APP/R3705/W/24/3349391 Planning Balance Summary Table

PINS has asked for a Planning Balance Summary table. The parties use slightly different scales for weighing harms and benefits in the Proofs. The Appellant has used a three-part scale with 'significant' at the top, whereas the LPA and Rule 6 parties' scales go up to 'substantial'. To assist the Inspector, the Appellant has 'realigned' its scale so a comparison can be made more easily.

Appellant scale(s):

		'Aligned' scale	
Benefits	Harms	Benefits	Harms
0) (none)	0) (none)	0) (none)	0) (none)
1) Minor	1) Minor	1) Limited	1) Limited
2) Moderate	2) Moderate	2) Moderate	2) Moderate
3) Significant/ substantial/ great	3) Significant/ substantial/ great	3) Significant	3) Significant
		4) Substantial	4) Substantial

LPA scale:

Benefits	Harms
0) No/negligible	0) No/negligible
1) Limited	1) Limited
2) Moderate	2) Moderate
3) Significant	3) Significant
4) Very significant	4) Very significant
5) Substantial	5) Substantial

R6 scale:

Benefits	Harms
0) None	0) None
1) Limited	1) Limited
2) Moderate	2) Moderate
3) Significant	3) Significant
4) Substantial	4) Substantial

	Topic	Appellant Steven Bainbridge MRTPI	LPA Jonathan Weekes MRTPI	R6 Gail Collins MRTPI
Benefits	Clean power	Substantial (Sig)	Substantial	Substantial
	Energy security	Substantial (Sig)	Substantial	Substantial
	Delivering on climate emergency declarations	Significant	Significant	Significant
	Good design / efficient use of land	Significant[1]	Limited[2]	Limited[3]
	Grid connectivity & rapidity of deployment	Significant	Significant[4]	Limited[5]
	Biodiversity	Substantial (Sig)	Moderate	Moderate
	Permanence/Remediability[6]	Significant	Limited	Limited
	Green infrastructure	Moderate	Moderate[7]	Moderate[8]
	Air Quality	Moderate	Very limited	None
	Economic development	Significant	Limited	Limited
	Farm diversification	Moderate	Limited[8]	Limited
	Flood risk betterment	Limited	Limited	Limited
	BMV land (as a benefit)	Limited	Limited[9]	None
Harms	Green belt	N/A (Grey Belt)	N/A (Grey Belt)	Substantial
	Landscape and visual	Moderate	Significant	Significant
	Heritage	Moderate[9]	Limited[10]	Significant[11]
	Permanence/ Remediability[7]	N/A	None/limited[12]	Moderate
	BMV (as a harm)	N/A	N/A	Moderate

[1] Appellant gives this significant weight taking into account dual use of land and good design.
[2] Dual use as per 9; Limited weight integrated to use of bifacial panels.
[3] R6 disagrees that solar is an efficient use of BMV. Also do not accept inclusion of the 'good design' point.
[4] Integrated into delivering clean power/energy security.
[5] In case of Appellant's evidence.
[6] Introduced by R6.
[7] Integrated into biodiversity.
[8] Dual use as per 3.
[9] Harms outweighed by public benefits. Proof notes great weight to assets' conservation per the NPPF but limited harms outweighed by public benefits. On a scale of limited to substantial harm, the harm is considered to attract moderate **weight** in the overall planning balance.
[10] Harms outweighed by public benefits.
[11] Harms outweighed by public benefits.
[12] Depends if ecology enhancements retained post decommission.