

Sturton le Steeple Parish Council

Deadline 4 Written Representation Paper 1

19th February 2026

Overview

Further to our earlier written representations and the Statement of Common Ground there are no areas of agreement. We continue to remain strongly opposed to the applicant on the following areas of concern;

- 1) Noise
- 2) Cumulative Impact
- 3) Landscape and Visual Amenity
- 4) Historic Environment
- 5) BMV Agricultural Land
- 6) Health and Wellbeing

Applicant Responses to ExA First Written Questions (EN010163-000365-8.11)

A review of the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions indicates several recurring concerns regarding the quality, clarity, and cooperativeness of the submissions. In many instances, the Applicant does not directly address the question posed. Instead, responses frequently redirect stakeholders to other documents—often without clear signposting—resulting in unnecessary additional work for all parties and hindering efficient examination of the issues.

The tone and approach of the responses can be characterised as overly rigid and unconstructive. When asked whether they are willing to undertake further work to meet the needs of affected stakeholders, the Applicant consistently adopts a narrow interpretation of what they consider “necessary,” even where additional work would provide tangible benefits to the local community or other interested parties.

The former agricultural buildings, now listed and converted, were dismissed in the hearing as “new houses with windows in the roof”. These properties are considered listed by curtilage association. As such, they are automatically given the same protection as the principle listed building, both in terms of statutory protection from alteration without authorisation (i.e. Listed Building Consent is needed), and also in protection with respect to the relevant planning policies and legislation when assessing planning proposals.

Some responses rely on assurances that certain activities cannot commence until the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has approved relevant plans. This presents a significant risk to our community. Bassetlaw District Council has chosen not to participate in the examination process, raising concerns that they may be insufficiently informed or

engaged when required to approve critical documents. This increases the likelihood that the Applicant will be permitted to proceed without adequate scrutiny or safeguards.

Consultation

The Applicant's consultation activities appear to have been conducted at a surface level, meeting only the minimum statutory requirements. While community views were collected, there is little evidence demonstrating how this feedback influenced or shaped the evolution of the project design.

Reasonable suggestions from residents and from Nottinghamshire County Council—particularly those aimed at mitigating impacts on local communities—have often been dismissed or inadequately addressed. This pattern suggests an unwillingness to meaningfully involve the community in the development process.

Furthermore, the Applicant frequently cites various documents in response to questions, yet these references are often difficult to trace or verify. This lack of transparency undermines confidence in the assurances being provided and complicates efforts to assess compliance with relevant legislation and policy.

Process at Hearings

During hearings, the Applicant regularly uses technical jargon and directs participants to other documents rather than providing clear, accessible answers. This undermines the ability of community members to engage fully in the process.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the consistency with which procedural rules are applied during hearings. Observations include:

- Significant variation in the amount of speaking time afforded to different participants, with some speakers receiving extended opportunities while others are encouraged to conclude prematurely.
- Community participants have been reprimanded for their language, whereas the Applicant has been permitted to make provocative or inflammatory remarks without challenge (we will outline full details within our formal complaint).

These issues collectively contribute to a sense that the process is not being applied evenly or transparently.

Recommendations

We respectfully request that the Examining Authority recommend to the Secretary of State that the Steeple Renewables NSIP **not** be granted development consent.

However, if consent is granted, we strongly call for the following safeguards:

1. Independent Design Review

A fully independent design review process with meaningful, structured community involvement that demonstrably influences the final design.

2. Construction Traffic Management

A formal role for community representatives in developing the Construction Traffic Management Plan, ensuring it accounts for the cumulative impact of multiple concurrent developments in the area.

3. Enhanced Mitigation and Collaboration

The Applicant must work collaboratively with stakeholders including Nottinghamshire County Council to strengthen mitigation measures and provide clearer assurances relating to:

- Landscape and visual impact
- Historic environment,
 - Archaeological Mitigation Strategy
 - Christian heritage and associated tourism
- Integration with Nottinghamshire County Council's existing highway permit schemes to minimise disruption
- Wildlife protection, particularly skylarks and badgers

4. Community Liaison Committee

We recommend establishing a community liaison committee to support partnership working and improve communication between the various developers whose projects collectively affect our community.

Request for Further Comment

We will submit a separate paper regarding Christian Heritage to answer the question raised by the ExA at ISH2. We request an extension to submit additional comments regarding The Health Impact Assessment.

ROAD CLOSURE



Red – Works area Blue – Diversion route

