



Application by Steeple Solar Farm Limited for an order granting development consent for the Steeple Renewables Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2): Issued on 3 March 2026

Responses are due by deadline 5: 24 March 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex C** to the [Rule 6 Letter](#) dated 10 October 2025. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the [project page of the National Infrastructure website](#) and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)' when asked.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should request a copy of the Microsoft Word version of the document from the Case Team (SteepleRenewables@planninginspectorate.gov.uk), enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.

Download a copy of this Microsoft Word version of the ExA's written questions, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by choosing 'Make a comment' and selecting 'Upload files'.



Abbreviations used:

BDC	Bassetlaw District Council	GHG	Greenhouse gas
BESS	Battery energy storage system	ISH	Issue specific hearing
CA	compulsory acquisition	NCC	Nottinghamshire County Council
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan	NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc
dDCO	the draft Development Consent Order	NHHM	North Humber to High Marnham
EA	Environment Agency	NPS	National Policy Statement
EM	the Explanatory Memorandum	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
ES	the Environmental Statement	OEMP	Operational Environmental Management Plan
ExA	Examining Authority	PM_{2.5}	Particulate matter less than 2.5µm in diameter (where the number denotes the particulate size diameter in micrometres)
ExQ1	Examining Authority's first written questions	SoCG	Statement of common ground

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: <https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010163-000026-Steeple%20Renewables%20Project%20Examination%20Library.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ2 1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index	
1. General and cross-topic questions.....	4
2. Need, site selection and alternatives.....	4
3. The Environmental Statement (general).....	4
4. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development.....	4
5. Biodiversity and ecology (including Habitats Regulations Assessment).....	4
6. Climate.....	4
7. Cumulative effects and interactions with other projects.....	5
7.1 Cumulative effects.....	5
7.2 Interactions with the proposed North Humber to High Marnham (NHMH) project.....	5
8. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations.....	6
9. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO).....	6
9.1 Articles.....	6
9.2 Schedule 2 – Requirements.....	7
9.3 Schedules 3, 4, 5 and 6.....	8
9.4 Schedule 10 – Protective provisions.....	8
9.5 Schedule 12 – Documents to be certified.....	8
10. Flood risk, drainage and the water environment.....	8
11. Historic environment.....	9
12. Land use and soils.....	10
13. Landscape and visual.....	11
14. Noise and vibration.....	11
15. Population.....	11
16. Socio-economic effects.....	11
17. Transportation and access.....	11
18. Other planning topics.....	12
18.1 Air quality.....	12

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
Q1.0.1	The applicant	<p>Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)</p> <p>The ExA notes that SoCG with the following parties have yet to be submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England • Network Rail • Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service • Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust <p>The ExA requests copies of these, unsigned if necessary, and updates to any previously submitted SoCG at deadline 5 to allow the ExA to fully understand the areas where outstanding issues remain in the examination.</p>
2. Need, site selection and alternatives		
Q2.0.1	The applicant	<p>Grid Connection</p> <p>Following the conclusion of the National Energy System Operator's recent review of grid connections (in December 2025), confirm the status of the grid connection agreement referred to in [APP-056] and [REP2-044]. In particular, provide an explanation of what the timescales for the offers confirmed under Gates 1 and 2 might mean for the delivery for the proposed development.</p>
3. The Environmental Statement (general)		
Q3.0.1		No further questions at this stage.
4. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development		
Q4.0.1	Applicant	<p>Detailed design</p> <p>Please explain how the detailed design process will include a formal role for community representatives to input into the design?</p>
Q4.0.2	The applicant	<p>ES Appendix 4.5 - Outline Design Principles</p> <p>Explain why provision has not been included for the Outline Design Principles [APP-093] to be updated in the draft development consent order (dDCO) to a full design principles document?</p>
5. Biodiversity and ecology (including Habitats Regulations Assessment)		
Q5.0.1	The applicant	<p>Environmental Improvement Plan 2023</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.39 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 states the Secretary of State should have regard to the aims and goals of the government's Environmental Improvement Plan 2023. The ExA notes the commentary on pages 107 and 108 of Appendix C: National Policy Accordance Table in the Planning Statement [APP-182] although it doesn't explicitly explain how the proposal has met the aims and goals of the plan. Please clarify this with specific reference to the sections of the plan.</p>
Q5.0.2	The applicant	<p>Information to inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>The updated document submitted at deadline 2 [REP2-016] omits appendices 1 and 2 that were contained in the previous document [APP-180]. For completeness, and to avoid uncertainty, please submit a full updated document containing the previous appendices.</p>
Q5.0.3	The applicant	<p>Effects to brown hares</p> <p>Please respond to the concerns raised by Fields for Farming [REP4-010] on the effect to brown hares from predators as a consequence of the proposed development.</p>
6. Climate		
Q6.0.1	The applicant	<p>Greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy</p> <p>In response to the requirements of paragraph 5.3.7 of NPS EN-1, the Planning Statement [REP2-040] (page 86 of appendix C) comments that the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) (ES appendix 4.1) [APP-089] and Outline Decommissioning Plan (ES appendix 4.2) [APP-090] identify a range of mitigation measures that have been embedded into the scheme to limit GHG impacts. Clarify if these documents are a substitute for a GHG Reduction Strategy, which is not explicitly proposed? If not, please submit one.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q6.0.2	The applicant	<p>Steps to reducing GHG emissions</p> <p>In response to the requirements of paragraph 5.3.9 of NPS EN-1, the commentary in the Planning Statement [REP2-040] (pages 86 and 87 of appendix C) focuses on the high level GHG savings of the proposed development stating that the GHG impact during construction, operation and decommissioning is assessed as being minor adverse and not significant, with the overall GHG impact as beneficial and significant. This does not appear to explain clearly the steps taken to reduce emissions at each of these phases. The ExA notes the list of measures in paragraph 12.8.2 of Environmental Statement (ES) chapter 12 and table 3.1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-089] although they appear somewhat generic in content.</p> <p>Provide further details of all reasonable steps that the applicant has taken to reduce the GHG emissions of the construction and decommissioning stage of the development and the extent to which stated measures would reduce GHG emissions.</p>
7. Cumulative effects and interactions with other projects		
7.1 Cumulative effects		
Q7.1.1	SNSE Limited and SNSD Limited	<p>Other potential projects</p> <p>The issue specific hearing (ISH) 3 submissions on behalf of SNSE Limited and SNSD Limited [REP4-013] (landowners for both the Steeple Renewables Project and parts of the North Humber to High Marnham Scheme) referred to other important projects which the landowner wishes to facilitate. Please submit details of other potential projects including projected timescales.</p>
Q7.1.2	The applicant	<p>Residential development</p> <p>Reference was made during ISH 2 under agenda item 5 [EV7-004] to a residential development for 9 houses being granted planning permission in Sturton le Steeple, close to the proposed battery energy storage system (BESS) compound. Confirm whether this proposed development has been included in the assessment of cumulative effects. If not, provide an updated assessment.</p>
7.2 Interactions with the proposed North Humber to High Marnham (NHHM) project		
