

Land adjacent to the A614, Worksop, Nottinghamshire

Landscape Statement of Common Ground in respect of the Inquiry commencing 20 January 2026

BY

- 1. ONE PLANET DEVELOPMENTS LTD**
- 2. BASSETLAW DISTRICT COUNCIL**

PINS Ref: APP/A3010/W/25/3367817

LPA Reference: 24/00384/FUL

Signed : 	Signed: K. Harte
Name: James Wallwork	Name: Kirsty Harte
On behalf of One Planet Developments Ltd	On behalf of Bassetlaw District Council
Date: 17/12/25	Date: 17/12/25

Contents

1. Introduction and Scope	3
2. Matters not in Dispute	4
3. Matters in Dispute.....	11

Appendices

Appendix 1: Application Layout

Appendix 2: Appeal Scheme Layout (Holborn Amendment)

Appendix 3: Screen ZTV

Appendix 4: Screen ZTV with Proposed Planting

Appendix 5: LVIA Methodology

Appendix 6: Summary of Visual Effects

Appendix 7: Summary of Landscape Effects

Appendix 8: Viewpoint Location Plan

1. Introduction and Scope

1.1. This Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) is made between the following parties:

One Planet Developments Ltd (“the **Appellant**”); and

Bassetlaw District Council (“the **Council**”)

together the “**Parties**”.

1.2. This SoCG has been jointly prepared by the Appellant and the Council and establishes the general matters on which the Parties agree and disagree.

1.3. This statement is supplemental to the main Statement of Common Ground agreed between the parties on 5th November 2025 and responds to the request made by the Inspector at the Case Management Conference for supplemental topic specific statements of common ground to be prepared in respect of Landscape, Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Matters.

2. Matters not in Dispute

- 2.1. Regarding site context, the proposal relates to land that lies adjacent to the A614 near Worksop.
- 2.2. The boundaries of the site are primarily comprised of mature trees and hedgerows. The proposal runs parallel to the A614 which forms the majority of the site's western boundary. The southern boundary of the site runs parallel to West Drayton Avenue, which is a public footpath. The northern boundary of the site runs roughly parallel with the southern bank of the river Poulter. The western boundary abuts mature woodland.
- 2.3. The appeal scheme comprises a solar farm and battery energy storage system. The extent of the red line is 88.31 hectares. The proposal includes associated works, infrastructure, and landscaping.
- 2.4. This a non-determination appeal so the Council have not issued a decision notice. However, the Officer's Report to Planning Committee at Section 11 recommends refusal with 3 reasons. The second reason for refusal states that:

"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."
- 2.5. On the basis of the revised landscaping plans submitted with the appeal, the Council no longer considers that the appeal should be refused on landscape grounds and accordingly withdraws this reason for refusal.
- 2.6. Section 5.2 of the Committee Report references relevant policies in the adopted Local Plan. Specifically, it refers to Policy ST33, which is concerned with design quality, and is referenced in the reason for refusal, along with ST35, which is concerned with landscape character. It does not, however, reference Policy ST8 as being relevant, which is referenced in the draft reason for refusal. Pg. 38 of the Committee Report refers to Bassetlaw District Council's Tree Officer who notes, from a tree point of view, there does not appear to be much of a loss and does not raise an objection.
- 2.7. Section 8 of the report addresses the summary of publicity response, noting three letters of representation have been received. Whilst concerns have been raised with regard to wildlife, impact on the roads, loss of arable land, and concerns regarding life recycling, there is no reference to harm to character and appearance per se, as far as members of the public are concerned.

2.8. Section 9 sets out what the Officer considers to be the main issues and cites landscape and visual impacts. Para. 10.8 of the Officer's Report refers to the Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy which states particular factors that a LPA will need to consider, and notes the following:

- Where a proposal involves greenfield land, it allows for continued agricultural use and encourages biodiversity improvements
- Solar farms are temporary structures and the installation can be removed when no longer in use, with land restored to previous use
- There is potential to mitigate landscape and visual impacts, for example, native hedgerows

Visual Amenity

2.9. Visual amenity and landscape character is addressed from para. 10.25 onwards. Para 10.25 notes the application was accompanied by an LVIA and reviewed by the Council's Landscape Consultant.

