

Spencer Barrowman  
Case Manager  
National Infrastructure Planning  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

8<sup>th</sup> July 2025

Dear Spencer

**Steeple Renewables Project - Planning Act 2008 section 51** Further to your letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> June 2025 providing advice following the decision of the Secretary of State to accept the application for examination (the “S51 Advice”), this letter, along with enclosure provides the responses of Steeple Solar Farm Ltd (the “Applicant”).

**(1) Minor errors and omissions**

**Waterbodies in a River Basin Management Plan (Doc 2.28)**

The Applicant confirms that the colours indicating different groundwater bodies has been changed.

**Waterbodies in a River Bain Management Plan (Doc 2.28)**

Please find the Applicant’s response to each of the below quoted points raised within the S51 Advice:

- (a) ‘Figure 2.28 only shows a partial route of the waterbodies labelled, whereas these are shown in full on ES Figure 8.1.’

The Applicant does not consider any amendments necessary. This is because Figure 2.28 is only intended to show the WFD classified waterbodies and therefore shows the classified sections of the watercourses only, whereas Figure 8.1 is intended to show all watercourses, whether WFD classified or unclassified. For example, Catchwater Drain is only classified under the WFD for part of its route, the classified section is shown on Figure 2.28 whereas the whole watercourse is shown on Figure 8.1.

- (b) ‘The labelled routes of some water bodies are also inconsistent between the two figures.’

The Applicant does not consider any amendments necessary. The upper end of Wheatley Beck follows a different route on the two figures. The routing on Figure 8.1 is correct and is taken from the Ordnance Survey’s Open Rivers mapping. However, the routing shown on Figure 2.28 is taken directly from Defra’s Catchment Data Explorer mapping, so the

inconsistency arises due to an error in Defra's mapping. This inconsistency is not considered material to the assessment of impacts.

**(c) 'Figure 8.1 omits the label for the Seymour Drain given on Figure 2.28.'**

The Applicant does not consider any amendments necessary. Figure 8.1 labels the Primary Ordinary Watercourses in the vicinity of the Site, whereas Figure 2.28 shows the RBMP classified waterbodies. Seymour Drain is not a Primary Ordinary Watercourse, but it is classified within a RBMP. Therefore, as above, the noted omission is due to a difference in what the two plans aim to show.

**(d) Figure 8.1 shows the Mother Drain and New Ings Drain. However, these are not included on Figure 2.28. It is presumed this is because these fall within the geographic catchment of the River Trent Catchment and therefore do not have a WFD status of their own, however the applicant is requested to clarify this.**

The Applicant does not consider any amendments necessary. Figure 8.1 aims to show all watercourses, whereas Figure 2.28 only aims to show WFD classified water bodies. The Mother Drain and New Ings Drain are not classified under the WFD. Therefore, as above, this is due to the difference in the purposes of the two figures.

**Land Plans (Doc 2.1)**

The Applicant confirms that a key plan, cut lines and improved labelling are to be appended to this letter.

**Works Plans (Doc 2.2).**

The Applicant confirms that cut lines and inclusion of Work Numbers on the respective Works Plans are to be provided for clarity.

**Access and Right of Way Plans (Doc 2.3).**

The Applicant confirms that cut lines are to be provided for clarity.

**Order Limits (Doc 2.4).**

The Applicant confirms that cut lines are to be provided for clarity.

**Site Layout (Doc 2.6).**

The Applicant confirms that cut lines are to be provided for clarity.

**Cable Crossing Plan (2.35).**

The Applicant confirms that cut lines are to be provided for clarity.

### Design and Access Statement (Doc 7.3).

A Design Approach Document (new document reference: EN010163/APP/7.6) has been produced combining information in the Design and Access Statement (Doc 7.3) and Appendix 4 of the ES, as requested.

### Figure 6.5a Visual Receptors (Settlements, A Roads, B Roads and Long-Distance Routes) (Doc 6.4.6).

The Applicant confirms that the correct version of Figure 6.5a is to be provided.

### Potential Main Issues for Examination.

The Applicant confirms that a 'Potential Main Issues for Examination' (new document reference: EN010163/APP/7.7) has been produced drawing upon the information within the application documentation, as requested.

### Additional Plans

Further to the above, in additional correspondence with yourself it was mutually agreed to update other plans that required the addition of cut lines but weren't requested within the S51 Advice. For the avoidance of doubt, these are:

- Figure 1.1 - Site Location Plan (Doc 6.4.1)
- Figure 2.1 - Indicative Site Layout (Doc 6.4.2)
- Figure 3.2 - Topographical Survey (Doc 6.4.3)
- Figure 17.2 - Utilities Plan (Doc 6.4.17)
- Plans of Statutory /Non-Statutory Nature Conservation (Doc 2.29)
- Important Hedgerow (Doc 2.34)

If you require further information, please contact [REDACTED], DCO Lead Developer at RES, via email [REDACTED]@res-group.com or phone [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely



DCO Lead Developer

