



Landscape Statement of Common Ground between Renewable Energy Systems Ltd and Rushcliffe Borough Council

Land East of Hawksworth and Northwest of Thoroton



Date: 04/06/2024 | Pegasus Ref: P24-0105

PINS Ref: APP/P3040/W/23/3330045



Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
Revision B	04.06.2024	CR/AC	CR/AC/RB	-

Signed: 	Signed: 
Name: Robert Browne	Name: Andrew Cook
Job Title: Director, Wynne-Williams On behalf of Rushcliffe Borough Council	Job Title: Executive Director, Pegasus Group On behalf of Renewable Energy Systems Ltd



Contents.

1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE	3
2. MATTERS AGREED AND NOT AGREED	3
Matters agreed	3
Landscape and Visual Effects	3
Glint and Glare	4
Amenity of Nearby Properties	4
Decommissioning And Reinstatement of Land	4
Vehicular Access and Traffic	4
Impact on Public Rights of Ways (PROW)	4
Matters not agreed	4

Appendices contents.

Appendix 1: Visual Summary Comparison Schedule between the Appellant, Hawksworth and Thoroton Action Group (HTAG) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC)	6
--	---



1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

- 1.1. This Landscape Statement of Common Ground (“**LSoCG**”) is made between the following parties:
 - a) Renewable Energy Systems Ltd (the “**Appellant**”); and
 - b) Rushcliffe Borough Council (**RBC** or the “**Council**”)
- 1.2. together the “**Parties**”.
- 1.3. This LSoCG has been jointly prepared by the Appellant and the Council and establishes the landscape matters on which the Parties agree and disagree.
- 1.4. Appendix 1 of this LSoCG is a Scott Schedule which sets out the visual effects as assessed by the Appellant, Hawksworth and Thoroton Action Group (HTAG) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC).
- 1.5. This LSoCG should be read in conjunction with the overarching SoCG between the Appellant and the Council which sets out the following sections concerning the appeal: factual background; minor amendments to the scheme; description of appeal site and planning history; the appeal proposal; planning policy; matters agreed and not agreed; and, draft planning conditions.
- 1.6. Matters agreed and not agreed which relate to landscape and visual are replicated in this document.

2. MATTERS AGREED AND NOT AGREED

Matters agreed

Landscape and Visual Effects

- 2.1. That the methodology used for the Landscape and Visual Appraisal and subsequent addendums was sound and in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3).
- 2.2. That any adverse landscape or visual effects associated with the infrastructure of the Proposed Development should be considered for the lifetime of the solar farm, but are reversible.
- 2.3. That the effects on both landscape (character and elements) and visual receptors would be localised.
- 2.4. That the landscape proposals associated with the Proposed Development would result in a net gain in the hedgerow and tree resource within the site.
- 2.5. That the site is not part of a valued landscape within the meaning of para 180(a) of NPPF.
- 2.6. Both parties have assessed the site as being of medium value and medium sensitivity.

Glint and Glare

- 2.7. The glint and glare assessment concludes that there would be no significant impact on residential properties.
- 2.8. That some Glint and Glare impact may arise, the proposed landscaping has been designed to mitigate this impact.

Amenity of Nearby Properties

- 2.9. The glint and glare assessment considered above also concludes that there would be no significant impact on residential properties following the establishment of mitigation measures through planting.
- 2.10. During construction, a construction method statement has been provided to protect residential amenity.
- 2.11. The proposal is acceptable in regard to its impact on residential amenity and accords with relevant planning policy.
- 2.12. Impacts arising from construction are suitably mitigated through the submitted construction method statement and there are no objections to the proposal from the Council's Environmental Health Officer.

Decommissioning And Reinstatement of Land

- 2.13. At the end of the operational lifespan (40 years), the solar panels and the majority of other infrastructure would be removed, and the site restored to agricultural use.

Vehicular Access and Traffic

- 2.14. It is proposed that the site would be accessed from a new vehicular access point off Thoroton Road. Required visibility splays will be provided by removing a small section of hedgerow (13.3 metres but compensated by new hedgerow planting within the site).

Impact on Public Rights of Ways (PROW)

- 2.15. The Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way Team is satisfied that the development has retained the Rights of Way in their current location to acceptable terms and has no objection to the proposals.

Matters not agreed

- 2.16. The effects of the Proposed Development on landscape character and visual amenity.
- 2.17. The level of intervisibility between the two settlements.
- 2.18. The site's susceptibility to the appeal scheme proposals; the Appellant has assessed the susceptibility as medium and the Council as high susceptibility.



- 2.19. To what extent the proposed appeal scheme would be at odds with the existing pattern of land use.
- 2.20. The magnitude of change to the character of the site during construction/decommissioning and the operational phases of the appeal scheme proposals.
- 2.21. The effect on the landscape character of the site during construction/decommissioning and the operational phases of the appeal scheme proposals.
- 2.22. The magnitude of change to the character of the landscape beyond the site during construction/decommissioning and the operational phases of the appeal scheme proposals.
- 2.23. The effect on the landscape character beyond the site during construction/decommissioning and the operational phases of the appeal scheme proposals.
- 2.24. To what extent the proposed landscape mitigation planting and management of the existing landscape features on the site can reduce the adverse landscape and visual effects associated with the appeal scheme proposals.
- 2.25. The value, susceptibility and sensitivity of the receptors at the eight representative viewpoints included in the Neo Environmental LVA (see Appendix 1).
- 2.26. The magnitude of change to the receptors at the eight LVA viewpoints during the construction/decommissioning and the operational phases of the appeal scheme proposals (see Appendix 1).
- 2.27. The assessment of the effects upon the receptors at the eight LVIA viewpoints during the construction/decommissioning and the operational phases of the appeal scheme proposals (see Appendix 1).



Appendix 1: Visual Summary Comparison Schedule between the Appellant, Hawksworth and Thoroton Action Group (HTAG) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC)

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RO

We are ISO certified **9001 14001 45001**



Pegasus_Group



@pegasusgroup



Pegasus_Group

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK