

# Summary Landscape Proof of Evidence

Land to the West of Wood Lane and Stocking Lane,  
Kingston Estate, Gotham

On behalf of Renewable Energy Systems (RES) Ltd

Date: 23 April 2024 | Pegasus Ref: P24-0106

PINS Ref: PO340/W/23/3329235 | LPA Ref: 22/00319/FUL

Author: Andrew Cook BA (Hons) MLD CMLI MIEMA CEnv





## Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
1	23.04.2024	AC	AC/CR	-



# Contents.

1. Summary and Conclusions .....	3
----------------------------------	---



# 1. Summary and Conclusions

## Introduction

- 1.1. I am instructed on behalf of Renewable Energy Systems (RES) Limited to present evidence relating to landscape and visual issues in respect of the scheme for which planning permission is sought for the construction of a solar farm together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure. This statement should be read in conjunction with the planning proof of evidence prepared by Nigel Cussen. The proposed scheme was a full application submitted to Rushcliffe Borough Council reference 22/00319/FUL. Having visited the site and surrounding area and having reviewed all the relevant documentation pertaining to this scheme, I have drawn the following conclusions which are set out in the proceeding paragraphs. The structure of this section of my proof reflects the key points which are articulated in the Inspector's CMC and decision notice dated 13<sup>th</sup> March 2023.

## Scale, Location, Layout and Appearance

- 1.2. With regard to scale, the proposal seeks to deliver a circa 49.9MW solar farm that by virtue of its scale would contribute significantly towards the renewable energy targets in light of the climate emergency. The quantum of development that is anticipated would extend over several fields, however, there would be no opportunity to appreciate the total scale of this scheme from any one location. The topography together with mature tree cover, extensive woodlands, tree belts, and hedges in the intervening landscape would mean that there would be very limited opportunity to appreciate the scale of the scheme.

## Effect on Landscape Elements

- 1.3. The proposed solar farm would have a negligible adverse effect on topography. In terms of trees with the additional planting there would be a moderate beneficial effect and with regard to hedges moderate beneficial effect. There would be a moderate adverse effect with regard to land cover with the introduction of the solar farm superimposed over pastureland. I consider that there would be some beneficial effects with regard to landscape elements that would form the green infrastructure of the site as part of the solar farm.



## Effect on Land Cover

- 1.4. Land cover is a specific term which refers to the way in which the land is managed. The site is currently managed for arable use. Alternating between pasture and arable is not a matter subject to planning. The scheme would require the host fields to be managed as pasture for the duration of a project but would be grazed and would benefit the fields from a soil/agronomy perspective.
- 1.5. Furthermore, the introduction of meadows would bring about material ecological enhancements. The local published Landscape Character Assessment advocates the management of pasture which is precisely what this scheme would seek to achieve. It is accepted that solar panels would be suspended above the grass swards. The introduction of the solar farm would have a moderate adverse degree of effect with regard to land cover associated with the site, given the arable land is converted to pasture with panels.
- 1.6. The character of the field parcels within the site would inevitably change in terms of their landscape character with the solar farm in place, but the character of the landscape beyond the immediate environs of the site would remain unchanged with the scheme in place and that would apply to the vast majority of the Landscape Character Area. Only a fraction of this area would physically change in terms of its character. This is an inevitable consequence of delivering renewable energy infrastructure.

## Effect on Visual Amenity

- 1.7. With regard to visual amenity, of particular note from my perspective is that this is an extensive solar scheme across a number of fields yet given the level and gently undulating nature of the local topography, combined with the field and hedgerow network and patchwork quilt of woodlands, the actual visual envelope and the degree to which this scheme would be seen from the surrounding area would be very limited.
- 1.8. There are a few public rights of way in the locality and some paths in the immediate vicinity and as such, there would be some opportunity to observe the scheme. Energy infrastructure is an integral part of the local landscape. The scheme's effect upon the visual amenity of the area would be very limited in degree and very localised in extent.



- 1.9. The visual effects would be very limited given the scale of the proposal. Policies require careful integration through existing landscape features and new planting to mitigate adverse effects to minimal levels. No policy in the Development Plan specifies absolutely no visibility whatsoever. I consider that to set such a high bar would be impossible to achieve.
- 1.10. In overall terms, the visual effects of the proposed solar farm would be very limited due to its substantial visual containment as a result of a combination of topography and surrounding woodlands. Where seen only small elements of the scheme would be observed and it would not be possible to appreciate the totality of the scheme from any one viewpoint location.

## **Effect on Landscape Character**

- 1.11. In terms of landscape character associated with the site, this is defined by the combination of various landscape elements principally topography, land cover, hedgerows, tree cover and the configuration of the fields themselves, the field pattern is sometimes referred to as the "grain" of the landscape. With the exception of some small areas of development such as the substation and inverters which would require some small loss of agricultural land, these landscape elements would be retained and remain as part of the landscape whilst the scheme is in place. It is accepted that where the panels would be located the continued agricultural use would be in the form of grazing rather than arable use.
- 1.12. The hedgerows would be reinforced with further hedgerow planting and the tree cover resource associated with the site would also be reinforced with some additional tree planting. Some of the hedgerows would be managed such that they would be maintained at a slightly higher level than is currently the case.
- 1.13. The trees over the project lifetime, both those existing and those introduced as part of the landscape proposals would all continue to grow developing larger canopies apart from those trees that are already fully mature. This growth over a 40-year period which is a significant period of time for both hedgerow and tree growth would result in reinforcing the defining positive characteristics of the site, with regard to these features. Furthermore, the increased vegetation growth would create a stronger sense of physical and visual containment associated with the site. This change would reduce visual effects that would come about over the project timescale.



- 1.14. Upon completion of the decommissioning phase, all built infrastructure would be removed both above and below ground across the entirety of the site. The management and growth of the hedgerows and trees across the site could continue to remain as part of the landscape post-decommissioning phase and would leave a positive legacy in terms of landscape character given that trees and hedgerows contribute to the landscape character locally.
- 1.15. Beyond the environs of the site the landscape character of the area would remain unchanged. With the proposed scheme in place, the character of the fields within the site would change as they would now accommodate solar arrays, but the underlying character of the fields would still be there and would fully return with the decommissioning of the solar farm in the longer term. However, it is proposed that as an integral part of the scheme, new hedgerows and tree planting would be introduced, and wildflower meadows created with arable land converted to pasture as advocated in the landscape character documents. All of these elements could remain after decommissioning as a positive legacy of the scheme and bring about enhancement to the landscape character in the long term.
- 1.16. The proposed scheme involves solar arrays and some associated infrastructure located in several fields which are managed for arable use. However, depending on farm management and maintenance and crop rotation, these fields could revert to pasture for a fallow period without any recourse to planning and similarly, grazed as pasture, again without any recourse to planning, such is the minor consequence of such a change of use in farming circumstances terms. It is intended that whilst the solar arrays would be installed and operational, the fields would continue to function as fields and accommodate grazing stock, and sheep for farming for the whole duration of the lifetime of the project. The site would continue to have an agricultural use.
- 1.17. Most of the existing landscape elements, vegetation, trees, and hedges could continue to remain and be reinforced post-decommissioning stage. Therefore, the character of the fields would remain accepting that they would also accommodate a solar farm, a renewable energy generating installation and as such, would change the current existing character of those developed fields. Beyond the confines of the red line site boundary, there would be no change to the physical fabric of the landscape character of the area.
- 1.18. In overall terms, I consider that there would be a minor adverse effect upon the landscape character of the site itself and its immediate environs. No off-site works are required (other than the point of connection to the Grid) to enable this scheme to be implemented other



than the cable connection. The effect upon the character of the surrounding landscape would be negligible and would remain and prevail materially unchanged with the proposed solar farm in place.

## **Effect on the Openness of the Green Belt**

- 1.19. As far as the solar farm is concerned, this benefits from a high degree of visual containment due to extensive woodland areas and evidenced by the fact that it is difficult to appreciate the proposal in terms of views from the countryside to the north, south, east and west and as such, any associated perception of openness related to this land is very limited. The perception of openness is most readily appreciated from the nearby roads around the site, but from these locations, the perception of openness would not change with the presence of the solar farm associated with the site and its countryside surroundings as a backdrop and context to the site as it still would feel very much part of the countryside and little difference in perception as most local views would remain unchanged. There are several bridleways adjacent to or passing through the site which would be set within new green lanes to retain their visual amenity and would reflect the character of green lanes in the locality. With these features in place, there would be little opportunity to observe the proposed solar farm restricted to a few fleeting views associated with field access points.
- 1.20. The introduction of the proposed solar farm would undoubtedly introduce built form where there is none currently. The aspect of openness is derived in part with regard to two aspects, the visual component and a spatial component. With regard to the visual aspect, it is evident that the perception of openness as it relates to the site is only readily appreciated from the nearby PRoWs and not from the wider countryside beyond due to the substantial physical containment of the surrounding extensive woodlands.
- 1.21. The proposed solar farm would be relatively modest in mass and footprint with regular spaces between the solar arrays that would reduce the overall scale of the development. Furthermore, the proposed scheme would be in place for a period of up to 40 years, before being fully demounted and the land returned to its former condition at the end of its use. As such, whilst 40 years is a long period of time, it is still not permanent. Therefore, the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be reduced and the site completely reinstated to its current open character. Consequently, both visually and spatially, the proposed





development would result in some limited and localised harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

- 1.22. In terms of the visual aspect of openness in overall terms when considered in the round, I consider the harm would be minor (adverse), and in terms of the spatial aspect of openness, the harm would be moderate (adverse). With both these aspects considered in overall terms, I consider that there would be moderate (adverse) harm to the openness of the Green Belt though this would be limited and highly localised within the context of the local woodland landscape.

### **Effects on the Purposes of the Green Belt**

- 1.23. The proposed scheme would not have any bearing upon the first purpose of the Green Belt, namely, to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. Whilst there are towns in every direction of the site, these are located several kilometres in distance and with the introduction of the proposed scheme, the solar farm would not cause any neighbouring towns to merge into one another. Indeed, the geographical disposition of neighbouring towns would remain unchanged with the proposed scheme in place and as such, the proposal would not conflict with this purpose. The proposal would inevitably introduce built infrastructure into 15 fields where the character of the site would experience a moderate adverse effect with the introduction of the solar farm. Beyond the site and its immediate environs, the character would remain unchanged. The proposal would cause encroachment in the countryside and as such, conflict with this particular purpose. The proposal would not affect the setting and special character of historic towns. The proposal would not have a bearing upon the recycling of derelict and urban land and as such, would not conflict with this purpose so far as it is relevant. In conclusion, the proposed solar farm would only conflict with one purpose in Green Belt terms.
- 1.24. In terms of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, the proposed solar scheme would be physically limited to the site itself. There would continue to be a strong disconnection between the distant urban areas beyond the Green Belt with the scheme in place. The encroachment, as a consequence of the solar farm, would be solely limited to the site itself, with the land beyond remaining as countryside. As such, the proposed solar farm would conflict with one purpose of the Green Belt, that of encroachment in the countryside.



However, the level of harm would be limited to a moderate degree, common ground with the Case Officer who recommended approval.

- 1.25. The proposed solar farm does not offend any of the other four purposes of the Green Belt.

## **Conclusions**

- 1.26. For the reasons stated above in this section of my proof, it is my professional opinion that on landscape and visual grounds and in so far as these matters relate to Green Belt, there are no substantive reasons for refusing planning permission for the proposed solar farm on land to the west of Wood Lane and Stocking Lane on the Kingston Estate. Therefore, the Inspector is respectfully requested to allow the grant of planning permission so far as landscape and visual issues are concerned.

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

# Expertly Done.

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



All paper sourced from sustainably managed forests

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

Registered office: Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT  
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



Pegasus\_Group



pegasusgroup



Pegasus\_Group

**PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK**