



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 August and 25, 26, 28 October 2023

Site visit made on 17 August 2023

by P J G Ware BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/W/23/3317818

Little Heath Lane, Little Heath, Berkhamstead

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Energi Generation against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01106/MFA, dated 31 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 25 MW Solar PV Array, comprising ground-mounted solar PV panels, vehicular access including internal access track, landscaping and associated infrastructure including security fencing, CCTV cameras, and grid connection infrastructure including transformers, substation compound buildings and cabling route to the point of connection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The Council confirmed (9 December 2021) that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required. There is no reason to disagree.
3. Little Heath Lane Solar Array Objectors were granted Rule 6 (R6) status and took a full part in the inquiry.
4. One of the reasons for refusal related to highway safety and the effect of construction traffic on a canal bridge. However following discussions the Highway Authority indicated that it was satisfied with the further information submitted by the appellant. The Council did not contest that reason for refusal.

Main issues

5. The parties are agreed that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt in terms of local and national policy.
6. With that background the main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt, and the purposes of including land within it.
 - The effect of the development on the landscape character of the area.

- Whether the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

The site, the surrounding area and the proposal

7. The appeal site is 32 ha in size and is broadly triangular in shape. It is surrounded by agricultural fields to the north, east and west. A main line railway is at the southern boundary and Little Heath Lane runs along the western side. The appeal site is undulating and slopes upwards from the railway line northwards. There are no Public Rights of Way across the site.
8. The site is adjacent the village of Bourne End which lies beyond the railway line in the valley bottom. The valley also includes the Grand Union canal and a main road. There are some dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the site along Little Heath Lane. Hemel Hempstead lies about 600 m to the east and Berkhamsted is about 1 km to the west along the valley floor.
9. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Beyond Little Heath Lane to the west is the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
10. The proposal includes ground-mounted solar PV panels across the majority of the red line site, along with internal access tracks, 70 pole-mounted CCTV cameras, security fencing, transformers and ancillary buildings.

Development plan policy context

11. The development plan comprises the saved policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)(BLP), the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013)(CS) and the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2016).
12. The reasons for refusal (leaving aside the highways issue) referenced policy CS5, which deals with inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Landscape effect is dealt with by policies CS24 (dealing with the AONB) and CS25 (dealing with landscape character).
13. Saved BLP policy 97 was cited in the reasons for refusal, but not listed in the Statement of Common Ground as a relevant policy. It deals with the AONB and appears to have been effectively superseded by CS24.
14. It is common ground that the adopted development plan does not contain an up to date policy on renewable energy. It is also clear that, especially under these circumstances, national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and national guidance is a very important material consideration.

Green Belt openness

15. There is no dispute between the parties that Green Belt is a spatial planning designation and not a landscape policy. That said, it is clear that the openness of the Green Belt has a spatial as well as a visual aspect, so assessment of openness is not just a matter of comparing the current nature of the land – in this case undeveloped pasture - with the proposal. The reason for refusal only alleges harm to the visual component of openness but, in line with national and

- local policy, I will consider both aspects. This approach was also adopted at the inquiry.
16. From a spatial perspective, the proposal would introduce a substantial amount of development into an open area. This would particularly result from the ground coverage of the arrays, along with the access tracks, fencing and other taller features. The appellant's position is that the development would be relatively modest in mass and footprint. In terms of three dimensional mass I agree with that position to an extent, as the panels themselves would be relatively limited in height – although some other elements of the scheme would be taller. I will return to that below in terms of the effect on the landscape. I do not agree that the footprint of the development would be modest as, dealing with that area which would become the solar farm (as opposed to the blue line area), the footprint would be very considerable. The proposal would cause moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt in spatial terms.
 17. I will deal with the visual effect of the proposal in more detail below but, in summary, I consider that the development would be visually prominent from a number of locations and would appear as an uncharacteristic form of development. It would cause moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
 18. The appellant's position is that the grass beneath the panels would still be seen. To a limited extent this is correct and this would reduce the visual impact of the scheme. However from a distance the panels and associated structures would blend together, as illustrated by a number of photomontages and plans, and the grass beneath the panels would be visible to only a very limited extent. Conversely as one approached the site, the grass would become much more visible, but the presence of the panels, fencing and other elements would be all the more prominent and harmful to the perception of openness.
 19. I acknowledge the appellant's argument that the proposal is temporary in nature (40 years) and that the development would be removed and the land restored to its former condition – in essence openness would be restored at that point. Leaving aside the discussion as to what may happen at the end of the 40 year period – which can only be speculation - I do not find this argument to be persuasive in terms of reducing the effect on Green Belt openness. Although the proposal is for a limited period, the length of that period is very substantial. But even more importantly, the fundamental aim of national Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. With that well established policy background it cannot be right that the fact that approval is sought for a 40 year period is accorded more than very limited weight in favour of the scheme in relation to the loss of openness. To do so would go against the concept of permanence.
 20. Consequently, both visually and spatially, the proposed development would result in moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This adds to the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness.

