cases are different to what is before me (including the character of the landscape and the parkland setting). I have determined the appeal before me on its own planning merits.

Planning Conditions

35. I have considered those conditions suggested to me having regard to the provisions of paragraphs 56 and 57 of the Framework.
36. In addition to the 'standard' condition requiring development to commence within three years, for the avoidance of doubt, a condition specifying the approved plans would also be necessary.
37. The proposed development is intended to be temporary in nature (permission has been sought for a period of 25 years) and in order to safeguard (in the longer term) the settings of designated heritage assets and the character and appearance of the area, it would be necessary to limit a permission to a period of 25 years.
38. As the public benefits of providing energy to Winslade Park are necessary to help outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritages, as well as being required to satisfy the flood risk sequential test, it would be necessary to attach a condition ensuring the electricity generated from the development was used as intended.
39. To limit flood risk, to preserve the setting of the listed Terrace Walk and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition would be necessary requiring the submission of details regarding the proposed substation.
40. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, conditions would be necessary requiring the proposed landscape planting to be undertaken in

¹⁹ From the appellant's Flood Risk Assessment, the 20-year and 100-year flood scenarios indicate flood depths from fluvial flooding between less than 0.2m-0.6m across the site. With climate change scenarios, the flood depths range from 0.2m-0.8m (up to 1m in the ditch). Parts of the site are also at high, medium and low risk of surface water flooding (mostly below 300mm). In addition, I note that the NP has identified the land south of Winslade Park as being prone to flooding.

²⁰ APP/U2235/W/23/3321094, APP/H1705/W/22/3304561, APP/E3335/W/24/3337226 and APP/M9496/W/23/3329001.

accordance with the submitted planting schedule, as well as controlling any external lighting or subsequent fencing, walls or other means of enclosure.

41. In the interests of reducing the risk of flooding, conditions would be necessary requiring: the development to be undertaken in accordance with the FRA; details of the appellant's further consideration for removing the artificially raised area of floodplain within the appeal site and; precluding development/storage of materials within 8 metres of the bank top of the Grindle Brook.
42. Pre-commencement conditions would be necessary in respect of the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, so as to ensure that the construction phase did not cause significant or lasting environmental harm; and a separate Landscape Environmental Management Plan, so as to mitigate the impact of the development upon the local landscape and biodiversity.
43. As the nearest dwellings are some considerable distance from the site and the purpose of the CCTV cameras would be to monitor the site and not neighbouring properties, a condition requiring details on the siting, design and angle or orientation of the cameras would be unnecessary.
44. In addition to the proposed CCTV cameras and security fence, the appellant has confirmed that motion sensors would also be installed. A condition requiring details of these would be necessary in order to help deter criminal activity.

Overall Conclusion

45. Given all of the above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed

Neil Pope

Inspector

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence within three years of the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:2,500 scale Ordnance Survey 'red line' site location plan (ref. P 01 Rev A); 1:1,500 scale proposed site plan (ref. SGS-1004-DR-ML-01); proposed deer fencing (ref. 1000-001); 1:75 scale proposed panel heights-flood risk (ref. SGS-1006-DR-ML-01); 1:50 scale general panel elevation layout (ref. SGS-1002-DR-ML-01); 1:1,500 scale CCTVs layout (ref. SGS-1009-DR-ML-01); 1:300 scale fencing layout (ref. 1007-DR-ML-01); 1:50 scale drainage ditch reinstatement and screening bund (ref. WPSD-MS-5-25/11/2023 rev 2); 1:50 scale illustrative construction details – Devon bank (ref. WPSD-MS-6-08/11/2023 rev 2); 1:500 scale landscape mitigating measures (ref. WPSD M1-08/11/2023 rev 2); 1:500 scale panels layout (ref. SGS-1001-DR-ML-01); 1:500 scale planting strategy masterplan (ref. WPSD M03-0-08/11/2023 rev 2); 1:1,000 scale terrain view (ref. SGS-1005-DR-ML-01); 1:75 scale panel heights – flood risk (ref. SGS-1006-DR-ML-01).
3. Within 25 years and six months following completion of construction of the

development hereby permitted, or within six months of the cessation of electricity generation by the solar PV facility, or within six months following a permanent cessation of construction works prior to the solar PV facility coming into operational use, whichever is the sooner, the solar PV panels, frames, foundations, inverter modules and all associated structures and fencing approved shall be dismantled and removed from the site. The developer shall notify the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in writing no later than five working days following cessation of power production. The site shall subsequently be restored in accordance with a scheme, which includes restoration and aftercare plans in order to return the land to its former condition, that shall have been submitted to the LPA within six months of the commencement of development and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the solar farm being brought into use. (Note: for the purposes of this condition, a permanent cessation of construction shall be taken as a period of at least 24 months where no development has been carried out to any substantial extent anywhere on the site.)

4. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the electricity produced by the solar panels hereby approved shall only be used to power the offices and commercial buildings at Winslade Park (including Winslade Manor, Brook House, The Stables Leisure and Blocks A-D). Only excess energy not required by Winslade Park, produced by the solar panels, shall be exported to the National Grid. Evidence of the distribution of the energy created at this site shall be provided to the LPA upon written request. Should the panels not be used to provide electricity for the offices and commercial buildings for longer than six months then the appeal site shall be decommissioned and returned to its former condition in accordance with the provisions of condition 3 above (excluding the reference to 25 years and six months).
5. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, no work shall commence on the proposed substation/ancillary building until details showing the siting and design (including size and external materials) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
6. The proposed landscaping shall be undertaken in accordance with the planting schedule in Appendix A to the Winslade Park Solar Array Project document by Westley Design Ltd 25 11 2023 rev 2, dated 28 February 2023.
7. No external lighting shall be constructed or provided unless and until details of the lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, any lighting shall be provided and retained in accordance with the approved details.
8. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (document ref. 21506-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0001 Issue P01 by Hydrock, dated 12 January 2023) and the mitigation recommendations within.
9. The development shall not be made operational until details of the developer's further consideration for removing the artificially raised area of floodplain along the Grindle Brook within the appeal site, as recommended by the Environment Agency in its consultation response of 4 March 2024, together with any details for removing

material, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

10. No built development, or storage of materials during or post-construction shall occur within 8 metres of the bank top of the Grindle Brook main watercourse.
11. No development shall commence until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) a Construction and Environmental Management Plan, to include a timetable of the works, hours of construction, route for construction traffic, hours for delivery and construction traffic, parking arrangements for delivery vehicles and construction traffic, pollution prevention, wheel washing facilities, any road closure, photographic evidence of the condition of adjacent public highways (including the bridge over the Grindle Brook) and arrangements for monitoring;
 - b) a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, to include a timetable for undertaking the landscape planting to which condition 6 above relates and the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures to which condition 12 below relates, as well as measures for protecting trees growing within/immediately adjacent to the site, including the mature oak tree along the northern boundary of the site during the construction phase;
 - c) proposed cable routes;
 - d) hardstandings, trackways and any associated drainage provision.The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
12. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out within the HT Ecology Ecological Impact Assessment Report dated November 2023. This shall include the creation of: a hedgerow along the western boundary of the site; a wildflower meadow underneath the solar panel arrays; a new wetland habitat; a native tree and shrub screening bund along the western boundary using material excavated from the existing ditch and; the installation of bird, bat and dormouse boxes on trees and suitable habitat adjacent to the site.
13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be provided without having first obtained permission from the Local Planning Authority.
14. Prior to the development becoming operational, details of the proposed motion sensors that are to be installed as part of efforts to deter criminal activity, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.