

When telephoning, please ask for: Tracey Coop
Direct dial 0115 914 8481
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 1 March 2023

To all Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

Planning Committee – Thursday, 9 March 2023

The following is a schedule of representations received after the agenda for the Planning Committee was finalised.

Yours sincerely



Gemma Dennis
Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

4. Planning Applications (Pages 1 - 6)

The report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth

Membership

Chairman: Councillor R Butler
Vice-Chairman: Councillor Mrs M Stockwood
Councillors: B Bansal, S Bailey, N Clarke, L Healy, D Mason, F Purdue-Horan,
V Price, C Thomas and J Walker

Rushcliffe Borough
Council Customer
Service Centre

Fountain Court
Gordon Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 5LN

Email:
customerservices
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Opening hours:
**Monday, Tuesday and
Thursday**
8.30am - 5pm
Wednesday
9.30am - 5pm
Friday
8.30am - 4.30pm

Postal address
Rushcliffe Borough
Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble at the far side of the plaza outside the main entrance to the building.

Toilets: are located to the rear of the building near the lift and stairs to the first floor.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

Recording at Meetings

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 allows filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control.

Rushcliffe Borough Council is committed to being open and transparent in its decision making. As such, the Council will undertake audio recording of meetings which are open to the public, except where it is resolved that the public be excluded, as the information being discussed is confidential or otherwise exempt.

22/00319/FUL**Applicant** Renewable Energy Systems (RES) Ltd**Location** Land to the West Of Wood Lane And Stocking Lane
Kingston Estate, Gotham, Nottinghamshire, NG11 0LF**Proposal** Installation of renewable energy generating solar farm comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays, together with substation, inverter stations, security measures, site access, internal access tracks and other ancillary infrastructure, including landscaping and biodiversity enhancements**Ward(s)** Gotham / East Leake**COMMITTEE UPDATE**

Since the committee report has been published the applicant has confirmed the following:

1. There would be no vehicular access to the site via Stocking Lane either for construction, operation or decommission of the site.
2. That field 16 and the remainder of 15 where solar panels are no longer proposed part of the proposal and therefore would remain in agricultural use for the lifetime of the project

COMMITTEE REPORT

The following changes are highlighted to the committee report:

Ward: For clarity - The application site falls within 2 Wards, Gotham and East Leake.

Paragraphs 6 / 125 / 154: It states there is a detached dwelling known as “Cuckoo Bush Farm (aka Pine Lodge)”. The house on the northern parcel of land is known as Cuckoo Bush Farm and not Pine Lodge. The location of Pine Lodge is to the south of the application site by Rushcliffe Golf Club, not directly overlooking it.

Paragraphs 13 / 243: Following a reduction in the developable area, the applicant confirms that the Carbon savings would be 20,000 cubic tonnes per year instead of 25,000 cubic tonnes per year. Likewise, the development would provide energy for approximately 12,400 homes and not 15,200 homes per year.

Paragraph 15: Reference is made that the panels would be 6.3m apart, at some points on the site, they would be 2m apart.

Paragraphs 22 / 58 – It is stated that “The landscape enhancement measures would remain as would the proposed access from the A60 public road (Bunny Hill).” It should

read “The landscape enhancement measures would remain as would the proposed access improvement from Kegworth Road.” Kegworth Road is the only proposed point of access (via Wood Lane).

Paragraph 56 – For the avoidance of doubt CBRE comments and comments from Rushcliffe Golf Course have been included the Local Residence and General Public comment section of the report.

Paragraph 97 – It is stated that the point of connection would be on the southern part of the site, it would be on the northern part.

Paragraph 116 – It stated in the report the impact that the visual impact of the development in terms of the overall level of harm ranges from a “moderate adverse” to “major adverse”. The applicant notes that the minor-moderate adverse harm is limited to views from the PRoW at the northern end of development field 15 and the impact along the same PRoW towards the southern end of field 15 to increase to a moderate-major level at Year 10, but the southern parcel has been removed from the proposals and therefore impact from the public footpath at this point would be “minor-moderate adverse”.

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Ward member. – representation

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr C Thomas

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- Based on the anticipated landscape and visual harm, the proposals should be refused on the basis very special circumstances have not been demonstrated
- There has been insufficient consideration of the impact on local wildlife sites and wildlife corridors
- The development would have an adverse impact on the extract of gypsum and there have been mining works on the site and in the area which may prohibit development and could be dangerous.
- The security fencing would be contrary to the recommendation of the crime prevention officer who suggests a more secure fence which would improve security but would have a greater harmful visual impact
- There are no conditions relating to tree protection measures

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report and submitted information. For information, in relation to trees the Arboricultural Impact Assessment in the chapter relating to Tree Protection and Site Recommendations. In relation to the fence design, it is considered under “Other Matters” within with the report and it is noted that the Crime Prevention Officer is not objecting to the application and provides comment on fence design as advice and recommendations.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: Fairview, East Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The development would have a harmful impact on wildlife
- It would lead to glare affecting aircrafts
- The noise associated with the development would be harmful
- It would adversely affect the natural beauty of the area

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: Foxhill Barn Stocking Lane West Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The application should be refused based on the visual impact and therefore, no special circumstances
- It would be an industrial development
- The conclusions of the visual harm have been underestimated

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report.

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: 1 Tomlinson Avenue Gotham

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The development would have an adverse impact on the approved Nature Conservation Strategy and the application should be refused

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: 30 Brookfield Way East Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The development would destroy the beauty of the countryside and would be an ineffective form of development

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report

6. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: 48 Sharpley Drive East Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The development would have a harmful impact on the users (including animals) of the footpaths and PROWs.
- The beauty of the countryside in this location would be harmed

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report

7. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: 3 Woodroffe Way East Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The development would not comply with Government Policy based on the time taken to consider the application

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The applicant has agreed submitted further information to address concerns about the proposals, an extension of the time has been agreed with the

application in accordance with the planning legislation and guidance. This approach is not contrary to government policy.

8. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: Pine Lodge, Stocking Lane East Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- There would be no special circumstances and the development is not justified on this basis
- There would be a harmful impact on food generation
- It would lead to business rates contributions

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report.

9. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation – objection

RECEIVED FROM: Foxhill Barn Stocking Lane East Leake

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The development would operate at a reduced capacity and therefore the benefits of the proposals relating of carbon savings would not be realised
- It should be located in other locations outside of the green belt

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted. These matters are already address in the committee report. The calculation of the carbon savings are based on the anticipated kilo watts per hour it would produce rather than the installed electrical capacity of the site. This has already been factored into the calculations to estimate carbon savings.

This page is intentionally left blank