



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

FAO : Emily Park
The Planning Inspectorate
Environmental Services
Central Operations
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Our Ref: 22/00124/PREAPP
Your Ref: EN010131-000007
Officer: Clare Cook/Daniel Galphin
Email: planning@bassetlaw.gov.uk

24 February 2022

Dear Emily,

Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) – Regulations 10 and 11

Application by Island Green Power Ltd (the Applicant) for an Order granting Development Consent for the Cottam Solar Project (the Proposed Development)

Scoping consultation and notification of the Applicant's contact details and duty to make available information to the Applicant if requested

I refer to your letter and enclosures dated 28th January 2022 regarding the above development.

The District Council understands that its views are sought, as a statutory consultee on the scoping opinion which has been submitted to the Secretary of State under the terms of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The District Council also understands that the Secretary of State will consult all the relevant statutory bodies in respect of this scoping opinion.

This project is cross border with the main element of the proposed solar farm being within West Lindsey District Council and the cabling element and connection being within Bassetlaw District Council. The scoping report refers to the fact that the exact location of the proposed cabling is not yet known although *Appendix 3* of the EIA Scoping Report outlines that potential cable route corridors are currently being considered but only a narrow width within these areas are required. Temporary construction compounds will also be required.

The submitted scoping report contains the following chapters and I comment on them accordingly:

The Scheme

The sites for built development are identified as being within a 19km radius of Cottam Power Station and are identified as Cottam 1, 2 and 3. *Appendix 3* in the EIA Scoping Report shows the exact locations of these sites. It is noted that the report also gives a detailed description of the physical characteristics and constraints of the surrounding areas which is welcomed.

It is noted that the exact type of solar panels is not yet decided and that the options have been separated into 'Option A – Tracking panels' and 'Option B – Fixed panels'. Further

assessment of the potential implications of the design should be considered and assessed in the ES when this option has been decided.

This is even more important when it comes to the cabling, the exact details of which (most notably the routing) are not yet known. This makes it more difficult to scope the overall project in detail.

Alternatives Considered

It is encouraging that the ES will contain a chapter that will consider alternative sites. This overall section of the EIA Scoping Report however is thin in detail as to what the alternative sites will be. Given that the site for the main development has already been selected, it would have been preferable if some consideration had already been given to this.

Consultation

It is promising to see that the applicant has already undertaken early consultation work with both Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council alongside other statutory consultees. It is also welcomed that further consultation will be taken with statutory and non-statutory consultees as 2022 progresses. However, there are some concerns about the specific details with regarding to consultation with the community. The term 'local community' has not been clearly defined in terms of its scope. It is important that as many methods are used to consult the local community as possible given the isolated nature of many of the settlement that have the potential to be impacted by the proposals. We would be happy to assist the developer with the specifics of this approach.

Consultation with the Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Planning Groups and elected Members within Bassetlaw will also be very important in the consultation process. However, this will become more important once more details on the cabling are known.

Comments on the general approach

As Bassetlaw District Council's jurisdiction falls within part of the cable search corridor and the anticipated connection point, the Council reserves the right to make further comments when more information is available to review in regards to the exact location of the cable corridor. The section entitled the 'Development Site' focusses on the main sites for the proposed solar panels and gives very little information in respect of the cabling areas (only one paragraph at 3.3). It is understood that at this point in time the precise cabling areas and type of cabling is not known; however once these are established the same exercise should be undertaken for these routes as the exercise that has been undertaken with regards to Cottam 1,2 and 3.

The issue of cumulative impact will need to be carefully considered as there are other NSIP projects in this locality for similar developments along with planning applications for the same. Whilst renewable energy is supported the ES must ensure that these cumulative impacts are assessed within both Bassetlaw, West Lindsey and other adjoining districts. It is noted that the scoping report states significant and committed developments will be assessed in this regard. However it should be noted that there are a number of other NSIPs in this locality that are at a similar stage to this application; these have not yet attained permission but need to be considered within the heading of cumulative impacts. Omitting the other potential NSIP sites gives a false assessment of environmental impacts. The District would be happy to assist in assessing and agreeing the applicant's list of other similar schemes in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire.

Each topic chapter should assess mitigation, this should be detailed and include a schedule of deliverable environmental commitments along with monitoring and control mechanisms. The order for mitigation should be avoid, minimise or reduce impact and remedy or compensate.

The ES should contain an appendix which sets out the evidence base documents that are to be used to inform the baseline would be welcomed. The evidence should be up to date and in accordance with the Regulations the District would be happy to assist in providing evidence where possible

In relation to the emerging Local Plan there have been further developments in this regard. The Council has recently undertaken a Regulation 19 Addendum consultation (ended on the 17 February, 2022). This Addendum together with the Publication version of the Plan will be submitted for Examination by the Secretary of State on 11 March 2022. This should be acknowledged and updated (eg at Paragraph 9.2.52)

There has been references made to Policy ST51 throughout the Scoping Document. This policy was part of the focussed Addendum consultation. Therefore, the reference at Paragraph 14.6.4 of the report will need to be updated to reflect this.

One policy included within the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan that may also be relevant to this proposal and the Scoping Document is Policy ST6: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area (CPRA). Currently, land at the former Cottam Power Station site is identified as a broad location for mixed use regeneration. As such, the site will be safeguarded from development which would jeopardise the comprehensive remediation, reclamation and redevelopment of the whole site.

In paragraph 5.4 it is important to note that Bassetlaw District does have a number of neighbourhood plans which form part of the development plan. Those that are relevant (once the cabling route is fixed) should be assessed in any future ES.

It is important to have a consistent approach is taken with regards to the policy context of each chapter. In any event it appears that little reference has been made to Bassetlaw Local Plan policies, emerging Local Plan policies or made Neighbourhood Plans. Whilst it is appreciated the specific cabling route is not yet known it is crucial that the ES contains a full and up to date reference to Bassetlaw's planning policy.

Proposed Topics

Climate Change

The Council comments as follows in respect of climate change:

The reference at Paragraph 6.2.2 regarding BDC's climate commitment is welcome.

The methodology for climate and biodiversity related assessments are sound. It is noted that it is proposed to scope out climate adaptation as this will be contained within specific chapters of the ES such as 'Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage'. This is considered to be satisfactory subject to the impacts of climate change being explicitly referenced and assessed within these chapters. It is considered acceptable to scope out the potential impacts of sea level rise out of the ES.

It is considered that a full climate change chapter should be scoped into the ES rather than a proportionate one to allow a full assessment to be undertaken in this regard.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

7.2.1 – Planning Policy Context and Guidance

No reference is made to the relevant policies within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy, the Emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan (2020 – 2037) or made Neighbourhood Plans.

A further review of relevant policies contained within the NPPF is also recommended eg para 174 is not quoted. It also appears that there are errors in the NPPF paragraph numbering eg should paragraph 98 be paragraph 100?

This is one of the key considerations for the District. However, without more precise details, it is difficult to make full substantive comments on the methodology. It is impossible at this stage to assess whether a 500m study area (para 7.1.9) is going to be sufficient without knowing the full extent and the design of the cabling. Obviously the issue of cumulative development will be critical to this chapter and will need to be considered when agreeing receptor sites. No receptor or viewpoints for Bassetlaw have been included in the scoping report for this chapter and these will need to be agreed. Therefore the distance of a 500m study area is not agreed by the District Council at this point in time.

Bassetlaw District Council has concluded a landscape assessment on Cottam Power Station and the proposals highlighted in ST6. The [Bassetlaw Local Landscape Assessment Addendum Document September 2020](#) suggest that there are important landscape, nature conservation and heritage considerations to take into account in considering a redevelopment of the site. Features including Cottam Wetlands, the former ash tip, existing trees and hedges, recreational routes (including the Torksey Viaduct) must be retained, but there is scope for a successful and sustainable redevelopment of the site. It is acknowledged that the type and scale of development proposed differs but the recommendations of the assessment should be considered as part of the next steps.

I would raise caution with scoping out a preliminary area of 5km. The amount of cumulative development that is proposed within the surrounding area may mean that a greater distance is required. Whilst it is appreciated that the scoping report is trying to set out parameters with regards to landscaping the visual study area needs to be agreed with the Council's consultant (who is in the process of being engaged) and until this time the study areas are not agreed by the District.

It is considered that this chapter is overlapping with other chapters eg heritage and biodiversity. Whilst it is appreciated that there is some overlap the chapter needs to be clear at the beginning as to what it intends to assess otherwise the document will become repetitive and confusing for the reader/assessor.

