

# Consultee Comments for Planning Application 24/00161/FUL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00161/FUL

Address: Land West Of Bradmore Road And North Of Wysall Road Land West Of Wysall Wysall

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gareth Elliott

## Consultee Details

Name: Conservation Officer

Address: Rushcliffe Borough Council, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire NG2 7YG

Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Conservation Officer

## Comments

Thank you for reconsulting me on this application. I visited the site in Spring 2024 to understand the landscape and heritage assets affected. I previously raised concerns about the proposal in line with those of Historic England and agreed with HEs assessment.

The proposal site is located west of the Wysall Conservation Area. Some associated infrastructure works would affect the Conservation Area as it would run through the village. There are listed buildings nearby, including the Grade I listed Church of Holy Trinity Holy Trinity Church, Main Street and the adjacent Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse, Main Street. West of the proposal site is the Grade II listed building Highfields, Nottingham Road. There is a public footpath found running from the village centre east to west out into the countryside west of the village and then turning north where it branches northwest to Bunny Wood and northeast to Bradmore Road.

Therefore, the impact of the proposal on the special interest of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area must be given consideration.

## Assessment

Wysall Conservation Area is an attractive rural village of which a key characteristic is the connection with the open countryside provided by views to and from the settlement as well as the rural approaches along tree and hedge-lined routes. Furthermore, views along the northern approach are identifiable and deemed a significant contributor to the conservation areas rural character. The villages wider landscape setting is predominantly arable fields.

Holy Trinity Church is located to the village centre and is associated with multiple identified views,

a focal point and other features identified on the Conservation Areas Townscape appraisal plan. The church retains fabric from the 12th century suggesting it dates to at least that time, however, the building has been adapted across multiple phases from the 13th to the 19th century. The interior has a roof of great architectural and historic interest, dating wholly from the 15th century and of two different roof forms, both well made. Externally, the church has undergone some alterations, most obviously to the roof structure. Holy Trinity is set within a key location of the village, and its immediate environs are built up with soft landscaping and strong connecting views across the settlement. Beyond its individual significance the contribution it makes to the settlement is high. The 13th century tower is a primary focal point and key landmark both within and from the wider surrounding landscape. Its primarily rural setting is a key contribution to the church's overall significance.

Manor Farmhouse to the west of the settlement is primarily 17th to 18th century yet is likely to have had an earlier phase evidenced by a stair turret and older fabric. The principal structure has architecturally interesting brick diaper work and is set on a stone plinth.

As well as Manor Farmhouse, Highfields is to the west of the main settlement and likely to be of 18th century origins. Historically associated with the Holy Cross Convent and Sir Thomas Parkyns of Bunny Hall, Highfields has been described as an intriguing building with unusual features in the Nottingham Pevsner. The setting of the property contributes highly to its significance as documentary evidence describes the use of a balcony on the roof to enjoy the wide-ranging views across the rural landscape.

Having reviewed the revised information, I consider the proposal would alter the contribution the rural landscape makes to the character and significance of the conservation area and the historic buildings. I would agree with HE's statement that enclosure of the proposed development is greater due to topography and existing vegetation than previously identified, therefore, the impact upon the setting of the conservation is mitigated. I agree with the conclusion that intervisibility to and from the listed buildings would be more limited by virtue of mature vegetation or forced views would be required to gain sight of these heritage assets from specific locations. Due to distance, landscape and vegetation any views are otherwise transitional when moving through the proposal site.

I agree that some concerns remain in terms of harm. This includes the site being visible within the wider landscape which in my view harms to the setting of Wysall, its landscape character and the nearby heritage assets. As landscape harm establishes this is likely to change and harm may be caused from within the site. I would refer you to the examples given by HE and would recommend that additional measures be sought to address visibility of the site within the wider landscape setting and from areas within the site. Historic England has suggested multiple mitigation measures across three paragraphs that are supported by Conservation. I would recommend that the Senior Landscape and Design Officer and the specialist Landscape Advisor be consulted for their expert specialist advice on these and other potential measures.

## Conclusion

For these reasons I consider that the proposal would cause harm to the designated heritage assets affected by the proposal. I consider the harm to be harm towards the middle of the less than substantial scale. As a result, the proposal would fail to achieve the objective described as desirable within Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 of preserving or enhancing the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses and preserving or enhancing the character and/or appearance of that area and would thus engage a strong and statutory presumption against granting planning permission.

As the level of harm is considered less than substantial permission could still be granted if it is concluded that public benefits outweigh harm through application of the test within Paragraph 215, NPPF (Dec 2024). In applying this test, it should be noted that it is not to be applied as a simple balance. Public benefits must not simply outweigh harm but must do so to a sufficient degree to justify departure from the statutory presumption against granting planning permission arising from the 1990 Act.

Ms Sera Baker, Conservation Officer  
Rushcliffe Borough Council