

**Land adjacent to the A614, Worksop,
Nottinghamshire**

**Archaeology 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 : A Jones	Signed:
Name: Amy Jones	Name: Grahame Appleby
On behalf of One Planet Developments Ltd	On behalf of Bassetlaw District Council
Date: 16.12.2025	Date: 16.12.2025

December 2025

This page is intentionally blank

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Archaeology Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been jointly prepared by Amy Jones, Head of Heritage at Cura Terrae Ltd (on behalf of ‘the Appellant’ - One Planet Developments Ltd) and Grahame Appleby at Bassetlaw District Council (BCP - ‘the Council’). It sets out those matters agreed and those which remain in dispute following the non-determination of a proposed solar farm and battery energy storage system at Land adjacent to the A614, Worksop, Nottinghamshire.
- 1.1.2 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.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been jointly prepared by the Appellant and the Council to establish the matters in relation solely to Archaeology on which the Parties agree and disagree.
- 1.1.4 This appeal is against the non-determination of the planning application for the installation and operation of a solar farm and battery energy storage system (output up to 40 MW) with associated works, equipment, infrastructure and landscaping (‘the Appeal Scheme’).

2. Archaeological Context

- 2.1.1 It is agreed between the parties that the Appeal site is located within an area of archaeological potential relating to Iron Age or Romano-British agricultural activity as referenced within the Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment and by the consultee responses from the Archaeological Advisor to the Council.
- 2.1.2 The Appeal site has been subject to a geophysical survey, the results of which were used to inform the Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment.
- 2.1.3 Within the Appeal site an area of cropmarks interpreted as being associated with Iron Age or Romano-British settlement activity has been identified to the northwest. This area of the north west field has been removed from the Appeal Scheme with the remains subject to preservation in situ.
- 2.1.4 There is the possibility for archaeology to be present within the wider Appeal site. These have been interpreted as cropmarks and geophysical anomalies likely to result from agricultural activity during the medieval and post-medieval period. In particular, there is evidence that these may relate to field systems associated with the deserted medieval village of Normanton.

3. Matters of Agreement

- 3.1.1 It is agreed between the parties that there is potential for archaeology to survive within the Appeal site. It is further agreed that this archaeology is likely to be of a low significance and associated with agricultural activity.
- 3.1.2 Given this potential, it is agreed that the Appeal site should be the subject of a programme of archaeological work. In the first instance this would comprise an archaeological evaluation, the scope and methodology of which would be agreed with the Council prior to works commencing.
- 3.1.3 The results of the archaeological evaluation will be analysed by both parties to establish what, if any, further works are required. These will prioritise preservation in site through review of construction methodologies. Where preservation in situ is not feasible, a strategy for further archaeological fieldwork will be established. This process will be set out in an Archaeological mitigation Strategy, to be agreed by the Council.
- 3.1.4 It is agreed between the parties that this potential can be secured through a suitably worded planning condition such as:

1 - No development shall take place, including any enabling works such as site clearance works, soil moving, temporary access or compound construction, or any operations involving the use of construction machinery, until a programme for archaeological evaluation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The programme shall detail the scope of proposed evaluation work, its timings, and objectives and be drawn up by and thereafter undertaken by suitably experienced archaeologists from a professionally accredited archaeological organisation. The programme should make provision for the local planning authority's archaeological advisors to be informed of works and to be allowed access to the site. The findings of the evaluation shall thereafter be published and submitted in writing to the local planning authority.

2 - No development shall take place other than in accordance with an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority following the completion of the archaeological evaluation in accordance with Condition 1 (above). The AMS shall include provision for any mitigation or monitoring work as informed by the archaeological evaluation to be carried out by a suitably qualified archaeologist or archaeological organisation, and shall include provision for the excavation/preservation of archaeological features as appropriate to their level of significance, to be approved in writing by the local planning authority. An archaeological management plan will be required for any archaeological features preserved in-situ. A written report detailing the results and post investigation assessments of any archaeological works shall thereafter be submitted to the local planning authority for local publication within a timeframe to be approved in writing by the local planning authority. No development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved AMS.

It is agreed that subject to the imposition of the above condition, archaeology impacts are acceptable and do not form a reason for refusal.