



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

Planning Committee

Agenda

Meeting to be held at
The Ceres Suite, Worksop Town Hall, S80 2AH
Wednesday, 16th July, 2025
at 6.30 pm

Please turn mobile telephones to silent during meetings. In case of emergency, Members/Officers can be contacted on the Council's telephone: 01909 533 252

In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, audio/visual recording and photography during Council meetings is permitted in accordance with the Council's protocol 'Filming of Public Meetings'.

Planning Committee

Membership 2025/26

Councillors: N J Sanders, S Fielding, C Adams, D Challinor, H J Digby,
G Dinsdale, D J Merryweather, G A N Oxby, S H Pashley,
D G Pidwell, S E Shaw and C Tindle.

Substitute Members: None.

Quorum: 3 Members

Lead Officer for this Meeting

A Curran

Administrator for this Meeting

L Thompson

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 16th July, 2025

Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Declarations of Interest
 - (a) Members
 - (b) Officers
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 21st May 2025 (Pages 5 - 8)
4. Minutes of Planning Consultation Group Meetings held between 12th May and 9th June 2025 (Pages 9 - 20)
5. Outstanding Minutes List (Pages 21 - 22)

Section A - Items for discussion in public

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

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

7. Report(s) of the Head of Planning and Place

Public Interest Test

(Mr Alastair Curran, the Head of Planning and Place, has deemed that all items on the Agenda are not confidential).

Planning Applications and Associated Items

- (a) 24/00384/FUL - Land Adjacent to A614 Worksop, Nottinghamshire (Pages 23 - 44)
- (b) Scheme of Delegation - Report to Follow

Exempt Information Items

The press and public are likely to be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Section B - Items for discussion in private

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

8. Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

Notes:

1. The papers enclosed with this Agenda are available in large print if required.
 2. Copies can be requested by contacting us on 01909 533 232 or by e-mail laura.thompson@bassetlaw.gov.uk
-

Planning Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 21st May, 2025 at The Ceres Suite, Worksop Town Hall, S80 2AH

Present: Councillor N J Sanders (Chair)

Councillors:

C Adams	D Challinor
D J Merryweather	G A N Oxby
S H Pashley	D G Pidwell

Officers: A Curran, L Thompson and E Wallace.

(The meeting opened at 6.30 pm.)

1 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor H Digby, G Dinsdale, S Fielding, S Shaw and C Tindle.

2 Declarations of Interest

2a Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

2b Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

Councillor S Pashley joined the meeting

3 Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd April 2025

Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd April 2025 be approved.

4 Minutes of Planning Consultation Group Meetings held on 31st March, 14th & 28th April 2025

Resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 31st March and 28th April 2025 be received.

5 Outstanding Minutes List

Resolved that the Outstanding Minutes List be received.

Section A - Items for Discussion in Public

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Public Interest Test

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

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

6a 24/01429/COU - 13 Bridge Street, Worksop, Nottinghamshire

The application sought permission for the change of use of ground floor from retail (class E) to an adult gaming centre (sui generis) and retention of offices (class E (g)(i)) on the first floor.

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

The application was presented at the previous Planning Committee held on 23rd April 2025 and Members resolved to defer the application to the next Committee meeting and request a response from the Crime Prevention Unit as a consultee.

The Head of Planning and Place provided a summary of the application for the benefit of Members who were not present at the previous Committee meeting and advised that officers had requested comments from the Crime Prevention Unit and followed this up, however no response was received.

Responses from other statutory consultees were detailed in the report.

In accordance with the rules for public participation, Mr Joshua Turner (Objector) and Mr Kelvin Wright (County Councillor) spoke in objection to the application.

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

In conclusion, the Chair summarised the debate

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions.

Formal vote for taking this course of action:

For: 3	C Adams, D Challinor and D Pidwell.
Against: 4	D Merryweather, G A N Oxby, S Pashley and N Sanders.
Abstain: 0	

Committee Decision Resolved that: To overturn the officer recommendation and refuse planning permission for the reasons as follows:

1. Fear of crime
2. Impact on health

It was proposed and seconded by Members that the wording of the reasons for refusal will be approved at a subsequent meeting of the Planning Consultation Group.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chair adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes

6b 24/01168/COU - 22 Bridge Street, Worksop, Nottinghamshire S80 1JQ

The application sought permission to convert floors above an existing shop into a 9 person HMO including the construction of a new rear porch entrance and dormer to the third floor.

The application was presented to Committee following referral from Planning Consultation Group.

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

The Head of Planning and Place presented the application. Members were presented with a location map and site photographs for consideration.

Responses from statutory consultees were detailed in the report.

Members were advised that following publication of the report, an issue has arisen concerning the Certificate of Land Ownership and further consultation is required.

In accordance with the rules for public participation, Mr Philip Jackson (Worksop Business Forum) spoke in objection to the application.

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

In conclusion, the Chair summarised the debate.

An amendment to the recommendation was proposed and seconded to allow for the application to be referred to Planning Consultation Group depending on the outcome relating to the Certificate of Land Ownership.

A vote on this amendment took place.

Committee Decision Resolved that: amendment approved.

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and the amendment approved by Planning Committee.

Committee Decision Resolved that: Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and the amendment made.

Exempt Information Items

Section B - Items for Discussion in Private

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

7 Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chair advised that the Head of Planning and Place had an update to deliver to Committee regarding the Steeple Renewables Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.

The Head of Planning and Place provided a summary of the project and advised that they are at the stage where statutory consultee responses are being collated which will be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

Members asked questions in relation to the agricultural grading of the land and flooding. These questions were addressed by the Head of Planning and Place.

Members noted the contents of the update.

The Chair thanked Members for attending and closed the meeting.

(Meeting closed at 8.15 pm.)

Planning Consultation Group

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 12th May 2025 via MS Teams

Present: Councillors: S Fielding, D Pidwell and N Sanders.

Officers in attendance: A Curran, L Hatami, D Holgate, R Pandya, A Sawantbirje and L Thompson.

(Meeting opened at 4.00pm).

95. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Pashley.

96. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

97. Planning Applications

Ref. No.	Description
23/00898/FUL	Two Storey Side and Single Storey Rear Extensions to Existing Dwelling, Erection of New Dwelling, Including Two New Detached Garages and Associated Works. Brickyard Cottage, Great North Road, Tuxford, Newark, Nottinghamshire NG22 0NW.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a two-storey side and single storey rear extension to an existing dwelling, erection of a new dwelling including two new detached garages and associated works.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbour on the grounds of loss of privacy due to the proximity of the new dwelling.

Officer advised there is a significant separation distance therefore will be no direct loss of privacy.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
25/00082/HSE	Proposed Double Garage.

Lyndale, Church Lane, West Drayton, Nottinghamshire DN22
8EB.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a proposed double garage.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

West Drayton Parish Council have raised an objection on the grounds of scale and sitting of the garage and being at odds with the character of Church Lane.

Two letters of objection have been received from residents on the grounds of overdevelopment, excessive scale and visual impact.

Officer advised that the garage will not be unduly prominent within the street scene and has no concerns of overdevelopment.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
25/00202/FUL	Retrospective Application for New Dwelling and Garage (Not Built in Accordance with P.A. 22/01208/FUL). Green Ivy, Greenside, Rampton, Nottinghamshire DN22 0HY.

Members were advised of a retrospective application seeking permission to retain a new dwelling and garage that was not built in accordance with P.A. 22/01208/FUL.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

Two letters of objection have been received from neighbours on the grounds of loss of privacy and specific aspects of the proposed development which have now been amended by the applicant.

Three weeping willow trees which were subject to a Tree Preservation Order have also been removed without permission.

Officer advised that the acceptance of this planning application will be conditioned only once the trees are replanted within 3 months after the decision is issued.

Members agreed that it would be appropriate to extend this to 6 months, as it is advised they are best planted from December to early April.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and the amendment to Condition 4.

98. Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

As there was no other business, the Chair closed the meeting.

(Meeting ended at 4:30 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Consultation Group

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 27th May 2025 via MS Teams

Present: Councillors: C Adams, G A N Oxby, S Pashley and N Sanders.

Officers in attendance: A Curran, J Elliott, R Pandya, A Singh and L Thompson.

(Meeting opened at 4.00pm).

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Fielding. Councillor G A N Oxby attended as substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

3. Planning Applications

Ref. No.	Description
20/00409/FUL	Demolition of the existing school building and construction of over 55's Affordable Housing Comprising 19 Apartments and 9 Single Storey Dwellings Parking Access and Associated Landscaping. North Border Junior School, Snipe Park Road, Bircotes.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for the demolition of an existing school building and construction of affordable housing, parking access and associated landscaping.

Officer advised that the above application was the subject of a report to planning committee on 01 June 2022, seeking partial demolition and redevelopment, which resolved to grant planning permission subject securing contributions in lieu of bus stop enhancements, open space and SuDs management.

The building has now deteriorated to a point that the original permission is no longer viable, and the applicant is now seeking demolition.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

The Conservation Officer and Heritage team have no objections subject to conditions.

One letter of support and two letters of objection have been received from neighbouring occupiers who are of the opinion that the building should be retained and listed.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

25/00259/HSE	Retention of Outbuilding (Garden Shed).
--------------	---

2 Ashfield Court, Everton.

Members were advised of a retrospective application seeking permission to retain an outbuilding (garden shed).

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

Ten letters of support have been received and one letter of objection from a neighbouring occupier on the grounds of position and materials of the shed.

Officer satisfied that the shed is modest in scale, screened by vegetation and will have no adverse impact on residential amenity.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

25/00335/HSE	Retain 2.2 Metre High Fence and Pergola to the Rear.
--------------	--

The Old Orchard, Low Street, Beckingham.

Members were advised of a retrospective application seeking permission to retain a fence and pergola to the rear of the property.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring occupier on the grounds of the height of the fence and impact on their garden.

Officer satisfied the fence and pergola are modest in size and there is existing mature vegetation between the boundary to ensure no significant impact on the privacy of the neighbour.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

25/00332/HSE	Erect Two Storey Rear Extension.
--------------	----------------------------------

14 The Paddocks, Beckingham.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to erect a two-storey rear extension to an existing bungalow.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

Beckingham cum Saundby Parish Council have written in support of the application but have commented that any concerns of residents should be addressed.

One letter of support has been received from a neighbouring occupier and no letters of objection.

Officer is recommending a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of visual impact and residential amenity. They are of the opinion that the extension will be obtrusive and dominating leading to overshadowing.

Officer recommendation – Refuse Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
25/00326/HSE	Detached Garage and Additional Fencing to One Boundary. 56 Ordsall Park Road, Retford.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a detached garage and additional fencing to one boundary.

This is a re-submission of an application that was previously refused planning permission, plans have since been revised and the garage has been repositioned by 7.2 metres.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring occupier on the following grounds:

- Overbearing in scale
- Overshadowing
- Concerns of overdevelopment of the site
- Potential use as secondary accommodation

Officer has no concerns of overdevelopment of the site and is satisfied the garage will be substantially set off the boundary of the property that has written in objection. They are also of the opinion that the height of the fence is appropriate to aid in the protection of their residential amenity and privacy.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

24/01168/COU Convert Floors Above Existing Shop into 9 Person HMO Including Construction of New Rear Porch Entrance and Dormer to Third Floor.

22 Bridge Street, Worksop.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to convert floors above an existing shop into a 9 person HMO including construction of a new rear porch entrance and dormer to third floor.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

This application was granted planning permission subject to conditions at Planning Committee on 21st May 2025. However, there was a concern regarding the certificate of land ownership and Members resolved to amend the recommendation so that further consultation could take place and the outcome be brought to a subsequent Planning Consultation Group meeting.

Officer advised Members that the correct Certificate of Land Ownership was served, and the issue is now resolved.

Outcome following PCG – Members noted the contents of the update.

Ref. No.	Description
24/01429/COU	Change of Use of Ground Floor from retail (Class E) to Adult Gaming Centre (Sui Generis) and Retention of Offices (Class E (g)(i)) on First Floor.

13 Bridge Street, Worksop.

At Planning Committee held on 21st May 2025, Members resolved to overturn the officer recommendation for this application and refuse planning permission on the grounds of fear of crime and impact on health.

Members further resolved that the exact wording of the reasons for refusal would be agreed at a subsequent Planning Consultation Group meeting.

Members discussed the reasons for refusal and agreed that they would draft a report with their rationale which would be reviewed by the Head of Planning and Place and brought back to PCG on 9th June 2025 to be finalised.

4. Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

As there was no other urgent business to consider, the Chair thanked Members for attending and closed the meeting.

(Meeting ended at 5:25pm)

Planning Consultation Group

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 9th June 2025 via MS Teams

Present: Councillors: D Challinor, D Merryweather, S Pashley and N Sanders.

Officers in attendance: L Hatami, D Holgate, L Thompson, C Walsh and L Walstow.

(Meeting opened at 4.00pm).

5. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Fielding. Councillor D Merryweather attended as substitute.

6. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

7. Planning Applications

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

25/00401/HSE	Proposed Gate and Piers.
--------------	--------------------------

	Little Grange Farm, Great North Road, Barnby Moor, Nottinghamshire, DN22 8QS.
--	---

Members were advised of a retrospective application seeking permission for a proposed gate and piers.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

One letter of objection has been received from a resident on the grounds of being overbearing and out of character with the area.

Officer advised that the gate and piers are partially screened by an existing boundary wall and vegetation and there are no adverse impacts on residential amenity or character of the area. Members noted that there is similar boundary treatment in the locality.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission.

Outcome following PCG – Members resolved to agree the officer recommendation and refer the issue of the decision to officers.

Councillor S Pashley joined the meeting.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

24/00783/COU	Conversion of Existing Offices E(g)(i) into 3 Nr Residential Dwellings C3(a).
--------------	---

24/00784/LBA Listed Building Consent for the Conversion of Existing Offices E(g)(i) into 3Nr Residential Dwellings C3(a).

25 The Square, Retford, Nottinghamshire, DN22 6DQ.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission and listed building consent for the conversion of existing offices into residential dwellings.

The officer report and plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. This documentation should be read in conjunction with the minutes.

The Conservation Officer is comfortable with the proposal subject to conditions ensuring the historical value of the building is retained.

The Highway Authority have no objections subject to adequate bin and bike storage.

One letter of objection has been received with concerns regarding possible loss of businesses due to construction should the application be granted. Members discussed the concerns raised by the objector which was the occupier of the tearoom at the ground floor, it was noted that the tearoom has now closed and is no longer in operation.

Members raised questions with regards to the size of the apartments being less than the National Minimum Space Standards. Officers advised that whilst the size of the units are smaller the balance in favour of the proposal was that the building is Listed, which limits what internal works can be undertaken and the proposal will bring back into use the upper floors and secure the optimum viable use.

Officer recommendation – Grant Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent.

Outcome following PCG – Members resolved to agree the officer recommendation and refer the issue of the decision to officers.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

24/01429/COU	Change of Use of Ground Floor from Retail (Class E) to an Adult Gaming Centre (Sui Generis) and Retention of Offices (Class E (g)(i)) on the First Floor.
--------------	---

13 Bridge Street, Worksop, Nottinghamshire.

Previously Members resolved to defer the application to the next Committee meeting and request a response from the Crime Prevention Unit as a consultee at the Planning Committee held on 23rd April 2025. An update was provided by the Head of Planning and Place that no response was received from the CPU.

At Planning Committee held on 21st May 2025 Members resolved to overturn the officer recommendation and refused planning permission on the grounds of fear of crime and impact on health.

Members further resolved that the exact wording of the reasons for refusal would be agreed at a subsequent Planning Consultation Group meeting.

Members provided the material reasons for the refusal based on the previous Committee resolution which were subsequently drafted by the Planning Development Manager. The wording was circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Officer recommendation – Members approve the wording of the reasons for refusal.

Outcome following PCG – Members approved the following wording of the reasons for refusal:

1. Fear of Crime

The proposed change of use of the ground floor from retail (class E) to a 24hour adult gaming centre (Sui generis) would have a detrimental impact on the day time economy of Worksop Town Centre due to their being existing instances of crime above the national average, in addition to a public fear of crime, which would result in an adverse effect on other town centre uses, residents and visitors to the town which would lead to a decline in footfall and an overall adverse impact on the viability and sustainability of the town centre contrary to policy ST3 (Worksop Central), ST11 (Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services) and ST12 (Management of Town Centres) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2024 and paragraphs 96 (Healthy and Safe Communities) and 135 (Achieving well-designed places) of the NPPF.

2. Impact on Health

The proposed change of use of the ground floor from retail (class E) to a 24hour adult gaming centre (Sui generis) would have a detrimental impact on the quality of life of residents and visitors to Worksop, which is identified as a Priority Regeneration Area, due to mental and physical health related harms in connection with the proposed use contrary to the objectives of the Bassetlaw District Local plan which seeks to promote healthier communities, reduce health inequalities, encourage healthy lifestyle choices and social interaction contrary to policy ST3 (Worksop Central) and ST12 (Management of Town Centres) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2024 paragraphs 96 (Healthy and Safe Communities) and 135 (Achieving well-designed places) of the NPPF.

8. Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

As there was no other urgent business to consider, the Chair thanked Members for attending and closed the meeting.

(Meeting ended at 5:00pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

16th July 2025

Outstanding Minutes List

Members please note that the updated positions are shown in bold type following each item.

(PDM = Planning Development Manager)

Min. No.	Date	Subject	Decision	Officer Responsible
-----------------	-------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------------------

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No:

24/00384/FUL FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR 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 ON BEHALF OF ONE PLANET DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Report by the Head of Planning and Place – Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

1.0 Purpose of the Report

1.1 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, equipment, infrastructure and landscaping land.

1.2 This application is reported to Planning Committee because the Bassetlaw District Council Scheme of delegation for determining applications sets out the applications that should automatically referred to Planning Committee:

- Applications for renewable energy generation where the application site exceeds 5 hectares in area.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Planning Committee resolve that had the Local Planning Authority determined the application it would have **REFUSED** planning permission.

2.1 Local planning authorities are responsible for renewable and low carbon energy development of 50 megawatts or less installed capacity (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Renewable and low carbon development over 50 megawatts capacity will be considered by the Secretary of State for Energy¹, under the Planning Act 2008, and the local planning authority will be a statutory consultee. Microgeneration is often permitted development and may not require an application for planning permission. The application was valid on the 10 April 2024 and does not form part of an allocation in the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 Adopted on the 29 May 2024. The applicant has submitted an appeal against Non Determination as the Local Planning Authority have not issued a decision within the agreed time frame. This report seeks to establish the resolution of the Planning Committee had the LPA have made the decision.

2.2 The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) have agreed that the procedure for determining the non-determination appeal is via Written Representations. Therefore, this report will

be the Council's Case at the Appeal.

- 2.3 The determination of the application now rests with the Planning Inspector and not with the Council, however, officers seek the opinion of Members of the Planning Committee with regards to the outcome they would have been minded to take, should the decision have rested with the Local Planning Authority.
- 2.4 This report sets out the key material planning considerations to enable Members to reach their opinion.
- 2.5 There are three letters of representation submitted raising concerns with the proposal details of which are set out later in the report.
- 2.6 The main issues of concern are that the proposal would erode the open and rural setting to those heritage assets listed above and especially that of Clumber Park, a grade I listed Registered Park & Garden, the proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to heritage assets whereby there have been no public benefits identified that would outweigh the harm and secondly that the proposal would be detrimental visually to the overall character and appearance of the local area contrary to policy

3.0 SITE CONTEXT

- 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.

4.0 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 The application is accompanied by various plans and technical documents which are available online for viewing.

5.0 PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning authorities must determine each planning application in accordance with the planning policies that comprise the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.1 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Listed Buildings Act) states: "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the local planning authority 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". This principle is expanded in the NPPF to cover a range of heritage assets: "Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification

Adopted Development Plan

- 5.2 The Adopted Development Plan for the site is:

- The Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 Adopted on the 29 May 2024

Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy

Policy ST5: Provision of Land for Employment Development

Policy ST9: Large Rural Brownfield Sites

Policy ST33: Design Quality

Policy ST35: Landscape Character

Policy ST38: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy ST39: Trees, woodlands and hedgerows

Policy ST40: The Historic Environment

Policy 41: Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Policy 46: Protecting Amenity

Policy ST48: Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation

Policy ST49: Renewable Energy Generation

Policy ST50: Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy ST51: Protecting Water Quality and Management

Policy ST52: Transport Infrastructure

Policy ST53: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active Travel

- NCC Mineral Local Plan 25 March 2021
- Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Pre-submission Draft Waste Local Plan August 2023

5.3 The Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) for the site is:

- The Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan

The Elkesley NHP was formally 'made' by Bassetlaw District Council following the referendum held on 12 November 2015. Work to review the Neighbourhood Plan commenced in mid 2023. Examination of the reviewed Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan commenced in May 2025. The Examination Report was published on 20 June 2025, with the next step being to seek approval of the report at the Bassetlaw Council meeting on 18 September 2025. As the plan has reached Examination Stage it is a material consideration and due to its stage in preparation 'Significant weight' can be attached to the plan.

Material Considerations

5.4 - National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (amended 2025)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's approach for the planning system and how these are expected to be applied.

Paragraph 11 explains that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay; and where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission shall be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The following paragraphs of the framework are applicable to this development:

1. Introduction.
2. Achieving sustainable development.
3. Plan-making.
4. Decision-making.
11. Making effective use of land.
12. Achieving well-designed places.

14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.
15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

- Best Practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy

6.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

20/00853/SCR - Screening Opinion - Proposed 40 MW Solar Farm – Decision : Not EIA Development – Date 04.08.2020

7.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 7.1 The following consultation response have been received and summarised below, detailed responses can be found on publicaccess.bassetlaw.gov.uk.

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

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.

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.

8.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLICITY

This application was advertised by neighbour letter, site notice and press notice and 3 of letters of representations have been received raising the following points:

- Impact on wildlife
- Impact on the roads during construction period
- Impact on loss of arable farmland
- Unclear on how the end of life recycling will take place

9.0 MAIN ISSUES

The main issues are:

- Principle of development
- Heritage Impacts
- Landscape and Visual Impacts

10.0 ASSESSMENT

PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

- 10.1 Policy ST1 sets out Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy The spatial strategy for Bassetlaw will be delivered over the plan period 2020-2038 through managed sustainable development and growth by appropriate to the size of each settlement or location to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, to regenerate the District's town centres, and to support necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities by promoting efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously

developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters that preclude such use; and by seeking to minimise the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3 agricultural land, where practicable.

10.2 The site is located in the open countryside, is not previously developed land, is classed as Grade 3 Agricultural Land (Best and Most Versatile), impacts on heritage assets and landscape character. However, the Local Plan explanatory text sets out the approach to the Green Agenda which is fundamental to the role of spatial planning is the delivery of sustainable development and the promotion of development that maximises resource efficiency and the use of more sustainable forms of energy. The capacity for renewable energy and low carbon technologies in the District is increasing. Importantly the type of provision is also changing; biomass is increasing at a smaller scale for heating, while solar panels on roofs or as a large scale mounted solar farms are now more prominent in the District. Annual monitoring¹¹ shows that there is more interest in low carbon technologies such as battery storage. Although not a renewable energy these can positively work towards the decarbonisation of the electricity sector and therefore reduce environmental impact.

10.2 Part 10 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's approach to Renewable Energy Generation. Policy ST49 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that development that generates, shares, transmits and/or stores zero carbon and/or low carbon renewable energy including community energy schemes will be supported subject to the satisfactory resolution of all relevant site specific and cumulative impacts upon:

- a) location, setting and position in the wider landscape, resulting from its siting and scale;
- b) natural and heritage assets and their settings;
- c) air and water quality;
- d) hydrology and hydrogeology;
- e) the best and most versatile agricultural land;
- f) existing highway capacity and highway safety;
- g) noise, light, glare, smell, dust, emissions or flicker;
- h) aviation and radar;
- i) recreation and local amenity.

10.3 Chapter 14 of the NPPF sets out the National Planning Policy stating that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. It goes onto say that 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;
- c) in the case of applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing renewable sites, give significant weight to the benefits of utilising an established site.

10.4 Therefore, the Bassetlaw Local Plan and the NPPF are in principle supportive of the development of new renewable energy schemes. However, the supportive policies, as advised above, contain locational requirements and these will need to be considered to assess if this scheme is acceptable on other material planning considerations.

SUSTAINABILITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT

10.5 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF sets out three dimensions for sustainable development, economic, social and environmental objectives

10.6 In reaching a decision on this case, the NPPF at paragraph 9 makes it clear that the objectives referred to above should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions but are not criteria against which every planning application should be judged against in guiding development towards sustainable objectives local circumstances need to be taken into account to reflect the character needs and opportunities of each area.

10.7 The Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy states that the Local planning authorities are responsible for renewable and low carbon energy development of 50 megawatts or less installed capacity (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Renewable and low carbon development over 50 megawatts capacity will be considered by the Secretary of State for Energy¹, under the Planning Act 2008, and the local planning authority will be a statutory consultee. Microgeneration is often permitted development and may not require an application for planning permission.

10.8 The Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy states particular factors that a Local Planning Authority will need to consider include:

- encouraging the effective use of previously developed land, and if a proposal does involve greenfield land, that it allows for continued agricultural use and/or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays
- that solar farms are normally temporary structures and planning conditions can be used to ensure that the installations are removed when no longer in use and the land is restored to its previous use
- the effect on landscape of glint and glare and on neighbouring uses and aircraft safety
- the extent to which there may be additional impacts if solar arrays follow the daily movement of the sun the need for, and impact of, security measures such as lights and fencing great care should be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including the impact of proposals on views important to their setting. As the significance of a heritage

asset derives not only from its physical presence, but also from its setting, careful consideration should be given to the impact of large scale solar farms on such assets. Depending on their scale, design and prominence, a large scale solar farm within the setting of a heritage asset may cause substantial harm to the significance of the asset

- the potential to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through, for example, screening with native hedges the energy generating potential, which can vary for a number of reasons including, latitude and aspect.

HERITAGE MATTERS

- 10.9 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.
- 10.10 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.
- 10.11 Policy ST40 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that there will be a 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.
- 10.12 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 (List Entry Number: 1001079; Designated: 1st January 1986), and the grade I listed 'Thoresby Park' Registered Park and Garden (List Entry Number: 1000361; Designated: 1st January 1986). 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' (List Entry Number: 1156026; Designated: 19th September 1977); the grade II* listed 'Drayton Gate' (List Entry Number: 1045058; Designated: 13th February 1967); and the grade II listed 'West Bridge' (List Entry Number: 1370411; Designated: 31st March 1985), which is itself also designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (List Entry Number: 1006400).
- 10.13 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 site's 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.

- 10.14 The key consideration is the scheme's impact upon the setting of the surrounding/nearby designated heritage assets, including that of: the grade I listed 'Clumber Park' Registered Park and Garden (List Entry Number: 1001079; Designated: 1st January 1986), the grade I listed 'Thoresby Park' Registered Park and Garden (List Entry Number: 1000361; Designated: 1st January 1986); the grade II* listed 'Gate Piers and Flanking Walls to Normanton Gate' (List Entry Number: 1156026; Designated: 19th September 1977); the grade II* listed 'Drayton Gate' (List Entry Number: 1045058; Designated: 13th February 1967); and the grade II listed 'West Bridge' (List Entry Number: 1370411; Designated: 31st March 1985), which is itself also designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (List Entry Number: 1006400).
- 10.15 The Council's Conservation Officer has significant concerns regarding this current proposal. The proposal would erode the open and rural setting to those heritage assets listed above and especially that of Clumber Park, a grade I listed Registered Park & Garden. There are various views into and out of the site from public vantage points which are a key part of the park's open countryside setting along its eastern boundary. The development would fail to preserve this open countryside setting. The scale and nature of this intervention would seriously undermine the setting of the adjacent/nearby designated heritage assets. The impact has been identified as 'less than substantial harm', as set out in paragraph 215 NPPF which states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The Conservation Officer acknowledges that there is a clear public benefit associated with the provision of the scheme, specifically in the form of the production of a substantial amount of clean renewable energy. However, it is on Conservation view that the provision of this public benefit would not outweigh the level of harm incurred.
- 10.16 The Conservation Officer welcomed the proposed changes/amendments, to that extent that they would: reduce the overall scale of the development area; reduce the extent in which the development area encroaches upon adjacent public thoroughfares; and reduce the immediate visual impact of the proposed development. However, Conservation still has concerns with the proposed scheme, on the basis that it would still result in the erosion of the open rural countryside setting of those heritage assets listed above and especially that of the grade I listed 'Clumber Park' Registered Park & Garden. The proposed amendment, while positive, would still not negate the concerns previously outlined by The Conservation Office4r.
- 10.17 The Gardens Trust and Nottinghamshire Gardens Tryst 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.

10.18 Historic England area statutory consulted and have raised concerns that the proposed development will cause less than substantial harm to numerous heritage assets, including multiple Grade II listed building forming the settlements of Hardwick-in-Clumber and Bothamshall, and the highly graded gates and park buildings which are significant individually and as part of the Clumber Park estate. Wider ranging views have the potential to impact on the historic, Grade I church of St Giles in Elkesley. It is also possible that the proposal that the development will cause a degree of less than substantial harm to the significance of the West Drayton Avenue approach to Clumber Park Grade I and Drayton Gate Grade II*, to the setting of the Drayton Gate and on the approach from the south to the West Bridge scheduled monument, as well as buried archaeology and other non-designated heritage assets, as it stands this would appear to be at a high level.

10.19 The applicant has set out what they see as the Public Benefits which include:

- the Net Zero by 2050 target
- Ecology and BNG of 170% in habitat units
- The solar farm will increase hedgerow by 248%
- Direct local employment during construction
- Site operation and management jobs during the 40 year life of the project
- Wider employment gains for the district
- Increased business rates of at least £100,000 per year
- Farm diversification payment to the landowner over the 40 years
- Local energy security and network resilience
- Heritage improvements including reinstatement of historic line of lost avenue and field pattern, the development is temporary and the heritage assets are permanent, the removed tree and hedgerow pattern will remain for the long term
- The proposed development will provide an income stream for the Thoresby Estate providing vital funds for the upkeep of the historically important Thoresby Park and gardens
- Soil improvements through cessation of use of agricultural chemicals
- Implementation of planting plans
- Removing pollution to the River Poulter due to lack of agricultural chemicals
- Improving run off to the river
- Remove need to abstract water from the River Poulter
- Flood resilience due to permanent vegetative cover which reduces surface water run off and improves infiltration
- Health improvements through reduced emissions and pollution

10.20 All of the above have been considered, however, these are benefits that could be experienced through the delivery of such a proposal in a different location and as such not resulting in the harm to the heritage assets identified above. It is considered that

the public benefits identified would not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

ARCHAEOLOGY

- 10.21 Policy ST39 of the Local Plan states that the value of Bassetlaw's historic environment is its rich variety which plays a major part in the District's local character and distinctiveness. Informing and managing change to the District's historic environment is underpinned by the Historic Environment Record, an archive, database and mapping resource kept by Nottinghamshire County Council of all known heritage assets in the District. The most important aspects include the buildings associated with the ducal estates of Welbeck Abbey, Clumber Park and Worksop Manor (known as 'The Dukeries') and their related estate settlements. Heritage assets are valued for their architectural, historic, archaeological and artistic interest, their communal value or social significance. The National Planning Policy Framework defines the conservation of heritage assets (historic buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas, archaeology or landscapes that have a degree of significance) as 'the process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.
- 10.22 The sites lies in an area of high archaeological potential associated with late Iron Age and Romano-British settlement activity. Two large areas of cropmarks within the site fields are identified in the Riley surveys from the 1980's. These are likely associated with late Iron Age/Romano-British settlement and agricultural activity, however the full extent and nature of this has yet to be determined. Smaller concentrations of cropmarks are also record within the site boundary and it is likely that further remains are present within the 'blank' areas between them.
- 10.23 The applicant has submitted a desk-based assessment (DBA) including the results of a geophysical survey. The DBA provides an outline of archaeological potential based on available sources and the geophysical survey and recognises the potential for prehistoric and Roman archaeological remains within the site boundary. An area in the northern portion of the site has been removed from the scheme based on the results of the DBA which is welcomed. However, the DBA states that the impact from solar farms is considered low. This is incorrect and the impacts are of equivalence to other forms of development when the cumulative effect is properly considered. Piling, kilometres of cable trenching, associated infrastructure, construction activity, decommissioning and numerous future refits and maintenance throughout the operational life of the solar farm are all highly intrusive and potentially destructive to any surviving archaeological remains.
- 10.24 The DBA further recommends that any further investigation and mitigation work can be conditioned (if permission is granted), based on the DBA and geophysical survey alone. However, the archaeology consultant would strongly recommend that the site should also be subject to trial trench evaluation prior to determination so that a proper assessment of archaeological potential and impact can inform an appropriate planning recommending and migration strategy.
- 10.25 To conclude, there is currently insufficient specific information on the archaeological potential for the site and the extent of impact to buried archaeological remains from

the proposed development. Given the high archaeological potential, but as yet unknown location, character and extent, it was recommended that applicant submit the results of an archaeological trial trench evaluation (full site boundary, minimum 3% coverage) to both target known anomalies in the desk-based research and the geophysical survey and also the 'blank' areas where other techniques have failed to establish potential. This would aim to determine the presence, absence, significance, extent depth and character of any archaeological remains which could be impacted by the proposed development as noted above.

VISUAL AMENITY AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

- 10.25 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 developments are visually attractive as result of good architecture, layout and appropriate landscaping, are sympathetic to local character and maintain a strong sense of place. The application is accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which has been reviewed by the Council's Consultant Landscape Architect.
- 10.26 Policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan outlines that all development must be of a high-quality design that 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.
- 10.27 Policy ST35 of the Local Plan states proposals that contribute to the nature and quality of Bassetlaw's landscapes will be supported where it can be demonstrated that:
- a) it protects and where possible enhances the distinctive qualities of the relevant landscape character policy zone, as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment 20096 by conserving, restoring, reinforcing or creating relevant landscape forms and features; and
 - b) in the case of the Local Plan site allocations, also promotes the development opportunities identified within the Site Allocations: Landscape Study 2019 and the Landscape Assessment Addendums 2020, 2021 and 2022.
- 10.28 The policy goes onto say that proposals in an edge of settlement location will be expected to create a positive interface between the urban and rural environments. This should be demonstrated through compliance with Part 1 of this Policy, and by giving appropriate consideration to layout, density, scale, massing and form of development in accordance with Policy ST33.
- 10.29 The proposed solar farm comprises solar photovoltaic panels measuring 2.38m x 1.3m, each of which would be fixed to aluminium or steel mounting frames set at approximately 25 degrees, with the height at the front being 0.91m above ground level, and the maximum height at the back being 3m. Alongside the solar panels, the proposed development includes 12 BESS containers, each measuring 12.19m x 2.5m

x 2.9m, with side mounted heating, ventilation and air conditioning units.

- 10.30 During the application consideration process, consultees raised concerns about the impact of the proposed solar farm on views from West Drayton Avenue, which is a Public Right of Way and a historic approach to Clumber Park. As a result, the applicant has modified the layout to pull panels away from the avenue. The new layout proposes planting a line of horse chestnut trees along the line of the avenue just outside an existing line of avenue trees. The existing trees will be retained but are in decline and the new planting will ensure that this feature continues into the future. As a further benefit it is proposed to reinstate the line of an avenue that extended east from Clumber Park 's Normanton Gate.
- 10.31 The solar panels will now start to the north of the Normanton Gate line and the intervening land down to West Drayton Avenue will remain arable farmland. The avenue trees and hedge, combined with the set back of the panels, will reduce their visibility from West Drayton Avenue.
- 10.32 In terms of effects on the character of the site itself, the LVIA is considered to be correct to state “the proposed development will substantially alter the character of the fields in which it is situated, replacing the rural character with one of a landscape containing low level electrical infrastructure”. It is also fair to agree with the assessment of ‘high’ landscape change to the character of the site. However, the LVIA asserts that this level will be reduced following establishment of proposed planting. The LPA and the Landscape Architect consultant do not agree with this. It is considered that the proposed planting will not counteract the comprehensive change of land use across the site and predict the ‘moderate to major adverse’ landscape effects will remain throughout operation.
- 10.33 Paragraph 7.9 of the LVIA asserts that the proposals will have some beneficial effects on wider character due to mitigation planting removing views to the existing arable fields. The LPA and Landscape Architect consultant also disagree with this assessment. The perception of undeveloped arable land on the site currently contributes to the wider rural character in the area surrounding the site. Removing this perception should not be seen as beneficial. It is therefore considered that the proposals would lead to a long-term minor adverse effect on the character of the surrounding landscape, which is a greater level of effect compared to the ‘neutral’ level assessed by the LVIA. However, it is important to note that this will be restricted to a limited geographic extent. The development is likely to be perceived through existing and proposed trees, but this perception will be heavily reduced by the vegetation.
- 10.34 To conclude, the information submitted within the LVIA, and associated addendum documents does broadly accord with methodology outlined in GLVIA3. However, multiple concerns have been raised about the application of this methodology and the summative assessments provided. In places, the LVIA underestimates the predicted level of landscape and visual effects, whilst also overestimating the effectiveness of proposed mitigation planting.
- 10.35 Therefore, the Council’s consultant has advised that they consider that the submitted

material does not accurately reflect the substantial change that is proposed for the site.

- 10.36 The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the aforementioned policies and will have a significant detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

- 10.37 Policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that all development must be of a high-quality design that reflects the principles of local design guidance, including the Bassetlaw Design Quality SPD. Policy 46 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that proposals for development should be designed to avoid and minimise impacts on the amenity of existing and future users through loss of privacy, overshadowing or overbearing impacts; and not generate unacceptable levels of noise, light, air, odour, vibration or other pollution.
- 10.38 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments that create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Paragraph 191 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.
- 10.39 There are no direct residential neighbours adjacent to the site, there may be some impacts during the construction phase due to potential traffic movements, however, it is considered that there would be no material impact on recreation or local amenity (including the Robin Hood Way or any other public rights of way) as a result of glint, and the Noise Impact Assessment NIA confirms that there would be no noise impacts. The Council's Environmental Health officer have not raised any concerns with regards to this outcome.
- 10.40 The nature and location of the proposed development being such that no other impacts on recreation or local amenity are likely to arise from this and as such the proposal is considered to comply with the aforementioned policies.

HIGHWAYS MATTERS

- 10.41 Policy ST53 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that development that contributes towards a sustainable, safe, active transport network and offers a range of public transport and active travel choices will be supported.
- 10.42 Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that schemes can be supported where they provide safe and suitable access for all. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF makes it clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

- 10.43 Paragraph 96 of the NPPF states that all development should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which encourage social interaction, are safe and accessible and enable and support healthy lifestyles. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF requires schemes to provide safe and suitable access for all users as well as looking at appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes.
- 10.44 The Transport Statement that accompanies the application concludes that, given the low volume of traffic generated by the proposal, the development will not have a significant impact on highway operation or road safety.
- 10.45 The Technical Note provides a detailed assessment of visibility in both the horizontal and vertical planes. It is identified that the northern splay is impacted by a crest in the road, although it is accepted that the effect is relatively minor. It is also identified that an existing road sign falls within the northern splay, which will impact on the splay, but will not fully obscure a car.
- 10.46 It is noted that there are countdown markers on the approach to highlight the presence of the access to approaching drivers. Additional measures are proposed to include appropriate signage for construction traffic to provide warning to other road users of the site access location on approach and to guide construction vehicles. As previously advised, approval of any traffic management signing scheme will need to be agreed in advance with the Highway Authority.
- 10.47 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.
- 10.48 It was advised that compensation will need to be secured for the removal of highway trees, in accordance with the CAVAT Assessment, to the value of £26,199. The CAVAT value must be paid prior to any works commencing on site, and this will need to be secured as part of any planning consent.
- 10.49 On this basis the Local Highways Authority has raised no objections. The proposal is considered to accord with the aforementioned policies.

ECOLOGY/TREES

- 10.50 The Environment Act 2021 introduced a requirement for development to deliver a 10% net gain to biodiversity. This BNG requirement applies only to those applications submitted after BNG took effect on 12 February 2024.
- 10.51 The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC Act) 2006 places a duty on all local authorities with regards to the conservation of biodiversity.
- 10.52 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 makes it illegal to intentionally kill, injure, or disturb certain wild animals, including birds, bats, and other protected species, or to damage their habitats.

- 10.53 Policy ST38 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that the Council will seek to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the district. In all cases, where the principle of development is considered appropriate the mitigation hierarchy must be applied so that firstly harm is avoided wherever possible; appropriate mitigation is provided to ensure no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species and as a last resort, compensation is delivered to offset any residual damage to biodiversity.
- 10.54 In addition, policy ST38 states that in line with national legislation, all new development should make provision for net biodiversity gain on site, or where this is not practicable, off provision will be considered.
- 10.55 The content of paragraph 186 of the NPPF states that in dealing with planning applications, councils must consider the harm of a scheme on biodiversity. It states that the following principles should be applied (in summary):
- If significant harm cannot be avoided adequately mitigated or compensated for permission should be refused.
 - Development within or outside a SSSI which is likely to have an adverse impact on it should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of location outweigh its impact.
 - Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused, unless there are exceptional reasons or compensation.
 - Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported. Opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.
- 10.56 The application is supported by a Biodiversity Net Gain Report, which concludes that a 169.89% gain in habitat units and 247.99% gain in hedgerow units.
- 10.57 The Council's Lead Ecologist considers that the target condition of 'moderate' for the Other lowland acid grassland too optimistic due to the presence of solar panels and would accept 'poor' condition. This change would still deliver 176.51 (89.92%) gain in habitat units.
- 10.58 Providing a revised metric is submitted prior to determination with the more modest outcome, there are no further objections relating to ecology.

FLOODING/DRAINAGE

- 10.59 The NPPF makes it clear that development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from the areas at the highest risk.
- 10.60 Paragraph 167 of the NPPF requires that proposals do not increase flood risk. asset when making a decision. Paragraph 205 of the NPPF is also particularly applicable where archaeology has been identified as a potential issue on site. This paragraph requires that applicants record to provide documentary evidence to

advance the understanding of the significance of the heritage asset.

- 10.61 Policy ST50: Flood Risk and Drainage of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states Proposals are required to consider and, where necessary, mitigate the impacts of the proposed development on flood risk, on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development. Proposals, including change of use applications, must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (where appropriate), which demonstrates that the development, including the access and egress, will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.
- 10.62 The site is located within zone 2 and of a groundwater source protection zone, designated for public water supply abstractions. The River Poluter is also located in proximity to the north-east site boundary.
- 10.63 The Phase 1 Preliminary Contamination Land Risk Assessment report supporting the application has identified limited potentially significant contaminant sources at the site, based on the previous and historical use of the land. The site is currently greenfield/agricultural land. Some localised presence of made ground may be present, associated with the historic small building and potentially infilled pond. Significant contamination with the potential to impact controlled waters receptors is not considered to be present. Whilst the Environment Agency do not expect significant contamination to be present, due to the presence of sensitive controlled waters receptors, they would request a condition to any permission that is approved.
- 10.64 It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in any flood risk or pollution impacts that could not be managed and mitigation by suitably worded conditions. As such the proposal complies with the aforementioned policies.

CONCLUSION/PLANNING BALANCE

- 10.65 In terms of matters weighing in favour of the proposals, the proposed development would see a solar farm with an export capacity of MVA, providing an annual electricity output of GW/h, sufficient to meet needs of nearly 15,500 homes. Alongside the solar panels, the proposed development includes 12 BESS containers which would allow electricity from the Grid to be stored in batteries at times of low demand and then exported back to the Grid at time of high demand; thus, the proposed development would effectively provide a 'balancing service' which would assist in balancing grid frequency at times of stress. The proposed development would support the need for providing clean and renewable energy and the increasing reliance on renewable energy forms by providing a quick and flexible back-up energy source to the Grid at times of high demand, contributing to ensuring a reliable energy supply to the Grid. There is a clear and pressing need for renewable energy developments to assist in meeting net zero targets, and with that, a clear need for supporting infrastructure such as Solar Farms and Battery Energy Storage Systems.
- 10.66 In addition to the above, the proposals would provide for a BNG onsite gain. The suggested target condition of 'moderate' for the Other lowland acid grassland is

considered too optimistic due to the presence of solar panels and would accept 'poor' condition. However, this would still deliver 176.51 (89.92%) gain in habitat units.

- 10.67 The proposals would result in economic benefit to the households and businesses experiencing the negative effects of rapidly rising energy costs, but also through employment during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Battery Energy Storage System. Furthermore, the proposals would support the rural economy through farm diversification, by providing the landowner with additional revenue. Limited weight can be attached to these matters, as they are unquantified.
- 10.68 The proposal would result in harm to the setting of the surrounding and nearby heritage assets that is not considered to be outweighed by the public benefits.
- 10.69 The proposal would result in an unacceptable level harm to landscape and visual impacts and harmful to the wider landscape character of the area when taking into account the nature of the landscape.
- 10.70 Finally, there is currently insufficient specific information on the archaeological potential for the site and the extent of impact to below archaeological remains from the proposed development as insufficient information is considered to have been provided to assess the overall impact on below ground heritage assets.
- 10.71 To conclude, it is considered that the harm that this development would create outweighs the public benefits.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that Planning Committee conclude that had the LPA been determining the application in its current state, permission would have been **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would erode the open and rural setting to those heritage assets listed above and especially that of Clumber Park, a grade I listed Registered Park & Garden. There are various views into and out of the site from public vantage points which are a key part of the park's open countryside setting along its eastern boundary. The development would fail to preserve this open countryside setting. The scale and nature of this intervention would seriously undermine the setting of the adjacent/nearby designated heritage assets.

For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that if permitted, the harm caused would be at the higher end of 'less than substantial', and the perceived public benefits would in no way outweigh the harm identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to Sections 66(1) & 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990; Policy ST40 & Policy 41 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038, paragraphs 202, 207, 208, 210, 212, 213, 215, 219 & 220 of the NPPF.

2. The proposed works are located within open space which would be detrimental visually to the overall character and appearance of the local area. The proliferation of structures on site, results in substantial harm to the open countryside and rural character and appearance of the locality.

As such, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the landscape character of the surrounding contrary to Policies ST8, ST33 and ST35 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.

3. Insufficient information has been provided to assess the impact on below ground heritage assets contrary to Sections 66(1) & 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990; Policy ST40 & Policy 41 (6) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038, Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

This page is intentionally left blank