



Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as Amended)

Appeal Statement of Case on behalf of:

Bassetlaw District Council

Appeal by:

One Planet Developments/Aurora Planning Limited

APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION OF THE FOLLOWING:

Installation and Operation of a Solar Farm and Battery Energy Storage System (Output upto 40 MW), With Associated Works, Equipment, Infrastructure and Landscaping

At

Land Adjacent To A614 Worksop Nottinghamshire

22 July 2025

Bassetlaw District Council Ref:

24/00384/FUL

Planning Inspectorate Ref:

APP/A3010/W/25/3367817

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement of Case (SoC) has been prepared by Bassetlaw District Council (the Council) as the Local Planning Authority (the LPA) in relation to 24/00384/FUL, a full application for the installation and operation of a solar farm and battery energy storage system (output up to 40 mw), ~~with associated~~ with associated works, equipment, infrastructure and landscaping.

2.0 The Appeal Proposal

- 2.1 The current scheme relates to the proposed construction and operation of a 54.5 GW-h solar farm and Battery Energy Storage System covering an approximate area of 73.22 Hectares on land adjacent to the A614. The proposed works would also include all associated works, infrastructure and landscaping.

- 2.2 The application includes:

Document Type	Drawing No/Description	Date Received
Application Form	-	03 April 2024
Glint Assessment	-	03 April 2024
BNG Baseline Report	-	03 April 2024
BNG Calculation Tool	-	03 April 2024
BNG Survey	-	03 April 2024
Elevations	Sheet 1 of 2	03 April 2024
Elevations	Sheet 2 of 2	03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey	Part 1	03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey	Part 2	03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey	Part 3	03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey	Part 4	03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey	Part 5	03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey	Part 6	03 April 2024
Tree Survey	-	03 April 2024
Zone of Theoretical Visibility	001	03 April 2024
Planting Plan	571-PP-01	03 April 2024
Planting Plan	571-PP-01	03 April 2024
Existing Site Layout	PL-00	03 April 2024
Proposed Site Layout	PL-01	03 April 2024
BESS Layout Plan	PL-02	03 April 2024
PV Detail	SD-01	03 April 2024
40ft Storage Container	SD-02	03 April 2024
40ft Welfare Container	SD-03	03 April 2024
CCTV Camera and Post	SD-04	03 April 2024
Security/Deer Fence	SD-05	03 April 2024

Formatted	... [1]
Formatted	... [2]
Formatted	... [3]
Formatted	... [5]
Formatted	... [6]
Formatted	... [7]
Formatted Table	... [4]
Formatted	... [8]
Formatted	... [9]
Formatted	... [10]
Formatted	... [11]
Formatted	... [12]
Formatted	... [13]
Formatted	... [14]
Formatted	... [15]
Formatted	... [16]
Formatted	... [17]
Formatted	... [18]
Formatted	... [19]
Formatted	... [20]
Formatted	... [21]
Formatted	... [22]
Formatted	... [23]
Formatted	... [24]
Formatted	... [25]
Formatted	... [26]
Formatted	... [27]
Formatted	... [28]
Formatted	... [29]
Formatted	... [30]
Formatted	... [31]
Formatted	... [32]
Formatted	... [33]
Formatted	... [34]
Formatted	... [35]
Formatted	... [36]
Formatted	... [37]
Formatted	... [38]
Formatted	... [39]
Formatted	... [40]
Formatted	... [41]
Formatted	... [42]
Formatted	... [43]
Formatted	... [44]
Formatted	... [45]
Formatted	... [46]
Formatted	... [47]
Formatted	... [48]
Formatted	... [49]
Formatted	... [50]
Formatted	... [51]
Formatted	... [52]