2.10. Policy ST35 is referenced, noting proposals that contribute to the nature and quality of the landscape will be supported where it can be demonstrated that:

- The proposal protects and, where possible, enhances distinctive qualities of landscape character identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment by conserving, restoring, reinforcing, or creating relevant landscape forms and features.
- In the case of site allocations and refers to the Landscape Study 2019 and Landscape Assessment Addendums dated 2020, 2021 and 2022.

2.11. Policy ST33 is referenced with regard to consideration being given to layout, density, scale, massing, and form of the development.

2.12. The proposed solar farm comprises panels attached the steel-mounted frames, minimum height 91cm above ground to a maximum height of 3m. The scheme also includes 12 BESS containers with a height of 2.9m.

2.13. The layout proposes planting a line of horse chestnut trees along the line of West Drayton Avenue, just outside an existing line of avenue trees. The existing trees will be retained, but are in a state of decline, and the new planting will ensure that this feature continues into the future, and is seen as a benefit. A further benefit is also recognised in terms of reinstating the line of an avenue that extended east from Clumber Park's Normanton Gate.

2.14. The solar panels would be located north of the Normanton Gate line, and the intervening land south of this line to West Drayton Avenue would remain as farmland. The avenue trees and hedge, combined with the setback of the

panels, will reduce their visibility from West Drayton Avenue. This is documented in para. 10.31.

- 2.15. Committee Report para. 10.32 notes in terms of effects on the character itself, the LVIA is considered to be correct to state that the proposed development will substantially alter the character of the fields within which it is situated, replacing the rural character with one of a landscape containing low level electrical infrastructure.
- 2.16. Para. 10.33 notes that it is considered that the proposals would lead to a long-term minor adverse effect on character of the surrounding landscape. It goes on to state, however, that 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.
- 2.17. Para. 10.34 notes that information submitted within the LVIA and associated addendum does broadly accord with the methodology outlined in GLVIA3. At para. 10.35, it is inferred that the Council's view is that there is a difference between the Council and applicant in terms of professional judgement rather than any concerns regarding methodology and the approach adopted. Para. 10.36 concludes there would be significant detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area.
- 2.18. The majority of Clumber Park will be visually unaffected. There would be very limited, heavily filtered, or slight glimpsed views from a few locations. The degree of visual effect on these locations would be negligible.

Residential Amenity

- 2.19. Para. 10.37 cites Policy ST33 and Policy 46 of the Local Plan which is concerned with the amenity of existing and future owner occupiers of property. The report goes on to note there are no neighbours adjacent to the site, and that it is considered there would be no material impact on the recreation or local amenity including Robin Hood Way or any other public right of way as a result of glint and glare.
- 2.20. Para. 10.40 notes that the nature and location of the proposed development is such that no other impacts on recreation or local amenity are likely to arise and as such, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies, ST33 and ST46.

Holborn Amendment

- 2.21. The application was considered on the basis of the proposed Site Layout Plan, which shows existing and proposed planting, drawing reference no. OPL011-PL-01, revision 10. The appellant has made minor modifications to this layout

plan which is referred to as the Holborn Amendment and is drawing reference no. OPLO11-PL-01, revision 12. There is also a Planting Plan prepared by Sightline Landscape and is drawing reference no: 571_PP_01_Rev C, and this has been updated to reflect the Holborn Amendment as well.

- 2.22. The site is not subject to any landscape protection designation (non-statutory landscape designation) and is not part of a valued landscape, whilst it is recognised that Clumber Park lies to the west of the site, which is a registered park and garden, lying beyond the adjacent A614 Blyth Road.
- 2.23. Two lines of pylons cross the eastern part of the site supporting existing 132kV and 400kV overhead cables.
- 2.24. There are no public rights of way or informal footpaths which extend across the site itself.
- 2.25. The project would be time limited to an upper limit of 40 years for the operational period of the project.
- 2.26. The project is proposed to be fully decommissioned at the end of its operational life with all infrastructure, except the substation and access track to it, removed, to allow otherwise full restoration of the site, as set out in the decommissioning statement submitted with the application.

Arboriculture

- 2.27. An arboricultural report was submitted with the application, dated November 2024. The scope of the report outlines any trees to be removed to facilitate development together with suitable protection for trees retained. The area surveyed is actually larger than the red line area, as illustrated in figure 1 of the report.
- 2.28. Internal para. 4.3 of the report notes that the construction of the proposed access off Blyth Road is likely to require the removal of a small number of trees and a small section of one hedgerow will need to be removed to construct the internal road. Trees either side of the Blyth Road access may need to be pruned to ensure visibility splays. The Council raise no objection with regard to tree loss as part of the application.

LVIA

- 2.29. An LVIA was submitted with the application, dated March 2024. This report notes a number of points, as follows.
- 2.30. The site does not lie in an area subject to a protective landscape designation.
- 2.31. The site does not lie within Green Belt.

- 2.32. The site lies within the Bothamstall Landscape Character Area which is described as having an enclosed nature and the landform is apparent resulting in low visibility. A strong sense of place, combined with low visibility gives moderate landscape sensitivity overall.
- 2.33. The site is divided internally by mature belts of conifers which further limits its extent and visibility.
- 2.34. The proposed development would not result in any significant changes to landform.
- 2.35. The proposed development would not result in any significant changes to natural drainage features.
- 2.36. The proposal would not result in the loss of any significant landscape elements including woodland, trees and hedges.
- 2.37. Beyond the site itself, there would be no physical change to the landscape elements that define the character of the wider landscape.
- 2.38. Visual appearance has a bearing upon landscape character. Beyond the actual visual envelope of the proposal, the landscape character of the wider surrounding area would remain unchanged with the proposed scheme in place.
- 2.39. There would be some filtered views of the proposal in winter, seen through the woodland edge along the route of the Robin Hood Way, which runs through woodland to the south of the site, and from Blyth Road, which runs close to the site's western boundary. There would be views of the proposal from the adjacent Clumber Park Hotel and car park at year 1. Once the surrounding proposed woodland planting has achieved a height of 3m, these views would fall away with the screening effect of the proposed planting.
- 2.40. With regard to the visual envelope, the following is noted.
- 2.41. The visual envelope would be very limited.
- 2.42. Visibility from the countryside to the north is limited to the northern boundaries of the site, its surrounding woodland and scrubland associated with the river Poulter landscape corridor.
- 2.43. Views from the countryside to the west are severely limited by the tree belts that flank either side of Blyth Road, the A614, which forms the eastern boundary to Clumber Park.

- 2.44. Views of the proposal from countryside to the south are limited to the nearby Robin Hood Way footpath and associated woodland with no views southward of Normanton Lane.
- 2.45. Views from the countryside to the east of the site are limited to the site's boundaries due to the presence of extensive woodland.
- 2.46. Visual effects would be limited to views from:
- Robin Hood Way, where adjacent to the site
 - Blyth Road, where adjacent to the site
 - Clumber Park estate, to the west of the site
- 2.47. The LVIA methodology accords with GLVIA3 guidance.
- 2.48. As set out in the LVIA, para. 1.3, a residential visual amenity assessment is excluded from the LVIA as it is considered the proposal is sufficiently distant from nearby residential properties such that any harm arising would not breach the public interest Lavender Test.
- 2.49. The scale of effects set out in table 1 of the LVIA is considered an appropriate scale with a verbal word scale of negligible, minor, moderate and major.
- 2.50. Landscape effects on topography would be negligible.
- 2.51. Effects on water features would be negligible.
- 2.52. With regard to trees and hedgerows, there would be a loss of a short section of hedgerow, 4m in length, to create internal access. There would be the loss of a few trees to create vehicular access off of Blyth Road.
- 2.53. The LVIA concludes at para. 7.6 with regard to trees and hedges there would be a moderate beneficial effect.
- 2.54. There would be no physical effect upon landscape elements beyond the site.
- 2.55. The viewpoints selected in the LVIA are considered suitable, representative and proportionate for the nature of the scheme and the site concerned.
- 2.56. The photomontages prepared follow best practice methodology and are proportional for the proposed project.
- 2.57. The mitigation planting within the southern part of the site is considered beneficial in landscape character terms.
- 2.58. Following decommissioning, all landscape mitigation planting would remain and would have a maturity of 40 years, enhancing the local landscape character.

- 2.59. The site and surrounding area fall within NCA 49, referred to as Sherwood. The key characteristics on page 5 of the document are considered to define the area and are relevant as are the statements of environmental opportunity (SEOs).
- 2.60. The effects upon landscape character are very limited and highly localised.
- 2.61. The effect upon general visual amenity would be limited and highly localised. Effects upon landscape elements would be beneficial in the nature of effect, reflecting the high BNG calculation metric.
- 2.62. Post-decommissioning the proposal would result in a beneficial legacy in landscape character and visual amenity terms.

3. Matters in Dispute

- 3.1. There are no matters in dispute.