



LAND WEST OF BRADMORE ROAD AND NORTH OF WYSALL
ROAD, WYSALL, NOTTINGHAM, NG12 5QZ -

LPA ref: 24/00161/FUL

PINS ref: APP/P3040/W/25/3375110

Proof of Evidence of

Simon Higson BA (Hons), MA, CMLI

Prepared for Rushcliffe Borough Council

and



February 2026

Felstone Consulting Limited

Email: contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk Web: www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk

Registered Office: 3 Princes Court, Royal Way, Loughborough, LE11 5XR. Company Registration Number: 14177017

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REPORT	1
2	AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT WITH LVIA BASELINE	3
3	SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS	6
4	SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS.....	9
5	LANDSCAPE STRATEGY PLANS.....	13
6	MATTERS IN DISPUTE	16

TABLES

Table SHP1 - Summary of disagreement with Updated LVIA baseline

Table SHP-2 – Summary Comparison of Landscape Effects (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SHP-3 – Summary Comparison of Landscape Effects (Cumulative)

Table SHP-4 – Summary of Visual Effects for Main Receptor Groups (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SHP-5 – Summary of Visual Effects for Main Receptor Groups (Cumulative)

Table SHP6 – Summary of Changes between the alternative Landscape Strategy Plans

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	S Higson's Landscape and Visual Assessment
Appendix 2	S Higson's LVIA Figures
Appendix 3	S Higson's LVIA Context Photographs

1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REPORT

1.1 Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1.1 I am Simon James Higson, Director at Felstone Consulting Limited (Felstone), a Practice Registered with the Landscape Institute.
- 1.1.2 I am a Chartered Landscape Architect and Chartered Horticulturist with over 20 years of professional experience. I have a BA (Hons) degree in Landscape Architecture from Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education (1998) and MA in Landscape Architecture from Leeds Metropolitan University (2000).
- 1.1.3 I have provided landscape planning, assessment, design and management advice in relation to a wide range of project work.
- 1.1.4 I have previously acted both as landscape expert witness and supported other witnesses. I was instructed by Heatons, on behalf of Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC) in November 2025 to act as landscape expert witness for the appeal.
- 1.1.5 I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

- 1.2.1 This document is my proof of evidence and sets out my assessment of landscape and visual effects, in so far as they relate to the reasons for refusal in the Decision Notice of 19th June 2025. The proposed development is a full planning application for the *“Construction, operation and subsequent decommissioning of a renewable energy park comprising ground mounted Solar PV with co-located battery energy storage system (BESS) at the point of connection, together with associated infrastructure, access, landscaping and cabling”*.
- 1.2.2 This proof of evidence is a summary of my findings. Appendix 1 is my own Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which is based on desk-top research and field work to the Study Area. Appendix 2 contains my LVIA figures and my context photographs are available in Appendix 3.

1.2.3 As was requested during the Case Management Meeting (CMC) on 7th January 2026, I have considered both the landscape strategy plan submitted during the application (CD1.28) and the 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan submitted as part of the appeal (CD 3.6).

2 AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT WITH LVIA BASELINE

2.1.1 Table SHP-1 below summarises where I disagree with the description of the baseline in Pegasus' Updated LVIA submitted following consultation responses to the planning application (CD 2.16) and discussed in more detail in my LVIA in Appendix 1 (with paragraph numbers in brackets).

Table SHP1 – Summary of disagreement with Updated LVIA baseline

Pegasus' Updated LVIA (CD 2.16)	S. Higson LVIA in Appendix 1
<i>arable fields separate the two parcels (2.1)</i>	In addition to the arable fields, there is a block of woodland positioned between Field 7 and 11. The eastern extent of the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm will also be located between Fields 3 and 11 of the Appeal Site (3.2.6)
<i>inter-visibility between the Development's northern and southern parcels is limited (2.3)</i>	There is visibility of the two parcels from the PRoW Wysall FP3 and Costock FP7, as well as from Wysall FP4. For example, refer to Pegasus Baseline Context Viewpoint 8 and my Context Photograph 5 both located within the northern parcel with views over the southern parcel (3.2.7)
<i>relatively tall hedgerows...which are characteristic of this landscape (2.12)</i>	Pegasus' viewpoint photographs show baseline views over the top of hedges. Based on the stated camera heights of 1.5m above ground level, these demonstrate relatively low hedgerows (managed in places to c 1.2-1.5m high) being characteristic of this landscape (3.2.8)
<i>the village of Wysall and Costock both lie in close proximity, but the intervening vegetation prevents from gaining any direct or unrestricted views (2.14)</i>	There are windows at several dwellings within Wysall visible from the Appeal Site, as illustrated by my Context Photographs 6 and 7. In addition there are defined 'Significant Views' in the Wysall Conservation Area Appraisal from Costock Road which I consider to be from within the village and has views of the Appeal site, as illustrated by my Context Photographs 14 and 16 (3.2.9)
No mention of Notts Wolds Way	As indicated on my Context Photograph 4 there is a waymarker post on PRoW Wysall FP3 within the Appeal Site referring to Notts Wolds Way. This route was also referenced in the consultation response from the Ramblers (CD 4.17) and is described in the

	online booklet published by Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society (3.2.10)
Description of the landscape is restricted to elements and features and overall character (2.1 to 2.19)	<p>There is no separate baseline assessment of aesthetic or perceptual aspects relating to the Appeal Site. The assessment therefore does not comply with GLVIA3 paragraph 5.4, bullet point 3 or paragraph 5.34 bullet point 1 (3.2.1 and 3.2.2)</p> <p>I have identified the following for the Appeal Site: medium scale, simple appearance, openness and sense of tranquillity. The Appeal Site has intrinsic beauty, with its distinctiveness and appeal enhanced by views of heritage assets such as Holy Trinity Church, ecological assets such as Bunny Old Wood, as well as longer distanced views of the Nottinghamshire Wolds and Charnwood from elevated areas (3.2.30)</p>
<i>identifies the site and study area fall within the National Character Area (NCA) 74 'Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds' (5.4)</i>	Whilst I agree that most of the Appeal Site and surrounding area are located within the NCA 74, part of the northern parcel (and northern study area beyond) is within NCA 48 'Trent and Belvoir Vales' (3.2.32)
<i>identifies the site falls within the 'Nottinghamshire Wolds' Regional Character Area, and the eastern most part of Draft Policy Zone NW01 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' (5.10)with regard to the neighbouring NW02 and NW03, the Development is not located within these landscapes (5.50)</i>	Whilst I agree that most of the Appeal Site and surrounding area to the west are located within NW01, a relatively small part of the Appeal Site (relating to the areas around each of the new site access points into each parcel and the buried cable connection between the parcels) is located within the adjacent NW03 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds' (3.2.38)
<i>the value of the local landscape is considered to be medium, being a pleasant working undesignated countryside, and without any demonstrable physical attributes that would take it out of the ordinary (5.27).</i>	I have concluded that the Appeal Site has Medium to High landscape value. This reflects the recreational opportunities along PRoW, ecological and cultural heritage interest of nearby assets, as well as scenic quality and extensive views from higher ground (3.3.3)
<i>In summary, the visual envelope of the Development does not extend towards Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill road, and this gives evidence of its highly localised effects (6.50)</i>	I have included a view of the Appeal Site from A60 'Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill Road' as my Context Photograph 9, to supplement those along the elevated PRoW network to the south (southeast and southwest), and have concluded that visibility would extend beyond localised and for c. 2km due to its valley side position, elevation range and undulating topography (5.5.23)

<p><i>The assessment of the Development, updated in October 2024, has concluded that out of the assessed 8 no. viewpoints... (8.70)</i></p>	<p>8 viewpoints are inadequate for a project of this scale and at this location / context. It is not consistent with the approach used in the LVIA that accompanied planning application for the adjacent scheme 22/00303/FUL (also prepared by Pegasus, February 2022) which identified 10 representative viewpoints subject to detailed visual assessment (4.3.3).</p> <p>I would suggest that the following views should have been specifically assessed as part of the LVIA during the application stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the 'Significant Views' from the track leading from Costock Road in the southwest of Wysall Conservation Area (my Context Photographs 14 and 16); and• my Context Photograph 8, from Costock FP4 next to the memorial bench near to Canaan Farm looking north-east towards the Appeal Site.
---	--

3 SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

3.1 Proposed Development in Isolation

3.1.1 My detailed re-assessment of landscape effects for the proposed development in isolation is set out in Section 3 of my Appendix 1. I have prepared a summary comparison Table SHP-2 below with the gradings from Pegasus' Updated LVIA.

3.1.2 In relation to landscape elements and features within the Appeal Site, I have identified major and adverse effects upon PROW, moderate adverse effects to the land cover and minor adverse effects upon topography. I have also identified minor adverse effects to the hedgerow resource in Year 1, rising to moderate adverse in Year 15. Whilst I have identified a negligible beneficial effect upon the tree resource in Year 1, this rises to moderate beneficial by Year 15.

3.1.3 I have also concluded that there would be major and adverse effects upon aesthetic and perceptual aspects (the existing medium scale, simple appearance, openness and sense of tranquillity) and the overall landscape character of the Appeal Site. The proposals would introduce new industrialising elements to the landscape introducing a fundamental change to agricultural land, experienced from several well-used PROWs that pass through the Appeal Site.

3.1.4 In terms of changes to local landscape character, I identify minor adverse effects upon the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps', with negligible to minor adverse effects upon the 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds' when the proposals are taken in isolation.

Table SHP-2 Summary Comparison of Landscape Effects (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Receptor	Pegasus' Updated LVIA	S. Higson LVIA in Appendix 1
Land Cover*	Moderate Beneficial	Moderate Adverse
Topography	Negligible	Minor Adverse
Tree and Hedgerow Resource	Major Beneficial	Hedgerow Resource – Minor Adverse Year 1, Moderate Adverse Year 15 Tree Resource – Negligible Beneficial Year 1, Moderate Beneficial by Year 15
PRoW	Nil	Major Adverse
Water Features	Nil	Negligible Neutral
Aesthetic and Perceptual Aspects**	-	Major Adverse
Character of the Appeal Site	Moderate*** Adverse (Year 1), Minor Adverse (Year 15)	Major Adverse
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	Minor adverse	Minor Adverse
Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'**	-	Negligible to Minor Adverse

*Receptor described as Ground Cover Vegetation in Pegasus' updated LVIA

**Receptor not assessed in Pegasus' updated LVIA

***Impact downgraded from Major in Pegasus' LVIA to Moderate in Pegasus' updated LVIA

3.2 Cumulative Effects of Proposed Development

3.2.1 My detailed re-assessment of cumulative landscape effects of the proposed development in conjunction with consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm, Bunny Hill, Costock is set out in Section 3 of my Appendix 1. I have prepared a summary comparison Table SHP-3 below with gradings from Pegasus' Updated LVIA, where available.

3.2.2 In terms of changes to local landscape character, I identify moderate adverse cumulative effect upon the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'. The combined area of the two solar farms would be much larger than the character area's namesakes of Gotham and West Leake, creating a new dominant feature / characteristic element for the area.

3.2.3 There would also be minor adverse cumulative effects upon the 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'.

Table SHP-3 Summary Comparison of Landscape Effects (Cumulative)

Receptor	Pegasus' Updated LVIA	S. Higson LVIA in Appendix 1
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	Minor adverse	Moderate Adverse
Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'*	-	Minor Adverse

*Receptor not assessed in Pegasus' updated LVIA

4 SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS

4.1 Proposed Development in Isolation

4.1.1 My detailed re-assessment of visual effects for the proposed development in isolation is set out in Section 4 of my Appendix 1, including predicted changes at individual viewpoints. I have prepared a summary Table SHP-4 for each of the main receptor groups below. I have not been able to identify an equivalent summary from Pegasus' Updated LVIA for comparison.

4.1.2 There are over 1.2km of public footpaths (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4) which extend through the Appeal Site and connect to other PRoWs to the north and east. These routes extend over higher ground, with important expansive views, including part of the Notts Wolds Way and Midshires Way. I have identified major adverse visual effects upon recreational users of these routes.

4.1.3 There are more distant PRoWs (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3) to the south which extend for over 3km from Costock to Wysall Road, Wymeswold, via Wysall Lane. In addition, there are views from other PRoW to the south, such as Thorpe in the Glebe FP7, near to Windyridge Farm. I have identified negligible (to moderate) and adverse effects for those recreational receptors in the range of 1-2km away to the south.

4.1.4 Moderate adverse effects are identified for local residents to the east and within the valley to the south of the Appeal site in Year 1, although by Year 15 effects these would reduce to negligible (to moderate) and neutral (to adverse). This would depend on the time of year and growth of the mitigation planting. This includes the 'Significant Views' from the track leading from Costock Road in the southwest Wysall Conservation Area.

4.1.5 I have also identified negligible to moderate adverse effects for local residents on elevated land to the south of the Appeal site, for the proposals considered in isolation.

4.1.6 There would be minor and adverse effects during Year 1 for users of the local road network overall, reducing to negligible (to minor) and neutral (to adverse) by Year 15. However, the sections of Wysall Road and Rempstone Road which pass by the southern access would have clear views into the site. Parts of Costock Road and sections of Bradmore Road, which passes by the northern access would also offer transient views.

Table SHP-4 Summary of Visual Effects for Main Receptor Groups (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Visual Receptor Groups		S. Higson LVIA in Appendix 1
Users of PRoW within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way	Year 1 and Year 15	Major Adverse
Users of PRoW to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3)	Year 1	Negligible (to Moderate) Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Moderate) Adverse
Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site	Year 1	Moderate Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Moderate) Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge	Year 1	Moderate Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Moderate) Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site, including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm, Hillcrest Farm and Windyridge Farm	Year 1	Negligible (to Moderate) Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Moderate) Adverse
Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60	Year 1	Minor Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Minor) Neutral (to Adverse)

4.2 Cumulative Effects of Proposed Development

- 4.2.1 My detailed re-assessment of cumulative visual effects is set out in Section 4 of my Appendix 1 including predicted changes at individual viewpoints. I have a prepared summary Table SHP-5 of cumulative visual effects for each of the main receptor groups.
- 4.2.2 There would be major adverse cumulative visual effects upon recreational users of the public footpaths (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4) which extend through the Appeal Site and connect to other PRoWs to the north and east.
- 4.2.3 I have identified moderate adverse cumulative visual effects for users of the more distant PRoWs (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8, HG61/3 and Thorpe in the Glebe FP7) to the south.
- 4.2.4 Moderate adverse cumulative visual effects are identified for local residents to the east and within the valley to the south of the Appeal site in Year 1, although by Year 15 effects would reduce to negligible (to moderate) and neutral (to adverse).
- 4.2.5 I have also identified moderate adverse cumulative visual effects for local residents on elevated land to the south of the Appeal site.
- 4.2.6 There would be minor and adverse cumulative visual effects during Year 1 for users of the local road network overall, reducing to negligible (to minor) and neutral (to adverse) by Year 15.
- 4.2.7 I would also note that cumulative visualisations have not been submitted to assist decision-makers. I consider this to be below the required standard, especially given the specific request as part of the initial consultation response from WWA (CD 4.64).

Table SHP-5 Summary of Visual Effects for Main Receptor Groups (Cumulative)

Visual Receptor Groups		S. Higson LVIA in Appendix 1
Users of PRoW within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way	Year 1 and Year 15	Major Adverse
Users of PRoW to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3)	Year 1	Moderate Adverse
	Year 15	Moderate Adverse
Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site	Year 1	Moderate Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Moderate) Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge	Year 1	Moderate Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Moderate) Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site, including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm, Hillcrest Farm and Windyridge Farm	Year 1	Moderate Adverse
	Year 15	Moderate Adverse
Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60	Year 1	Minor Adverse
	Year 15	Negligible (to Minor) Neutral (to Adverse)

5 LANDSCAPE STRATEGY PLANS

5.1 Comparison between the plans

5.1.1 My detailed re-assessment in Appendix 1 considers the alternative landscape strategy plans, including within Section 5.6. I have prepared a summary Table SHP-6 below of the changes referenced in the Appellant's Landscape Hearing Statement para 1.17. (CD 8.2.1).

5.1.2 The 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would not alter the overall landscape assessment gradings. There would be an increase in visual enclosure for certain locations through additional planting intended to fill in gaps and correct omissions in the original submission.

5.1.3 In terms of visual impact, the additional planting shown within the southern parcel would likely increase the level of screening for residents to the east and within the valley to the south of the Appeal site by Year 15 and when in leaf. However, some of the existing longer distance views over arable fields would also be lost (at certain positions).

5.1.4 I also note that the proposed construction laydown area to the north of the new access road from Bradmore Road is now shown as part of the "*retained arable land managed for nesting skylark introduced through the appeal*" on the enhanced landscape strategy. However, there is no explanation of where the construction compound would be relocated to in the Appellant's Summary of Changes Document (CD 3.4).

5.2 Changes to PRoW Wysall FP3

5.2.1 The alignment of Wysall FP3 was incorrectly drawn on the submitted plan and its position has also been adjusted on the enhanced landscape strategy plan.

5.2.2 This discrepancy is illustrated by the photomontages provided at Viewpoint 8 (CD 1.10), where the proposed fencing and gate and mitigation planting encroaches onto the worn pathway across the arable field.

5.2.3 The result is an obstruction of Wysall FP3. Also refer to my Figure SH-14 which is my overlay of submitted landscape strategy (PRoW as orange long dash) and enhanced landscape strategy (PRoW as orange dots). However, this alteration has not been identified in the Appellant's Landscape Hearing Statement or on the summary of

changes plan (CD.35).

5.2.4 I would also query the Footpath Buffer Distances plan (CD 2.9) where the incorrect position of the PRoW in relation to the fencing is misleading. The footpath buffers should in any case be measured from the new mitigation hedgerow planting which are not shown on this drawing and the stated width of the proposed corridors is therefore incorrect.

5.3 Changes to PRoW Wysall FP4, Security Fencing and Gate in Fields 5 & 6

5.3.1 The alignment of Wysall FP4 was also incorrectly drawn on the submitted plan and its position has also been adjusted on the enhanced landscape strategy plan.

5.3.2 The 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan consequently also includes an amendment to the alignment of the security fencing and gate in Fields 5 & 6 to avoid the obstruction of PRoW Wysall FP4. However, the alteration of the access track to pass through the existing hedgeline has not been identified in the Appellant's Landscape Hearing Statement or on the summary of changes plan (CD.35). As above, I would also query the Footpath Buffer Distances plan (CD2.9) where the incorrect position of the PRoW in relation to the fencing and lack of new hedgerows is misleading.

5.3.3 I would also query the review of potential cumulative visual effects assessment of Highfields Viewpoint 4 in Table 2 of the Updated LVIA. This viewpoint is positioned on the PRoW Wysall FP4 by the area of the security fencing obstruction. The Updated LVIA suggested major cumulative visual effects at Year 1 reducing to negligible at Year 15, due to the proposed maturing mitigation planting. However, there is no mitigation planting that would provide screening alongside this footpath on the submitted plans. There is no mention of the fencing obstructing the path.

Table SHP6 – Summary of Changes between the alternative Landscape Strategy Plans

Appellants Landscape Hearing Statement	S. Higson LVIA in Appendix 1
<i>a. the addition of hedgerow trees along the southern boundary of Field 3</i>	There is potential for additional thickening of part of the boundary by Year 15, although solar panels extending up the slopes are still anticipated to be visible from elevated positions (e.g. PRoW to southwest).
<i>b. the addition of a small scale linear copse along the eastern boundary of Field 15.</i> <i>c. the addition of hedgerow trees withing the internal hedgerows, between Fields 12 and 15, Field 14 and 15, and Field 13 and 14</i>	This would relate to local residents to the east of the Appeal Site and within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, users of permissive footpaths and also the defined 'Significant Views' in the CAAMP, on the Costock Road. There is potential for additional screening of the solar panels by Year 15 at these locations, although in winter views will still be filtered. During the summer, when the additional trees are in leaf, the existing longer distance views over arable fields will also be lost.
<i>d. The route of Public Footpath Wysall FP4 confirmed to coincide with an existing agricultural track leading from Bradmore Road into the Appeal site</i>	The route of Wysall FP4 had been incorrectly drawn on the submitted plans. When positioned on its correct alignment on the enhanced landscape strategy it would have conflicted with the submitted security fence and gates, creating an obstruction to the PRoW. Associated with the amendment to the PRoW route on the enhanced landscape strategy plans, the security fencing and access track have been re-aligned with a new cut through the existing hedge.
<i>e. Omission of the previously proposed hedgerow along the northern edge of Field 9</i>	This is simply no longer required due to the error of the incorrectly drawn route of Wysall FP4 on the submitted landscape strategy plan noted above.
<i>f. Additional hedgerow to the southern edge of Field 5 and Field 6 to enclose Public Footpath Wysall FP4 to the north.</i>	This would also relate to users of the footpath and the adjustments associated with the incorrectly drawn route of Wysall FP4 on the submitted landscape strategy plan noted above. The new hedgerow planting, in conjunction with the existing hedge would create a corridor and inevitably reduce the wide expansive views currently obtained along this route. Also refer to Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4 Wysall FP4.

6 MATTERS IN DISPUTE

6.1.1 I have concluded that the proposal would not recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the landscape and would be contrary to paragraph 180(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

6.1.2 The proposals would not be sensitive to its location (by obstructing the route of PRoW, diverting existing desire lines and enclosing views) or be matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic (by extending industrial scale solar development over more visible higher ground) and as such would be contrary to paragraph 4.7.2 of NPS EN-1.

6.1.3 The proposals also conflict with NPS EN-3, paragraph 2.10.35 with adverse visual impacts identified for users of the PRoWs within the Appeal Site, reducing their ability to appreciate the surrounding landscapes.

6.1.4 The proposals would not comply with Rushcliffe LP1 Policy 10 or LPP2 Policies 1, 1, 22 and 34 as it would not conserve or enhance the appearance or character of the landscape, field patterns or views. It would degrade and not reinforce valued local characteristics.

6.1.5 The proposals do not align with the Key Design Principles for the siting of solar projects in the 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' character area. The Appeal Site is well away from the areas identified as being more appropriate for further large-scale solar projects.

6.1.6 The inclusion of solar on the higher ground of the northern parcel also conflicts with the Key Design Principles for the character area, which encourages development to be nestled on low ground. Consequently, the visual effects would not be restricted to localised areas.

6.1.7 In terms of cumulative effects, there would be combined, successive and sequential visibility of the two solar farms. Once constructed, they would become a new dominant feature / characteristic element for the local 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' character area, with the proposed development tipping the balance through its additional effects.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 3



Felstone Consulting Limited

Email: contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk Web: www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk

Registered Office: 3 Princes Court, Royal Way, Loughborough, LE11 5XR. Company Registration Number: 14177017