Green Belt purposes

21. In terms of the purposes of the Green Belt designation, the Council's position is that the land currently performs well against four of the five purposes as set

- out in national policy, and that the proposal would harm the purposes of designation. (It is agreed that the fourth purpose, relating to historic towns, is not relevant in this instance).
22. I will deal with the first two purposes of designation together, as they are very closely linked in this case.
23. The gap along the valley between Hemel Hempstead to the east and Berkhamsted to the west is relatively narrow. It comprises sloping land running down to the transport links between the two settlements at the foot of the slope, and is interspersed by roads such as Little Heath Lane running up the valley side. To the east, the Council has released a large parcel of land for development (the LA3 site) which makes the remaining gap all the more important.
24. The site currently performs well in relation to the Green Belt purposes related to the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. The appellant has stressed the distance between the towns and the limited intervisibility. However the LA3 development combined with the proposal would significantly reduce the gap and the effect of this would be clearly visible from the opposite side of the valley, amongst other locations.
25. However one describes the nature of the proposal – and various terms were used at the inquiry – to my mind it would result in a significant reduction in these first two Green Belt purposes.
26. In relation to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, the site currently performs a useful function. This is almost self-evident as the site is currently an open field and forms part of a number of such fields which are representative of the countryside in the area. The proposal, however it might be described, would not appear as countryside. Despite the maintenance of some space between and around the panels, the arrays and associated structures would fundamentally alter the countryside appearance of the fields. This would result in encroachment, in contradiction of the third Green Belt purpose.
27. The final purpose of the Green Belt is to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Council stated that the site performs well against this purpose. However there is no suggestion that derelict or other urban land is available or suitable for the proposal. Under these circumstances I do not consider that the location of the site in the Green Belt assists in deflecting development towards urban areas. Accordingly, the proposal would not be in conflict with this purpose of the Green Belt.

Green Belt conclusion

28. The parties agree that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. In addition the proposal would result in moderate harm to the openness of the designated area and conflict with three of the purposes of Green Belts. The harm to the Green Belt arising from these matters attracts substantial weight against the proposal. The proposal would conflict with policy CS5 and national policy.

The effect on landscape character, including the Chilterns AONB

29. The Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Study and the Stage 2 Green Belt Review both noted that the site had a high or very high sensitivity to change. I do not take these documents as highly material, and I am fully aware that they deal with potential housing development as opposed to a solar farm. However they do serve as a useful background to considering the baseline landscape.
30. The national approach relating to the effect of solar development is set out in Planning for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. Amongst other matters this states that "The deployment of large-scale solar farms can have a negative impact on the rural environment, *particularly in undulating landscapes*. However, the visual impact of a well-planned and well-screened solar farm can be properly addressed within the landscape if planned sensitively." (My emphasis). This approach is reflected in the industry's own guidance which notes that flat sites are best for PV projects.
31. Whilst I agree with the appellant that solar farms do not have to be completely hidden to be acceptable, the extent of any slope has a direct and obvious correlation with the degree of effect and any potential harm caused by a proposal. In this case the significant slope down to the valley floor brings most of the proposal above the height of buildings, movement corridors and viewpoints in the valley below. In addition the presence of the slope on the other side of the valley increases the visibility of the appeal site from that direction.
32. Before turning to the effect on landscape character at various locations, it is useful to identify the location of viewpoints from which the development would be visible. There was some disagreement between the parties on this matter – at least in written evidence - where the appellant implied that there were no views of the site from the north and west.
33. At close range there are gaps – two in particular - in the hedgerow along Little Heath Lane from which clear views of the site can be gained. These would be most relevant to walkers or horse riders, as drivers' attention would be predominantly focussed on the narrow road. Views across the site can be clearly obtained from Little Heath House and Rosamaria, also on Little Heath Lane. On the opposite side of the site, some much more limited views can be obtained from Pouchen End Lane.
34. From the valley floor there are a number of views up the slope of the site. These can be obtained from the railway line, from the Canal Walk (and of course the canal itself) and from properties on either side of the canal. To some extent these views are filtered by buildings and trees, and to a variable extent these limit the effect on the landscape. However the appeal site is clearly visible rising up from the valley from a range of viewpoints.
35. Crossing to the other side of what is a relatively steep and narrow valley, the site is clearly visible from a number of public viewpoints on Boxmoor Trust land (as representative of other locations) and the golf course, along with some parts of eastern Berkhamsted as it rises up the southern slope of the valley.
36. The parties differed as to the effect of the proposal from some viewpoints. It was suggested that this was because of shortcomings in the appellant's Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) exercise. It is certainly true that the ZTV was based

on panel heights of 2.4m whereas the panels can reach 2.8m, and some other elements of the infrastructure would be substantially taller. However I have no reason to consider that this significantly influenced the landscape professionals in reaching their conclusions. Nor do I accept that the criticism of the appellant's photographs and montages is well founded. I, and I am sure others, have reached my conclusions largely based on my site visit and the submitted plans.

37. The parties are agreed that there would be a large adverse impact on landscape character within 500m of the site. This is an important matter as this distance would include views from Bourne End, Little Heath Lane and the dwellings located along it, Pouchen End, the Grand Union canal and walk, and the railway line. From all those locations the effect on the landscape character would be moderately adverse. (This radius also includes part of the AONB, which I will deal with below.)
38. As one moves further from the site the parties agree that the impact would decrease from large to moderate – at a point somewhere between 500m and 2kms. Precisely where this transition – not a fixed point - would occur depends on the exact viewpoint and the exercise of professional judgement. Within this wider radius I am especially concerned with the landscape effect as viewed from the Boxmoor Trust land and the golf course on the southern side of the valley. From this area the appeal site rising up the far side of the valley is very visible in largely uninterrupted views.
39. From those locations, although I appreciate that there would be gaps between the panels and spaces elsewhere on the site, the proposal would read as a largely uninterrupted mass. Whether one describes this as an industrial development or something which is increasingly to be expected in the countryside, what matters is the effect on the landscape in these panoramic views, where one can appreciate both Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamstead and the gap between. The proposal would have a moderate (at best) effect on the landscape.
40. One matter which might add to the effect of the proposal on the landscape is the question of glint and glare. At the inquiry it was stated for the appellant that an anti-reflective coating would be used, although this matter was not covered in evidence. I am not in a position to determine the effectiveness of any coating and any consequent effect on the landscape.

Conclusion on the effect on general landscape character

41. Much of the landscape effect of this proposal relates directly to the sloping nature of the site, which has the consequence of increasing visibility and potentially increasing the effect of the scheme. This consideration is in the light of the national and industry approach to the best siting of solar developments.
42. It was said at the inquiry that the appellant had considered the specific consequences of the slope. Whilst I do not have any reason to doubt this, there is little or no evidence of this in the written evidence or the initial appraisals.
43. The appellant posited two highly relevant questions. Firstly "Whether the panels would be visible from a number of vantage points in the surrounding

area, and the weight to be attached to that visibility.” From what I have already said it will be clear that my response is the panels would be visible from a number of vantage points and that the effect on the landscape would be at best moderate. The second question, which to an extent feeds back into the first, is “Whether the undulating form of the site and its clear downward slope to the south would increase the visibility and impact of the development compared with flat and, if so, whether this matters.” To those questions, for the reasons set out above, I would answer in the affirmative.

44. For the above reasons, the proposal would cause at least moderate harm to the landscape character of the area. It would conflict with policy CS25. That the harm would persist for 40 years weighs in the balance against the development.

The effect on the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

45. I will now turn to the potential effect of the proposal on the AONB. There was some discussion at the inquiry as to precisely where the AONB boundary runs – to the west of Little Heath Lane, down the centre line of the road or even on the east side adjoining the appeal site. To me this is tantamount to considering angels dancing on a pinhead. What matters is that the appeal site is not in the AONB, but is very close to it.
46. National policy confirms the existence of the concept of the ‘setting’ of an AONB where it requires “..*that development within their setting* [i.e. of an AONB] *should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on AONBs.*” [My insertion]
47. There is no definition of the setting of the AONB in the development plan. The Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB), to whom the Council deferred in this respect, clearly considered that the appeal site forms part of the setting of the AONB. Indeed given the fact that the AONB and the appeal site are contiguous or virtually contiguous, it would be surprising were that not the case. In support of this position, I am aware that the 2km radius from the site (referenced above) includes part of the AONB.
48. The appellant’s position is that the effect on setting would be limited and highly localised. To an extent I agree as, although there are few views of the site from within the designated area, the main consequence of the proposal would be in taking views towards the AONB from the south. In this case, I am especially concerned with the views of the site and the AONB from the higher land on the far side of the valley. In those views one can appreciate the site set against the AONB and, as the appellant accepted, the site forms part of the same landscape. The views towards the AONB from the far side of the valley would be adversely affected – there was reference to the appeal site forming part of the ‘gateway’ to the designated area, which is an approach I recognise.
49. The CCB, whilst acknowledging the views into the AONB, also dealt with the perceptual qualities for people inside the area. In my view there would be a very limited effect on those qualities.
50. Overall, the proposal would harm the landscape setting of the AONB, and would conflict with policy CS24 and national policy. This adds additional weight to the landscape factors weighing against the proposal. Although the viewpoints and the appearance of the proposal are the same as considered in

general landscape terms, this is not double counting, as the policy context is quite different.

Valued landscape

51. The term 'valued landscape' is found at paragraph 174(a) of the Framework. If an area is classified as a valued landscape this policy bites. In the Council's landscape evidence to the inquiry it was explained in some detail that the area was considered to be a valued landscape – a contention refuted by the appellant's landscape witness.
52. In the officer's report on the application (written by the Council's planning witness who appeared at the inquiry giving planning evidence) there was no suggestion that this was a valued landscape. Not was there any reference to this in the decision notice. The agreed Statement of Common Ground specifically stated that the site was not in a valued landscape. Although I do not doubt the professional opinion of the Council's landscape witness, it is far from clear if this is a position held by the Council itself.
53. For an area to qualify as a valued landscape it has to have sufficient qualities to elevate it above more everyday areas. As will be seen above, I am concerned with the effect of the proposal on the landscape qualities of the area, but this does not mean that I automatically consider that it has valued landscape status or that Framework paragraph 174(a) applies. In conclusion I do not consider that the site is part of a valued landscape as referenced in the Framework.

Overall conclusion on landscape

54. The proposal would cause at least moderate harm to the landscape character of the area and, to that, I add the further harm related to the setting of the AONB. I do not consider that the site falls within a valued landscape in Framework terms.

Renewable energy benefits

55. A material consideration in the determination of this and other proposals for renewable energy are the various elements of national policy and guidance setting out the importance of providing renewable energy infrastructure. A brief summary of some key policy documents is set out below, but there is no need to rehearse these in detail, as the importance of renewable energy is (subject to the point below about part of the Councils' evidence) not in dispute. What is in dispute is the weight which should be accorded to this matter, and subsequently whether this and other benefits outweigh the harm.
56. Dealing first with the Framework, the policy is clear that even small scale projects can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and that such schemes should be approved if any impacts are, or can be made, acceptable. Planning Practice Guidance on renewable and low carbon energy also encourages the identification of suitable areas for renewable energy. Draft and emerging National Policy Statements support the need for the delivery of major energy infrastructure.
57. The Energy White Paper (December 2020) and the Net Zero Strategy (October 2021) both emphasise the measures required to transition to low carbon energy generation by 2035. This is in the light of the fact that the government has declared a climate emergency and set a statutory target of achieving net

- zero emissions by 2050. This is also a material consideration. The importance of urgent action has been emphasised in a number of documents, for example the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change which indicates that delay in global action to address climate change will miss a rapidly narrowing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future.
58. At the local level, it is common ground that the development plan does not contain an up to date policy on renewable energy. The Council has not allocated any sites for renewable energy schemes and policy CS28 sets out only a general ambition to secure emissions reductions and energy efficiency. The Council itself has declared a Climate Emergency, but the approach – as explained at the Inquiry - is to focus on energy efficiency and rooftop solar schemes. The development plan is silent on the approach to be adopted towards larger renewable proposals.
59. Turning away from the clear national support, in principle, for renewable energy projects, a further element of national policy is that developers should not be required to demonstrate a need for such projects. Given this approach to need, it seemed surprising that much inquiry time was taken up with the question of the appellant's search for a site.
60. It is clear that, with the extent of Green Belt and AONB in the area, any potential sites are likely to be within some type of designated area. However the appeal site benefits from an available connection to the grid which is an obvious asset in terms of speedy delivery. Criticism that the search could have been more extensive does not take the matter much further, as the nature of electricity generating proposals could theoretically mean that a development could be located anywhere in the country, or even abroad. A line has to be drawn somewhere and it is concluded that the appellants undertook an extensive and reasonable site search.
61. Equally the discussion at the inquiry as to whether the appellant company could economically build a smaller solar farm takes the consideration of the merits of the appeal scheme very little further. It was stated for the appellant, but not supported by evidence, that smaller solar farms are no longer viable. Conversely the appellant's own website appears to be promoting smaller schemes. But in any event I have to deal with the proposal before me, and there was nothing to suggest that a smaller development would be viable or that there was a suitable location for it.
62. Before concluding on renewable energy, it is necessary to address one substantial element of the Council's evidence. The planning officer who was the case officer and appeared for the Council at the inquiry clearly and specifically questioned the legitimacy and direction of renewable energy policy in a substantial part of his evidence. In particular he stated that the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change should be treated with a fair degree of scepticism, and that there is a clear dichotomy between science and policy. It was, to say the very least, most unusual to hear and read those views being put forward on behalf of an authority which has itself declared a Climate Emergency.
63. In response to a question from me related to the materiality and weight of these views, the response was that the weight to be accorded to them was a matter for the decision maker. That was not helpful as it did not indicate the

weight which the witness considered should be attached to his evidence. However, for the avoidance of doubt I have taken no account of those views – partly because criticism of government policy is far removed from the scope of the inquiry, partly because the criticism was largely unsupported by evidence, and partly because I remain in genuine doubt as to whether the views put forward represented those of an individual officer or of the Council.

64. In conclusion on renewable energy, it is clear that national policy as a whole supports and encourages the development of renewable energy sources, including solar developments. There is a significant national need to reduce carbon emissions and increase renewable energy generation to achieve Net Zero by 2050 and a Net Zero electricity system by 2035. These matters carry significant weight in support of the appeal proposal.

Other material considerations

65. The Council does not allege any amenity effect on the occupiers of residential properties, although the proposal would be visible from a number of dwellings. This has been raised in representations by others opposed to the proposal. However, having viewed the site from a number of affected properties, although the view would undoubtedly change, I do not consider that the residential amenity of the occupiers would be harmed.
66. In terms of the loss of agricultural land, the proposed development would not result in a significant loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. In addition there is the potential that the land could be used for grazing between and under the panels if the development goes ahead. I do not consider that this matter weighs against the proposal.
67. There is a suggestion that the proposed security fencing, which I have assessed as part of the proposal, would be inadequate and would need to be replaced with something more sturdy and visually intrusive. However, even if this were to be the case, that would be the subject of separate consideration, and is not before me.
68. The effect of the proposal on ecological interest was not raised by the Council or by any nature-focussed organisation, but was the subject of detailed evidence in opposition to the proposal by an expert local resident. However the balance of the evidence is that the site is of limited ecological value, and that this is largely confined to the boundaries - which will largely be retained. There would be an agreed Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 77% in area units and 34% in linear units. A condition could deliver a skylark mitigation plan. For all these reasons, the effect of the proposal on ecology is not a matter weighing against the proposal.
69. I appreciate that, during the construction period, there would be an employment benefit, reducing very substantially when the development is operational. I have noted the appellant's statement that the landowner would reinvest the monies into the area (who wrote in to that effect), but there can be no guarantee of this. I give these matters very limited weight.
70. The appellant criticised the way in which the Council dealt with the application, and in particular whether the submitted reports had not been read, and the fact that there was no professionally qualified landscape input. However I do

not consider that there is persuasive evidence that the Council's decision making process was flawed.

Planning balance and conclusion

71. The parties agree that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. In addition, the proposal would result in moderate harm to the openness of the designated area and conflict with three of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The harm to the Green Belt arising from these matters attracts substantial weight against the proposal.
72. In addition, particularly given the slope of the site and its visibility, the proposal would cause at least moderate harm to the landscape character of the area. To that, I add the further harm related to the setting of the AONB.
73. The policy and guidance related to renewable energy carries significant weight in favour of the proposal. However this does not confer an automatic approval of such schemes. To this I add the very limited weight related to the economic benefit of the proposal.
74. In this case, the harm to the Green Belt and that caused by the landscape/AONB issues would not be clearly outweighed by the other considerations identified and therefore the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.
75. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P. J. G. Ware
Inspector

APPEARANCES

ENERGI GENERATION LTD

David Hardy. Partner CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP	
He called:	
Daniel Haigh BSc(Hons) GradDip PgDip CMLI	Associate Director RSK ADAS Ltd
Ian Wickett FCIHT	Senior Associate Director RSK
Emma Mundy BSc(Hons) MSc CEcol CEnv MCIEEM	RSK ADAS Ltd
Kenny Dhillon BSc(Hons) PgCert TP MRTPI	Director, Planning and Landscape, RSK ADAS Ltd

DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Sam Fowles of Counsel, instructed by Head of Legal Services	
He called:	
Carly Tinkler BA CMLI FRSA MIALE	Independent landscape architect
Andrew Parrish BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Lead planning officer

LITTLE HEATH LANE SOLAR ARRAY OBJECTORS (RULE 6 PARTY)

Michael Vallence (who also gave evidence) and Ms Dina Westenholz-Smith
--

INTERESTED PERSONS/ORGANISATIONS

Michael Stubbs	Chiltern Conservation Board
Christopher Berry	CPRE Herts
Elizabeth Hamilton	Local resident
Michael Pritchard	Bourne End Village Association
Mr Mawe	Local resident

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

Doc 1	Appellant opening
Doc 2	LPA opening
Doc 3	Rule 6 opening
Doc 4	Table comparing levels of L & V effects
Doc 5	Statement by Bourne End Village Association
Doc 6	Energi Generation photograph of solar farm
Doc 7	Statement by Mrs Hamilton and 10 appendices
Doc 8	Designing out crime officer letter
Doc 9	PPG Natural environment
Doc 10	NE Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land
Doc 11	Hansard extract 1/5/2019
Doc 12	Conditions agreed between the parties (and note of disputes over conditions related to date of first export and Saturday working, and condition 10)
Doc 13	Agreed accompanied and site visit routes
Doc 14	Crays Hill appeal decision (3318171)
Doc 15	Amendment to SOCG
Doc 16	Tables of comparison of landscape and visual effects ADAS and DBC
Doc 17	Sherbourne appeal decision (3317247)
Doc 18	Closing statement by Rule 6 party
Doc 19	Closing statement by the Council and authorities
Doc 20	Closing statement by the appellant

CORE DOCUMENTS

Can be accessed using the following link:

[Public inquiries \(dacorum.gov.uk\)](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk)