

# Steeple Renewables Project

## Potential Main Issues for Examination

July 2025

Document Reference: EN010163/APP/7.7

Revision: 1

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)

Regulations 2009 - Regulation 5(2)(q)



## Potential Main Issues for Examination

Document Properties		
Prepared By	The Steeple Renewables Project Consultant Team	
Version History		
Version	Date	Version Status
Application Version	July 2025	Rev 1

## Table of Contents:

1	Introduction.....	3
2	Summary of Current Position .....	4
3	Potential Main Issues for Examination .....	9

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Potential Main Issues for Examination ('PMIE') document has been prepared on behalf of Steeple Solar Farm Limited (the 'Applicant') in relation to an application for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') for the Steeple Renewables Project (the 'Proposed Development') made to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero pursuant to the Planning Act 2008.
- 1.1.2 This document has been prepared and submitted in compliance with the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus (September 2024) and Regulation 5(2)(q) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 ('the APFP Regulations') which states: "*The application must be accompanied by... any other documents considered necessary to support the application*".
- 1.1.3 The purpose of this document is to provide the Examining Authority ('ExA') with a summary of the main residual issues with key stakeholders at the time of the DCO Application submission. This document has been prepared alongside relevant stakeholders and contents agreed, where possible, prior to the submission of the DCO Application. This document has been presented in the format provided by the Planning Inspectorate. The issues set out in **chapter 3** do not constitute a definitive list of matters likely to be raised during the DCO Examination and does not preclude stakeholders from raising further concerns during the planning process.
- 1.1.4 It is anticipated that a number of the issues outlined in this document may be resolved between the submission of the DCO Application and Examination, including once stakeholders have had an opportunity to review the DCO Application and through the evolution of the application documents, including the negotiation of 'protective provisions', where necessary. It is the Applicants intention to continue to work with stakeholders throughout the DCO Examination to resolve issues wherever possible.

## 2 Summary of current position

2.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of the current position on potential main issues following engagement with the key stakeholders. **Figure 1** provides a list of the potential main issues for examination by subject matter. **Table 1** provides a list of the potential main issues for examination by reference to key stakeholders.

### **Figure 1: Potential Main Issues for Examination by Subject Matter**

- Air emissions – Adequacy of ES treatment of air emissions.
- Cultural Heritage – Assessment of harm to heritage assets within the ES and the need to agree and secure a Written Scheme of Investigation during the Examination.
- Ecology/ Ecology Surveys/ Ecology Assessments/ Biodiversity net gain (BNG) - The regard given to Advice Note 10: Habitats Regulations Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects. Protected species surveys and measures to protect any protected species. The need to agree and secure an Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy and a Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy during the Examination. The need for hedgerow removal plans. The identification of trees; impacts and mitigation. Amount of tree and hedgerow planting. The relationship between biodiversity and soils management during the operational phase.
- Fish Mitigation – The regard provided in the ES to fish mitigation and impacts of culverts to fish.
- Fire – Adequacy of fire risk assessment in the ES and mitigation measures proposed.
- Glint and glare – Adequacy of glint and glare assessment within the ES, its impact to residential properties, railway, highways, air craft and users of public rights of way.
- Health/ Health Impacts/ Electromagnetic Fields – Adequacy of the ES to consider impacts to health including electromagnetic fields.
- Highways – Adequacy of the ES to consider traffic, transport, and access. Increase in traffic on local roads, safety, and road maintenance. The condition of local roads.

- Landscape and Visual Amenity/ Landscape Harm – Adequacy of landscape and Visual Amenity in the ES, level of harm identified and mitigation measures proposed.
- Noise – Adequacy of ES consideration to noise.
- Non-Invasive Species – Regard and consideration of Non-Invasive species in the ES.
- Public Rights of Way – Adequacy of the ES to safeguard existing public rights of way and provision of permissive paths.
- Use of Agricultural Land/ Contamination /Release of Chemicals to Ground – Adequacy of the ES regarding the case for the use of Best Most Valuable agricultural land. Impact on soil quality, food production and food security. Soil management options during the operational stage.
- Water Usage/ Water Framework Directive/Flooding/ Flood Risk Assessment/Loss of Land for Drainage/Easements/Impact to Groundwater and Draining Water – Adequacy of the ES to assess the water environment, water usage provision and water contamination, including the regard given to Advice Note 18: The Water Framework Directive. The Flood Risk Assessment, changes to land drainage including any impact on existing land drains. The potential for increased runoff. Regard to easements to water infrastructure within the Order Limits. Impacts to drinking water. Use of rainwater harvesting and re-use.
- Waste - Adequacy of ES treatment of waste and use of the waste hierarchy.

**Table 1: Potential Main Issues for Examination by Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Position at time of DCO Application submission
Environment Agency (EA)	The EA have outstanding concerns regarding ecology survey work, ecology assessments, fish mitigation, non-invasive species, biodiversity net gain (BNG), impacts of culverts on fish, Flood Risk Assessment, Water Framework Directive, ground water, waste and fire. The Applicant considers it is likely that these issues will be resolved once the full suite of application documents are available for the EA's review. The EA is engaging in further discussions with the Applicant regarding these issues. These issues have been identified based on the



	information available at submission. The EA may have additional comments to make once they have reviewed all relevant DCO application documents. Further details are provided in <b>Table 2</b> below.
North Leverton with Habbleshthorpe Parish Council (NLHPC)	NLHPC has outstanding concerns regarding landscape harm, drinking water, contamination, loss of land for drainage, release of chemicals to ground, glint and glare, use of agricultural land and electromagnetic fields. The Applicant is hopeful these issues will be resolved once the full suite of application documents are available for NLHPC's review. These issues have been identified based on the information available at submission. NLHPC's may have additional comments to make once they have reviewed all relevant DCO application documents. Further details are provided in <b>Table 3</b> below.
North and South Wheatley Parish Council (NSWPC)	NSWPC has outstanding concerns regarding flooding and use of agricultural land. The Applicant is hopeful these issues will be resolved once the full suite of application documents are available for NSWPC's review. These issues have been identified based on the information available at submission. NSWPC's may have additional comments to make once they have reviewed all relevant DCO application documents. Further details are provided in <b>Table 4</b> below.
Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC)	NCC has outstanding concerns regarding Landscape and visual amenity, cultural heritage, health, highways, public rights of way and waste. At this time, the Applicant does not consider an agreement with NCC on the levels of pre-determination trenching (cultural heritage) will be reached. The Applicant will continue to engage with NCC through SoCG process. Further details are provided in <b>Table 5</b> below.
Bassetlaw District Council (BDC)	BDC has outstanding concerns regarding ecology, cultural heritage and waste. The Applicant considers it is likely that the majority of these issues will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 6</b> below.
Natural England (NE)	NE has outstanding concerns regarding ecology, health impacts, air emissions, use of agricultural land. The Applicant considers it is likely that the majority of these issues will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 7</b> below.
Historic England (HE)	HE has outstanding concerns regarding cultural heritage. The Applicant will continue to liaise with Historic England prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 8</b> below.
Canal and River Trust (CRT)	CRT has outstanding concerns regarding Landscape and visual amenity, health impact as well as glint and glare. The Applicant

	considers it is likely that the majority of these issues will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 9</b> below.
Anglian Water (AW)	AW has outstanding concerns regarding easements, water usage, rainwater harvesting and re-use. The Applicant considers it is likely that the majority of these issues will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 10</b> below.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	NWT has outstanding concerns regarding ecology. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 11</b> below.
UK Health Security Agency (HAS) and Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	UK HAS and HSE have outstanding concerns regarding health impacts and fire. The Applicant considers it is likely that these issues will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Tables 12 and 13</b> below.
National Highways (NH)	NH has an outstanding highway concern. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 14</b> below.
Network Rail (NR)	NR has an outstanding concern regarding Glint and Glare. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 15</b> below.
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council (S-I-SPC)	S-I-SPC has an outstanding concern regarding noise. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 16</b> below.
Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)	LCC has an outstanding concern regarding Waste. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 17</b> below.
West Lindsey District Council (WLDC)	WLDC has outstanding concerns regarding landscape and visual amenity as well as the use of agricultural land. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 18</b> below.
Hayton Parish Council (HPC)	HPC has an outstanding concern regarding noise. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 19</b> below.
City of Doncaster Council (CDC)	CDC has an outstanding concern regarding highways. The Applicant considers it is likely that this issue will be resolved prior to Examination. Further details are provided in <b>Table 20</b> below.



- 2.1.2 The Applicant intends to agree Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') with relevant stakeholders to be set out in the Rule 6 and Rule 8 letters issued by the ExA following acceptance of the DCO Application. These SoCGs will remain live through the course of the Examination as the Applicant continues to engage on any outstanding matters, and a final position will be submitted prior to the close of Examination.

### 3 Potential Main Issues for Examination

- 3.1.1 **Tables 2 to 20** below set out the outstanding potential main issues with each of the relevant stakeholders that have not been resolved prior to the submission of the DCO Application.
- 3.1.2 The tables provide an overview of the concerns held by each Stakeholder, where this concern is addressed in the DCO Application, and the Applicant's position on the likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to, or during, the Examination. The tables include a **Red** / **Amber** / **Green** rating to highlight the likelihood of each issue been resolved. The following consideration has been applied to each colour:
- Red** – fundamental disagreements which are unlikely to be resolved during Examination.
- Amber** – issues which are in discussion and maybe resolved during Examination.
- Green** – issues that are likely to be resolved prior to or during Examination.

**Table 2: Environment Agency outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Environment Agency	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
EA 1	Ecology – Survey Work	<p>Issue: Surveys have not included relevant protect species such as water voles and otters.</p> <p>Impact: Inadequate surveys undermine mitigation and environmental enhancements on site.</p> <p>Solution: Include the Biodiversity Mitigation Areas (Eastern and Western) in surveys for otter and water vole. Survey results will also give a wider picture of the population in the area to help with providing mitigation for these species.</p>	<b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>The Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Targeted surveys for otter and water vole were not reported specifically for the Biodiversity Mitigation Areas because no development is planned there, and significant impacts on otter / otter habitat can be scoped out. Notwithstanding this, surveys of the ditches and drains as part of the habitat baseline work were undertaken in the Biodiversity Mitigation Areas, including spot-checks of ditches for otter and water vole signs while assessing the ditch habitat condition in April 2024. As part of this, surveyors would record the presence of field signs for any notable species (including otter and water vole ) if/where present. No direct</p>

					<p>evidence of otter or water vole use of the mitigation areas was recorded.</p> <p>Natural England, local planning authority Ecologists and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have not raised not any concerns or objections as to the robustness of the survey work for otter or water vole.</p> <p>It is concluded that the work undertaken provides a robust basis for determining the otter and water vole baseline at the Site. Further survey work in the Biodiversity Mitigation Areas would not give any greater certainty to potential impacts or influence the design or mitigation proposals as no changes to the in-channel or riparian zones of existing ditches and watercourses in the offsite biodiversity mitigation areas are proposed.</p> <p>Residual minor risks to otter and water vole will be managed by implementation of appropriate working methods during construction / decommissioning and habitat management during operation; these are outlined in the Outline CEMP and LEMP.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					On this basis, no further survey are proposed to establish baseline or inform mitigation.
EA 2	Ecology – Species Assessment	<p>Issue: Not all relevant protected species have been included in assessments.</p> <p>River lamprey and sea lamprey have not been noted as forming part of the designation of the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p> <p>Impact: Protected species may be harmed due to lack of assessment and appropriate mitigation being put in place.</p> <p>The River Trent (and associated tributaries) is functionally linked to this SAC in terms of habitat for both lamprey species. The impacts on these species and the conservation objectives of the SAC have not been considered.</p> <p>Solution: Include river lamprey and sea lamprey in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and ensure that mitigation is</p>	<p><b>ES Appendix 7.2: Designated Sites [EN010163/APP/6.3.7]</b></p>		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>The Applicants Position</b></p> <p>River lamprey and sea lamprey were listed in the Humber Estuary SAC designation in <b>ES Appendix 7.2: Designated Sites [EN010163/APP/6.3.7]</b> baseline report.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to arise on lamprey species is assessed in section 5 of the <b>Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010163/APP/ 5.5.]</b>.</p> <p>No impact pathway has been identified to the SAC or to lamprey specifically, and therefore specific mitigation measures are not proposed. This assessment is set out in the HRA.</p>

		in place to protect them where impact pathways are identified.			
EA 3	Ecology – Fish Mitigation	<p>Issue: There is insufficient mitigation information in order to protect fish during construction and decommissioning.</p> <p>Impact: Certain construction activities in relation to watercourse crossings, such as open cut trenching, may have a negative impact on notable fish populations.</p> <p>Solution: Robust mitigation measures to control pollution and fine sediment runoff into waterbodies need to be included in the CEMP.</p> <p>Additional narrative / explanation: Where open trench crossings are proposed, it is assumed that waterbodies will be flumed, or coffer dammed and thus require over-pumping. It may be necessary for a fish rescue and relocation to take place and for key spawning and migration periods to be avoided. Any over-pumping should ensure that screens are fitted on inlets and outlets of</p>	<b>ES Appendix 4.1 - Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b>		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Further mitigation information for fish is provided in <b>ES Appendix 4.1 - Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p>

		pumps and that they are compliant with the Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009.			
EA 4	Ecology – Non Invasive Species	<p>Issue: INNS have not been appropriately considered in proposals.</p> <p>This section mentions that no works are intended to take place in the water and the spread of Canadian pondweed is therefore highly unlikely to take place.</p> <p>Impact: Any new watercourse crossings are likely to require access to the water environment.</p> <p>Solution: Provide an INNS Management Plan for all INNS species present. Please also consider the INNS species at risk of being introduced.</p> <p>Additional narrative / explanation: Eradication of INNS will help to achieve Watercourse Metric units. Please include American mink, especially with the water vole population on site.</p>	<b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity</b> <b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>An INNS Management Plan will be provided post-consent.</p>



EA 5	Ecology – Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Issue: New open span bridges are proposed.</p> <p>Impact: These proposed watercourse crossing would be extra encroachment which would impact the unit score.</p> <p>Solution: Consider this extra encroachment. Provide the River Condition Assessment results and Watercourse Metric report to the EA to review.</p>	<p><b>ES Appendix 7.12 Biodiversity Net Gain [EN010163/APP/6.3.7].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>All watercourse crossings and any extra encroachment are included within the relevant BNG assessment</p> <p>(refer to the ‘User comments’ within the watercourse metric worksheets provided in <b>ES Appendix 7.12 Biodiversity Net Gain [EN010163/APP/6.3.7]</b>, which identifies where encroachment from new tracks/crossings is predicted.</p>
EA 6	Ecology – Impacts of Culverts on fish	<p>Any culverting of a watercourse or waterbody that contains fish can impact on lifecycle migration, both locally and more long distant. Culverting also impacts on fish habitat and spawning habitat by decreasing the quality of substrate. Therefore, we are opposed to the culverting of any watercourse and would prefer the installation of a clear full span crossing that maintains the natural substrate and allows free passage of fish.</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>New culverting of watercourses suitable for fish is not proposed, and any access crossings will be clear span to avoid these impacts. This is included in the <b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]</b>. The proposed culverts on seasonally wet ditches will not impact on fish as the ditches are considered to be unsuitable for fish on the basis of being seasonally wet only with shallow water (ca. 5cm).</p>

EA 7	Flood Risk Assessment and Water Framework Directive	The EA undertook a review of a draft submission of the Flood Risk Assessment and Water Framework Directive Assessment supporting this ES. A number of comments were made regarding the sources of information referenced within these reports, the analysis of this information and the assessment of effects.	<p><b>ES Appendix 8.1 FRA [EN010163/APP/6.3.8].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 8.3 WFD Assessment [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant has taken full account of the comments made by the EA on the two technical reports. The <b>FRA ES Appendix 8.1 [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b> and <b>WFD Assessment ES Appendix 8.3 [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b> have been updated in response to the comments received.</p>
EA 8	Groundwater	The potential thermal implications of buried cables, in relation to risks to groundwater.	<p><b>ES Chapter: 8 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges heat can be a groundwater pollutant, and this could be caused by thermal transmission from high voltage (HV) underground cables. The Applicant confirms no sensitive abstractions or protected habitats have been identified that could be affected by this impact. The <b>Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage Chapter of the ES [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b> assesses the impacts of heating of groundwater from HV cables. The assessment determines the residual effects as negligible and not significant.</p>

					Additionally, it is also likely bentonite, or concrete will be used to reduce cable separation, however, this is subject to the final detailed design.
EA 9	Waste	Possible construction waste identified in 17.6.17 does not include surplus soil from earthworks. While the volumes generated may be small, all waste must be handled appropriately and legally. Contaminated soil will need additional control measures.	<b>ES Appendix 15.2 Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.15]</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  An <b>ES Appendix 15.2 Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.15]</b> accompanies the DCO application and sets out how soils (topsoil and subsoil) will be protected during the construction phase, and any damage to soil structure will be rectified as part of the construction phase. All soil to be reused onsite or disposed of offsite will be appropriately characterised by the construction contractor. Soil will be managed in line with Defra “Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites” (Defra, 2009).
EA 10	Fire	Receptors for fire need to include land, surface water and groundwater.	<b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8].</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  The Major Accidents and Disasters section of this ES Chapter assesses the risk of fire to relevant local residents, habitats and species,

			<p><b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b></p> <p><b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b></p> <p><b>Outline Fire Risk Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.3, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b></p>		<p>landscape features, surface water and groundwater.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation through the careful design of the Proposed Development and additional mitigation measures are secured in the unlikely event of an uncontrolled fire through the following documents - <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]),</b> <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> and <b>Outline Fire Risk Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.3, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b></p> <p><b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b> further outlines the potential effects of firewater and contaminated runoff.</p> <p>The risk of fire as a major accident and disaster is determined as a not significant residual effect.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 3: North Leverton with Hablesthorpe Parish Council outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by North Leverton with Habbleshorpe Parish Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NLWHP C 1	Landscape and Visual Amenity – Landscape Harm	The project will harm the landscape character of the ward in direct conflict with the ward plan.	<p><b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity [EN010163/APP/6.2.6].</b></p> <p><b>ES Figure 6.9 Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.4.6].</b></p>		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Regarding landscape character effects, NPS EN-1 sets out at paragraph 5.10.5 that ‘<i>Virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation</i>’. NPS EN-1 goes on to state at paragraph 5.10.6 that ‘<i>Projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate</i>’. In the case of the Proposed Development it is recognised that some localised effects on landscape character would arise, but it is considered that the project has minimised potential harm to the landscape though the</p>

					design of the Proposed Development and the provision of appropriate mitigation, as set out in <b>ES Figure 6.9 Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.4.6]</b> .
NLWHP C 2	Drinking Water, Contamination and loss of land for drainage.	Eastern part of the Site falls within a Drinking Water Protected Area. Information required on how drinking water will be protected. Further information required regarding potential impacts of release of hazardous substances to watercourses. Noted that the site visit was undertaken during dry weather, require assurance the build will not cause drainage and flood risks. Considered there was potential for construction works to result in release of chemicals to the ground and underlying aquifers. Notes there could be a loss of land drainage.	<p><b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 8.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 8.1 FRA [EN010163/APP/6.3.8].</b></p>		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant notes the request for information regarding protection of drinking water and surface water. This is discussed in Section 8.7 of <b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the request for assurance regarding impacts on drainage and flood risk. These are discussed within <b>ES Appendix 8.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b> and <b>ES Appendix 8.1 FRA [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes concerns raised regarding the potential for release of chemicals to the ground / groundwater during construction. This is discussed within Section 8.7 of this ES.</p> <p>The Applicant notes concerns raised regarding potential loss of land drainage. This is discussed</p>

					within Section 8.7 of <b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b> .
NLWHP C 3	Health Impacts – release of chemicals to ground	<p>Construction activities have the potential to result in the release of chemicals to the ground which could percolate into underlying aquifers. This is significant despite the report trying to say there will be few consequences. This is prime agricultural land with affected water courses.</p> <p>The report states that effects rising from the construction will be temporary which directly conflicts with other elements of the report as seen above.</p>	<p><b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p> <p><b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b></p>		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment and agrees there is potential for the release of chemicals to the ground during construction. However, management measures will be complied as per the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b> to ensure best practice is followed to minimise the risk of release of pollution or sediment. <b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b> of the ES fully details the assessment. Impacts on hydrogeology are anticipated to be not significant.</p>
NLWHP C 4	Health Impacts – drinking water	The eastern part of the site falls within a drinking water protected area. What will be done to ensure the drinking water is protected? The report states that there remains potential for the release of hazardous materials which could impact local	<b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk and Drainage</b>		<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Protection of drinking water and surface water is assessed within <b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk and Drainage</b></p>



		<p>watercourses. It continues to say that the effect could be temporary, direct and of local importance. What does that actually mean? We need firm guarantees.</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.8].</b></p> <p><b>Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8].</b></p> <p><b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010163/APP/6.3.8].</b></p>		<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.8].</b> Impacts on drainage and flood risk discussed within <b>Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b> and <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010163/APP/6.3.8].</b></p>
NLWHP C 5	Health Impacts – Glint and Glare	<p>The report states that there will be negligible effects and then goes on to say that there is potential for temporary after image for pilots flying over the sites. This is serious and life threatening for those in the aircraft and ultimately those on the ground. We have the RAF from RAF Waddington, RAF Coningsby and aircraft from Gamston Airport, Sandtoft Airport, and the potential reopening of Doncaster Sheffield Airport. There needs to be further significant research undertaken before we can sign off on this.</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [EN010163/APP/2.6.16]</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p><b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [EN010163/APP/2.6.16]</b> glint and glare impacts upon aerodromes (licensed, unlicensed and military) within 15km of the Proposed Development have been considered. The military aerodromes mentioned are greater than 24km and 48km from the Proposed Development. The assessment of any aviation effects for developments over 20km is not a usual requirement and therefore no significant impact is predicted upon these RAF aerodromes.</p>

					<p>For two unlicensed aerodromes, the glare intensity is categorised as having 'potential for temporary after-image'. Glare within this category requires assessment in context to the aerodromes operations. The assessment had concluded that the instances of yellow glare could be operationally accommodated for, and that the Proposed Development will not impact the operations at these two aerodromes.</p> <p>No significant impacts are predicted upon the remaining nine aerodromes assessed, including the potential reopening of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.</p> <p>Further detail is included in Section 16.7.8 of <b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.16].</p>
NLWHP C 6	Use of Agricultural Land	Express concern about the loss of land for food production and the potential for sheep grazing.	<b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.15].		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>This is addressed in section 15.7 of <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.15].</p>
NLWHP C 7	Electromagnetic Fields	Electromagnetic Fields - The report states that given the route of the cabling there does not need to be any mitigation measures in	<b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p>

		place. However, the report also states that as yet, the length and the route of the cabling is unknown. There may need to be mitigating factors in place.	<b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.17].</b>		Electric, Magnetic and Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) are assessed in <b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues [EN010163/APP/6.2.17]</b> . The scope of the assessment of EMFs is limited to consideration and assessment of any cables associated with the Proposed Development which exceed 132kV. The only part of the Proposed Development to exceed this voltage is the underground export cable between the Proposed Development and the existing West Burton Power Station substation, which will be an underground 400kV cable system. The assessment determines no significant effects from EMFs will be caused and therefore additional mitigation measures are not required.
--	--	---	-------------------------------	--	--

**Table 4: North and South Wheatley Parish Council outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by North and South Wheatley Parish Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NSWPC 1	Flooding	Commented that the land is likely to become very hard affecting its ability to absorb water	<b>ES Appendix 8.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy</b>		<b>Medium</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>

		and likely to exacerbate existing flooding in Sturton-le-Steeple and South Wheatley.	[EN010163/APP/6.3.8].		<b>ES Appendix 8.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]</b> discusses the impact of the Proposed Development on flood risk, including measures to help reduce the flood risk to Sturton-le-Steeple. It is not considered that the Proposed Development will adversely affect the ability of the land to absorb water or cause the ground to become hard.
NSWPC 2	Use of Agricultural Land	Express concern about the loss of land for food production and the potential for sheep grazing.	<b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [EN010163/APP/6.2.15]</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  This is addressed in section 15.7 of <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [EN010163/APP/6.2.15]</b> .

**Table 5: Nottinghamshire County Council outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Nottinghamshire County Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NCC 1	Landscape and Visual Amenity - Methodology	Our review has raised several queries regarding the methodology employed for creating the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). Detailed information on the approach taken and the	<b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  It is considered that the SZTV plans are an appropriate basis to illustrate the potential

	for ZTV Creation.	assumptions made would be beneficial to ensure accuracy and transparency.	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.6].</b></p> <p><b>ES Figure 6.6a Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility (SZTV) and View Point Locations (10km radius</b></p> <p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.6b SZTV and View Point Locations (5km radius</b></p> <p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.6c SZTV and View Point Locations (2km radius</b></p> <p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.7 SZTV and landscape character</b></p>		<p>visibility of the Proposed Development. The plans have been taken to site and ‘ground-truthed’ in the field and rather than underestimating any potential visibility, the plans are an overestimation of the extent of likely visibility. This is because although built form and larger blocks of woodland are included in the SZTV model, hedgerows are not, and these serve to notably limit potential visibility even when allowing for their cycle of cutting across the year. Notwithstanding this, an additional ‘bare earth’ layer has also been provided in the ZTV plans which accompany the Environment Statement (ES).</p>
--	-------------------	---	--	--	---

			[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.8a SZTV and Visual Receptors [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.8b SZTV and Visual Receptors [EN010163/APP/6.4.6] and ES Figure 6.8c SZTV and Visual Receptors [EN010163/APP/6.4.6].		
NCC 2	Landscape and Visual Amenity - Adherence to GLVIA3 Guidance Notes.	It is imperative to confirm whether the most recent Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) Guidance and clarification notes have been utilised to inform the assessment. Adherence to these guidelines is crucial for maintaining consistency and reliability in the evaluation process	<b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.6].		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>  The most recent GLVIA3 Guidance and clarification notes have been utilised to inform the assessment.
NCC 3	Landscape and Visual - Photographic Record Pages.	There are noted inconsistencies within the photographic record pages provided. A thorough revision to ensure uniformity and	<b>ES Appendix 6.1 - Viewpoint Photographs</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>  An updated version of the Photographic Record which addresses any minor inconsistencies is

		accuracy across all visual materials is recommended.	[EN010163/APP/6.3.6].		set out at <b>ES Chapter 6 Appendix 6.1 - Viewpoint Photographs</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.6].
NCC4	Landscape and Visual - Integration with Other Disciplines.	The documents would greatly benefit from illustrating how the landscape considerations integrate with other relevant disciplines such as cultural heritage and ecology. Demonstrating this interdisciplinary approach will enhance the comprehensiveness and robustness of the assessment.	<p><b>ES Chapter 9 – Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 8 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.8].</p> <p><b>ES Figure 6.9 Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy</b></p>		<p><b>High Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The LVIA has been cognisant of the findings of the Cultural Heritage Assessment (<b>ES Chapter 9 – Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]) and other relevant ES Chapters, including the Ecology Chapter (<b>Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]) and the Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage Chapter (<b>Chapter 8</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]). In particular, the landscape and ecological mitigation set out in <b>ES Chapter 6: Figure 6.9 Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy</b> [EN010163/APP/6.4.6] has been prepared collaboratively by the authors of the respective Chapters and also includes additional flood risk mitigation.</p>



			[EN010163/APP/6.4.6].		
NCC 5	Cultural Heritage - Archaeology	Potential impacts to archaeology are flagged and the significance of the roadside settlement near Segelocum is mentioned specifically. It is noted that the geophysical survey will need to be supported by other forms of evaluation.	<p><b>ES Appendix 9.4 – Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The remains west of Segelocum have been excluded from the Proposed Development. A programme of trial trench evaluation is being arranged to target ‘fixed’ areas of large-scale development (<b>ES Appendix 9.4 – Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>) with further trenching and/or mitigation to be undertaken post-determination (<b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>).</p>
NCC 6	Cultural Heritage - Viewpoints	Queries raised via the location of the visual receptors provided on the LVIA viewpoints drawing, and wish to discuss with Pegasus Group. To potentially consider additional receptors to the south of the 2km buffer.	<b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP-6.2.9].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Viewpoints were clarified in email to NCC Building Conservation team, sent 9th April</p>

					2025. Consultation will continue post-submission and during examination..
NCC 7	Cultural Heritage - Archaeology	<p>The applicant's approach to cultural heritage is so far confined to desk-based research and geophysical survey. NCC would expect the PEIR to contain a completed desk-based Assessment (DBA) and completed geophysical survey with a solid programme of evaluation trenching either agreed or underway.</p> <p>Currently the applicant has not completed a DBA which should form the baseline research for the EIA, but a full programme of geophysical survey has been largely completed, with a second phase of work nearing completion (Appendix 9.2). The applicant states in table 9.4 that a trenching plan is in production and will be presented once the geophysical survey has been completed.</p> <p>While the current progress is somewhat behind expectations, much of the data required for an effective DBA has been summarised in the PEIR and appendices, however NCC would recommend that this is properly drawn together into a separate archaeological DBA document.</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Baseline</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.4 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching</b></p>		<p><b>Low</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The <b>Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (ES Appendix 9.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> includes a desk-based archaeological assessment (DBA) as part of Section 5 – Heritage Baseline Assessment. Key sources are identified in Section 3 – Methodology. <b>Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report (ES Appendix 9.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> has been undertaken across all accessible areas of the Site and a programme of targeted, pre-determination trial trenching is proposed (<b>ES Appendix 9.4 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>), with further post-determination evaluative works and mitigation outlined in the <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b>.</p> <p>See above comments, the DBA has been incorporated into the <b>Cultural Heritage</b></p>

		<p>NCC welcome the extent of geophysical survey undertaken and that this will feed into a programme of pre-examination evaluation trenching...</p> <p>...NCC recommends that the full order limits should be subject to trial trench evaluation with a minimum 3% coverage where geophysics has been undertaken and 5% coverage where it has not. Any less would be insufficient to properly inform the EIA assessment and for the production of an informed AMS."</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b></p> <p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p>		<p><b>Technical Baseline (ES Appendix 9.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]).</b></p> <p>This is not considered to be an proportionate response to the Site in terms of its archaeological potential, and the nature of the Proposed Development. As above, the areas considered to have the greatest potential for significant archaeology have been excluded from the Proposed Development, and a programme of pre-determination, focussed on the 'fixed', large-scale elements of development is proposed (<b>ES Appendix 9.4 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>). Further evaluative works and mitigation are outlined in the <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b>.</p> <p>At this time, the Applicant does not consider an agreement with NCC on the levels of pre-determination trenching will be reached. Nevertheless the Applicant will continue to engage with NCC through SoCG process.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

NCC 8	Cultural Heritage - Archaeology	<p>Section 9.2.8 – The applicant has quoted paragraph 2.10.112 of EN-3, but crucially failed to quote the associated Footnote 94 that states: The results of pre-determination archaeological evaluation inform the design of the scheme and related archaeological planning conditions.</p> <p>Section 9.3.3 – Data from the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) should also be consulted...</p> <p>...Section 9.6.18 – Confining evaluation trenching to targeted areas of archaeological potential identified solely through the desk-based and non-intrusive methodologies (which have known limitations for successfully identifying some archaeological sites within the County), leads to significant confirmation bias in the assessment results. It is essential that evaluation trenching is also used as a prospection technique for sites that do not show up in geophysics results, such as highly sensitive pre-historic features and human remains. It is impossible to design a proportionate mitigation strategy without understanding the archaeological resource properly and the proposed impacts upon it from the</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Reference to Footnote 94 is included at section 9.2.9 of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]</b>. Pre-determination evaluative works have been used to inform the design, with areas having been excluded from development on the basis of the geophysical survey results (<b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>).</p> <p>Consideration of data from the PAS is included within Section 5 of <b>Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (ES Appendix 9.1 [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b>.</p> <p>As noted above, the design has been informed by the evaluative works to date, and a programme of targeted trial trenching is proposed, focussing on the ‘fixed’ areas of development. The inherently flexible nature of the Proposed Development across the remainder of the Site is considered to allow for a range of mitigation options to follow on from further trial trenching, to be undertaken post-determination, as outlined in the <b>Outline</b></p>
-------	---------------------------------	--	--	--	--

		development. Sufficient trenching results from across the site are needed to inform design and mitigation.			<b>Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]).</b>
NCC 9	Cultural Heritage - Archaeology	<p>Section 9.7.4 – The ‘most significant areas of archaeological potential’ will not be known until the evaluation trenching has been completed, however we welcome the recognition of the importance of evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Section 9.7.5 – NCC do not accept that cable trenching constitutes ‘low impact’ works. These are highly destructive to archaeological remains and monitoring (watching brief) cannot be agreed as a mitigation measure until the archaeological potential is fully understood. NCC do not accept the applicant’s assessment of significance or impact in this section.</p> <p>Sections 9.7.3 to 9.7.8 Construction Phase – This section is not well presented and should be reworked to also include all construction effects including piling, ground works for infrastructure, cable trenching across the whole site, plant tracking, environmental works (swales, planting, etc) and any other proposed ground impacts. Suggestions for mitigation are also irrelevant in this section and have been</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.3 - Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.4 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of</b></p>		<p><b>High Applicants Position</b></p> <p>This refers to areas “...as identified by the geophysical survey...”, with such areas having been excluded from development. Our suggested approach to trial trenching is outlined above.</p> <p>Our position with regard to potential mitigation measures has been clarified, with reference to alternative forms of mitigation (if appropriate), as outlined in <b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p>Section 9.7.3 to 9.7.8 has been clarified, with reference to the general below ground impacts across the Site. The approach to mitigation is also clarified, as above.</p> <p>There is no planned mid-life refit. Units will be maintained and repaired/replaced on an ad hoc basis. The situation with regard to</p>

		<p>based primarily on the hope that there are no significant assets in areas of impact.</p> <p>Sections 9.7.9 to 9.7.20 Operational Phase - This scheme will require mid-life refits at least once. The removal of old infrastructure and installation of new will have significant ground impacts. This section fails to acknowledge this and further fails to acknowledge that any mitigation measures can only be assessed through appropriate evaluation at this stage. Evaluation during operation will not be possible. The applicant's assessment of indirect impacts to designated assets is also concerning and we question the blanket 'not significant' conclusion in every instance, however NCC defer to comments from the Conservation Team and Historic England on this.</p> <p>Sections 9.7.20 to 9.7.24 Decommissioning Phase - As above, decommissioning is likely to have significant ground impacts beyond that of construction. The applicant is relying upon appropriate mitigation being undertaken prior to construction to mitigate any potential decommissioning work. This does require appropriate evaluation to be undertaken and an</p>	<p><b>Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p>		<p>archaeological evaluation and mitigation has also been clarified, and a programme of pre-determination, focussed on the 'fixed', large-scale elements of development is proposed (<b>ES Appendix 9.4 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>). Further evaluative works and mitigation are outlined in the <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works (ES Appendix 9.5 [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b>.</p> <p>The effects of decommissioning on archaeological remains are considered, and are discussed at 9.7.19 of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]</b>. Where areas of archaeological interest are identified, then specific protocols with regard to decommissioning may be required, as outlined in <b>ES Appendix 9.3 – Archaeological Mitigation Statement [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>, and <b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>.</p> <p>The situation regarding mitigation has been clarified in Section 9.8, and the reference to an</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

		<p>understanding of the decommissioning methodology which has not been detailed here.</p> <p>Section 9.8 Mitigation – The applicant proposes only two types of archaeological mitigation work; avoidance (preservation in situ) and ‘no dig’ solutions. While these may be appropriate, they have also failed to include monitoring (watching brief), a method previously put forward in this document for mitigation. Other techniques such as excavation and strip map and record should also be considered where archaeological sensitivity and development requirements warrant it. An Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) should be commissioned to oversee the implementation of any mitigation measures which are likely to be complex when combined with construction schedules. No specific mitigation measures can be ruled out at this stage of assessment, and all potential techniques should be detailed in this section of the PEIR in the absence of more specific evaluation data.</p> <p>Section 9.8.3 – Preservation in situ areas will require an ongoing commitment to monitoring during the operational life of the solar farm to</p>			<p>ACoW is acknowledged and is included. Further details with regard to proposed mitigation are provided in <b>ES Appendix 9.3 – Archaeological Mitigation Statement [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>, and <b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>.</p> <p>Noted and clarified in Section 9.8.4 <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]</b>.</p> <p>Noted and clarified in Section 9.11 and Table 9.5 (formerly Table 9.6) of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]</b>.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



		<p>ensure compliance and enforcement if necessary.</p> <p>Section 9.11; Table 9.6 – requires updating to include all potential archaeological mitigation techniques except where areas have been removed from development.</p>			
NCC 10	Health Impacts	<p>Public Health note that any further specific health impacts arising from the proposed development, either negative or positive, on human health from the construction of the proposed Solar Farm are being considered as part of the scope of the PEIR. The Nottinghamshire Net-Zero framework and policies have been referenced, and the project's contribution to achieving these Net-Zero goals has been outlined. While the project acknowledges some impact on human health in various sections, it does not explicitly detail these impacts.</p> <p>NCC request that a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be undertaken for this project notts-spatial-planning-health-framework.pdf It would assist in the identification of any potential impacts on human health and assist the</p>	<p><b>Health Impact Assessment (HIA) [EN010163/APP/7.2].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant has prepared and submitted a <b>HIA</b> is with the DCO application <b>[EN010163/APP/7.2]</b>. Further detail regarding the methodology, accounting for the referenced Spatial Planning and Health Framework published by Nottinghamshire County Council is presented in Section 4 of the HIA.</p>

		applicant in understanding the importance of HIA and its 12 indicators.			
NCC 11	Highways	<p>NCC advised a proposal of this magnitude will have significant impact on the existing transportation network, mainly during the project's construction phase.</p> <p>Includes the request for a TA, OCTMP, Safety Audits, PRoW Management Plan, and Construction Traffic Management Plan to assess the additional traffic demands and any required mitigation to the highway network, prepared in accordance with current Planning Practice Policy, Nottinghamshire County Council's Design Guide and other industry accepted guidance on TAs.</p>	<p><b>TA (ES Appendix 13.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b></p> <p><b>OCTMP (ES Appendix 13.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b></p> <p><b>A workforce travel plan has also been prepared as part of the DCO support documentation.</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Discussions with the LHA have been held, and a <b>TA (ES Appendix 13.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]), OCTMP (ES Appendix 13.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13])</b> (which includes a PRoW Management Plan contained within the <b>OCTMP (ES Appendix 13.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13])</b> have been prepared in this context.</p> <p>Further comment on the provision of Road Safety Audits are presented in the <b>TA (TA provided in ES Appendix 13.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b></p> <p>A workforce travel plan has also been prepared as part of the DCO support documentation.</p>
NCC 12	Public Rights of Way	<p>Advised that the landowner rights of access should be confirmed.</p> <p>A PRoW Management Plan is required for each PRoW in the vicinity of the site. A PRoW</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010163/APP/6.2.13].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Landowner rights have been confirmed and access to the land through the use of the PRoW</p>

		Condition Survey is requested before and after construction.	<b>OCTMP (Appendix 13.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b>		network, using the Restricted Byways has been confirmed as acceptable.  A PRoW Management Plan and a Condition Survey will be provided in the <b>OCTMP (Appendix 13.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b>
NCC 13	Highways – Scope of Assessment	Indicated that the scope of the assessment is acceptable. Indicated that the operational phase would be scoped out of the assessment.	<b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010163/APP/6.2.13].</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  The operational phase will be scoped out of <b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010163/APP/6.2.13].</b>
NCC 14	Highways - Construction	Required clarification on the numbers of vehicles accessing the site, access, mitigation during construction.	<b>OCTMP (ES Appendix 13.2 [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  Vehicle trip generation, routing, access and mitigation, as discussed and agreed with NCC and will be included in the <b>OCTMP (ES Appendix 13.2 [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b>
NCC 15	Waste	The PEIR does not appear to have considered the adopted Waste Core Strategy, saved policies of the Waste Local nor the emerging Waste Local Plan in Chapter 6 – Planning Policy of Volume 2. Whilst not a waste proposal, the Waste Core Strategy contains two policies which are relevant to this development consent order:	<b>Planning Statement [EN010163/APP/7.1].</b>  <b>Outline Construction and Environmental</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  The Proposed Development is not a waste proposal. There are no waste facilities existing (or historical) within the Order Limits, and therefore there is no safeguarding issue. The

		<p>WCS2 and WCS10, with the new Waste Local Plan containing similar policies, SP1 and SP8 respectively.</p> <p>Policies WSC10 and SP8 both seek to safeguard operational and permitted waste management facilities. There are no waste facilities within the proposal area and so the County Council therefore do not consider there to be a safeguarding issue, but this should be detailed in the Supporting Planning Statement.</p> <p>In terms of WCS2 and SP1, both policies seek for all developments to be designed, constructed and operated to minimise the creation of waste and maximise the recycling and recovery of waste. These policies are aimed at managing waste as high up the waste hierarchy as possible and to avoid the disposal of materials. Chapter 17 – Miscellaneous Issues includes a section on waste where it is outlined that a detailed Environmental Management Plan will be prepared for the construction and decommissioning phases, looking to control and manage waste on-site. The proposal also seeks to minimise waste, maximise re-use and recycling opportunities and so following the</p>	<p><b>Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b></p> <p><b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b></p>		<p><b>Planning Statement [EN010163/APP/7.1]</b> outlines Waste at Section 6.14, confirming there is no safeguarding issue.</p> <p>The Waste Section of this ES Chapter details the Proposed Development is designed, constructed and to be operated under the 'Waste Hierarchy' guidance and abide by the principles of sustainable waste management. An <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> are submitted with the DCO application. The Applicant agrees that the Proposed Development is in line with Policies WCS2 and SP1 – this is addressed in <b>Appendix C- Local Planning Policy Accordance Table of the Planning Statement [EN010163/APP/7.1]</b>.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

		waste hierarchy. The application therefore appears to be in line with Policies WCS2 and SP1 and the promoter should address this within the future Supporting Planning Statement.			
NCC 16	Waste	When considering the Cumulative effects of waste, the promoter in paragraph 17.6.42 notes that there are several potential schemes that could result in cumulative volumes of waste at the decommissioning stage. This could then create pressure on the capacity of local recycling plants or landfill sites, with the industry for recycling solar panels still emerging but expected to have advanced by the end of proposal's operational life. The promoter recommends this would be managed through the CEMP and decommissioning schemes, with consultation undertaken with waste management providers to ensure waste could be accommodated. The County Council welcomes the acceptance of the cumulative impact of this proposal with others in terms of potential decommissioning waste volumes. Very significant volumes of PV panels would need to be disposed of or recycled and whilst it is preferable that the panels are recycled, it should be noted that such industry, on the scale	<p><b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.17].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Within the Waste section of <b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.17], cumulative effects are assessed for the Proposed Development. An <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</b> (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]) and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan</b> (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]) are submitted with the DCO application, and detailed versions will be prepared in consultation with waste management providers to ensure waste could be accommodated post-consent. The Applicant retains that the main elements of the Proposed Development are all capable of being recycled, with recycling routes generally available for the materials.</p>

		required, is not established. Other NSIP schemes in the area, for example Gate Burton, considered the worse-case scenario that the panels would need to be disposed of. The County Council believes such an approach should continue to be taken, with consideration given to whether additional disposal capacity requirements would be required with reference to the current capacity forecasts set out in the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Needs Assessment that accompanies the emerging Waste Local Plan. This would lead to potential understanding of capacity requirements, which the Council could consider in future Plans.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 6: Bassetlaw District Council outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Bassetlaw District Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
BDC 1	Ecology – Non Statutory Designated Sites	<u>Non-statutory Designated Sites</u>  Further details should be provided about the scope for additional/incidental management of	<b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  <b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]</b> includes details of

		<p>any of these sites as part of the management regime of the wider site.</p> <p><u>Habitats</u></p> <p>Further details should be provided on the seeding/planting in the Solar Areas, the timing of management (noting probable presence of nesting birds, leverets, herpetofauna etc.) and the approach towards use of chemical control of vegetation on site given the vast scale of the project and proximity to major watercourse.</p> <p><u>Badger</u></p> <p>Further details on protections for retained/created setts from machinery operating on site etc. during the operational phase.</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 7.14 Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.7].</b></p>		<p>mitigation and enhancement measures and <b>ES Appendix 7.14 Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.7].</b></p>
BDC 2	Ecology - Bats	<p>Further details are required on what compensation and enhancement for bats will be made available beyond any licencing requirements. For example, it is expected that identified commuting routes will be bolstered, main foraging areas retained and enhanced, but will new roosting provisions be provided?’</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Designed-in measures will mitigate for potential adverse effects on bat foraging / commuting by the retention, and enhancement, of habitats used by bats.</p> <p>Designed-in measures retain all trees / buildings with bat roost suitability. Further</p>

					<p>roost enhancements such as bat boxes are proposed.</p> <p>Assessment and mitigation are included in the <b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]</b>.</p>
BDC 3	Ecology - Birds	<p>Proposals for the inclusion of gaps in fencing for badger are admirable however it may be prudent for ground nesting birds, such as skylark, if these gaps were not present in all sectors and larger mammals such as badger, fox and hedgehog were excluded at least from some of the mitigation areas, if not some of the solar areas as well. The losses of skylark breeding territories to the scheme are substantial and clarification on exactly what bespoke compensation for this red listed species will be provisioned is needed.</p> <p>Noted that access wasn't possible to the proposed Eastern Mitigation Area, and this will be surveyed in 2024. Further details of which species breed here is needed and further information on what if any improvements can be made to this habitat for it to be a 'Mitigation Area'.</p>	<b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]</b> .		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>With regard to skylark mitigation, a skylark strategy is provided with <b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]</b> as <b>Appendix 7.13: Skylark Mitigation Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.7]</b>. Agreement on the approach to skylark mitigation and the general design of the Mitigation Areas at the Site (noting the comment on curlew) has been sought with the relevant local consultees.</p> <p>Management and reference to nesting birds is also addressed within <b>ES Appendix 7.14 Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.7]</b>.</p>



		Further details are required on the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan for the whole site and how this will consider nesting birds (this will likely also have beneficial effects on other species). Although much research pertains to skylark in Solar Farms, other species such as meadow pipit, linnet etc. may be prevalent and nest in the sward in and around panels.'			
BDC 4	Ecology - Reptiles	Further details on the mitigation and compensation for these species is required.	<b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  Consideration of impacts, mitigation and enhancement is provided within <b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b>
BDC 5	Ecology – Great Crested Newt, Water Vole, Terrestrial Invertebrates and Aquatic Invertebrates	<u>Great crested newts</u> Further details on the mitigation and compensation for this species are required. <u>Water vole</u> Further details on the mitigation and compensation for this species are required. <u>Terrestrial invertebrates</u>	<b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>  Consideration of impacts, mitigation and enhancement is provided within <b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7]</b> for these features.

		<p>Further details on enhancements for these species is required.</p> <p><u>Aquatic invertebrates</u></p> <p>The separation between the solar areas and the River Trent is very much welcomed given the research into solar farms and Ephemeroptera etc.’</p>			
BDC 6	Ecology – In combination effects	<p>Several other proposed solar developments similar in scope and scale and in proximity to or even bounding the site are emerging and these will doubtless be considered. Further details are required on communication between project teams and how habitat connectivity across these sites will be achieved. A lack of coherent connection between significant landscape features on the sites will represent a substantial loss for biodiversity in the region and ecology as a profession.</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Assessment of cumulative and in-combination effects is included in the <b>ES Chapter 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b></p>
BDC 7	Cultural Heritage - Littleborough Scheduled Ancient Monument	<p>Concerns are raised re the potential impacts to the Littleborough Scheduled Ancient Monument within the site area, with reference to potential for impacts to potentially associated archaeological remains.</p>	<p><b>Plans of statutory/ non statutory historic or schedule monument sites</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Segelocum Roman town Scheduled Monument has been removed from the Order Limits, and development has been offset from</p>

			<b>[EN010163/APP/2.30].</b> <b>Order Limits</b> <b>[EN010163/APP/2.4].</b>		the asset, avoiding identified and potentially associated archaeological remains.
BDC 8	Cultural Heritage – Study Radius	Study radius generally accepted but noted taller and/or higher grade assets in a wider vicinity should be considered.	<b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>  Assets beyond the 3km study area have been considered where appropriate. No assets beyond the search radius have been identified where impacts to setting are anticipated.
BDC 9	Cultural Heritage - Viewpoints	Photographic viewpoints study requested taking into account the setting of all heritage assets in the study area, key viewpoints along public highways and rights of way, and the natural contours of the landscape, including views from and towards publicly-accessible high and low points.	<b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</b> <b>Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (ES Appendix 9.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]).</b> <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>  Viewpoints have been considered in conjunction with the landscape team and visualisations have been utilised where appropriate. Views, in so far as they are relevant to heritage assets and their significance are also considered in detail within the <b>Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (Appendix 9.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> . Points with regard to public highways, rights of way, and natural contours within the landscape, are considered to be relevant to landscape rather than

			<p><b>Residential Amenity</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.6].</p> <p><b>ES Figure 6.6a Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility (SZTV) and View Point Locations (10km radius</b> [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], <b>ES Figure 6.6b SZTV and View Point Locations (5km radius</b> [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], <b>ES Figure 6.6c SZTV and View Point Locations (2km radius</b> [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], <b>ES Figure 6.7 SZTV and</b></p>		<p>heritage. Visibility of the Proposed Development has been considered carefully as part of the LVIA process.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>landscape character [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.8a SZTV and Visual Receptors [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.8b SZTV and Visual Receptors [EN010163/APP/6.4.6] and ES Figure 6.8c SZTV and Visual Receptors [EN010163/APP/6.4.6].</p>		
BDC 10	Cultural Heritage - Archaeology	<p>Identifies that the full potential impact zone, including cable connection corridors will require geophysical survey.</p> <p>Flags that the impacts associated with decommissioning should be considered.</p> <p>Recommends a programme of pre-determination trial trenching.</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Cable routes are included and surveyed in <b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p>The effects of decommissioning on archaeological remains are considered at</p>

			<p>[EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p>		<p>paragraph 9.7.19 of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p>A programme of pre-determination trial trenching targeting ‘fixed’ areas of large scale development is proposed (<b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]).</p>
BDC 11	Waste	<p>Consideration should be given to the impact of waste generated from the construction / decommissioning phase and or end of life solar arrays requiring replacement in terms of how and where it is disposed of and transportation away from the site. There are other solar schemes in the area that are operating on similar time scales therefore there is the potential for significant amounts of waste if this is not carefully considered.</p>	<p><b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</b> (<b>ES Appendix 4.1</b>, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</p> <p><b>Outline Decommissioning Plan</b> (<b>ES Appendix 4.2</b>, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>No standalone ES chapter is proposed to assess Waste, but Waste is included as a section within this chapter assessing all phases of development (construction, operation and decommissioning) and the potential for cumulative effects. The accompanying <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</b> (<b>ES Appendix 4.1</b>, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]) and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan</b> (<b>ES Appendix 4.2</b>, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]) submitted as part of this DCO application include details of how</p>

					waste is managed in accordance with the waste management hierarchy.
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 7: Natural England outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Natural England	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NE 1	Ecology – National Designated Sites	<p>Clarborough Tunnel SSSI lies approximately 40m from the development boundary and has been identified as the only SSSI triggering one of Natural England’s Impact Risk Zones (IRZs). NE concur with this and consider impacts to any other SSSI’s as a result of the proposed development to be unlikely</p> <p>Paragraph 7.8.12 states that as the nearest part of the proposed development to Clarborough tunnel SSSI is the Western mitigation area, no impacts on the SSSI are anticipated. NE would concur that impacts to the SSSI during operation are unlikely as a result of this, however, it is unclear at this stage exactly what construction activity is likely to occur within proximity to the SSSI. We advise that there may</p>	<b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>A full assessment on the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on relevant nationally designated statutory sites and the need for further mitigation is included in <b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b></p> <p>The Clarborough Tunnel SSSI has been considered within the Construction Dust Risk Assessment in <b>ES Appendix 14.1(C) - Air Quality Appendices [EN010163/APP/6.3.14].</b></p> <p>The SSSI is classified as a medium sensitivity receptor, which when combined with distance from the source of dust emission is defined as</p>

		be potential for impacts to the SSSI via the following pathways – construction traffic and construction dust.			<p>having a low area sensitivity, in line with IAQM guidance.</p> <p>However, given that there is a high risk of unmitigated dust risks from dust soiling to human receptors, the highest level of mitigation measures have been proposed for implementation across the Site. The Applicant has committed to producing a Dust Management Plan when detailed construction information is available, as secured within <b>ES Appendix 4.1 OCEMP [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b>. This will detail how to practically implement the mitigation measures proposed, including monitoring.</p>
NE 2	Health Impacts – Access to Public Rights of Way	<p>The site is crossed in various location by Public Rights of Way &amp; Natural England welcome the intention to provide a Public Rights of Way Management Plan.</p> <p>The provision of additional footpaths (shown in Figure 6.7) is also welcomed, to further increase the accessibility of the PRoW network in the area.</p> <p>Review of the Accessible Natural Greenspace profile and Accessible Green Infrastructure layers on the NE Green Infrastructure mapping</p>	<p><b>Health Impact Assessment (HIA) [EN010163/APP/7.2].</b></p> <p><b>Works Plans [EN010163/APP/2.2].</b></p> <p><b>Planning Statement</b></p>		<p><b>High Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant has had due consideration of the potential impacts on accessibility for relevant target groups during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Further detail is presented in Section 7 of the <b>Health Impact Assessment (HIA) [EN010163/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>



		<p>tool show that despite its rural nature, the development site and surrounding areas have poor greenspace provision and accessible Green Infrastructure. The establishment of permissive footpaths and accessible enhancement areas are thus increasingly valuable in improving the Green Infrastructure provision for the surrounding local communities. As a result, NE would recommend a focus on ensuring local communities are able to access the PRoW network in and around the site.</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/7.1].</b></p>		<p>The provision of additional footpaths is provided in the form of two new permissive paths are proposed. These will connect footpath BW9 to footpath BW5 in the eastern half of the Site and footpath FP41 to footpath FP24 in the western half of the Site. These paths will operate during the life of the Proposed Development and will comprise a short mown corridor and/or wooden board walk contained by 4-5m deer fencing and hedgerows, as required. The permissive paths are located within the spatial parameters of Works No.9 area, as illustrated within <b>Works Plans [EN010163/APP/2.2]</b>.</p> <p>In summary, as outlined in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010163/APP/7.1]</b>, temporary closures of existing PRoW within the Order Limits are not anticipated. However, in the unlikely event this is necessary for health and safety purposes, temporary closures will be limited to the minimum duration required to ensure continued connectivity. The Outline PRoW Management Plan will set out how diversions will be managed if they are absolutely necessary.</p>
--	--	---	-----------------------------------	--	--

NE 3	Air Emissions	<p>Due to the proximity of the SSSI to the development site, construction traffic emissions could cause an adverse effect to the SSSI, i.e. via ammonia, NOx Emissions &amp; subsequent Nitrogen deposition. Chapter 14 (Air Quality) sets out the screening criteria used for consideration of impacts to ecological receptors: 1000 AADT and/or 200 HDV AADT increase on the Affected Road Network (ARN) within 200m of a sensitive site.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.3.23 states Construction traffic is unlikely to be routed within 200m of Clarborough Tunnel SSSI, and that any change in traffic is expected to be below the relevant thresholds anyway. NE welcome this consideration, and advise that where this is the case, impacts could be ruled out. Nonetheless, this information should be clearly illustrated in ES to evidence the likely absence of any traffic emission related impacts to Clarborough Tunnel SSSI.</p>	<b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010163/APP/6.2.13].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Construction traffic routing is not proposed to travel with 200m of the Clarborough Tunnel SSSI as shown in Inset 13.3 of <b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010163/APP/6.2.13]</b> ES chapter. Therefore, there are not expected to be any significant impacts to ecological receptors identified at Clarborough Tunnel SSSI.</p>
NE 4	Air Emissions	<p>Due to the proximity of the SSSI to the development site, construction dust could cause an adverse effect to the SSSI, i.e. via smothering. Appendix 14.3 includes a dust</p>	<b>ES Appendix 14.1(C) - Air Quality Appendices</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Clarborough Tunnel SSSI has been considered within the Construction Dust Risk</p>

		<p>assessment, in line with IAQM guidance. The assessment identified the SSSI as a sensitive receptor within 50m, which is welcomed, although Table A1.9 states that ecological sensitivity is 'low', despite the SSSI being of medium sensitivity. NE would advise that ecological sensitivity should be classed as 'Medium' as a result of the SSSI.</p> <p>Nonetheless, NE consider the mitigation measures outlined in Table A14.11 likely to be sufficient to avoid a significant adverse effect to the SSSI. These should be secured within the oCEMP and DCO requirements. Table A14.11 states the Dust Management Plan 'may include' monitoring. NE advise the plan must include monitoring, which should form the basis for the plan, especially at the SSSI &amp; other sensitive ecological receptors, to enable a flexible approach to be taken &amp; action to be taken where unacceptable dust emissions are identified.</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.14].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.1 OCEMP [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p>		<p>Assessment in <b>ES Appendix 14.1(C) - Air Quality Appendices [EN010163/APP/6.3.14].</b></p> <p>The SSSI is classified as a medium sensitivity receptor, which when combined with distance from the source of dust emission is defined as having a low area sensitivity, in line with IAQM guidance.</p> <p>However, given that there is a high risk of unmitigated dust risks from dust soiling to human receptors, the highest level of mitigation measures have been proposed for implementation across the Site. The Applicant has committed to producing a Dust Management Plan when detailed construction information is available, as secured within <b>ES Appendix 4.1 OCEMP [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b> This will detail how to practically implement the mitigation measures proposed, including monitoring.</p>
NE 5	Use of Agricultural Land	<p>Natural England [NE] advise that a full ALC survey should be undertaken of all land within the full order limits, including the cable route and enhancement areas. This is to understand</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agricultural [EN010163/APP/6.2.16].</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Land in the Cable Route Corridor (CRC) is not affected, and so has not been surveyed, as described in <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and</b></p>

		<p>the baseline conditions to inform soil handling practices and minimise potential damage.</p> <p>NE advise that avoidance of BMV land for any temporary sealing should be the goal.</p> <p>NE advise that intrusive land use change may affect the potential for land to retain its BMV status.</p> <p>NE advise that the breakdown of land take for all elements of the development should be set out.</p> <p>The SMP should cover all soils and should detail the involvement of a suitably qualified soil specialist during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p>			<p><b>Agricultural [EN010163/APP/6.2.16]</b>, section 15.7. As described in section 15.7, no physical works will take place in the enhancement areas.</p> <p>As described in <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agricultural [EN010163/APP/6.2.16]</b> section 15.7, BMV use is minimised.</p> <p>Noted and addressed <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agricultural [EN010163/APP/6.2.16]</b>, especially section 15.7.</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 15.2- Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.15]</b> covers soils and details the involvement of a suitably qualified soil specialist during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

**Table 8: Historic England outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Historic England	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
HE 1	Cultural Heritage	Agree in principle with search radius but note that professional judgement should still be applied to include particularly sensitive/important assets beyond this.	<b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b>		<b>High Applicants Position</b>

		<p>Highlights the importance of accounting for kinetic views, rather than just fixed views to consider setting impact.</p> <p>Identify some specific assets to consider but note this is not an exclusive list.</p> <p>Also highlighted are archaeological remains which potentially extend beyond the Scheduled area associated with Segelocum Roman town, but which may be related.</p> <p>A programme of trial trench evaluation is recommended in consultation with the LPA.</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/SPP/6.2.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline</b></p> <p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b></p> <p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p>		<p>Assets beyond the 3km study area have been considered where appropriate. No assets beyond the search radius have been identified where impacts to setting are anticipated.</p> <p>Views, including kinetic views (where appropriate) are considered in <b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p>All identified assets, and others, are considered within <b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b> and, where appropriate, are considered in <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/SPP/6.2.9].</b></p> <p>Identified remains west of the Scheduled Monument have been excluded from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As above, a programme of pre-determination trial trenching targeting 'fixed' areas of large scale development is proposed (<b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b>).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

HE 2	Cultural Heritage – Archaeology	<p>Historic England note the assertion that the construction phase of the Proposed Development would not result in any direct, physical impacts to any designated assets. However we would draw attention to the commitment to a targeted programme of trial trench evaluation. We would take the opportunity to comment that this strategy should thoroughly encompass ‘blank areas’ to most fully evaluate potential for non-designated archaeological remains. We note and support the Planning Inspectorate’s prior comment that Environmental Statement should consider the need for intrusive evaluation, and this should be developed in consultation with the local planning authorities.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed cable route, it is stated that none of the areas identified for cable infrastructure correspond with any of the key areas of archaeological potential identified to date. However, we would like to draw attention to the current completeness of baseline surveys and suggest a more thorough baseline required to ascertain potential level of harm to non-designated remains before an appropriate</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Baseline</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.3 - Archaeological Mitigation Strategy</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.4 - Outline Written Scheme of</b></p>		<p><b>Moderate</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Certain areas of the Site, considered to have the highest potential for significant archaeological remains have been avoided through the design of the Proposed Development, so as to preserve these remains in situ. An <b>Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (ES Appendix 9.3, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> provides further information with regard to these areas and the methodology for ensuring preservation. As outlined in detail above, programme of targeted pre-determination trial trenching is proposed, focussed on the ‘fixed’ areas of develop where there is no flexibility (<b>ES Appendix 9.4 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>). Further trial trenching and/or mitigation will be undertaken post-determination, as outlined in <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b>.</p> <p>The <b>Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Appendix 9.1 [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> provides a detailed</p>
------	---------------------------------	--	---	--	---

		<p>mitigation strategy can be considered proportionate.</p> <p>The NTS specifies that the operational phase of the proposal will only result in indirect effects, however we would like to draw attention to the potential for the requirement for half-life maintenance and suggest this should be considered as part of the impact assessment...</p> <p>...It is stated that decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not result in any physical effects to heritage assets. However, this would need to be clearly evidenced and methodology assessed in a management plan (CMP). We suggest that currently, there is little clarity as to how the decommissioning will be completed as well as incomplete baseline data regarding the archaeological potential, therefore it is difficult to say with clarity the physical effect on any remains. In summary, we note and support the Planning Inspectorate's prior comments that Development on known and unknown archaeological remains during decommissioning should be included in the ES.</p>	<p><b>Investigation for Pre-Determination Trial Trenching [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b></p>		<p>assessment of the Site's archaeological potential, informed by <b>ES Appendix 9.2 - Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Report [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>. As noted above, a programme of pre-determination trial trenching targeting large, and 'fixed' elements of development is proposed. It is considered that the inherently flexible nature of the type of development allows a range of potential mitigation options, which are provided in <b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>.</p> <p>There is no planned mid-life refit. Units will be maintained and repaired/replaced on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>The effects of decommissioning on archaeological remains are considered and are discussed at 9.7.19 of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]</b>. Where areas of archaeological interest are identified, then specific protocols with regard to decommissioning may be required, as outlined in <b>ES Appendix 9.3 - Archaeological Mitigation Statement [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b>,</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

					and <b>ES Appendix 9.5 – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]</b> .
HE 3	Cultural Heritage - Grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE: 1275773)	With specific reference to the Grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE: 1275773) within Sturton-le-Steeple, the PEIR NTS notes some visible built form in the wider surrounds of the asset, and recognises that it will impact some longer distance views towards the church tower, but suggests that this would no impact the significance of the asset, this would need to be carefully evidenced against our published guidance regarding the setting of Heritage assets. Further to this, Chapter 9 of the PEIR states that views are considered as part of the ZTV, and it is however acknowledged that the setting of an asset does not rely wholly on visibility, therefore further assessment should be considered.	<b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</b>  <b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  A detailed assessment of potential impacts to the significance of the asset is provided in the <b>Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (ES Appendix 9.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> . The key and contributory elements of the asset's setting (both visual and non-visual) are considered in <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]</b> at paragraph 9.7.14.
NE 4	Cultural Heritage - Segelocum Roman Town Scheduled Monument	We note The Segelocum Roman Town Scheduled Monument (NHLE: 1003669) has been removed from the red line, and development has been offset from the asset. However, attention should still be given to the potential for archaeological remains that contribute to the significance of the monument	<b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</b>  <b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Post-Consent</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  As noted, the Scheduled Monument has been excluded from the Order Limits, and the development has been offset from identified archaeological remains to the west of the asset.



	(NHLE: 1003669)	in the wider landscape, such as trackways and roads.	<b>Archaeological Works</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].		Where potentially contemporary significant archaeological remains have been identified in the wider vicinity, these have also been excluded from the Proposed Development, as outlined in section 9.8 of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9]. Due to the nature of the scheme, it is considered that impacts to other potentially associated archaeological features in the wider landscape could be mitigated via a variety of possible measures, as outlined in Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for <b>Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b> (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]).
NE 5	Cultural Heritage - Archaeology	<p>We note the reference to both colluvial deposits and ridge and furrow. We ask that the potential for colluvial deposits and ridge and furrow to mask and obscure underlying archaeological deposits be considered, and appropriate mitigation be considered.</p> <p>The PEIR notes beneficial effects will arise from the removal of the Proposed Development and the restoration of the Site to agricultural use, however, we note that the prior sections highlight upstanding earthwork remains</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Baseline</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.3 - Archaeological</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>As noted above, <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b> (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]) has been prepared, outlining the methodology for further evaluative works, and a range of mitigation options, depending on the results.</p> <p>Extant ridge and furrow earthworks and potential impacts are considered in <b>ES</b></p>

		<p>identifiable via Lidar and ask that the impact to these are considered.</p> <p>Finally, the PEIR notes that should significant archaeological remains be encountered during the trial trench evaluation, such remains could either be avoided by the Proposed Development, or 'no dig' methods of construction be utilised. We would highlight the potential for crush or compression effects on below ground archaeology as a result and ask that this is factored into the assessment and approach.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Strategy</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 9.5 - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9].</p>		<p><b>Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.9], and in <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.9].</p> <p>The <b>Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (ES Appendix 9.3, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b> provides further details with regard to the preservation methodology in specific areas of the Proposed Development. Further details with regard to 'no dig' methods of construction and/or avoidance are provided in <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Works (ES Appendix 9.5, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9])</b>. There is no evidence to show that 'no dig' construction methods would result in crush or compression effects that would be so significant that they would be harmful in of themselves.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

**Table 9: Canal and River Trust outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by the Canal and River Trust	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination

CRT 1	Landscape and Visual Amenity - Viewpoints	We note that some 26 Assessment Viewpoints are identified (6.6.32 and Table 6.3) and shown on Figure 6.6. Of these only Viewpoint 26 appears to be offer a view from the immediate vicinity of the River Trent... We suggest consideration is given to potentially identifying viewpoints on the river around Littleborough, Marton or Torksey to demonstrate how visible (or not) the development is likely to be.	<p><b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.6].</p> <p><b>ES Figure 6.6a Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility (SZTV) and View Point Locations (10km radius</b> [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], <b>ES Figure 6.6b SZTV and View Point Locations (5km radius</b> [EN010163/APP/6.4.6], <b>ES Figure 6.6c SZTV and View Point Locations (2km radius</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The potential for visibility of the Proposed Development from the River Trent has been considered carefully as part of the LVIA process. The ZTV plans clearly illustrate the highly limited potential for any visibility from the river, which is primarily a function of the high embankments that bound the majority of the river as it passes through the study area. Furthermore, the Proposed Development is offset from the river to a notable degree, with the shortest distance between the built elements of the Proposed Development and the river being around 1km. In the case of the section of the river to the south-east of the Proposed Development around Littleborough, Marton and Torksey, the ZTV plans clearly demonstrate there would be no views from the river, with Torksey also located over 4km from the built elements of the Proposed Development.</p>
-------	---	---	---	--	---

			<p>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.7 SZTV and landscape character</p> <p>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.8a SZTV and Visual Receptors</p> <p>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6], ES Figure 6.8b SZTV and Visual Receptors</p> <p>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6] and ES Figure 6.8c SZTV and Visual Receptors</p> <p>[EN010163/APP/6.4.6].</p>		
CRT 2	Health Impacts – Glint and Glare	The Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion advises that the proposed assessment area should include river users on the River Trent to ascertain whether the potential impact of glint or glare may give rise to a Likely Significant Effect (LSE). The Scoping Opinion highlights the comments made by the Canal & River Trust (set	<p><b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare</b></p> <p><b>{EN010163/APP/6.2.16}.</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The PRoW and waterways have been considered separately, with PRoW pertaining to pedestrians walking, and waterways pertaining to boat navigation and river traffic. The</p>

		<p>out in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report) on this matter.</p> <p>The PEIR discusses potential impacts on public rights of way and waterways (16.3.32) but only appears to consider waterway impacts in the context of impacts on pedestrians walking alongside waterways: "significant effects from glint and glare are not possible upon pedestrians/observers along PRoWs and waterways." The PEIR does not go on to consider potential impacts on boat navigation, which is particularly important as this part of the River Trent is a commercial waterway and is used by larger freight-carrying vessels as well as leisure craft. Our earlier advice in response to the Scoping Opinion request referred to potential effects on river users, by which we primarily meant river traffic rather than pedestrians walking alongside the river.</p> <p>We consider that it is reasonable to expect that the Glint and Glare Assessment should specifically consider the potential effect on vessels navigating along the river in order to determine whether the proposed development</p>			<p>Proposed Development would not give rise to LSE's due to the baseline conditions, the separation distance of 900m between the location of solar panels and that the reflection intensity is similar for solar panels and still water. This is further mitigated by the proposed landscaping plan. No significant impact is predicated upon PRoW (pedestrians walking) and waterways (boat navigation and river traffic).</p> <p>The assessment has assessed the potential impact upon river users at a high-level without being geometrically modelled. Further detail is included in Section 16.7.9 of <b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare {EN010163/APP/6.2.16}</b>.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

		would give rise to LSEs and, if so, identify how they are to be mitigated.			
CRT 3	Glint and Glare	The Glint and Glare Assessment should specifically consider the potential effect on vessels navigating along the river in order to determine whether the proposed development would give rise to LSEs and, if so, identify how they are to be mitigated.	<b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [EN010163/APP/6.2.16].</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b> The assessment has considered the potential impact upon vessels navigating along the river as waterways. Further detail is presented in section 16.7.12 of <b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [EN010163/APP/6.2.16].</b>

**Table 10: Anglian Water outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Anglian Water	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
AW 1	Easements	Queried whether appropriate easements are provided for Station Road water booster station and require information on the interactions of the Scheme with the water booster station on Station Road.	<b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8].</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b> The Applicant notes the requirement for further information on the interactions of the scheme with the water booster station on Station Road. Discussions with AW regarding this point are ongoing, but it is noted that the only proposed infrastructure in the vicinity of the booster

			<b>Site Layout</b> [EN010163/APP/2.3].		station is an existing access track (to be retained).
AW 2	Water Usage	Need to set out in detail how the project will be supplied with water and if new connections to network required. Consider impacts of climate change on water availability.	<b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.8].		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant notes the need to identify how the Development will be supplied with water and the impacts of climate change on availability. Section 8.7 of <b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8]</b> details likely water usage and identifies options for water sources for all stages of Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that AW will advise whether new supplies are feasible. A Pre-Planning Assessment Report (06.05.25) from AW confirms the availability of up to 20m3 per day via an existing main on Gainsborough Road.</p>
AW 3	Rainwater harvesting and re-use	Further details of proposals for rainwater harvesting / re-use required.	<b>ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Applicant notes the requirement for further details of proposals for rainwater harvesting / re-use. Rainwater harvesting is discussed within</p>

			[EN010163/APP/6.2.8].  ES Appendix 8.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8]		ES Appendix 8.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN010163/APP/6.3.8] and in Section 8.7 of ES Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010163/APP/6.2.8].
--	--	--	---	--	---

**Table 11: Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NWT1	Ecology – Biodiversity Mitigation Areas	<p><u>Eastern Mitigation Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the creation of wet woodland habitat, but we recommend removing it from the area where scrapes are proposed. Nesting wading birds such as lapwing prefer open areas to nest within because trees and other tall structures provide perching places for avian predators.</li> </ul>	ES Appendix 7.14 - Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.7].		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>These comments have been considered and fed into the design where they are considered to be appropriate. Further details on the design of the Biodiversity Mitigation Areas is provided in <b>Appendix 7.14 - Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan</b> [EN010163/APP/6.3.7].</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fenton Gorse – woodland planting is proposed adjacent to this site. We ask that natural regeneration is considered to allow wildlife to benefit from successional habitats. We suggest that Fenton Gorse receives management to create a varied scrub structure.</li> <li>• Peninsula – we support the idea in principle but negative impacts on the botanical interest of Littleborough Lagoon LWS would need to be avoided. A bund would provide foraging habitat for birds along the water's edge, a loafing area for wildfowl and a sheltered area of water with protection from prevailing wind. On going management would be necessary to retain an open aspect.</li> <li>• Grazing – large cattle would be our preferred choice as grazing animals for this area due to them producing a more diverse sward than sheep. Conservation grazing should be the priority over commercial grazing to provide the greatest benefits for wildlife.</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support a 5m buffer between LWS ditch and agricultural land where wet scrapes could be created.</li> </ul> <p><u>Western Mitigation Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We suggest establishing grassland and allowing the adjacent woodland to ‘creep out’ to provide a scrub edge to the woodland</li> <li>▪ We suggest beetle banks rather than broader field margins because they will have greater benefit to skylarks. There may be an opportunity for tenant farmer to be paid through SFI to manage features.</li> <li>▪ We would like to see lapwing plots incorporated into this area but we acknowledge that the Eastern Mitigation Area could provide nesting and foraging habitat for lapwing.</li> </ul>			
NWT 2	Ecology – Cable Route Corridor and Local Wildlife Sites (LWS)	We are concerned about potential adverse impacts on Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). Details should be provided on how these sites will be	<b>ES Chapter 7: Ecology &amp; Biodiversity [EN010163/APP/6.2.7].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Details of the cable route are presented within the Environmental Statement (ES). No</p>

		<p>protected during the construction and decommissioning stages of this proposal.</p> <p>Mitigation, in the form of directional drilling will be employed for cabling beneath watercourses and hedgerows during construction, to avoid damage to linear habitats. We support that approach. However, the extent of the damage and loss to LWS is not clear and we therefore request further information about the cabling process and the LWS that are to be affected. Cabling operations should be carried out according to a PMW or Ecological Method Statement in the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works to supervise and advise during the process to avoid direct impacts upon protected and notable species and ensure the working area is restored to a high standard.'</p>			<p>LWS are in or adjacent to the cable route; adverse effects to the LWS's are not expected from the cable route.</p> <p>Mitigation measures (such as directional drilling) for retained habitats are presented within the ES. Protection measures are described in the <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 12: UK Health Security Agency outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by UK Health Security Agency	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
HSA 1	Health Impacts	<p>Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role on NSIPs is summarised in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 11 Annex G - Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - Advice Note Eleven, Annex G: The Health and Safety Executive - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). This document includes a section "Risk Assessments" describing the applicable legislation containing the requirement for risk assessment and the role of the HSE.</p> <p>Within the PEIR Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues Table 17.1: Consultation responses, in response to HSE comment within the EIA Scoping Consultation the applicant has responded "Details relating to consultation with West Burton A Power Station, and any future</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access</b>  <b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.13]</b></p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p><b>ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010163/APP/6.2.13]</b> confirms this information.</p>

		assessment (if required) will be set out within the subsequent ES.” Within the current PEIR Section 17.7 Major Accidents and Disasters there is some consideration of events occurring from, or impacting, the development. HSE would advise these matters are considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex G taking account of the following: “it may be beneficial for applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses.” Note, that there are no requirements for any risk assessments submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority to also be considered by HSE.			
HAS 2	Fire	The current submission does not consider in detail any risks or impacts that might arise as a result of accidents such as fires. The development will incorporate lithium-ion batteries to store the energy captured. It is recognised that there is a risk of spontaneous ignition with these which could lead to a range of pollutants being emitted with the potential for adverse human health effects. In the event of	<b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b> <b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.17].</b> <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction and Environmental</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>  The Major Accidents and Disasters section of <b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues [EN010163/APP/6.2.17]</b> assesses the risk of an uncontrolled fire event to relevant local residents, habitats and species, landscape features, surface water and groundwater. It is

		<p>a fire, a mixture of substances would be released into the environment which could impact health. Given the proximity of the development to residential properties it would be useful to give some consideration to what products of combustion could be released from the site infrastructure during a major fire and any other potential emissions from the battery storage units and how these accidents could affect people's health.</p> <p>We recommend that accidents and fires which could cause an uncontrolled release to the environment should be considered in the ES.</p>	<p><b>Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.3 Outline Fire Risk Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p>		<p>acknowledged that in the unlikely event of a fire, air pollutants could be released. However, the Applicant maintains that through appropriate mitigation measures secured through the <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b>, <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> and <b>Outline Fire Risk Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.3, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> the risk is low and not assessed further.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 13: Health and Safety Executive outstanding issue**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Health and Safety Executive	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
HSE 1	Health Impacts – West Burton A Power Station	Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the	<b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>

		<p>expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role on NSIPs is summarised in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 11 Annex G - Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - Advice Note Eleven, Annex G: The Health and Safety Executive - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). This document includes a section "Risk Assessments" describing the applicable legislation containing the requirement for risk assessment and the role of the HSE.</p> <p>Within the PEIR Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues Table 17.1: Consultation responses, in response to HSE comment within the EIA Scoping Consultation the applicant has responded "Details relating to consultation with West Burton A Power Station, and any future assessment (if required) will be set out within the subsequent ES." Within the current PEIR Section 17.7 Major Accidents and Disasters there is some consideration of events occurring from, or impacting, the development. HSE would advise these matters are considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex G taking account of the following: "it may be beneficial for</p>	<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.17].</b></p>		<p>The Applicant confirms the design of the Proposed Development, and its' main components have been sited carefully to avoid impacting West Burton A Power Station. The design of the Proposed Development is in accordance with relevant Health and Safety Legislation, and the health and safety of workers in the construction, operation and decommissioning stages of the Proposed Development has been assessed in the Major Accidents and Disasters section of <b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues [EN010163/APP/6.2.17]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken meetings with UK Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA) and EDF to discuss arrangements for access and the construction principles regarding the grid connection cable. No consultation response has been received from West Burton A Power Station. Further information on hazardous substance consent will be sought from BDC to accompany the DCO application.</p>
--	--	---	--------------------------------------	--	---

		applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses.” Note, that there are no requirements for any risk assessments submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority to also be considered by HSE.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

**Table 14: National Highways outstanding issue**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by National Highways	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NH 1	Highways	Indicated that the use of A1(M) Junction 34 would be acceptable in principle during the construction period. However, assessment would be required.	<b>TA (ES Appendix 13.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  The A1M junction 34 has been considered & trips levels reviewed at the junction in the <b>TA (ES Appendix 13.1 [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).</b>

**Table 15: Network Rail outstanding issue**



Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by National Highways	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
NR 1	Glint and Glare	<p>Since your proposal would involve interaction with Network Rail's operational railway, it is strongly advised that you take all potential areas of concern to Network Rail into account, in their documentation for consideration at planning.</p> <p>Therefore, it is imperative that Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region be consulted directly by you, to ensure that all risks to our railway infrastructure are safely managed from all construction related activities associated with your proposed development.</p>	<b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [EN010163/APP/6.2.16].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>Receptors such as assets and signals to be included in the glint and glare assessment had been identified via the Automated Intelligent Video Review (AIVR) Network Rail portal. Further detail is included in Section 16.3.2 of <b>ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [EN010163/APP/6.2.16].</b></p>

**Table 16: Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council outstanding issue**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
S-I-S PC 1	Noise	General commentary regarding the potential for construction noise with specific reference to cumulative construction noise impacts.	<b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p>

			<p><b>[EN010163/APP/6.2.11].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p> <p><b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b></p>		<p>The Applicant acknowledges that some noise and vibration could be generated during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development via the use of certain construction plant, the operation of various ancillary electrical equipment and the additional traffic generated by the Proposed Development in isolative and cumulative terms.</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations [EN010163/APP/6.2.11]</b> addresses all relevant potential noise and vibratory effects from the introduction of the Proposed Development, concluding that noise and vibration generated during the temporary construction, operation and decommissioning of the site is considered not significant in the context of normal planning requirements, provided that typical mitigation measures are implemented, and that best practice is followed. Further safeguards during construction through <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b>, operation through <b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b> and decommissioning through <b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Decommissioning Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 17: Lincolnshire County Council outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Lincolnshire County Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
LCC 1	Waste	Further consideration should be given to the impact of waste generated from the decommissioning phase and/or end of life solar arrays requiring replacement, in terms of how and where it is disposed of and its transportation from the site. Given the number of other solar schemes in the locality that would be operating on similar timescales there is potential for significant amounts of waste to be generated at this stage. The impact from replacement and/or decommissioning should also be considered cumulatively with these other developments.	<b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b> <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b> No standalone ES chapter is proposed to assess Waste, but Waste is included as a section within <b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues [EN010163/APP/6.2.17]</b> assessing all phases of development (construction, operation and decommissioning) and the potential for cumulative effects. The accompanying <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4])</b> submitted as part of this DCO application include details of how

					waste is managed in accordance with the waste management hierarchy.
LCC 2	Waste	LCC welcomes the inclusion of waste within the miscellaneous issues chapter of the PIER. LCC is pleased to see the implementation of the waste hierarchy. It is noted that due to the proposed longevity of the scheme final waste destinations are unable to be certain, LCC welcomes the intension to reuse and recycle where possible. However, as there are currently limited recycling opportunities for solar PV panels the worst-case scenario should also be assessed should the anticipated recycling facilities not arise.	<p><b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.17].</p> <p><b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</b> (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</p> <p><b>Outline Decommissioning Plan</b> (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]).</p>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The Waste Section of <b>ES Chapter 17: Miscellaneous Issues</b> [EN010163/APP/6.2.17] details the Proposed Development is designed, constructed and to be operated under the 'Waste Hierarchy' guidance and abide by the principles of sustainable waste management. An <b>Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</b> (ES Appendix 4.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]) and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Plan</b> (ES Appendix 4.2, [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]) are submitted with the DCO application, and detailed versions will be prepared in consultation with waste management providers to ensure waste could be accommodated post-consent. The Applicant retains that the main elements of the Proposed Development are all capable of being recycled, with recycling routes generally available for the materials.</p>

**Table 18: West Lindsey District Council outstanding issues**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by West Lindsey District Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
WLDC 1	Landscape and Visual Amenity – Cumulative Impact with other DCO development.	Given the close proximity of these projects to one another [Gate Burton Energy Park; Cottam Solar Project; and West Burton Solar Project], they will likely be viewed as one large solar park. The cumulative landscape character impacts must be considered as a kinetic and sequential basis, with an appreciation of the scale of change across districts.	<b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity [EN010163/APP/6.2.6].</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p> <p>The potential for cumulative landscape and visual effects has been considered in Section 6.10 of <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity [EN010163/APP/6.2.6]</b>. This includes consideration of the Gate Burton, Cottam and West Burton projects. As part of the assessment regard has been given to the potential for effects to be perceived in a sequential manner as one moves around the wider landscape covering the projects, including the landscape of West Lindsey.</p>
WLDC 2	Use of Agricultural Land	Express a need to consider the cumulative impact with other consented or in-process schemes, and to protect BMV agricultural Land.	<b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [EN010163/APP/6.2.15]</b>		<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Applicants Position</b></p>

					This is addressed in section 15.7 of <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [EN010163/APP/6.2.15]</b> .
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 19: Hayton Parish Council outstanding issue**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by Hayton Parish Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
HPC 1	Noise	General commentary regarding the potential for noise impacts associated with the site with specific reference to the proposed battery storage facilities and the potential requirement for barriers/screening of noise generating equipment.	<b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations [EN010163/APP/6.2.11].</b>  <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b>  <b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental</b>		<b>High</b>  <b>Applicants Position</b>  The Applicant acknowledges that some noise and vibration could be generated during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development via the use of certain construction plant, the operation of various ancillary electrical equipment and the additional traffic generated by the Proposed Development in isolative and cumulative terms.  <b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations [EN010163/APP/6.2.11]</b> addresses all relevant potential noise and vibratory effects from the introduction of the Proposed Development, concluding that noise and vibration generated

			<b>Management Plan</b> <b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b>  <b>ES Appendix 4.2</b> <b>Outline</b> <b>Decommissioning</b> <b>Plan</b> <b>[EN010163/APP/6.3.4].</b>		during the temporary construction, operation and decommissioning of the site is considered not significant in the context of normal planning requirements, provided that typical mitigation measures are implemented, and that best practice is followed. Further safeguards during construction through <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b> , operation through <b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b> and decommissioning through <b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010163/APP/6.3.4]</b> .
--	--	--	---	--	--

**Table 20: City of Doncaster Council outstanding issue**

Ref	Area of Disagreement	Summary of concern held by City of Doncaster Council	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during Examination
CDC 1	Highways	Requested the A361 / A368 signalised junction at Bawtry to be considered and traffic levels reviewed.	<b>TA (ES Appendix 13.1,</b>		<b>High</b> <b>Applicants Position</b>

			[EN010163/APP/6.3.13]).		Construction traffic numbers at this junction are included within the <b>TA at ES Appendix 13.1 [EN010163/APP/6.3.13]</b> .
--	--	--	-------------------------	--	---