



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

Summary 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	SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS	1
3	SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS.....	2
4	MATTERS IN DISPUTE	3

1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REPORT

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This summary proof has been prepared by Simon James Higson, Director at Felstone Consulting Limited (Felstone), a Practice Registered with the Landscape Institute. It sets out my summary 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.

2 SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

2.1 Proposed Development in Isolation

- 2.1.1 My detailed re-assessment of landscape effects for the proposed development in isolation is set out in Section 3 of my Appendix 1.
- 2.1.2 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.
- 2.1.3 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.
- 2.1.4 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.

2.2 Cumulative Effects of Proposed Development

- 2.2.1 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.

2.2.2 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.

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

3 SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS

3.1 Proposed Development in Isolation

3.1.1 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.

3.1.2 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.

3.1.3 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.

3.1.4 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.

- 3.1.5 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.
- 3.1.6 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.

3.2 Cumulative Effects of Proposed Development

- 3.2.1 My detailed re-assessment of cumulative visual effects is set out in Section 4 of my Appendix 1 including predicted changes at individual viewpoints.
- 3.2.2 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.
- 3.2.3 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.
- 3.2.4 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).
- 3.2.5 I have also identified moderate adverse cumulative visual effects for local residents on elevated land to the south of the Appeal site.
- 3.2.6 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 MATTERS IN DISPUTE

- 4.1.1 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).
- 4.1.2 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.

- 4.1.3 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.
- 4.1.4 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.
- 4.1.5 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.
- 4.1.6 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.
- 4.1.7 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.

FELSTONE
CONSULTING
CHARTERED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

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