

Dear Ms Richardson

1. Thank you for your email of 20 July.
2. We refer to the following documents:
 - a. Our solar installation information statement dated 21 May 2026 (**BHSS**);
 - b. Arboricultural Method Statement (please see the latest version – v2 dated 22 July 2026) (**AMS**);
 - c. Tree Protection Plan (again please see the latest version updated for the revised panel layout – v2 dated 20 July 2026) (**TPP**);
 - d. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, dated 20 May 2026 (**AIA**);
 - e. In conjunction with an earlier application, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, dated 29 September 2022 (**AIA22** – submitted with DM/23/0632);
 - f. In conjunction with the earlier application, a Tree Protection Plan, dated 29 September 2022 (**TPP22** – submitted with DM/23/0632).
3. We provide with this note some further information that is relevant to your considerations in response to your email of 20 July and to Emily Wade's of 13 July.
4. The following photographs show that the proposed installation of solar panels will be in an open area of weeds. There is no need for removals from either hedge, other than temporarily for access (see the AMS).

Facing south west (wide angle setting)



Facing north east



Nature of the development area

5. Ms Wade (13 July) describes the land proposed to be used for this development as “occupied until its recent partial clearance by planting” and “one of the more prominent aspects of the surviving verdant setting of the house”. The first of those two comments is incorrect and the second appears to be an excess of creative licence on Ms Wade’s part. Both give the entirely false impression that the area intended for development is or was recently an area of mature and valuable planting.
6. As the TPP and AMS (section 6) make clear, to the extent there is planting of value it lies in the hedge immediately adjacent to Portsmouth Wood Drive (labelled TG1 by the arboriculturist), delineated by the line of barrier fencing shown on the TPP. The first photograph above faces the TG1 hedge which is visible on the other side of the open area, the second looks back in the other direction. The TG1 hedge will be retained, there is no need for removals under the currently proposed panel layout, other than temporarily to facilitate access, and the requirements for its protection under the AMS and the TPP will be followed.
7. As we set out in the BHSS (p4), the area intended to site the panels was mown grass under the last but one owners of Barrington House and thereafter gradually became overgrown, previously mainly with brambles and now with weeds as the photographs above show.
8. You said (20 Jul) “I note that you have started to clear this area in light of the current application proposal”. This comment is misleading and begs some clarification. First, as we have already set out in the BHSS (p4), two trees had to be felled following our receipt of the AIA22. Their removal was a necessity and was unrelated to this application. Their removal represents the bulk of such clearance as we have conducted.

9. At para 2.5 the AIA22 said:

- a. “To address safety issues it has been recommended that tree T1 is removed as this tree has significant decay at the lower trunk”; and
- b. “The adjacent tree T2 should also be felled as it would now become exposed to the elements because of T1 removal”.

The stumps of these two trees are labelled differently, as T7 and T8, in the AIA.

- 10. Since adapting the layout of the panels to take into account the AIA (BHSS p1) no permanent removals from the TG1 hedge, or the hedge to the south, are needed. The interventions that may be needed will be the clearing of the weeds shown in the photographs above and possibly some minor pruning. Any such work will be conducted in accordance with the AMS and TPP.
- 11. Whether the open area intended for development under this application was “verdant”, in the country house garden sense that Ms Wade talks of, at any point in history is not clear. She has certainly provided no evidence that it was and it has been either grass or rough low level overgrowth in living memory.

Impact on Barrington House

- 12. We have taken care to ensure that the development does not impinge on any view of the main house and that it will be out of sight from the house, from passers-by and from the neighbours, subject only to some further growth required of the short new section of evergreen hedge (see BHSS pp2-3). Ms Wade makes no mention of any of these important aspects of the application and appears to have ignored them. The measures include:
 - a. The panel layout has changed to reflect the AIA (BHSS p1) and to minimise any impact on TG1 and its root area (see TPP).
 - b. The solar installation will be low to the ground. As set out in the BHSS (p2) the proposed panels are to be mounted on tubs that are themselves 390mm high, the highest edge of the panels then being 300–400mm above that surface. That produces a maximum height from the ground of c.700-800mm. As installed the maximum elevation of the panels would be less than one third of the way up the northern wall (see the line on the photograph on BHSS p3). Consequently this is a very low profile installation.
 - c. The panels’ angle, 10-15 degrees off the horizontal, means that they would present only a very oblique view of their faces to anyone looking from the roads above or below, were they not anyway screened altogether all year round as intended.
 - d. A short stretch of laurel hedge has been planted to complete the screening. As of May, 80cm of new growth was required which equates to around two seasons for this species and so about 16-18 months. Because of the helpful differences in elevation this hedge can grow to sufficient height to screen all of the panels from Barrington Wood (for the length where screening is not already in place) without obstructing the sunlight from reaching the panels (BHSS p4).
- 13. Ms Wade (13 Jul)), in her historical exposition about the house, mentions that it was requisitioned by the military during WWII and has an interesting list of former inhabitants. With respect, these points are not relevant to the application. She makes no mention of prominent modern extension on the most visible, south facade of the main house, nor that the proposed development lies out of sight from the house, nor that there is a modern garage in between,

nor that it will in time be entirely screened from neighbours and passers by even via the length of site boundary that does not already have all year round screening. All of these are among the points that might be relevant to your considerations.

14. Ms Wade's claims about our proposal are contrary to our submissions and to the evidence of the site, including as shown in the photographs above and in the BHSS on p3. She criticises the "prominence of the site" its "proximity to the house" and "its elevation and profile". In response to these and her related points:
 - a. The proposed panels will sit at most c.700-800mm above the ground at their highest point (para 12.b above). They would be dwarfed by the very much larger garage immediately to their east. They will sit on tubs which are intended to have a natural look, are minimally intrusive to the ground and will be pretty much edge on to any passer by that is able to see them. They will not be "prominent" in context in any meaningful way.
 - b. The highest point of elevation will be below the ground floor of the house. It is difficult to see how the elevation can be a reasonable point of criticism given that the panels would in any case be screened including, in due course, by vegetation in the only remaining gap.
 - c. The site is not particularly proximate to the main house. The modern garage sits between house and the site, screening it from that direction, and the site is about as far from the neighbouring West House, which is of modern design, as it is from Barrington House.
15. The proposal has been carefully designed, and adapted during this application process, to protect the setting and significance of the house as well as to protect the TG1 hedgerow. We are disappointed that Ms Wade has not recognised this or taken it into account. Her conclusions regarding the application are not justified in her email and are without any foundation.

NDHA status

16. You said (20 Jul) "the Officer dealing with the refused application that went to appeal [Flat 4 Old Mill House] agrees with Emily, that the Inspector for the Barrington House appeal had been incorrect in their judgement". The appeal decision that you refer to (APP/D3830/D/23/3333915) relates to a different property in a different town and does not present any view on the part of that inspector regarding Barrington House.
17. We anyway do not accept that a comment in the unrelated Appeal Decision could somehow be interpreted as overturning a decision of a planning inspector in respect of another (in this case the rejection of NDHA status on Barrington House - APP/D3830/D/23/3332694).
18. We note that under section 79(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the planning inspector "may reverse or vary any part of the decision of the local planning authority" (our emphasis). The most recent Appeal Decision relating to Barrington House (BHSS p2) rejected the proposed NDHA status for reasons that were set out by the appeal inspector. The appeal inspector was legally entitled to make this decision and as a result Barrington House does not have NDHA status.
19. In any case, we are more interested than anyone in preserving the period nature of Barrington House, while also seeking to ensure its continued utility, including as climate change continues. The proposed development does not impinge on the attractiveness or historical importance of the main house, whether the house has NDHA status or not, as set out above and in the BHSS.

National Planning Policy Framework

20. You will doubtless be aware that according to the National Planning Policy Framework local planning authorities should *“give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings, both domestic and non-domestic (including through installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights)”* (para 167).
21. It also says, at para 168:
- “When determining planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon energy developments and their associated infrastructure, local planning authorities should:*
- a) not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal’s contribution to a net zero future;*
- b) recognise that small-scale and community-led projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions...”*
22. There is also a reference to chapter 16 of the Framework where a proposal would affect *“conservation areas, listed buildings or other relevant designated heritage assets”*, none of which, to emphasise, apply to this application. Barrington House is not in a conservation area, is not listed and does not have NDHA status under the last appeal decision as detailed above. However, were this provision to apply, it says *“a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”*. A balanced judgement would see that the merits of this application are considerable and the impacts on the setting of Barrington House, visual amenity in general and the nearby vegetation are minimal.

Yours sincerely

Simon Weeden