

# Steeple Renewables Project

**Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council**

January 2026

Document Reference: EN010163/EX/8.30

Revision: 2

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)



## Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council

| Document Properties |  |                |
|---------------------|--|----------------|
| Prepared By         | The Steeple Renewables Project Consultant Team |                |
| Version History     |  |                |
| Version             | Date   | Version Status |
| Examination         | January 2026                                   | Rev 2          |

Table of Contents:

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Introduction.....                       | 3  |
| 2 | Current Position.....                   | 4  |
| 3 | Appendix A1 - Record of Engagement..... | 28 |
| 4 | Appendix A2 – Signing Sheet.....        | 30 |

Table of Contents:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Table 1 – Matters Engaged in this SoCG .....                                    | 4 |
| Table 2 – Current position of matters relevant to the parties’ discussions..... | 5 |

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared to support the Examination of the Development Consent Order ('DCO') application for the Steeple Renewables Project (the 'Proposed Development').
- 1.1.2 The SoCG has been prepared jointly by Steeple Solar Farm Limited (the 'Applicant') and Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council ('S-I-SPC') in order to clarify the current position of the relative parties on specific matters that are, or have been, under discussion. It seeks to confirm to the Examining Authority ('ExA') where there are points of agreement between the parties and where agreement has not been reached to date. It therefore aids the ExA in identifying any specific issues that may need to be addressed during the Examination and provides a structure to any further discussions for the parties engaged in the SoCG.
- 1.1.3 This document has been prepared in response to a specific request from the ExA as per the Rule 6 Letter Issued 10<sup>th</sup> October 2025.

### 1.2 Terminology

- 1.2.1 Section 2 of this document sets out the relevant matters raised through discussion between the parties. It provides a summary of the position of each party and identifies the status of discussion on each matter:
- "Agreed" means that a matter has been resolved between the parties and is not anticipated to be subject to further discussion:
  - "Under discussion" means that a matter remains in active dialogue between the parties and a final position has not been reached:
  - "Not Agreed" means that the parties have established a final position that they cannot resolve the matter and will remain a point of difference.
- 1.2.2 In accordance with the request from the ExA in the Rule 6 Letter, a Low, Medium and High 'traffic light' (also known as a RAG system) is applied to each matter to indicate the likelihood of their resolution during the Examination period.

### 1.3 Status of this document

- 1.3.1 This document is currently at draft stage. Matters engage are summarised in Table 1.

**Table 1 – Matters engaged in this SoCG**

| Noise | Cumulative Impact | Landscape and Visual Amenity | Historic Environment | BMV Agricultural Land | Health and wellbeing |
|-------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|       |                   |                              |                      |                       |                      |

## 2 Current Position

- 2.1.1 Table 2 on the next page provides a summary of the current position of the Applicant and S-I-S PC in relation to specific matters that have been under discussion to date.
- 2.1.2 Where a matter is not represented in the table, it should be assumed that it is either: (i) agreed between the parties and has never required detailed discussion; or (ii) not relevant to the discussion between the parties.
- 2.1.3 Appendix A of this document provides a record of engagement undertaken between the parties in relation to the Proposed Development. This is limited to engagement which is materially relevant to the contents of this SoCG and does not seek to include every correspondence between the parties (e.g. that which was primarily administrative).

**Table 2 – Current position of matters relevant to the parties’ discussions**

| Row ID    | Topic | Applicants Position   | S-I-SPC’s Position  | Status     |
|-----------|-------|---|---|------------|
| S-I-SPC 1 | Noise | <p>Some noise and vibration could be generated during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations [APP-069]</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 not significant.</p> <p>Further safeguards during construction through <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-089]</b>, operation through <b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [APP-092]</b> and decommissioning through <b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan [APP-090]</b>.</p> <p>Requirements 7 (CEMP), 9 (OEMP) and 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration) of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> secure these safeguards.</p> | <p>In 2023 the neighbouring parish of Hayton and Tiln saw the installation of a small-scale solar farm in Tiln. Via direct information received we completely disagree with the applicant’s position. Residents living within a half mile radius of the solar farm have found that the level of noise generated is very disturbing, so much so that some feel unable to enjoy using their garden in the summer months. The RES application is significantly larger, it is located closer to resident’s homes and will have a huge impact on people’s lives, their enjoyment of their personal outdoor spaces and take away the enjoyment of walking the many public rights of way in the area. It is also to be noted that since the installation of the solar farm at Tiln, a previously well used footpath has become unused and in fact are no longer passable in places. Countryside walks around the perimeter or passing through solar farms have proven to be an unpleasant experience, the noise is very notable making the experience unpleasant.</p> <p>We therefore disagree with the statement that some noise and vibration could be generated. Our position is that a great deal of noise and vibration will be generated and it will have a huge</p> | Not Agreed |

Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council  
Steeple Renewables Project

www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk

|           |       |  |  |            |
|-----------|-------|--|--|------------|
|           |       |  | detrimental impact on the residents of Sturton, Fenton and surrounding areas.  |            |
| S-I-SPC 2 | Noise | The applicants position is the methodology in <b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations [APP-069]</b> has identified a selection of residential receptors surrounding and located closest to the Site as potentially most sensitive to construction noise associated with the introduction of the Proposed Development.   | In our statement above we talk about the ongoing effect on residents during the operational phase. We therefore do not agree with this statement.  | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC 3 | Noise | The Applicants position is <b>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibrations [APP-069]</b> concludes that noise and vibration generated during the temporary construction, operation and decommissioning of the site is not significant.  | We would strongly disagree with this statement. Whilst we accept that noise during construction and decommissioning is temporary, there will be a constant low frequency hum emitting from the farm throughout its operation, this will be clearly heard by those on the boundary to the farm and by residents who walk the many public rights of way in the area. We believe that the ongoing noise will have a significant impact on nearby residents and those wishing to enjoy outdoor pursuits within the area. | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC 4 | Noise | The Applicants position is noise controls during construction are secured through <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-089]</b> , operation through <b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-092]</b> and decommissioning through <b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan (oDP) [APP-090]</b> . |  | Not Agreed |



|           |                   |   |  |            |
|-----------|-------------------|---|--|------------|
| S-I-SPC 5 | Noise             | The Applicants position is Requirements 7 (CEMP), 9 (OEMP) and 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration) of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> secure these safeguards.  |  |            |
| S-I-SPC 6 | Cumulative Impact | <p>Cumulative Infrastructure impacts have been considered in relevant Chapters of the <b>Environmental Statement [APP-058 to APP-075, REP2-018 and REP2-020]</b>.</p> <p>Adverse effects are localised and reversed following decommissioning at the end of the Proposed Development's operational life. NPS EN-1 acknowledges adverse effects are likely given the scale of energy NSIPs, and in accordance with paragraph 5.10.35 of NPS EN-1 significant residual visual effects of the Proposed Development are outweighed by the Proposed Development's benefits set out in Section 5 of the <b>Planning Statement [REP2-040]</b>.</p> | <p>By way of context, residents of the parish and surrounding villages are suffering from consultation fatigue due to the very large number of applications for industrial projects in the local area. The pace of change in the community is unprecedented. This is illustrated by: (i) the substantial planning history at the West Burton Power Station, its associated West Burton Bole Ings Ash site and the neighbouring Sturton-le-Steeple quarry which is detailed at Appendix B to the Applicant's Planning Statement [EN010163/APP/7.1]; and (ii) the cumulative long and short list of relevant planning applications at ES Appendix 2.3 [EN010163/APP/6.3.2].</p> <p>There are currently more than 14 development projects (4 of which are NSIPs) with varying levels of impact on the parish which are all at different stages of the planning and development consent process. These include:</p> <p>a) The development of Sturton-le-Steeple Quarry (NSIP);</p> | Not Agreed |



|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>b) The North Humber to High Marnham National Grid (NSIP);</p> <p>c) The decommissioning of West Burton Power Station; and</p> <p>d) The Spherical Tokamak for Energy Production (“<b>STEP</b>”) plant which the government is planning to build at the West Burton power station site.</p> <p>There are also a number of smaller projects taking place within the Parish.</p> <p>This is making it very difficult for local residents and business owners to keep up to date. They are overwhelmed with information which is causing heightened anxiety and confusion amongst the community. Accordingly, while the PC has endeavoured to include as much detail as possible in these registration comments, it reserves the right to add to these at the appropriate junctures in the examination process as it has more time to work through the huge volume of documentation associated with the application.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>Steeple Renewables is by far, the most concerning project threatening our local community. The negative impact of which will far outweigh any perceived benefits.</p> <p>Failure to adequately assess cumulative impacts</p> <p>The applicant has carried out some assessment of the cumulative impacts of other projects as part of the relevant chapters in its Environmental Statement [EN010163/APP/6.2.0 to 6.2.19]. However, there are at least three aspects where the PC considers this assessment to be inadequate:</p> <p>The first, is the failure to assess the cumulative impacts of the construction phases of these various projects. While construction impacts are generally viewed as temporary, local residents are concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple industrial projects which will become increasingly disruptive over time. It will also result in disruption and negative impacts of construction being felt by the local community for an extended period of time. This does not appear to have been considered by the Applicant in its assessments.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|           |                   |  |   |            |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---|------------|
|           |                   |  | <p>The second, is the exclusion of the STEP project from the assessment of cumulative impacts due to it still being in the early stages. This is a large-scale Government-backed initiative which will have very real impacts on the local community. Even if the limited detail available at this stage prevents a full cumulative effects assessment from being carried out, it should at the very least be taken into consideration when assessing the long term cumulative effects of development on this community.</p> <p>The third is the apparent failure to produce any visualisations of cumulative effects as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Indeed, the assessment of cumulative effects in the Landscape chapter of the Environmental Statement [EN010163/APP/6.2.6] is very surface level.</p> |            |
| S-I-SPC 7 | Cumulative Impact | Cumulative and in combination effects of the development have been summarised in <b>ES Chapter 18: Summary [APP-075]</b> .   |   | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC 8 | Cumulative Impact | There would be significant beneficial effects on employment and economic contribution as a result of the combined effect of the Proposed Development with other developments during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. During the construction phase a significant adverse cumulative effect is | We don't agree that this particular project should be linked with STEP and others and together being described as having significant beneficial effects on employment and economic contribution. The local farming industry and it's connected supply chain supports our local economy already and this will be lost. A limited number of specialist workers brought in to site solar panels for a period of time will not boost the economy to the same level as years of farming and supplying.   | Not Agreed |

|           |                   |   |  |            |
|-----------|-------------------|---|--|------------|
|           |                   | <p>identified for accommodation demand. This presents a worst-case scenario should the other developments' construction timeframes overlap, however, in reality this is unlikely and the significance level identified would be reduced. When considering cumulative effects with other renewable generation projects with the Proposed Development during the operational phase, there would be a beneficial cumulative effect on climate change through the contribution to the UK's legally binding emission reduction targets.</p> <p>Table 18.5 and Table 18.6 of ES <b>Chapter 18: Summary [APP-075]</b> provide a qualitative assessment of the in-combination effect interactions on receptor groups including local residents. Construction and decommissioning have been presented together because the types of effect interactions would be broadly the same with decommissioning effects likely to be less significant than the construction phase. In conclusion, no significant adverse in-combination effects have been identified.</p> | <p>Although we recognise renewable generation projects in general would have a beneficial cumulative effect on climate change we again state:</p> <p>This particular project is too large for this space and inappropriately situated surrounding a community.</p> |            |
| S-I-SPC 9 | Cumulative Impact | <p><b>ES Appendix 4.1 outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [APP-089], ES Appendix 4.4 outline Operational Management Plan (oOMP) [APP-092] and ES Appendix 4.2 outline Decommissioning Plan (oDP) [APP-090]</b> provide safeguards to local communities through the various phases of development.</p>  |  | Not Agreed |

|               |                                    |  |   |            |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|
| S-I-SPC<br>10 | Cumulative<br>Impact               | Requirements 7 (CEMP), 9 (OEMP) and 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration) of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> secure further details of each plan.  |   | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>11 | Landscape<br>and Visual<br>Amenity | <p>Landscape and Visual Amenity has been considered within <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact and Residential Amenity [APP-064]</b> and Chapter 6 and 7 of the <b>Planning Statement [REP2-040]</b>.</p> <p>Main landscape and visual impacts minimised through sensitive siting of the largest components (BESS and substation) nearest the West Burton Power station and grid connection point. The Proposed Development also benefits from a green infrastructure led landscape and ecological design. Adverse effects are localised and will be reversed following decommissioning at the end of the Proposed Development's operational life.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-116]</b> has been provided as part of the DCO support documentation that outlines the proposed habitat establishment, management and monitoring requirements and used as a basis to develop the final LEMP secured by Requirement 6 of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> prior to development.</p> | <p>The PC has three main concerns regarding the landscape impacts of the scheme:</p> <p>The first has been addressed above and relates to the inadequate assessment of cumulative impacts and failure to produce visualisations. Linked to this is a concern that cumulative effects have been downplayed on the basis that the landscape has already been, or will already be negatively impacted by existing energy development (see e.g. para 6.10.9 of Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement). Existing harmful development should not serve as a carte blanche for further harmful development. For example, viewpoint 20B of the photomontages at Appendix 6.2 to the Environmental Statement [EN010163/APP/6.3.6] shows how a single detracting feature in an otherwise open, agricultural landscape (in this case the existing West Burton Power Station) can be compounded by further development, rendering the entire view industrial in nature.</p> <p>The second is the apparent assumption that simply screening off the proposed development from view with the planting of large</p> | Not Agreed |

|               |                                    |  |   |            |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|
|               |                                    |  | <p>hedgerows will result in their being no negative visual effects. In some instances, the closing off of a previously open view across the landscape is itself harmful. Particularly stark examples of this can be seen in viewpoints 17B, 17C and 17D of the photomontages Appendix 6.2 to the Environmental Statement [EN010163/APP/6.3.6] (in both summer and winter views).</p> <p>Third comment to be addressed under historic impact</p> |            |
| S-I-SPC<br>12 | Landscape<br>and Visual<br>Amenity | <p>The methodology of <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity Impact and Residential Amenity [APP-064]</b> is to identify, evaluate and describe the current landscape character of the Site and its surroundings and also any notable individual or groups of landscape features within the Site; determine the sensitivity of the landscape to the type of development proposed; identify potential visual receptors (i.e. people that would be able to see the Proposed Development) and evaluate their sensitivity to the type of changes proposed; identify and describe any impacts of the Proposed Development in so far as they affect the landscape and/or views of it and evaluate the magnitude of change due to these impacts; identify and assess any cumulative landscape and visual effects; identify and describe mitigation measures that have been adopted</p> |   | Not Agreed |

|               |                                    |  |   |            |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|
|               |                                    | to avoid, reduce and compensate for landscape and visual effects;<br>and evaluate the level of residual landscape and visual effects.  |   |            |
| S-I-SPC<br>13 | Landscape<br>and Visual<br>Amenity | <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity Impact and Residential Amenity [APP-064]</b> concludes some significant adverse effects are identified (to hedgerows during construction, the land cover and character of the Site itself, and to some of the PRoW and Roads which pass through the Site), but these are highly localised and limited in nature, with many of the effects reduced by Year 15 following implementation of the landscape mitigation planting. Indeed, this planting would result in significant beneficial effects in terms of the hedgerow network at the site. | <p>We agree that there will be significant adverse effects. We disagree with the statement that effects are highly localised and limited, in truth the whole village will suffer from the effects. We are a hot-spot for NSIPs and smaller projects, and whilst we do care about climate change our main responsibility is to our residents and preserving the village as much as possible in its current state. You state that many of the effects (but not all) are reduced by year 15. 15 years is an extremely long time to expect residents to deal with the significant impact that will be made to the landscape and visual amenity.</p> <p>The assumption that screening off the proposed development from view with the planting of large hedgerows will result in their being no negative visual effects is incorrect. In some instances, the closing off of a previously open view across the landscape is itself harmful. Again the change to the current PRoW routes will massively impact residents. Walking through, or around a solar farm will be a very different experience to walking through open countryside, as seen in a neighbouring Parish the once very popular footpaths are now unused, in previous years regular footfall would maintain the walking routes, they are now overgrown and impassable.</p> <p>As we have stated previously this particular project is simply too large I scale and will have devastating effects</p> | Not Agreed |



|               |                                    |  |  |            |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------|
| S-I-SPC<br>14 | Landscape<br>and Visual<br>Amenity | Existing hedgerows, trees and woodland to be retained will be buffered from the development and habitat diversity will be managed as set out in the <b>ES Appendix 7.12 outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Plan [APP-116]</b> .   |  | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>15 | Landscape<br>and Visual<br>Amenity | A detailed Landscape Ecological Management Plan, building on the outline details, is secured by Requirement 6 (LEMP) of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> . Part (f) of requirement 6 (LEMP) secures details of landscaping planting.   |  | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>16 | Historic<br>Environment<br>Impact  | <p>All assets within the study areas relevant to the assessment have been assessed following a staged approach, in line with Historic England Setting GPA 3 (2017 2nd Ed). The assessment of all assets at Step 1/2 of the Historic England approach can be found at Appendix 1 of <b>ES Appendix 9.1 – Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [APP-122]</b>. Assets taken forward for further steps within the HE guidance and for detailed assessment are outlined within Section 9.6 of <b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [APP-067]</b> and Sections 5 and 6 <b>ES Appendix 9.1 – Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [APP-122]</b>.</p> <p>In the case of the Proposed Development, which is time limited (NPS EN-3 2.10.160), the significant public benefits of the Proposed Development in terms of renewable energy generation and climate change benefits clearly outweigh the reversible less than substantial harm to the No.6 identified designated heritage assets and low level less than substantial residual harm to non-designated heritage assets.</p> | <p>Failure of the LVIA to adequately have regard to the cultural heritage and historic significance of the Site and surrounding area. This was a point raised by consultees leading to assurances from the Applicant that the LVIA has been “cognisant” of the findings of the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the Environmental Statement. However, there does not appear to be any concrete evidence of this “cognisance” in the LVIA itself. For example, there is no reference to the significance of historic green lanes and field patterns nor to Bassetlaw’s important Pilgrim Trail ( [REDACTED] which passes through the Site. As the Applicant recognises (see para 6.3.22 of the Landscape Chapter of the ES), “people at tourist attractions with a focus on a specific view” and “visitors to historic features/estates where the setting is important to an appreciation</p> | Not Agreed |

|  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Requirement 17 of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> safeguards archaeology through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).</p> | <p><i>and understanding of cultural value”</i> increases the sensitivity of visual receptors.</p> <p>The site and surrounding areas benefit from a wealth of cultural heritage and the impact on a number of important historic features does not appear to have been assessed (or adequately assessed) by the Applicant in its Cultural Heritage assessment. The following features of historic significance must be taken into account in assessing the impacts of the Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>e) Sturton-le-Steeple’s Christian heritage;</li><li>f) Historic landscape features;</li><li>g) Littleborough;</li><li>h) Habbleshthorpe; and</li><li>i) The West Burton Round.</li></ul> <p>(Sturton-le-Steeple’s Christian heritage</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>Sturton is a village of incomparable significance in English Christian history, being one of the epicentres of the Pilgrim story. This was most recently explained in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Nick Bunker, <i>Making Haste from Babylon</i>, Penguin, 2014</li><li>b) Michael Haykin and others, <i>Strangers &amp; Pilgrims on the Earth</i>, H &amp; E, 2020.</li><li>c) Adrian Gray, <i>Restless Souls, Pilgrim Roots</i>, BWR, 2020</li></ul> <p>The combination of significant figures that emerged here make Sturton of unparalleled importance in respect to its size. John Lassells (d1546) emerged as one of the most significant leaders and martyrs of the English Reformation; John Smyth (c1554-1612), the first English Baptist, was born and educated here; John Robinson (1576-1625), the spiritual leader of the Mayflower Pilgrims was also born here; his sister in law, also born here, went to New England as the wife of the first leader of the Pilgrims.</p> <p>The links with both Baptists and the Mayflower bring many American visitors to Sturton. Travelling through this district of Bassetlaw, they often comment that they at least have reached 'the real England' with its pattern of small villages and fields. This landscape will be destroyed by the proposals and the attraction</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>of the area’s heritage much reduced. Views across the fields to the Sturton tower, familiar to Smyth and Robinson in their day, will be destroyed.</p> <p>The PC have been working directly with Bassetlaw District Council to enhance tourism for our area by commissioning an important piece of Sculpture that has been paid for through Rural England funding at a cost of £10,000 as well as a £1,000 donation from Pilgrims and Prophets Tourism.</p> <p>We are very proud of our Christian Heritage and strong links with the Mayflower Pilgrims. We are attracting tourism. We seek to advance this further by welcoming more visitors, using our focal point of the Sculpture and Information board, using our village hall facilities to provide refreshments and working directly with Bassetlaw District Council on promoting Sturton Le Steeple further.</p> <p>We have already had a significant number of tours to date to reflect our Christian Heritage. These have included international visitors. A most recent walking tour was oversubscribed, and an extra date had to be put in.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|               |                                   |  |   |            |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|------------|
| S-I-SPC<br>17 | Historic<br>Environment<br>Impact | <p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [APP-067]</b> methodology for designated heritage assets (comprising listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, world heritage sites), is a 3km study area from the Site boundary. For searches of the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record ('NYHER') to identify non-designated heritage assets and records, a search area of 1km from the Site Boundary was utilised.</p> <p>A Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility ('SZTV') has been utilised to identify areas where the Proposed Development may theoretically be visible in the surrounding landscape. It is however acknowledged that the setting of an asset does not rely wholly on visibility. Therefore, no assets have been unduly excluded from the assessment using the SZTV and all have been given some level of consideration in the assessment process.</p> | SEE BELOW RESPONSE  | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>18 | Historic<br>Environment<br>Impact | <p><b>ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [APP-067]</b> concludes no significant effects to cultural heritage.</p>   | <p><b>We do not believe our cultural Christian heritage has been adequately considered. We do not agree with the less than substantial harm to the No.6 identified designated heritage assets and low level less than substantial residual harm to non- designated heritage assets designation placed on our significant historical village.</b></p> <p><b>We call for an independent historian to research our Christian Cultural Heritage and links with The Mayflower Pilgrims, Martyr and Baptist Church history. Our Christian Heritage should not be silenced</b></p> | Not Agreed |

|               |                                   |  |   |            |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|------------|
|               |                                   |  | <p>under the blanket covering of 'climate change benefits'</p> <p>Our aim as a village to support tourism in these areas has not been adequately considered. Our significance continues to come to light. We have very recently been visited by the Governor' of the Australian Society of Mayflower Descendants and on a separate occasion, a Polish Baptist Minister planning a larger group trip here.</p> <p>Our contribution to climate change benefits and renewable energy generation are clearly already at a very high level with the The Spherical Tokamak for Energy Production ("STEP") plant which the government is planning to build at the West Burton power station site. We do not support all of our external fields and historical vistas being used for solar in addition.</p> |            |
| S-I-SPC<br>19 | Historic<br>Environment<br>Impact | Requirement 17 of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> safeguards archaeology through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). |   | NOT AGREED |

|               |   |  |  |            |
|---------------|---|--|--|------------|
| S-I-SPC<br>20 | Loss of Best<br>and Most<br>Versatile<br>Agricultural<br>Land | <p>Use of agricultural land is addressed in section 15.7 of <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [APP-072B]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 3: Site Description, Site Selection and Iterative Design Process [APP-061]</b> and the <b>Design and Access Statement [REP2-042]</b> detail the process the Applicant has followed for site election and design review.</p> <p>There are no sites that are of sufficient scale to enable the construction of the Proposed Development on non-agricultural land, or land that is of a lower ALC grade without constraint.</p> <p>Approximately 72.1% of the land within the Order Limits forms BMV land.</p> <p>However, the Proposed Development will only result in temporary disturbance of approximately 12.1 ha of BMV agricultural land. This land will not be lost, in that it is all capable of restoration to a comparable grade at the decommissioning phase.</p> <p>The reinstatement to comparable soil properties and land grade would be undertaken in accordance with a Soil Management Plan secured by Requirement 11 of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b>, with regard to the measures stated within <b>ES Appendix 15.2- Outline Soil Management Plan [APP-132]</b>.</p> | The Proposals would result in a significant and harmful loss of productive farmland which carries with it associated food security risks and a loss of jobs for farmers and supporting industries. The Applicant's planning statement recognises that 72.1% of the land within the Order Limits meets the definition of "Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land". This is more than just a policy designation, this is land that is used to produce wheat, barley, oil seed rape, beans and sugar beat. Those products are in turn used to make bread, biscuits, breakfast cereals, animal feed, beer and much more. Grazing the fields with sheep during the operational phase of the development will simply not mitigate for the real life cost of what is being lost. | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>21 | Loss of Best<br>and Most<br>Versatile                         | The assessment methodology of <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [APP-072B]</b> is the consideration of agricultural land quality of the Site, and the extent to which the Proposed  |  | Not Agreed |



Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council  
Steeple Renewables Project

www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk

|            |   |  |   |            |
|------------|---|--|---|------------|
|            | Agricultural Land                                 | Development will affect the inherent land quality. It has also considered the method of construction and the impact this would have on soil qualities. The potential for removal of the panels and therefore the reversibility of the impact, and the extent to which agricultural use can continue during the life of the Proposed Development. |   |            |
| S-I-SPC 22 | Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | <b>ES Chapter 15: Land Use and Agriculture [APP-072B]</b> concludes overall, no significant, adverse residual cumulative effects are identified for the construction, operational and decommissioning stages for the Proposed Development.   | <p>We strongly disagree with this statement, we draw back to our original comment which we feel has been completely overlooked.</p> <p>The Proposals would result in a significant and harmful loss of productive farmland which carries with it associated food security risks and a loss of jobs for farmers and supporting industries. The Applicant's planning statement recognises that 72.1% of the land within the Order Limits meets the definition of "Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land". This is more than just a policy designation, this is land that is used to produce wheat, barley, oil seed rape, beans and sugar beat. Those products are in turn used to make bread, biscuits, breakfast cereals, animal feed, beer and much more. Grazing the fields with sheep during the operational phase of the development will simply not mitigate for the real life cost of what is being lost.</p> | Not Agreed |

Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council  
Steeple Renewables Project

www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk

|               |   |  |   |            |
|---------------|---|--|---|------------|
| S-I-SPC<br>23 | Loss of Best<br>and Most<br>Versatile<br>Agricultural<br>Land | The <b>outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) [APP-132]</b> sets out the key principles and considerations for the handling of soils for the Proposed Development.  |   | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>24 | Loss of Best<br>and Most<br>Versatile<br>Agricultural<br>Land | The reinstatement to comparable soil properties and land grade would be undertaken in accordance with a Soil Management Plan secured by Requirement 11 of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b>   |   | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC<br>25 | Local<br>Residents<br>Health and<br>Well Being                | <p>The <b>Health Impact Assessment [APP-183]</b> addresses how the Proposed Development may affect wellbeing. The HIA notes that as far as possible, avoidance and minimisation of how the possible effects by the Proposed Development are managed through embedded design in terms of layout.</p> <p>Further safeguards are provided during construction through <b>ES Appendix 4.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-089]</b>, operation through <b>ES Appendix 4.4 Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [APP-092]</b> and decommissioning through <b>ES Appendix 4.2 Outline Decommissioning Plan [APP-090]</b>.</p> <p>Requirements 7 (CEMP), 9 (OEMP) and 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration) of the <b>dDCO [REP2-007]</b> secure these safeguards.</p> | <p><b>Health and wellbeing</b></p> <p>This Proposals will have significant detrimental effects on the health and wellbeing of our population and will widen health inequality. There are both direct and in-direct factors that contribute to this adverse impact which have not been appropriately investigated, nor have the public been informed which is wholly unacceptable. These factors include:</p> <p>the loss of open countryside which contributes to mental health and well-being through walking;</p> | Not Agreed |

|            |                                       |   |   |            |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|------------|
|            |                                       |   | <p>the constant threat of over-industrialisation and the bombardment of information relating to multiple large-scale projects leading to increased levels of anxiety; and</p> <p>the risks to farmers' jobs (a group that are often considered to be at increased risk of suicide).</p> <p>The Applicant's Health Impact Assessment [[EN010163/APP/7.2] suggests that the Proposals will lessen health inequality while at the same time recognising that there are risks to health as a result of potential water contamination, fire risk and flooding risks.</p> |            |
| S-I-SPC 26 | Local Residents Health and Well Being | The methodology of the <b>Health Impact Assessment [APP-183]</b> is to identify the potential impacts on health and well-being (on existing residents) arising from construction, operation and decommission of the Proposed Development; and to identify ways to minimise any negative impacts and enhance any potentially positive impacts. | It is not positive for our residents to be ignored. We have seen people clearly distressed. Fields of solar panels are distressing for our residents and our farmers. We see no advantages for our residents only negative impact.  | Not Agreed |
| S-I-SPC 27 | Local Residents Health and Well Being | The <b>Health Impact Assessment [APP-183]</b> concludes during the construction phase, there is the potential for moderate negative impact on all identified sensitive receptors, with the exception of on-site workers, in respect of social and community influence on  | <p><b>We strongly disagree with the following statement:</b></p> <p>Once the Proposed Development is operational, the</p>   | Not Agreed |

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  | <p>health. This relates specifically to the potential for a sense of local pride and neighbourliness to be negatively affected while construction and decommissioning are ongoing, as well as a potential for social isolation of people who may feel intimidated or unsafe as a result of construction and decommissioning activities. There is also potential for up to moderate negative impact on all identified sensitive receptors, including on-site workers, in respect of living/environmental conditions, specifically dust and noise during construction and decommissioning. A CEMP and CTMP is proposed that will help minimise any negative impacts during the build phase for all sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Once the Proposed Development is operational, the majority of the impacts in relation to health and wellbeing are positive for all sensitive receptors, whether existing and future users of the Site and amenities in the study area.</p> | <p>majority of the impacts in relation to health and wellbeing are positive for all sensitive receptors, whether existing and future users of the Site and amenities in the study area.</p> <p>We do not foresee any positive impacts on residents, we can see the following negative impacts which is an extensive list:</p> <p>the loss of open countryside which contributes to mental health and well-being through walking, cycling and other outdoor pursuits</p> <p>Concerns over house prices, Sturton is currently a desirable village in a semi-rural area, it has a wide mix of inhabitants but many have chosen to move to the village because of their desire to live in the</p> |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|

|               |                                       |  |  |            |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|------------|
|               |                                       |  | <p>countryside and have all of the benefits that this affords.</p> <p>This development is not small in scale, it will totally dominate the area and completely change the topography of the area</p> <p>Inverters and transformers create a low frequency hum which is known to be noticeable and disruptive in quiet rural areas, the noise emitted from the farm will overshadow the noise you come to expect from the countryside</p> |            |
| S-I-SPC<br>28 | Local Residents Health and Well Being | <p><b>ES Appendix 4.1 outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [APP-089], outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-129], ES Appendix 4.4 outline Operational Management Plan (oOMP) [APP-092] and ES Appendix 4.2 outline Decommissioning Plan (oDP) [APP-090]</b> provide safeguards to local communities through the various phases of development.</p> |  | Not Agreed |

Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council  
Steeple Renewables Project

[www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk](http://www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk)

|               |  |   |  |            |
|---------------|--|---|--|------------|
| S-I-SPC<br>29 | Local<br>Residents<br>Health and<br>Well Being | Requirements 7 (CEMP), 8 (CTMP), 9 (OEMP) and 21<br>(Decommissioning and Restoration) of the <b>ddCO [REP2-007]</b> secure<br>further details of each plan. |  | Not Agreed |
|---------------|--|---|--|------------|

## A1 Record of Engagement

| Date       | Method of Engagement   | Purpose/Description  |
|------------|--|--|
| 18/09/2023 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                  | Introductory email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.   |
| 22/09/2023 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                | Email requesting attendance at Parish Council meeting on 11/10/23.   |
| 22/09/2023 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                  | Clarifying facilities ahead of in-person meeting.  |
| 25/09/2023 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                | Confirming facilities ahead of in-person meeting.  |
| 11/10/2023 | Meeting  | Briefing meeting with Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.   |
| 12/10/2023 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                | Request for meeting slides.  |
| 12/10/2023 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                  | Providing meeting slides.  |
| 23/10/2023 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                  | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council informing them of the launch of early informal consultation.              |
| 15/12/2023 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                  | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council informing them of the close of early informal consultation.               |
| 11/03/2024 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council.                  | Email sharing the early informal consultation report.  |
| 17/05/2024 | Meeting  | Update meeting with Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council, North and South Wheatley Parish Council and Cllr James Naish. |
| 02/08/2024 | Email from Alison Cadge to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Email to request sharing of any relevant information in regard to flooding in Sturton-le-Steeple.                    |
| 06/01/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council                   | Email updating Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council on the project status and requesting an update meeting.             |
| 10/01/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council                 | Liaison over dates for update meeting.   |
| 15/01/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council                   | Liaison over dates for update meeting.   |
| 16/01/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council                 | Liaison over dates for update meeting.   |
| 20/01/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council                   | S42 Notification   |



**Statement of Common Ground between Applicant and  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council  
Steeple Renewables Project**

[www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk](http://www.steeplerenewablesproject.co.uk)

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
| 21/01/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council   | Liaison over dates for update meeting.   |
| 22/01/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Liaison over dates for update meeting.   |
| 28/01/2025 | Meeting                                      | Update meeting with Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council  |
| 31/01/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council   | Providing answers to follow up questions from update meeting on 28/01/2025.  |
| 27/02/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council   | Mid consultation reminder email.   |
| 28/02/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Statutory consultation response.   |
| 03/03/2025 | Email to Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council   | Email thanking the Parish for their response to the statutory consultation.  |
| 04/03/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Request to keep consultation materials.  |
| 15/07/2025 | Email  | S56 Notification.  |
| 11/11/2025 | Email  | Email with SoCG version 1 attached.  |
| 25/11/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Comments on SoCG provided.   |
| 18/12/2025 | Email  | Email with revised SoCG attached (version 2) with the inclusion of Row ID's S-I-SPC 2 - S-I-SPC 5, S-I-SPC 7 - S-I-SPC 10, S-I-SPC 12 - S-I-SPC 15, S-I-SPC 17 - S-I-SPC 19, S-I-SPC 21 - S-I-SPC 24, S-I-SPC 26 - S-I-SPC 29. |
| 19/12/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Extension of time request to comment on SoCG version 2 until middle of January.  |
| 19/12/2025 | Email  | Extension of Time agreement suggested until 09/01/2026.  |
| 21/12/2025 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Extension of Time agreement accepted until 09/01/2026.   |
| 08/01/2026 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | Comments on SoCG version 2 provided.   |
| 15/01/2026 | Email  | Email with clean version of the SoCG issued for signing.   |
| 19/01/2026 | Email from Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council | SoCG version 2 returned signed via attachment to email.  |

## A2 Signing Sheet

Duly signed and authorised on behalf of  
Steeple Solar Farm Limited (the 'Applicant')

|            |                      |
|------------|----------------------|
| Name:      | ██████████           |
| Job Title: | DCO Lead Developer   |
| Date:      | 19/01/2026           |
| Signature: | ████████████████████ |

Duly signed and authorised on behalf of  
Sturton-le-Steeple Parish Council

|            |                      |
|------------|----------------------|
| Name:      | ██████████           |
| Job Title: | Parish Clerk         |
| Date:      | 19/01/2026           |
| Signature: | ████████████████████ |