Q7.2.1	The applicant	<p>Consideration of NHHM project</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of National Grid Electricity Transmission's Plc (NGET)'s deadline 3 submission [REP3-053] states "Unfortunately, to date the Applicant has been unwilling to meaningfully engage in such co-operation, preferring instead to simply assert that NGET should route the NHHM Project to avoid the SR Project entirely." Paragraph 41 states similar. Noting the figures contained in part 1 of appendix D in [REP2-052] and the maps in [AS-022], which illustrates the referred to western and eastern corridor routes and shows the possibility of likely interactions between the two schemes early in the consultation process, to what extent has the proposed development sought to accommodate the proposed NHHM Project as part of the site selection and iterative design process? If not, explain why not.</p>
Q7.2.2	The applicant	<p>Effect with Wood Lane proposal</p> <p>Figures have been provided in your deadline 2 submission [REP2-052] (part 2, paragraph 2.5) on the anticipated impacts in the event the NHHM alignment follows the 'Landowner Alternative Route'. Can the applicant explain the extent to which this route would affect the Wood Lane solar farm proposal in comparison to the statutory consultation route?</p>
Q7.2.3	The applicant, SNSE Limited and SNSD Limited	<p>'Landowner Alternative Route'</p> <p>Reference has been made in submissions [REP2-052] and [REP4-013] (SNSE Limited and SNSD Limited) to a preferred western corridor route for the NHHM project or alternative route. Noting figure D on page 13 of NGET's deadline 3 submission [REP3-053] that these routes would also appear to require land within the order limits, please confirm whether this route would also require the benefit of protective provisions to be secured on the face of any consented order for the proposed Steeple Renewables development to secure any future route that could be proposed? If not, explain why not.</p>
Q7.2.4	NGET	<p>'Landowner Alternative Route'</p> <p>Paragraph 28 of your deadline 3 submission [REP3-053] states you will provide figures of the affected land for what the applicant refers to as the "Landowner Alternative Route". Provide those figures.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q7.2.5	NGET	<p>Holford Rules</p> <p>Provide a response to the applicant's comments in their deadline 2 submission [REP2-052] paragraph 74 of part 1 and paragraph 2.17 of part 2 (response to the ExA's first written questions (ExQ1) Q7.0.4) that the proposed route of the NHHM project would fail Holford Rule 7's supporting notes.</p>
Q7.2.6	NGET and the applicant	<p>Need for protective provisions</p> <p>If protective provisions were not applied as part of any consented DCO for the proposed Steeple Renewables development, what effect (if any) could this have on any land rights requests as part of the proposed NHHM application? If NGET would be required to apply for acquisition of rights as part of any future DCO application for the NHHM project in any case, explain the purpose of seeking and securing the protective provisions you require (aside from any need case argument).</p> <p>Conversely, if protective provisions were to be applied to any consented DCO for the proposed Steeple Renewables development, could the application of protective provisions in favour of NGET result in unnecessary duplication if compulsory acquisition of land or rights is sought and later consented as part of any future application for the proposed NHHM project?</p> <p>Whilst primarily addressed to NGET, the applicant is also invited to provide any comments to this question.</p>
Q7.2.7	NGET and the applicant	<p>Protective provisions</p> <p>In the event that protective provisions may be imposed in favour of NGET in respect of the proposed NHHM project on any consented DCO for the proposed Steeple Renewables development, should the provisions be accompanied by a plan that specifically identifies areas that may be affected? If not, explain why not.</p>
8. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations		
Q8.0.1	The applicant	<p>Funding</p> <p>With reference to your answer to ExQ1. 8.0.4 [REP2-052] funding. Explain how all decommissioning costs are secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q8.0.2	The applicant	<p>Justification – Areas under existing overhead power lines</p> <p>With reference to your answer to ExQ1. 8.0.10 - Justification – Areas under existing overhead power lines [REP2-052]. It is unclear from your response whether you need compulsory acquisition (CA) of different plots for decommissioning as opposed to construction and maintenance and if so, why?</p>
Q8.0.3	The applicant	<p>Justification – Plot 05/09</p> <p>With reference to your answer to ExQ1. 8.0.11 - Justification – Plot 05/09 [REP2-052]. If you have secured an option agreement with the landowner, please can you explain why you are seeking CA particularly given your admission that CA powers will not be needed of this plot?</p>
Q8.0.4	The applicant	<p>Clarification – Order limits</p> <p>With reference to your answer to ExQ1. 1.0.10 - Clarification – Order limits [REP2-052]. It appears that you require temporary possession of plots 02/23 and 06/23; is the landowner aware of this possibility so they have had the opportunity to participate in the examination?</p>
9. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		
9.1 Articles		
Q9.1.1	The applicant	<p>Article 7 – Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance</p> <p>Explain why paragraph (1) has included paragraphs (d), (fb) and (ga) in addition to (g) from section 79(1) the Environmental Protection Act 1990, which the ExA notes were not included in the 'The Gate Burton Energy Park Order 2024', 'The Cottam Solar Project Order 2024' or 'The Mallard Pass Solar Farm Order 2024' which the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [REP2-009] has referred to as precedence for its inclusion? In your response, explain clearly what the inclusion of each of these paragraphs would result in the undertaker not being liable for and why they are required.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q9.1.2	The applicant	<p>Article 16 – Protective works to buildings</p> <p>The EM [REP2-009] (paragraphs 6.72 and 6.73) contains very limited justification for this article. Noting the content of NSIP Advice Note 15: drafting development consent orders on the information EMs should contain, please provide further justification of the need for this article to allow the ExA, and ultimately the Secretary of State, to be clear why the article is necessary for the proposed development.</p>
Q9.1.3	The applicant	<p>Article 19 – Compulsory acquisition of land</p> <p>The Secretary of State has added a clause to similar articles contained in the made 'The Helios Renewable Energy Project Order 2025' (article 20) and 'The Fenwick Solar Farm Order 2026' (article 21) stipulating that compulsory acquisition does not apply in relation to any mine or minerals rights. Explain whether a similar clause is required to the proposed development and if not, explain why not.</p>
9.2 Schedule 2 – Requirements		
Q9.2.1	The applicant, Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC), Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) and Sturton le Steeple Parish Council	<p>Community Liaison Group</p> <p>The ExA notes comments by Sturton le Steeple Parish Council [REP4-003] and NCC's response to action point 15 from ISH 3 [REP4-001] expressing support for establishing a community liaison committee, where NCC would support any requirement being added to the dDCO requiring the owner of the consent to initiate or actively participate in a local community liaison group. The ExA is aware that requirements relating to community liaison groups have been included on other made DCO's, such as but not limited to 'The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025' (requirement 4) and 'The West Burton Solar Project Order 2025' (requirement 4).</p> <p>The ExA requests the applicant liaise with the local authorities and the Parish Council to agree whether the imposition of a similar requirement would be appropriate for the proposed development and if so, provide appropriate wording for the dDCO. If not, parties are to explain why such a provision would not be appropriate or necessary.</p>
Q9.2.2	The applicant	<p>Requirement 3 – Detailed design approval</p> <p>Sub-paragraph (2) requires submitted details to accord with the 'design parameters' although the definition in article 2 only refers to the 'environmental statement' which is considered too broad in scope. To improve precision, should the definition be more tightly defined, such as including reference to ES Appendix 4.5 - Outline Design Principles or any other documents that specifically set out design principles? If not explain why not.</p>
Q9.2.3	The applicant, NCC, BDC and other interested parties	<p>Requirement 9 – Operational environmental management plan (OEMP)</p> <p>Further to previous questions raised on the subject of maintenance, should provision be made in sub-paragraph (2) for the OEMP to set out details of a maintenance schedule to provide greater transparency on the type of maintenance works that the local authority and local residents can expect, and confirmation that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result would not be materially worse than those report in the ES? If not, explain why not and if so, provide details of any additional wording.</p>
Q9.2.4	The applicant	<p>Requirement 13 – Public rights of way diversions</p> <p>Subparagraph (3) includes the tailpiece "unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority in consultation with the highway authority". Section 5.3.17 of NSIP Advice Note 15: drafting development consent orders states tailpieces such as these should not be included in requirements. Please remove reference to the tailpiece or explain why it has been added and why it is justified given the content of Advice Note 15.</p> <p>In addition, there also appears to be no maintenance clause in sub-paragraph (3), such as requiring the implemented measures to be maintained throughout the operation of the relevant part of the authorised development. Please clarify or explain why one is not required.</p>
Q9.2.5	The applicant	<p>Procedure for Discharge</p> <p>NCC's response to action point 12 from ISH 3 [REP4-001] has referred to provisions contained within schedule 2 of the made 'The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025' which splits the discharging responsibilities of specific requirements between different planning authorities. The applicant is requested to comment on whether such a provision should be included as part of the dDCO for the proposed development, and to explain its reasons if not.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
9.3 Schedules 3, 4, 5 and 6		
Q9.3.1	The applicant	<p>Plan reference</p> <p>The description of works column in each schedule refers to the 'streets, access and rights of way plan'. However, document [AS-005] is entitled the 'Access and Rights of Way Plan', which is also referred to in schedule 12. Please amend to ensure all references to the title of the document are consistent.</p>
Q9.3.2	The applicant	<p>Accuracies</p> <p>The applicant is requested to undertake a thorough review of all references to point numbers and locations within these schedules to ensure they are all accurately described, with any corrections included in the dDCO to be submitted at deadline 5.</p>
9.4 Schedule 10 – Protective provisions		
Q9.4.1	<p>The applicant</p> <p>Anglian Water Services</p> <p>Cadent Gas Limited</p> <p>EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Exolum Pipeline System Limited</p> <p>Holcim UK Limited</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc</p> <p>NGET</p> <p>Network Rail Infrastructure Limited</p> <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board</p> <p>West Burton Solar Project Limited</p> <p>Any other party affected by protective provisions and not listed</p>	<p>Wording for Protective Provisions</p> <p>The ExA noted the applicant's update during compulsory acquisition hearing 1 [EV6-001] on the current position of agreeing protective provisions.</p> <p>The ExA requests that any party affected by protective provisions provides any preferred wording you are seeking to the dDCO at deadline 5 where disagreement remains with the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant is also requested to update schedule 10 of the dDCO at deadline 5 providing full wording of all outstanding provisions with those parties requiring protective provisions (even if not agreed). Where areas of disagreement remain, the applicant is requested to lead on providing a table setting out the specific wording for each party that is subject to disagreement, the wording that the objecting party is seeking and each party's position for the wording requested.</p>
Q9.4.2	The applicant and Leep Utilities	<p>Request for update</p> <p>Can the applicant and Leep Utilities [RR-016] update the ExA as to whether the proposed development would affect or interfere with any assets belonging to LEEP Utilities and if so, whether any protective provisions are currently being negotiated? If so, advise where any outstanding areas of disagreement are.</p>
9.5 Schedule 12 – Documents to be certified		
Q9.5.1	The applicant	<p>Incomplete details</p> <p>Columns (2) and (3) in the table remains incomplete in the latest version of the dDCO [REP3-005]. Please complete this section in full for the next version of the dDCO to be submitted at deadline 5 with any changes to document references incorporated into the final dDCO to be submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The ExA would also query whether ES Appendix 4.5 - Outline Design Principles [REP2-031] should be included as a certified document. If not, explain why not.</p>
10. Flood risk, drainage and the water environment		
Q10.0.1	Applicant	<p>Unexpected contamination</p> <p>Please respond to the EA's comments in [REP4-004] section entitled 'RR-025/20 (Unexpected contamination) Progress ongoing.'</p>
Q10.0.2	Applicant	<p>BESS – water used in firefighting</p> <p>Please respond to the EA's comments in [REP4-004] section entitled 'RR-025/22 (Water used in firefighting) Progress on-going.'</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q10.0.3	Applicant	BESS drainage Please respond to the EA's comments in [REP4-004] section entitled 'RR-025/23 (BESS drainage) Progress on-going.'
Q10.0.4	Applicant	Content of Outline CEMP Please respond to the EA's comments in [REP4-004] section entitled 'RR-025/31 Content of oCEMP'.
Q10.0.5	Applicant & EA	Flood risk assessment – decommissioning phase The EA stated that the FRA should be updated to include an assessment of decommissioning phase flood risk impacts and include an assessment of floodplain volume loss due to infrastructure within the 100 year plus 39% climate change extent [REP3-048] ; EA 9.1]. Applicant and EA to update on this matter.
Q10.0.6	EA	Hydraulic assessment Regarding the updated hydraulic assessment 1d models submitted by the applicant. Does the EA have any outstanding comments?
Q10.0.7	Applicant	Flood risk assessments – possible pump failure Please detail how the flood risk assessment has included for possible pump failure and the impact on local watercourses.
11. Historic environment		
Q11.0.1	The applicant	Policy compliance NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.16 states “A documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage asset, and therefore the ability to record evidence of the asset should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted, and whether or not consent should be given.” Can you confirm how the proposed development has met this paragraph?
Q11.0.2	The applicant	Archaeological significance Your response [REP2-050] to NCC's Local Impact Report [REP2-063a] paragraph 5.2.7 agrees that areas of high archaeological potential have been identified by the geophysical survey [APP-123] and that the “state of preservation, depth, date and significance has not been established”. Noting the latter comment, please set out clearly how the Secretary of State can appropriately seek to identify and assess the particular significance of the areas of high archaeological potential that have been identified by the geophysical survey (particularly in and areas A to D) that may be affected by the proposed development, including its setting, as required in NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.22.
Q11.0.3	The applicant	Areas not surveyed ES Appendix 9.2: Magnitude Surveys Geophysical Survey Interim Report [APP-123] contains an area of approximately 66 hectares that has yet to be surveyed. The ExA notes that this area has been identified by NCC, in appendix 4 of its response to ExQ1 Q11.0.11 [REP2-063] , as an area with high archaeological potential. Provide further information, supported by surveys, detailing the archaeological significance of these areas, or signpost to where this is contained in the application documents.
Q11.0.4	The applicant and NCC	Post consent archaeological works ES Appendix 9.5 [APP-126] paragraph 5.2 refers to the scope of proposed post-consent trial trenching, outside the areas already trenched during pre-determination, and states as part of these works it is proposed that trial trenches will be sited on areas within the east of the site which have potential for geoarchaeological deposits, including possible palaeochannel(s). Noting appendix 4 of NCC's response to ExQ1 11.0.11 [REP2-063] highlights wide areas of archaeological significance in the western part of the site, does this paragraph or the document in general require updating to refer to wider areas? If not, explain why not.
Q11.0.5	NCC	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation The ExA notes your comments in the SoCG with the applicant [REP4-032] (issue NCC 22) regarding stated shortcomings of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation. Can NCC expand further upon what it considers are highly questionable statements and a reductive interpretation of policy? Can NCC advise further what it is seeking to improve the content of the document?
Q11.0.6	The applicant	North Leverton Windmill (Grade II* listed) Your response [REP2-050] to the comments made in paragraph 5.1.8 of NCC's Local Impact Report [REP2-063a] acknowledges that the use of the windmill forms part of its significance although considers that the proposed development “will not have any impact upon this” and the visitor experience to the windmill (the historic fabric, the moving sails, the ability to purchase flour milled at the windmill and its immediate agricultural surroundings) will not change to such an extent that would cause of harm to its significance.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Can the applicant provide a more detailed analysis clarifying its reasoning in relation to this assessment? In particular, to what extent has the loss of arable land to the proposed development and any grain from those fields used to mill flour at the windmill been considered as part of the findings in paragraph 6.50 of ES Appendix 9.1 [APP-122] (which states the immediately surrounding agricultural land makes a 'minor' contribution to the asset's significance) and paragraph 9.7.18 of ES chapter 9 [APP-067] (which states the immediately surrounding agricultural land and key elements of the asset's setting will be unaffected by the proposed development)?
Q11.0.7	Historic England	<p>Relationship between Grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul and the scheduled monument comprising the medieval settlement and open field system immediately south east of Low Farm</p> <p>Your response to ExQ1 Q11.0.4 [REP2-065] identifies the relationship between these two designated heritage assets and highlights concerns regarding the effect from the proposed development on that relationship, resulting in harm to the significance of both assets. It further suggests consideration of refinement of detailed design to reduce the level of harm to both assets. In response to action point 11 from ISH 2 [REP4-031] (pages 24 and 25), the applicant disagrees with the emphasis placed on the relationship.</p> <p>Can Historic England provide comments on the applicant's position and explain further the refinement of detailed design sought to reduce the level of harm identified to both assets?</p>
Q11.0.8	The applicant and NCC	<p>Use of ballasted foundations for preservation <i>in situ</i></p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.13 of ES chapter 4 [APP-062], ES Appendix 4.5 [APP-093] and section 9 of ES Appendix 9.5 [APP-126] refer to the use of ballast slab foundations where archaeology constraints have been identified and areas of 'no dig' construction. Provide further details explaining how the use of such foundations would preserve any archaeological sensitive areas or assets of archaeological significance in perpetuity, how these would be secured as part of the detailed design process and the extent to which such foundations could affect assets that are located at shallow depths.</p> <p>NCC is also asked to submit comments on the suitability of using ballast slab foundations in areas of high archaeological significance and the potential effects to assets.</p>
Q11.0.9	The applicant	<p>Christian Heritage and the Pilgrim Trail</p> <p>Comments were submitted by Sturton le Steeple Parish Council at deadline 4 [REP4-037] providing further submissions to explain 'How the Christian Heritage contributes to the significance of the heritage assets in the area in our opinion'. Please respond to the points made.</p>
Q11.0.10	The applicant	<p>Archaeology and Solar Farm: Good Practice Guide – Consultation Draft, August 2025</p> <p>Your evidence provided through written submissions and hearings has referred to this document. For completeness, please submit a full copy to the examination so it can be made available on the examination library.</p>
12. Land use and soils		
Q12.0.1	The applicant	<p>Top soil removal and reinstatement</p> <p>Please provide evidence that the top soil to be removed to enable the proposed development, can be taken away and stored for 40 years and then reinstated and be suitable for farming.</p>
Q12.0.2	The applicant	<p>Waste</p> <p>With reference to the SoCG between the applicant and NCC [REP4-032] (issue NCC 12), please provide details of expected waste arisings, and of their proposed treatment, from operation and decommissioning within the OEMP and decommissioning plan as well as a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule via the Outline CEMP at deadline 5.</p>
Q12.0.3	The applicant	<p>Effects on farm businesses</p> <p>With reference to your answer to ExQ1 12.0.5 [REP2-052], provide the updated ES chapter regarding the effects on farm businesses.</p>
Q12.0.4	The applicant	<p>Food security</p> <p>Your answer to ExQ1 12.0.4 [REP2-052] is unclear. Please submit a further response addressing the original two specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit evidence of the National Food Strategy Review and signpost to where the referred to findings are in this document.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<i>2. Explain how you are working closely with farmers that would be affected by the proposed development and the measures you are adopting to achieve this.</i>
13. Landscape and visual		
Q13.0.1	The applicant	<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Following the submission of the Cumulative SZTV Plan [REP2-054], the updated viewpoints (ES Appendix 6.1 [REP3-017] and [REP3-018]) and photomontages (ES Appendix 6.2 [REP3-019] and [REP3-020]) and the additional winter photomontages [REP3-050], the ExA requests that both ES Appendix 6.3 [APP-099] and ES Appendix 6.6 [APP-102] are updated to provide written commentary on the combined and sequential cumulative effects. Where there is the potential for cumulative effects, the name of the scheme should be referenced along with the likely extent of effects.</p>
Q13.0.2	The applicant	<p>Residential visual amenity assessment</p> <p>The response to relevant representations [REP1-008] (page 308) states the "perimeter fence of the Steeple DCO and the western elevation of Keepers Cottage is 76.3 metres at the nearest point". Yet ES appendix 6.4 [APP-100] notes that the nearest approximate distance to the nearest built element of proposed development and direction from this property is 105 metres. Please clarify the exact distance and provide any necessary updates to the assessment in ES appendix 6.4 to address any discrepancies.</p>
Q13.0.3	NCC	<p>Landscape mitigation</p> <p>Your position in the SoCG [REP4-032] (issue NCC 25) considers that any DCO should secure robust landscape mitigation, long-term management (for a minimum of 15 years), and post-establishment monitoring. Confirm the additions or alterations you are seeking to the dDCO, or application documentation, to address your concerns and whether this has been incorporated in other solar schemes.</p>
Q13.0.4	The applicant and Doncaster Sheffield Airport	<p>Glint and glare – Effects on aviation</p> <p>In the SoCG with BDC [REP3-047] (issue BDC 20), the BDC comment that Doncaster Sheffield Airport should be included as one of the stakeholders to be consulted as they are currently going through the regulatory process to reinstate controlled airspace to enable the reopening of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.</p> <p>Can the applicant and the airport confirm the extent of any consultation that has taken place and whether the airport has raised any concerns or comments in respect of the proposal?</p>
14. Noise and vibration		
Q14.0.1		No further questions at this stage.
15. Population		
Q15.0.1	The applicant	<p>Residential development in Sturton le Steeple</p> <p>Regarding the new housing development approved in Sturton le Steeple, (referred to in ISH 2, item 5), has this been assessed in respect of noise, vibration, fire risk etc from the proposed development? If not please provide it.</p>
16. Socio-economic effects		
Q16.0.1		No further questions at this stage.
17. Transportation and access		
Q17.0.1	The applicant	<p>Construction traffic management</p> <p>Please explain how the construction traffic management plan will include a formal role for community representatives to input into the plan?</p>
Q17.0.2	NCC and Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service	<p>Emergency access to the BESS from Common Lane</p> <p>In response to action number 3 from ISH 2 [REP4-031], the applicant has stated that "any route required for access from Common Lane to the BESS is a public highway, is not gated and is not subject to a weight restriction. The Applicant is aware that there may be gates, or weight restrictions along Common Lane further along the lane, but there are no such restrictions before the point at which the Applicant will</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		take access into its site. The Applicant has been engaging with Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service to confirm that they are content with the access arrangements and understand that NCC as local highway authority will be making representations to confirm the status of Common Lane.” Please confirm you are content or otherwise with these arrangements?
18. Other planning topics		
18.1 Air quality		
Q18.1.1	The applicant	<p>Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})</p> <p>Reference is made within ES chapter 14 [REP2-020] (paragraph 14.2.9) to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs publishing interim guidance in October 2024, which applies to future developments and those that were in pre-application at the publication of the guidance and how they can demonstrate appropriate consideration of targets for PM_{2.5} set out in the Environmental Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023. The guidance emphasises the importance of implementing appropriate mitigation measures during the design stage to minimise PM_{2.5} emissions and exposure than assessing the likelihood of exceeding the limit value. Please clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How has exposure to PM_{2.5} been considered when selecting the development site. 2. What actions or mitigations have been considered to reduce PM_{2.5} exposure for development users and nearby receptors (such as residents and visitors) and to reduce emissions of PM_{2.5}, including cumulatively, and its precursors. 3. If no mitigation measures have been implemented, why was this not proposed.
Q18.1.2	The applicant	<p>BESS safety – toxic plume dispersal</p> <p>During ISH 2 on environmental matters, the applicant referenced the prevailing wind direction regarding dispersal of toxic fumes in the event of fire. What are the plans for toxic fume dispersal when the wind is not blowing from the prevailing direction and how are these plans secured?</p>