

## 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.