40ft Customer Switchgear	SD-06	03 April 2024
250,000L Water Tank	SD-07	03 April 2024
40ft Battery Container	SD-08	03 April 2024
Power Control System	SD-09	03 April 2024
MV Transformer	SD-10	03 April 2024
Access Track	SD-11	03 April 2024
DNO Substation Plan	SD-12	03 April 2024
DNO Substation Sections	SD-13	03 April 2024
Palisade Fence	SD-14	03 April 2024
MV Power Station	SD-15	03 April 2024
Site Location Plan	SP-01	03 April 2024
Design and Access Statement		03 April 2024
Flood Risk Assessment		03 April 2024
Geophysical Survey		03 April 2024
Decommissioning Method Statement		03 April 2024
Planning Statement		03 April 2024
Statement of Community Involvement		03 April 2024
Transport Statement		03 April 2024
Forgesolar Glare Analysis	X10 documents	03 April 2024
Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment		03 April 2024
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Appendix A	03 April 2024
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Appendix B	03 April 2024
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Appendix C	03 April 2024
Sun Positions Calculations		03 April 2024
Noise Impact Assessment		03 April 2024
Agricultural Land Classification Report		03 April 2024
Glint Aviation Report		03 April 2024
Fire Strategy		03 April 2024
Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment		12 April 2024
Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment	Part 2	12 April 2024
Site Drawings	X20	26 July 2024
Site Maps	X20	26 July 2024
Site Maps	X36	26 July 2024
Coal Mining Report		26 July 2024
Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment		26 July 2024

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted Table

Heritage Impact Assessment	Heritage Note	26 July 2024
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal		11 September 2024
Proposed Site Layout Plan	OPL011-PL 01 REV 10	11 September 2024
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Addendum 1	11 September 2024
Tree Survey	Part 1	18 November 2024
Tree Survey	Part 2	18 November 2024
Heritage Impact Assessment	Addendum	24 February 2025
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Part 2	24 February 2025
Planning Statement		24 February 2025
Visibility Assessment		01 April 2025

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm, No bullets or numbering

Part 1 — Phase 1 Contamination Risk Survey

- ~~Part 2 — phase 1 Contamination Risk Survey~~
- ~~Badger Survey. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling 3D Image Front. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling 3D Image Left Side/Front. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling 3D Left Side Rear. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling 3D Image Rear. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling 3Dd Image Right Side/Front. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling 3D Image Right Side Rear. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Garage 3D Image External Side/Rear. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Garage 3D Image Front. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Garage 3D Image Internal Side/Front. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Garage 3D Image Internal Side/Rear. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Garage 3D Image Side. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Site Location Plan. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling Floor Plan. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Block Plan. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling Proposed Elevations. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Dwelling Proposed Section. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Location Plan. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Garage Proposed floor and Elevations. Received 26 February 2024.~~
- ~~Flood Risk Assessment. Received 26 February 2024.~~

3.0 Site and Surroundings

3.1 [The proposal site relates to an area of land which lies adjacent to the eastern aspect](#)

of the A614 on the outskirts of the Worksop. The proposal site is situated within the immediate setting of both the grade I listed 'Clumber Park' Registered Park and Garden, and the grade I listed 'Thoresby Park' Registered Park and Garden. The site is also located within the immediate setting of several other designated heritage assets, including that of: the grade II* listed 'Gate Piers and Flanking Walls to Normanton Gate'; the grade II* listed 'Drayton Gate'; and the grade II listed 'West Bridge', which is itself also designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

3.2 The site itself is comprised of a range of open field systems that are located along the eastern aspect of the A614 road. The boundaries of the site are primarily comprised of mature trees and hedgerows, as one would expect of an area of open rural countryside. The proposal site runs parallel to the main thoroughfare of the A614, which encompasses the sites western boundary. The southern boundary of the site runs parallel with West Drayton Avenue, which is itself a public footpath. The northern boundary of the site runs roughly parallel with the southern banks of the River Poulter, beyond which lies another publicly accessible footpath. The western boundary of the proposal site abuts a swath of mature woodland. The proposal site contributes resolutely to the open rural countryside setting of the heritage assets outlined above. The setting of the grade I listed Clumber Park, as well as that of the adjacent grade I listed Thoresby Park, owe much of their setting/significance to this open and rural character.

The site relates to an area of former agricultural land which is located along the western aspect of Gainsborough Road in the village of Saundby. The site is within the immediate setting of the Saundby Conservation Area. The site is also within the setting of several other designated heritage assets. The site is fairly open, with unspoilt views and open feels being a key characteristic of the surrounding area.

4.0 Relevant Planning Background

Planning History

4.1 Set out below is the key planning history:

Reference	Proposal	Decision
20/00853/SCR 23/01310/FUL	Screening Opinion - Proposed 40 MW Solar Farm Erect Detached Eco-Friendly House with Detached Garage	NOT EIA Development Refuse

Publicity and consultation

4.2 The Local Planning Authority publicised the application by way of neighbour letter, site notice and press notice and 3 of letters of representations were received raising the following points:

- Impact on wildlife
- Impact on the roads during construction period

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

- [Impact on loss of arable farmland](#)
- [Unclear on how the end-of-life recycling will take place](#)

~~application by site notice and neighbourhood letters and received one number of representations.~~ The representations can be found in the documents sent to the Planning Inspectorate and on the public file, ~~a summary of the issues raised are set out below:~~

Support:

- ~~Located behind trees and not visible from the highway.~~
- ~~Simple design suitable for the area.~~

- 4.3 The follow consultations have been undertaken, the consultation responses can be found in the documents sent to the Planning Inspectorate and on the public file, a summary of the issues raised are set out:

[BDC Conservation Officer](#)

[In summary, the Conservation Officer objects to the proposed development as the level harm incurred to the setting of the surrounding/nearby heritage assets is considered to be less than substantial for the purposes of the NPPF.](#)

[East Markham Parish Council](#)

[No objections.](#)

[Landscape Architect Consultant](#)

[Multiple concerns raised about the application of the methodology and the summative assessments provided. In places, the LVA underestimates the predicated level and visual effects, whilst also overestimating the effectiveness of proposed mitigation planting.](#)

[BDC Lead Ecologist](#)

[The proposal will provide a significant onsite gain. Therefore, no objections subject to conditions.](#)

[Historic England](#)

[Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. They consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in their advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 205, 206, 208, 212 of the NPPF.](#)

[Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Advisor](#)

[To date, this service has not received a draft Written Scheme of Investigation for](#)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: First line: 0 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

[archaeological trenching \(3% coverage within the full site boundary\)](#)

[NATS Safeguarding](#)

[The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with their safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS \(En Route\) Public Limited Company \("NERL"\) has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.](#)

[The Gardens Trust](#)

[The GT and NGT consider allowing a solar array development in this location would cause harm to the significance of the setting of two historic registered parklands and the of designated listed buildings strongly linked to these historic estates of Clumber and Thoresby, thus failing to conserve the heritage significance and setting of the registered parklands.](#)

[BDC Tree Officer](#)

[From a tree point of view there does not appear to be much of a loss – no objections.](#)

[NCC Highways Authority](#)

[On the basis of the information provided, it is accepted that the access, subject to the proposed improvements and mitigation measures, will be acceptable to serve the site during the construction phase. Minimal movements will occur during the operational phase, as with the existing junction.](#)

[Newark and Sherwood District Council](#)

[The harm to the Registered Park and Garden would be contrary to policy and advice contained within S16 of the NPPF and should be taken into account in determining the application, balancing the scale of harm and the significance of the heritage asset. In accordance with the NPPF, harm to heritage assets needs to be given appropriate consideration in the planning balance against the public benefits of the scheme.](#)

[Gamston Aviation Limited](#)

[No objections.](#)

[Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust](#)

[Requested a CEMP and LEMP.](#)

[National Trust](#)

[Whilst they do not object in principle, they have some concerns relating to the setting of Clumber Park. In this case, the proposals site is located 50m from the eastern boundary of Clumber Park, separated by the A614. Therefore, the proposals present a potential risk to the wider setting of the Registered Park and Garden and associated historic arrival and entrance points. An important element of setting is also experiential in nature, with large numbers of visitors able to access and explore Clumber Park's natural beauty.](#)

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

[Historic England](#)

[Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds.](#)

[Fire Protection Officer](#)

[The LPA may seek to utilise a well worded planning condition to ensure once the final scope of the development is known, this jointly agreed by relevant parties prior to commencement.](#)

[NCC Flood Risk](#)

[A detailed surface water management plan is required to ensure that the development is in accordance with NPPF and local planning policies. It should be ensured that all major developments have sufficient surface water management, are not at increased risk of flooding and do not increase flood risk off-site.](#)

Beckingham-Cum-Saundby Parish Council – No Objection and welcomes eco-friendly design.

BDC Environmental Health:

Ventilation=No Comments

Noise=As the proposed dwelling is relatedly distant from neighbouring properties, it is unlikely that there will be any major issues with respect to noise. Any noise arising could be effectively controlled under Statutory Nuisance provisions:

The proposal site is immediately adjacent to a proposed solar Farm (Saundy Solar Farm 22/00358/FUL). An examination of the proposed site layout for the solar farm indicates that only solar panels will be placed close to the proposal site, with no close by battery storage or transformer equipment which could be a source of noise:

Lighting=No Comments

Contaminated Land=The information currently available suggest that there have been no contaminative uses at the above site, however there is the presence of a sensitive receptor and unknown contaminate uses could have occurred on or around that location. Therefore, In would request that the following note included:

If during the development, land contamination not previously considered is identified; (such as burred asbestos, hydrocarbon contamination and heavy metals) then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately. No further works shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Authority:

The application is a resubmission of previous application 23/01310/FUL which was refused planning content, partly on the grounds of highway safety:

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm

This application seeks permission for a new build residential development. The proposal would result in an isolated domestic access on a unit length of the A620 which would not be encouraged in principle by the Highway Authority.

The A620 has no footways on the application side of the carriageway. Future residents intending to use the local north-bound bus stops would be required to unnecessarily cross and re-cross the busy A620, or risk walking along the highway verge or nearside carriageway edge, to the detriment of highway safety. The location may evenly limit the movement of individuals living at the development other than by private car. Therefore, the LPA is requested to consider whether this is a suitable location.

This length of A620 is subject to a 40moph speed limit although at a site visit it was noted that the nearby interactive speed sign indicated that passing vehicles often exceeded this speed. The identified visibility splays on the submitted block plan are inadequate and are incorrect measured. At this time, the applicant has not demonstrated that appropriate visibility splays, commensurate to the measured vehicle speeds on the priority road, can be achieved from the site access in both the vertical and horizontal planes. Further guidance on visibility splays is available in adopted 3.3 of the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide.

It is noted that the application site is significantly lower than the A620 carriageway. This latest submission indicates a new access position to the north of the application site, and it is stated on the application form that the new access position is at a point where there is a higher level topography on the land and less of an incline from the grass verge of the roadside. It is stated that this will ensure a 1 in 20 gradient or better on the access driveway. No topographical data however been provided to confirm this, and it is still unclear whether an appropriate gradient could be achieved.

The Highway Authority considered the proposal to be contrary to the objectives of paragraph 114 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it fails; to provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users, to address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport, to give priority to pedestrians within the neighbouring area and to create a place that is safe that minimises conflicts between pedestrians, cyclist and vehicles. This would result in an unaccepted impact on Highway Safety. For these reasons, the Highway Authority recommends that the application is refused.

BDC Conservation

The proposal site relates to an area of former agricultural land which is located along the western aspect of Gainsborough Road in the village of Saundby. The site is within the immediate setting of the Saundby Conservation Area (Designated: 16th June 2010). The site is also within the setting of several other designated heritage assets, most prominent of which is the grade II listed Church of St Martin (List Entry Number: 1045083; Designated: 1st February 1967).

The site itself is a plot of former agricultural land, roughly linear in plan form and orientated on a north-south axis, running parallel with the adjacent thoroughfare of Gainsborough Road. The site is bordered to the north, west and south by several post-enclosure agricultural fields. The site is bordered to the east by the Gainsborough Road (A620). The site is afforded fairly substantial screening along all of its boundaries, primarily from a mix of mature hedge-rows and self-set broadleaf trees.

The current scheme relates to the proposed erection of a single residential dwelling on land to the west of Gainsborough Road. The proposed dwelling is comprised of a double-pile plan form, three-bay frontage and two-storey façade which is surmounted by a gable plan roof. The proposed dwelling is materially comprised of red-facing bricks and composite slate roofing tiles. The development would also see the erection of a detached single storey garage. The current scheme follows on directly from an earlier application which sought to erect a single residential dwelling on land to the west of Gainsborough Road (P.A. 23/01310/FUL). Conservation raised concerns with the design of this earlier scheme:

The key consideration is the scheme's impact upon the setting of the Saundby Conservation Area. Also, due consideration is the scheme's impact upon the setting of the other nearby designated heritage assets:

The current scheme follows on from an earlier application which sought to erect a single residential dwelling on land to the west of Gainsborough Road (P.A. 23/01310/FUL). This earlier application was materially similar to that which is currently proposed. Conservation raised concerns with the design of this earlier application. Conservation concerns specifically related to the developments modern domestic/suburban appearance. The earlier scheme, if implemented in its proposed form, would have resulted in a development which would have appeared to sit uncomfortably within the otherwise rural open countryside setting of Saundby Conservation Area. This would have consequently harmed the setting of the aforementioned Saundby Conservation Area. Conservation would maintain/reiterate this original stance in regard to the current scheme, in so far that the same objectionable qualities highlighted in the earlier application are present within the current scheme. Therefore, Conservation have provided their initial/original comments to P.A. 23/01310/FUL below:

"The principle of the development may well be acceptable, at least in regard to the scheme's impact upon the surrounding built heritage. However, Conservation has concerns with the design of the proposed scheme. The open countryside landscape in which Saundby sits helps to establish the conservation area's rural agricultural setting. The proposal site currently contributes to this open countryside setting. Therefore, any development of this site would inevitably result in harm to the setting of the Saundby conservation area. In order to offset this harm, any development of this site would have to be sympathetically designed in terms of scale, form and materiality".

"Conservation has concerns with the current design of the proposed scheme. The proposed dwelling has a somewhat contemporary appearance, a fact which is owed the building's simple form and architectural arrangement. This appearance is indicative of

~~modern domestic/residential development, the type of which that one might expect to see in a contemporary suburban housing estate.~~

~~The contemporary appearance of the proposed dwelling would sit uncomfortably within the otherwise rural open countryside surroundings, which would consequently harm the setting of the nearby Saundby conservation area. There appears to be no tangible public benefit arising from the scheme that would offset or justify this degree of harm. With that in mind, Conservation would recommend that the scheme be amended to better mitigate the incurred impact of development”.~~

~~“When advising upon the design of any new development which takes place within the context of the historic built environment, Conservation will often advocate for the adoption of: a design which is either an accurate historic pastiche of the type of building that one might expect to see within the given context; or a design which is both modern and innovative in its appearance but still architecturally and materially sympathetic to the surrounding context”.~~

~~“With the above in mind, Conservation would recommend that the design be amended to conform to either one of the two architectural approaches outlined above. Some examples of both accurate historic pastiche development and modern innovative development have been provided below. Should the applicant require further guidance in relation to this matter then they are encouraged to contact a member of the Councils Conservation Team”.~~

~~Amendments Required: Conservation has no concerns with the principle of the proposed development. However, Conservation has some concerns with the design of the proposed scheme, particularly with the developments modern domestic/suburban appearance. The scheme, if implemented in its current form, would result in a development which would appear to sit uncomfortably within the otherwise rural open countryside surroundings. This would consequently harm the setting of the nearby Saundby conservation area. There appears to be no tangible public benefit arising from mind, Conservation would recommend that the scheme be amended in line with the comments made above.~~

~~In reaching these views, Conservation has had regard to: Sections 66(1) & 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy (December 2011); Policies ST42 and 43 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038; and Paragraphs 195, 200, 201, 203, 205, 207 and 212 of the NPPF (December 2023);~~

~~**BDC Environmental Services – No Comments Received.**~~

~~**Environment Agency – No Comments Received.**~~

5.0 Planning Policy Context

- 5.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 66(1) imposes a statutory test that requires “in considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building or

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

its setting, the local planning or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

- 5.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning authorities must determine each application under the Planning Acts in accordance with the Development Plan so far as material to the application unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Adopted Development Plan

- 5.3 The Adopted Development Plan for this site is:

- Bassetlaw District Local Plan (2024)

- 5.4 Neighbourhood Plan

[The Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan](#) ~~No adopted neighbourhood plan for Buckingham.~~

Commented [DH1]: Is this correct?

Guidance - Material Considerations

- 5.5 Relevant guidance for this application is:

- National Planning Policy Framework 2024
- National Planning Practice Guidance

- [NCC Mineral Local Plan 25 March 2021](#)

- [Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Pre-submission Draft Waste Local Plan August 2023](#)

~~- National Design Guide~~

Formatted: Font: Arial

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2.01 cm, No bullets or numbering

6.0 The Case for the Council

- 6.1 The LPA considers the key matters in the assessment of this appeal are:

- [Principle of development](#)
- [Heritage Impacts](#)
- [Landscape and Visual Impacts](#)

- ~~— Principle of development~~
- ~~— Design and Visual Appearance~~
- ~~— Landscape Character~~
- ~~— Highways Concerns~~

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

[6.2 On the 16th July 2025 the LPA present this application to the Planning Committee to resolve the position the Council will take at an upcoming appeal \(PINS ref APP/A3010/W/25/3367817\) against non-determination of an application for 24/00384/Ful - Full planning permission for installation and operation of a solar farm and battery energy storage system \(output up to 40 mw\), with associated works.](#)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt, Superscript

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm, No bullets or numbering

equipment, infrastructure and landscaping land.

6.3 The Planning Committee minutes (APPENDIX A) are to be read in conjunction with this statement.

Principle of development

~~6.2 Policy ST1 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan sets out the spatial strategy for Bassetlaw:~~

~~The site is located within the village of Harwell, outside of the defined small rural settlement of Everton. The site is therefore located within the countryside.~~

~~Part 4 states that land outside of development boundaries and/or outside the built up area(s) of settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy as part of the wider countryside, where development will only be supported where consistent with other policies in the development plan or national policy;~~

~~The NPPF sets out the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. Under the requirements of the NPPF, the Council can demonstrate a 7.2 year housing land supply (as confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate) and as such, a deliverable 5 years supply of housing can be achieved.~~

~~6.2 Policy ST2 of the Local Plan sets out the criteria in relation to housing growth in rural Bassetlaw. Policy ST2 requires proposals for developments outside of a development boundary of a settlement to meet criteria set out which include those supported by a neighbourhood plan, the replacement of an existing dwelling, the conversion of a permanent redundant or disused non-residential building that is capable of conversion. Developments that meet that criteria are also required to comply with other considerations of part 2 of the policy ST2 and other relevant policies of the Local Plan. Proposals consistent with part 3 of policy ST2 should also minimise the loss of the best and most versatile land.~~

~~Paragraph 84 of the NPPF sets out that decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the circumstances apply, these include the essential need for a rural worker, representing the optimal viable use of a heritage asset, re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting, the sub-division of an existing residential building or of a design that is exceptional quality.~~

~~6.3 The proposed residential development would not be acceptable in principle. The council currently has a 5-year housing supply and does not need to accept applications which fall short of key requirements. The council also has significantly met its self-build requirements and is not under pressure to grant new dwellings which have the capacity to create further adverse implications. Development within Saundby is classed in the as rural development and is considered to have limited or no service/facility provision and are reliant upon other settlements for such needs. It is not felt to be appropriate to encourage more housing in these areas (other than conversions or replacement dwellings) as this is likely to increase the need for residents to travel to access even basic services.~~

Design and Visual Appearance

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm

Commented [DH2]: Have they applied on para 84 ? If so on what basis and why do we disagree?

Commented [DH3R2]: Seems there are heritage matters - need to address para 84 b of the NPPF

6.4 Section 12 of the NPPF refers to achieving well designed places. Specifically, paragraph 131 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development; it creates better places in which to live and work in and helps make development acceptable to local communities. Paragraph 135 states that decisions should aim to ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses and support local facilities and transport networks. Furthermore it provides that development should respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. The NPPF goes on to state it is “proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness” and permission should be “refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions”.

Policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan outlines that all development must be of a high-quality design that: Point a) has a clear function, character and identity based upon a robust understanding of local context, constraints and distinctiveness, while reflecting the principles of national and local design guidance:

6.5 Policy ST40 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan state that there will be presumption against development that will be detrimental to the significance of a heritage asset, proposed development affecting heritage assets, including alterations and extensions that are of an inappropriate scale, design or material, or which lead to the loss of important spaces, including infilling, will not be supported and the setting of an asset is an important aspect of its special architectural or historic interest and proposals that fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a heritage asset will not be supported:

Any planning application for development which will affect a listed building or its setting must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses:

A similar duty exists where the proposed development will be within a conservation area where section 72 of the same Act requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area:

Policy ST40 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan state that there will be presumption against development that will be detrimental to the significance of a heritage asset, proposed development affecting heritage assets, including alterations and extensions that are of an inappropriate scale, design or material, or which lead to the loss of important spaces, including infilling, will not be supported and the setting of an asset is an important aspect of its special architectural or historic interest and proposals that fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a heritage asset will not be supported:

Commented [DH4]: Need a separate section on Heritage as this is separate to design and visual appearance . ST40 and policy 41 plus Chapter 16 NPPF, paras 207, 210 discuss significance, impacts and level of harm. Total loss, substantial harm or less than substantial harm and how this is outweighed by public benefits.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm

6.6 BDC Conservation were consulted who had no concerns over the principle of the development from their standpoint. The did however require amendments to be submitted to ensure the design and appearance of the building was suitable for the locality and historic setting of the area. The current scheme is materially similar to that seen in the previous application 23/01310/FUL. The proposed building represent a modern style building which is inappropriate for the setting and surrounding historic area. The contemporary design would hinder the Saundby Conservation Area. BDC Conservation presented examples of building types and design which would be more appropriate that the proposed development could use to have a more sympathetic design. Examples can be found below:

Formatted: Indent: Left: -1.27 cm



6.7 The site is located within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands – Policy Zone 03: Beckingham, an identified Landscape Character zone. The zone ahs the following features:

Conserve: Landscape Feature

- Conserve historic field pattern by containing new development within historic enclosed boundaries, maintain existing hedgerows, restore and reinforce poor
- hedgerow boundaries where necessary:
- Seek opportunities to restore arable land to pasture:
- Conserve and enhance woodland/plantation blocks, seek to reinforce as appropriate and improve connectivity across the area:
- Conserve hedgerow planting along roadsides, seek to reinforce and enhance as appropriate:

- ~~Conserve the biodiversity and setting of the designated SINC's, seek to enhance where appropriate.~~

~~Built Features:~~

- ~~Conserve the open rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development of appropriate design and scale around the existing settlements of Beckingham, Saundby and North Wheatley.~~
- ~~Conserve and respect the local brick built vernacular in any new development.~~

~~The proposed development would be in contrast to the identified Landscape Character Zone as the proposed development would potentially impact the openness of the rural character of the landscape. Whilst there are dwellings located along the A620, the proposed dwelling has a significant separation distance between them to create a breach of the open landscape.~~

~~Highways matters~~

- 6.8 ~~The proposed development would be in contact to paragraphs 114 and 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework and ST53 of the Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan as the development would fall short of creating safe highway conditions. The proposal would have access onto the A620 which is a high speed road and is not considered suitable for this type of development buy the Highway Authority. Future residents would be put at risk when crossing the A620 or walking alongside the road on the verge which is unsuitable for pedestrians. Inadequate visibility splays have been submitted which currently presents highway risk are present with the high speed road. Furthermore, no topographical data has been submitted with the application which can confirm whether the suggested gradient for the new access can be achieved. To conclude Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Authority object to the proposal which in its current state falls short of local and national policy.~~

Commented [DH5]: This is repeated

~~PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION~~

- 7.1 ~~The proposal would be in contrast contrary to policy ST2 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan and paragraph 184 of the national Planning Policy framework. The proposal would fall short of key requirements for sustainableuitable development and is located outside the development boundary. The council has a sufficient 5 year housing supply and therefore there is no demonstrated need for such development.is not under pressure to acceptable development schemes which falls short good design and safety measures.~~
- 7.2 ~~The proposal represents s a building which is modern/contemporary in its design and appearance. This is contrary to contrast with policy ST33 and ST40 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan, and the development it is current form would represent harmful development to the Saundby Conservation Area by virtue of its design and appearance along with impact on the character of the conservation area..~~

Commented [DH6]: Are there any other issues?
Flooding, drainage, trees ecology etc

7.3. The proposal falls within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands – Policy Zone 03: Beckingham, which is a landscape character zone which requires conservation. The development would be in contrary to the built features of this policy zone, as the proposed detached dwelling would break open countryside views, which need to be preserved.

7.4 The proposal has an objection from Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Authority, who are a statutory consultee. The Highway Authority have concerns regarding the suitability of the site, pedestrian safety regarding the high-speed nature of the A620 and lack of pedestrian access facilities, the plotting of incorrect/inadequate visibility splays on the submitted plans and the lack of topographical information submitted to show the gradient of the proposed new highway access is possible. Ultimately the proposed development falls short of local and national policies relating to highway safety.

The Council's Response to the Appellant's Case

'State whether the Council has any response to the Appellants case or not'

7.0 Suggested Conditions

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Commented [DH7]: Just need to look at their grounds for appeal

Commented [DH8]: This is a list of conditions should the inspector allow the appeal

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm

Commented [DH9]: There may not be any depending on what we have made reference to in the statement of case

Page 2: [1] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [2] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [2] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [3] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [4] Formatted Table	Kirsty Harte	22/07/2025 13:36:00
-----------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Formatted Table

Page 2: [5] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial, Not Bold

Page 2: [6] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [7] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [8] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [8] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [9] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
-----------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [10] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [10] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [11] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [12] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [12] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [13] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [14] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [14] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [15] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [16] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: Not Bold		
Page 2: [17] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [17] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [18] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [19] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [19] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [20] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [21] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [21] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
Page 2: [22] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		

Page 2: [23] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [23] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [24] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [25] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [25] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [26] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [27] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [27] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [28] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [29] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [29] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [30] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [31] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [31] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [32] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [33] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [33] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [34] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [35] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [35] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [36] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [37] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [37] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [38] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [39] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [39] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [40] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [41] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [41] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀
Page 2: [42] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
Font: (Default) Arial		
▲		◀

Page 2: [43] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [43] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [44] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [45] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [45] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [46] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [47] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [47] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [48] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [49] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [49] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [50] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [51] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [51] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Page 2: [52] Formatted	Kirsty Harte	24/07/2025 09:08:00
------------------------	--------------	---------------------

Font: (Default) Arial

Planning Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 16th July, 2025 at The Ceres Suite, Worksop Town Hall, S80 2AH

Present: Councillor N J Sanders (Chair)

Councillors:

S Fielding	C Adams
D Challinor	S H Pashley
D G Pidwell	C Tindle

Site visit attendance: D Challinor, S Fielding, S Pashley, D G Pidwell, N J Sanders.

Officers: A Curran, D Holgate, L Thompson and E Wallace and J Wignall.

(The meeting opened at 6.30 pm.)

8 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor H J Digby, G Dinsdale, D J Merryweather, G A N Oxby and S E Shaw.

9 Declarations of Interest

9a Members

Councillor C Adams declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in:

Item 7(a) – Planning application: 24/00384/FUL – Land Adjacent to A614 Worksop, Nottinghamshire

for being the Ward Member. Councillor Adams left the meeting for the duration and determination of this item.

9b Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

(A two minute break was taken)

10 Minutes of the Meeting held on 21st May 2025

Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st May 2025 be approved.

11 Minutes of Planning Consultation Group Meetings held between 12th May and 9th June 2025

Resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 12th May and 9th June 2025 be received.

12 Outstanding Minutes List

PLANNING COMMITTEE

There were none.

Section A - Items for Discussion in Public

13 Verbal Submission - Update from Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Identity, Planning & Place

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Identity, Planning & Place (Councillor S Scotthorne) attended the meeting to provide an update to Members in relation to the Council's newly drafted Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). The SPDs are designed to improve development quality and once passed, the Council will be able to continue to positively implement the Local Plan and most importantly move towards achieving more positive outcomes for communities and assist in achieving the Council Vision 2040.

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder and the Chair also congratulated all those associated with the Planning Services Team for the awards that they won at the East Midlands Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) Awards for Planning Excellence Reception 2025 and Rajlaxmi Gaware for being nominated as Young Planner of the Year.

(Councillor S Scotthorne left the meeting)

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

14 Report(s) of the Head of Planning and Place

Public Interest Test

The Head of Planning and Place determined that all items on the Agenda are non-confidential.

Planning Applications and Associated Items

14a 24/00384/FUL - Land Adjacent to A614 Worksop, Nottinghamshire

The application was reported to Planning Committee to resolve the position the Council will take at an upcoming appeal (PINS ref APP/A3010/W/25/3367817) against non-determination of an application for 24/00384/FUL. The application sought full planning permission for the installation and operation of a solar farm and battery energy storage system (output up to 40 mw), with associated works, equipment, infrastructure and landscaping land.

The site was subject to a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Development Manager presented the application. Members were presented with a location map, aerial image, site plan layout, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment submitted by the applicant and a map identifying nearby Designated Heritage Assets for consideration.

Responses from statutory consultees were detailed in the report.

In accordance with the rules for public participation, Mr David Peill spoke as the Applicant.

Members asked several material and non-material questions during the debate. These questions and comments were addressed by the Head of Planning & Place and Planning Development

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Manager.

The Conservation Officer was present to address questions in relation to the Designated Heritage Assets.

In Conclusion, the Chair summarised the debate.

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: The Planning Committee resolve that had the Local Planning Authority determined the application it would have REFUSED planning permission.

Committee Decision Resolved that: had the Local Planning Authority determined the application, the Planning Committee would have REFUSED planning permission.

(A five minute comfort break was taken)

(J Wignall and members of the public left the meeting and Councillor C Adams rejoined the meeting).

14b Scheme of Delegation - Report to Follow

This item was withdrawn from the Agenda.

Section B - Items for Discussion in Private

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

15 Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

As there was no other business to discuss the Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

(Meeting closed at 7.45 pm.)