Once the details are known early discussions are recommended with both District's and their landscape consultant to set out how the landscape and visual assessment chapter will be developed and the proposed viewpoints and study areas should be agreed with the local authorities prior to commencement of the ES.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Please see attached comments from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.

Again there is little reference to the cabling routes other than there will be limited ecological disturbance. This is not agreed at this point in time as the effects on ecology and biodiversity cannot be established until the routes have been defined. It also states that only

a desktop survey is proposed for the cabling routes; again this is not agreed and the District would expect to see full ecological surveys undertaken for these routes.

It is important to mention that the cable search corridor area impacts upon a Main green corridor in the form of the River Trent (Local Plan policy ST39: Green and Blue Infrastructure). Should the area be chosen as part of the cable corridor impact upon the green corridor care should be taken to protect the function, setting, biodiversity value, landscape, access and recreational value of the Main corridor. It is worth noting that in close proximity to the Cottam Power Station site, a Local Wildlife Site designation covers a significant part (Eastern side of the site – site ID 1/101). It is understood that scoping has been undertaken for residual effects on ecological features as indicated in Table 8.1. It would be prudent to understand the level of impact and ensure that mitigation is commensurate to address impacts identified.

Whilst the Bassetlaw Core Strategy 2011 is quoted in the policy section, there is no reference to the emerging Local Plan or any made Neighbourhood Plans. Another key document is 'Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services' as this is the most recent Defra approved strategy for biodiversity in the UK. For meaningful policy to enhance local biodiversity the core 4 principles **must** be included in their enhancement criteria: Better, Bigger, More, Joined.

The need for 10% net gain is welcomed and this should be scoped into the assessment. The Environment Act 2021 promotes biodiversity net gain in new development, albeit from 2023. However, the NPPF recommends securing net gains now. Reflecting the principles of national planning policy and the emerging provisions of the Act we would strongly recommend that the proposal secures at least 10% net gain in biodiversity to ensure that the value of the development exceeds the pre-development on site habitat value by at least 10%.

Lighting, even during construction phase, has the potential to impact on ecology and given the fact that there are still unknowns in respect of the location and design of this proposal it is considered that lighting should remain in the EIA and its effect on ecology should form part of this chapter.

It is considered that nothing should be scoped out of this chapter.

Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage

The scoping report acknowledges that the work relating to the cable areas is less advanced than the other 3 sites and therefore at this point in time little comment can be made on the scope in respect of the cabling areas within Bassetlaw.

The council welcomes reference to Policies ST52 Flood Risk and Drainage and ST53 Protecting Water Quality and Management. Further detail on flood impacts and drainage solutions would be welcome. The [Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in June 2021](#) concluded that the Cottam Priority Regeneration Area was found to be highly susceptible to groundwater flooding. Whilst it is acknowledged that this proposal may not have the same impact on flood risk as mixed use regeneration, such issues should be given due consideration in the planning process.

It is welcomed that nothing is proposed to be scoped out of this chapter

Ground Conditions and Contamination

Again it is acknowledged that the cabling element in this regard is less advanced. The Council would expect full investigations to be undertaken with respect of this topic for the areas that will affect Bassetlaw.

It is welcomed that this topic is scoped in at this point in time until further discussions with relevant officers have been undertaken.

Minerals

The safeguarding of minerals is given local and national importance in the Section 17 of the NPPF (facilitating the sustainable use of minerals) and the Policy SP7 of the Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Local Plan. It is proposed to scope consideration of mineral safeguarding out of the ES as the proposed scheme is for a temporary period and as such, any mineral sterilisation would not be permanent. This is considered to be acceptable but it is recommended that ongoing consultation is done with the County Planning Authorities at Nottinghamshire County Council and Lincolnshire County Council to properly determine whether this approach is acceptable. Given that Bassetlaw will only include the cabling it is very possible that there will be no mineral safeguarding consideration as the final routing of cables will only include a very small section of the search area for potential cable routes.

Please see the response from The Coal Authority, this reads as follows:

“I can confirm that the area of cabling and grid connections within the administrative area of Bassetlaw District Council falls outside the coalfield area. Accordingly, if it is considered that the application is EIA development, there is no requirement for the applicant to consider coal mining legacy or mineral safeguarding as part of their Environmental Impact Assessment. In addition, there will be no need to consult us on any subsequent planning application for this site.”

Archaeology

Advice from the Council's Archaeological Advisor states:

“The Cottam Solar Project Scoping Opinion provides details for the construction of a 600MW solar farm spread over three sites and a substation/energy store facility and cable corridors. All three main sites are located in Lincolnshire, however part of the proposed cable connection routes and substation will be located in Nottinghamshire (Bassetlaw) with the connection point proposed at the Cottam Power Station. The following relates primarily to the proposed cable connection routes and associated substations/stores proposed for Bassetlaw.

I have not been consulted prior to submission of this scoping report and have significant concerns on the Cultural Heritage section (section 12) of the submitted documents.

I am disappointed to note that the applicant has not engaged prior to this submission or to undertaking/commissioning geophysical survey work, which may not meet the standards and quality control requirements expected.

It is also concerning that the cable corridor routes have not been determined and therefore not considered other than a vague statement in section 12.1.2. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will need to include all scoped in cable routes and substation sites in the form of desk-based research, non-intrusive and intrusive evaluation and be included in the ES (Environmental Statement) prior to submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.

The review and initial assessment of assets presented in this document is based on very limited data and many of the conclusions drawn cannot be justified at this stage without further desk-based research, non-intrusive and intrusive evaluation. The following are just some of the statements with which I cannot currently agree:

Section 12.2.17 states that 'Despite the lack or limited nature of previously recorded evidence for prehistoric and Roman period activity....the results of the geophysical survey have identified concentrations of anomalies that could represent settlements and enclosures of a late prehistoric or Roman period date.' The lack of site-specific information is an indication of limited investigation rather than limited archaeological potential.

Section 12.2.18 goes on to say that even if archaeological remains of prehistoric or Roman periods are present in the Site 'There is no evidence however to suggest the presence of any remains of a greater than local significance'; Such a statement is entirely unfounded until it is informed by trial trenching. The statement regarding assumed diminished significance is an unhelpful and unjustifiable theme throughout the document. The author is presupposing that locally significant archaeology which is impacted by the development should not be dealt with. As no fieldwork has been completed this is based entirely upon a limited selection of desk-based sources and a partial ongoing geophysical survey. This is entirely insufficient grounds as a basis for competent assessment of the archaeological potential.

The Methodology for further Evaluation and Mitigation states that 'where it is identified that there may be potential...further archaeological evaluation will be taken' (Section 12.3.13) This is unacceptable. This would only give us more information on what is already known. The absence of information does not mean an absence of archaeology. The full extent of the proposed impact zone needs to be evaluated with geophysics informing a programme of trial trenching and those results will inform the archaeological mitigation. This cannot be done until the location, depth, extent and importance of surviving archaeology has been determined through a programme of effective evaluation.

We also disagree with the proposed scoping out of direct impacts upon designated heritage assets (12.4.2) as the potential impacts have not been sufficiently assessed.

There needs to be an approach with sufficient evaluation in order to fully understand the archaeological potential and to inform a reasonable appropriate mitigation strategy to be submitted with the DCO application. The full suite of available desk-based information needs to be competently assessed including all available records, air photos, LiDAR and local sources. This understanding and the geophysical survey results then inform a robust programme of trial trenching to provide evidence for the site-specific archaeological potential of the development.

Given the above, the general methodology proposed in this document is currently insufficient and there is insufficient baseline evidence to support it.

Requirements for Environmental Statement

The ES will require further desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact areas, including the cable route corridors and any associated structures. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation secured in the DCO.

Regarding desk-based sources, the Environmental Statement will require:

Full LiDAR coverage and assessment; full aerial photo coverage and assessment; archaeological reports; relevant documents from the Record Office covering each site; and the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) data must also be consulted.

Map regression should include all available maps to provide a reasonable understanding of the development of the sites.

The HER search should be for at least 5km for visual impact on designated assets.

The wide-ranging options for the cable routes currently impact known scheduled monuments and highly sensitive areas of known archaeology. There will also be multiple areas of as yet unknown archaeological remains which must be identified and characterised at the assessment phase.

The subsequent mitigation strategy has the potential for significant financial and scheduling impacts. Sufficient evaluation is essential in informing the selection process and in ensuring the subsequent design and work programme is devised with an understanding of the level of archaeological work which may be required before and during the construction phase. Pre-determination evaluation of the cable connection corridors and associated structures can be very useful with informing a decision on the most cost effective and viable route/locations.

Geophysical Survey

It is apparent from the documents that geophysical survey has already commenced. As there has been no engagement to date and no Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted, I also have concerns about the methodology, practice and extent of the work which is currently being undertaken and what quality control mechanisms have been put in place.

Regardless of the approach to geophysical survey already employed, I would expect the following as a minimum: a single Written Scheme of Investigation that all contractors adhere to. This must include appropriate quality and control measures to ensure consistency of data recovery across the site. The proposed cable route(s) must be included in the survey. Separate reports from each contractor should be supplied in full with an overarching report presenting the combined results as this will be the basis for the subsequent evaluation trenching.

Evaluation Trenching

Trenching results are essential for effective risk management and to inform programme scheduling and budget management. Failing to do so could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided. A programme of trial trenching is required to inform a robust mitigation strategy which will need to be agreed by the time the Environmental Statement is produced and submitted with the DCO application.

Settings Assessment

Regarding a competent Settings Assessment, the application site may affect the setting of several Scheduled Monuments as well as a large number of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The Settings Assessment/Heritage Impact Assessment needs to begin from an understanding of the significance of each of those assets in order to assess the potential impact of the development on them and put forward any potential benefit or mitigation of proposed negative impact.

In conclusion, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will require desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact including the cable connection corridor routes and associated structures. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation. The provision of

sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The EIA will need to contain sufficient information on the archaeological potential and must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains.

This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 states **"The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner...the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on...material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape."** (Regulation 5 (2d))"

Built Heritage

Advice from the Council's Conservation Officer is as follows (also please see enclosed response.):

"This proposal would see a solar farm development comprising 3 distinct sites, all on the east side of the River Trent and some distance from it, very much outside of the Bassetlaw boundary. However, there would be power connections into Bassetlaw, connecting to the existing Cottam substation and land in the vicinity.

- *Within the affected area are 2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments, these being the roman town at Littleborough, and the Fleet Plantation Moated Site. There are a range of Listed Buildings in the vicinity, including Holy Trinity Church and the adjacent Font (both grade II), Church of St Nicholas (grade I), Ferry Farmhouse (grade II) and Littleborough Toll Bar (grade II). There are also several non-designated heritage assets, including the power station and cooling towers at Cottam. These are all identified on the Council's 'Bassetlaw Heritage Mapping' web page: <https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-services/conservation-and-heritage/bassetlaw-heritage-mapping/>*
- *There are a number of complex archaeological sites in the area affected, identified on aerial photographs/the NMP and from fieldwork. The significance of these, and their implications on this proposal, will be addressed separately by our Archaeologist from Lincolnshire County Council, Matt Adams.(see above)*
- *The majority of the visual impact will be on the Lincolnshire side of the river. Within Bassetlaw, from an above-ground heritage point of view, an underground cable route would be very much preferred to an overhead one. The landscape in that part of Bassetlaw district, being adjacent the Trent, is very flat and open (see attached contour map), so overhead cabling and supporting structures would have a big visual impact for a considerable distance, and will undoubtedly affect the setting of a range of heritage assets along or close to the route.*
- *The proposed Cottam Solar Park would not appear to include any new associated structures such as substations, fencing or cabins, other than temporary ones during the construction phase. This is very much welcomed.*

- *A buried cable option would likely require excavations of 1.4m depth. Archaeological work would be required, including geophysical surveys of the affected areas. I would defer to the views of our Archaeologist on this matter.*
- *During the Gate Burton project meeting, it was considered that a route near or through Littleborough would be the most complex, given the archaeological significance of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and surrounding area, so the southern routes around Cottam village were considered the most likely. I would suggest this also be the case for the Cottam Solar Park project.*
- *Landscape impact surveying should include views from high points within Bassetlaw (contour map attached), both alongside the river and from further away (e.g. Sturton le Steeple, South Leverton, etc), especially having regard to vistas from both roads and public footpaths. Although given the distances involved, it is considered unlikely there would be any visual impact from the Bassetlaw side.*
- *Similarly, views of Bassetlaw assets from the east side of the river should also be considered (e.g. Sturton le Steeple church spire). As we have recently found with several other solar farm proposals in Bassetlaw recently, those key views might extend several miles and be less obvious until seen on the ground. But again, this is considered less likely an issue for Cottam, given the distances involved between those assets and the 3 solar farm sites.*

In reaching these views, I have had regard to: Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990; Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy (December 2011); Section 16 of the NPPF (July 2021); and guidance contained in Historic England's Advice Note 15 - Commercial Renewable Energy Development (Feb 2021)."

Transport and Access

Please see the response from Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority, this reads as follows:

The Grid Connection Corridor (GCC) has the potential to affect several public rights of way in Nottinghamshire. Nottinghamshire County Council's Countryside Access Team will provide a separate response.

"The EIASR confirms that a Transport Assessment (TA), Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and a Construction Environment Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Impact Assessment to be submitted in support of the proposal. The scope of the TA and CTMP will include the GCC. The CTMP should also include a chapter on construction worker travel patterns and measures to encourage travel by alternative modes to single occupancy vehicle.

The TA methodology is to be based on the DfT Guidance on Transport Assessments, 2007 (GTA) and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic, 1993. Whilst the GTA is now archived, this still would provide a methodology that complies with more recent National Planning Practice Guidance. The methodology is therefore acceptable. The Nottinghamshire Highway Authority will require the scope of the TA to consider all main junctions within Nottinghamshire that would be likely to experience an increase in traffic greater than 30 two-way peak hour movements (based on passenger car units (PCU)). This is likely to be limited to the construction of the grid connection and associated infrastructure as the proposed

construction routes to the solar farm sites avoid Nottinghamshire. Where the TA addresses environmental impacts, this should be contained within a separate section to avoid confusion. It would also be helpful if the study area could be split into respective local highway authority areas.”

It is crucial that a full analysis of any affected public rights of ways is undertaken once the cabling routes are known. If temporary closures are necessary during the construction phase it is requested that these closures, wherever practicable, are employed sensitively to optimise the connectivity of the wider PROW network. In order to fully consider the PROW network and the impact of the proposal on the network, the applicant should undertake a full assessment of the PROW network and apply for a search of the Definitive Map for Public Rights of Way row.landsearches@nottscc.gov.uk The Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way team would welcome discussions regarding the enhancement and improvements to the Public Rights of Way network.

Noise and Vibration

Given the fact that the details of the design and location of the proposed cabling is not yet known it is considered that ground vibration or noise should not be scoped out of the ES.

Glint and Glare

No comment to make on this topic, the District is pleased to see that it is scoped into the ES.

Electromagnetic Fields

Human health is a material consideration and the District consider that this should be scoped into the ES.

Lighting

It is agreed that this does not have to be a standalone chapter; however it will need to be addressed in other relevant chapters such as biodiversity, transport etc.

Major Accidents and Disasters

The scope for this topic is agreed.

Air Quality

The scope for this topic is agreed providing that mitigation measures are reported in the CEMP.

Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Human Health

As stated in Paragraph 21.2.1 of the Scoping Report, the scale and geographic distribution of the proposals means that its effects have the potential to impact a significant geographic area and the associated population. As part of the cable route and the connection point are within Bassetlaw District, the inclusion of a joint district area assessment in the form of a Local Impact Area for socio-economic, tourism and recreation, and human health impacts is welcomed.

Public Health comments are contained within the response from Nottinghamshire County Council.

Agricultural Circumstances

It is considered that this is an important issue for the relevant Districts, especially when considering these proposals cumulatively with other similar proposals. It therefore should be scoped into the ES. If this approach is not taken then it is crucial that it is addressed elsewhere in another topic.

Waste

Please refer to Nottinghamshire County Council response.

Telecommunications, Utilities and Television Receptors

The proposed approach to this chapter is agreed

Summary

The table at 25.1 regarding minerals should state that the cabling areas should be scoped in at this stage as per the main body of the report, or the main body of the report should be changed.

It is considered that all of archaeology and built heritage needs to be scoped in. It is not acceptable to scope out the impacts on some heritage assets or direct impacts on heritage assets.

Noise and vibration should not yet be scoped out in respect of the cabling routes as the exact location is not known.

Light pollution also needs to be covered in the transport topic and human health.

The summary table needs clarification as it states a chapter on lighting is scoped out but will be covered in the landscape chapter; however the landscape chapter states that lighting is scoped out.

This forms a response from Bassetlaw District Council on the applicant's scoping opinion for the Cottam NSIP and we would be grateful if the comments contained within it can be considered as part of your formal scoping response.

Yours faithfully



Development Team Manager

Enc

Archaeological Advice

Bassetlaw Conservation Manager Response

Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Officer's response

Nottinghamshire County Council Response

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust response