



**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: 22/00140/PREAPP  
Your Ref: EN010131-000027  
Officer: Clare Cook/Daniel Galphin  
Email: [planning@bassetlaw.gov.uk](mailto:planning@bassetlaw.gov.uk)

1 March 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 West Burton Solar Projects Ltd (the Applicant) for an Order granting Development Consent for the Cottom 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 28<sup>th</sup> 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.

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 West Burton 1, 2, 3 and 4. It is positive to see that a description of each of the sites has been included and sets out the key constraints as this will set the basis for the rest of the EIA.

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. The majority of the project will be situated in West Lindsey but West Burton 4 and the grid connection infrastructure and energy storage located within the administrative boundary of Bassetlaw District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council.

It is difficult to make more precise comments about the cabling as the exact routing of the cables is not yet known. Once these details become clearer, it will be easier to make a better judgement on the constraints that will be most likely to be impacted.

### **Alternatives Considered**

Although the Scoping Report states that a section in the EIA will include a chapter on alternatives that have been considered, this should ideally be completed much earlier in the process. This section contains very little detail and opportunity for statutory consultees to view the justification for not using the alternative sites. I am not aware through the consultation to date that any information has been presented in regards to alternative sites. This really should be front loaded and available in initial consultation.

### **Consultation**

In terms of consultation this needs further detail in respect of how this will be undertaken. The District Council is supportive of the broad principles in respect of consultation; however it is key that public consultation is meaningful and wide reaching. It would be useful to understand what is meant by 'local community', it will be important that a number of methods are used to engage people both in Bassetlaw and West Lindsey. The District is happy to assist the developer in this regard.

Consultation with the Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Planning Groups and elected Members will also need to be a key aspect of the proposal.

### **Comments on the general approach**

In respect of the cabling routes, connection points and energy storage (5<sup>th</sup> site) 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. Once these exact details are known it would be expected that the same exercise will be undertaken for these routes/sites as the exercise that has been undertaken with regards to the rest of the NSIP.

It is welcomed that the applicant acknowledges that baseline conditions will need to be agreed with the relevant consultees and that there is an acknowledgement of the need to assess future baselines.

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 terms of the proposed built development there are options set out in the scoping report as to what form this will take and therefore once this is known the scope for the ES should be reassessed to ensure that all environmental impacts are covered for the specific development.

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 para 9.2.6).

There has been references made to 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.

It is noted that the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan (Review), adopted in November 2021, is not referenced in the list of Host Authority Planning Policies. The Neighbourhood Plan covers the full extent of the West Burton Power Station site, the proposed areas for storage, and a significant portion of the cable corridor search area.

7.2.2: As above, the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan (Review), adopted November 2021, is not currently identified in the Local Planning Policy section. In particular, the Plan is accompanied by a Design Code, which has influenced policies within the Plan (see pages 24 – 36 / Policy 2a - Protecting the landscape character, significant green gaps and key views).

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

## **Proposed Topics**

### **Climate Change**

The Council comments as follows in respect of climate change

The methodology for climate and biodiversity related assessments are sound. The reference at Paragraph 6.2.3 regarding BDC's climate commitment is welcome

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**

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. Obviously the issue of cumulative development will be critical to this chapter and will need to be considered when agreeing the study area and receptor points eg until an analysis of cumulative development has been undertaken it is not possible to agree a study area of 5km. The fact that West Burton 4 is on a sloping topography may mean that it needs a different study areas compared to a latter landscaping and vice versa. Whilst it is accepted that this is one NSIP it is clear from descriptions of sites that West Burton 1-3 are different certainly in terms of topography compared to West Burton 4 and it is therefore questioned as to whether West Burton 4 in terms of landscape needs its own methodology and justification for analysis.

As the Council is in the process of appointing a landscape consultant we are not in a position to agree the methodology, viewpoints and study area at this point in time. Once a landscape consultant is appointed it is expected that they in conjunction with the Council will work collaboratively with the applicant's consultant to agree these important starting points.

As stated in Paragraph 7.1.4, West Burton 4 is located on sloping landform which falls from north to south and the landscape surrounding the Site is peppered by numerous woods and coverts which visually combine to form wooded horizons and provide enclosure to the landscape. A further scoping into landscape impacts of West Burton 4 may be useful to fully realise the potential impact the proposal may have on the small rural settlements of Gringley on the Hill and Clayworth, as well as the surrounding area.

With regards to the cabling and sub station it is impossible at this stage to assess whether a 500m study area is going to be sufficient without knowing the full extent and the design of the cabling.

The Council cannot therefore agree at this point in time to scope out the study area/visual study area beyond 5km as there is insufficient information to justify this and we have not had any evidence presented in terms of cumulative development. The scoping report seems to justify this approach with regards to the eastern element of the development (para 7.5.1) but does not give full assessment to the west.

### **Ecology and Biodiversity**

Please see attached comments from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.

West Burton 4 identified on Figure 3.5 borders a Minor green corridor in the form of the Trent Valley Way (Policy ST39: Green and Blue Infrastructure). Should the area be chosen care should be taken to protect the function, setting, biodiversity value, landscape, access and recreational value of the minor corridor. Furthermore, the proposed location of West Burton 4 is located within 2.5KM of the Sutton & Lound Gravel Pits SSSI, as well as the Chesterfield Canal SSSI. Local Wildlife Site designations can also be found over Chesterfield Canal (Site reference - 1/82), Lovers Lane – Clayworth (Site reference 2/464) , Lancaster Lane Hedge – Clayworth (Site reference 2/465). It is understood that scoping has been undertaken for residual effects on ecological features as indicated in Table 8.5.1 It would be prudent to understand the level of impact and ensure that mitigation is commensurate to address impacts identified.

The LPA is pleased to see that the applicant acknowledges that this is an iterative process and that further surveys may be required subject to consultation with the ecological bodies. It is important that given the timescales of these projects that ecological surveys are kept up to date.

With regards to cabling and the substation location the effects on ecology and biodiversity cannot be established until the routes / locations have been defined.

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 Council welcomes reference to Policies ST52 Flood Risk and Drainage and ST53 Protecting Water Quality and Management in Paragraph 9.2.60. Further detail on flood impacts and drainage solutions would be welcome especially in the context of the small rural settlements of Gringley on the Hill and Clayworth. Paragraph 9.2.19 highlights that the EA's Flood Risk Map for Planning indicates that the majority (>90%) of the Site is located within Flood Zone 1 (Low Probability) of flooding, with a small portion of the extreme southwest of the Site located in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability). Therefore, inclusion of scoping for Fluvial risk of the Flood Zone 2 area within the Site that is associated with Chesterfield Canal is supported.

Given the nature of the application for West Burton it does not appear to seek to significantly increase the impermeable area. The LLFA would comment that surface water run-off from the site should not be exacerbated, and that any runoff from any hardstanding/small buildings on the site should be captured on site, to prevent increasing runoff from the site.

Policy 4 (Reducing the risk of flooding) of the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan (Review) has relevance to this section of the assessment

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

### **Ground Conditions and Contamination**

It is considered that this topic should be scoped into the ES.

### **Minerals**

The County Planning Authority at Nottinghamshire County Council has drawn attention to Policy SP7 in the emerging Minerals Local Plan due to the potential risk of mineral unnecessary mineral sterilisation. The County Planning Authority also drew attention to Adopted Minerals Local Plan March 2021 (Policy MP2c) and Policies Map Inset 4.

Although the project is only for a temporary period and as such there would not be any permanent sterilisation of potential mineral resources, attention should be drawn to Sturton le Steeple Quarry. As the site is not active, it may not have been picked up as part of the initial scoping project. The northern cabling route therefore could have the potential to cause issues for this site if operations were to re-commence.

Please find below the response from the Coal Authority:

*"I have reviewed the project site against our coal mining information and can confirm that, whilst the area falls within the coalfield, it is located outside the Development High Risk Area as defined by the Coal Authority; meaning that there are no recorded coal mining legacy hazards at shallow depth that could pose a risk to land stability at the surface.*

*Accordingly, if you consider that the application is EIA development, there is no requirement for the applicant to consider coal mining legacy as part of their Environmental Impact Assessment. In addition, the Local Planning Authority will not need to consult us on any subsequent planning application for this site."*

## **Archaeology**

Advice from the Council's Archaeological Advisor states:

*'The West Burton Solar Farm Scoping Opinion provides details for the construction of a 480MW solar farm spread over four sites and a substation/energy store facility and cable corridors. Three sites are located in Lincolnshire and one in Nottinghamshire (Bassetlaw District). The proposed cable connection routes and substation are also largely located in Nottinghamshire with the connection point proposed at the West Burton Power Station. The following relates to the proposed site in Bassetlaw (West Burton 4) and the cable connection routes.*

*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 substation and 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:*

12.1.1. says the document has considered 'the potential for the survival archaeological remains' but as no fieldwork has been completed this seems to be based entirely upon a limited selection of desk-based sources and a partial ongoing geophysical survey. This are entirely insufficient grounds as a basis for competent assessment of the archaeological potential.

The document states that each site 'has been subject to modern ploughing and drainage scheme which may have impacted any previously unrecorded sub-surface archaeological remains' (12.2.4, 12.2.3 which oddly follows the above, 12.2.6, 12.2.9). This statement is entirely unfounded until it is informed by trial trench evaluation.

12.2.50 states that 'any potential impact on buried archaeological remains could be mitigated by appropriate design to remove the potential for any direct impacts on archaeological features'. This cannot be considered until the location, depth, extent and importance of surviving archaeology has been determined through a programme of effective evaluation.

12.3.13 Trail trench evaluation is part of the process for assessing archaeological potential. The scheme cannot rely on desk-based and geophysical sources alone to identify archaeological potential as indicated in this section.

Section 12.3.13 offers non-intrusive mitigation proposals. These cannot be accepted at this early stage. Data from intrusive evaluation and a detailed assessment of impact from decommissioning will need to be presented before this can be considered.

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 substation. 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 and time depth of the sites.

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

### **Full impact zone**

The full potential impact zone will require geophysical survey to inform a programme of archaeological trial trenching to identify site-specific archaeological potential and subsequent mitigation.

*The full extent of the proposed impact area including the cable connector route corridors must be included in the evaluation process. The wide-ranging options for the 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 substation location can be very useful with informing a decision on the most cost effective and viable route.*

#### *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 substation. 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))* ‘

Based on this consultation response it is concluded that this approach taken in this chapter is not acceptable and comments from the consultee should be addressed.

## **Heritage**

Please find attached comments from the Council's Conservation Officer:

Please find further comments from the Archaeological Advisor with respect to potential heritage impacts.

*‘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.’*

It is difficult to recommend that the assessment on a large number of designated and non-designated heritage assets be scoped out when a statutory consultee has stated that *‘the application site may affect the setting of several Scheduled Monuments as well as a large number of designated and non-designated heritage assets’*. Although of the relevant policies (both national and local) have been included in the legislative context, reference to them throughout the chapter appears limited. The claim that there are ‘no impacts’ on a large of number of identified heritage assets appears to be more of an assertion than a substantiated claim.

Based on the above, it is considered that a more broad scale analysis of the potential impacts on the identified heritage assets should not be scoped out. More direct emphasis should be given to Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy, Section 16 of the NPPF and the relevant sections of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas Act) 1990.

## **Transport and Access**

Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have raised the following:

*‘The Transport Assessment (TA) methodology will be based on the Guidance for Transport Assessments (GTA), 2007. Although this has been archived, the methodology in the GTA complies with National Planning Practice Guidance and is therefore considered to be acceptable. The scope of the TA should include all main junctions within Nottinghamshire that would ‘that would be likely to experience an increase in traffic greater than 30 two-way peak hour movements (based on passenger car units (PCU))’.*

*‘The proposed construction route to Site 4 is the A1, A614, A638, A631, and B1403 Clayworth Road. This is likely to be acceptable subject to the TA demonstrating that there is*

*sufficient highway network capacity and road space for abnormal loads. It should be noted that the route passes through Bawtry and the A631/A638 junction which is the responsibility of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council as local highway authority. 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.'*

The following further comments are made by the County Council

*'The West Burton Solar Project: Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (EIASR) confirms that West Burton 4 is crossed by rights of way and has rights of way along its boundaries. The Grid Connection Corridor (GCC) also has the potential to affect several public rights of way in Nottinghamshire. Sites 1 to 3 are not in Nottinghamshire.*

*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 Public Rights of Way Team welcome the provisions set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report for the protection and enhancement of the network of Public Rights of Way within the proposed development site. The focus is on both the physical installation of solar Panels and the cabling requirements. Only one of the four solar panel sites are within the Nottinghamshire boundaries (West Burton 4) and all comments will relate to this site only.

A number of public right of way (PROW) have been identified within and alongside West Barton 4 site. These PROW (status and location) should be confirmed as correct by contacting the team on [row.landsearches@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:row.landsearches@nottscc.gov.uk)

Consideration should be given to:

- how these are affected by the solar installation, such as width and surface of PROW corridors within or adjacent to the site, views of the installations affecting amenity or the rural route, ensuring that views are still available,
- how PROW within the buffer zones will be affected visually, what methods will be employed to screen the sites from view, will the geography assist
- vehicular access – if PROW are used as access how will the public safety be managed (will this require a temporary TRO), how is the surface to be managed to take the traffic, restoration and repair after installation and future maintenance for the duration of the development
- Potential Increased connectivity of the PROW network is noted in para 4.4.8. Any plans will need to be shared at an early stage with PROW team for consideration. Will these be permissive routes for the duration of the site and removed on decommissioning or dedicated in perpetuity.

With regard to the cabling and public rights of way, until this corridor has been narrowed down it is impossible to comment. Underground cabling may affect PROW in the short term during the construction phase and it is requested that these closures, wherever practicable, are employed sensitively to optimise the connectivity of the wider PROW network and any works that affect the safe use of the PROW should be closed temporarily under a formal Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO), which is managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority.

The Rights of Way team would welcome discussions regarding the enhancement and improvements to the Public Rights of Way network at the earliest opportunity.

### **Noise and Vibration**

It is considered that noise and vibration should not be scoped out of the ES. The development is likely to give rise to these issues and should be fully assessed in conjunction with other topic areas.

With specific regard to vibration, it is accepted that the impact from vibration to the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings from the installation of the solar panels, (eg pile driving of the support posts) is unlikely to be significant, and will be very limited in duration. However, as the siting of the electrical transformers and battery storage facilities (which could take up to 24 months to complete), and the cabling routes have not yet been finalised, I would consider it too early to disregard the possibility of nuisance from vibration and it should not, therefore, be “scoped out”.

In addition, the Scoping Report refers to the levels of vibration not exceeding those at which “cosmetic damage” may occur to properties. It is suggested that vibration could amount to a nuisance to residents at levels significantly below those that could result in damage, and that this possibility should be considered in any subsequent Environmental Impact Assessment.

### **Glint and Glare**

The District is pleased to see that it is scoped into the ES.

The Public Rights of Way Officer has questioned how glint and glare is this being assessed with regard to walkers and equestrians. Although identified in para 16.1.1, no further consideration or assessment has been given; it is expected that this will be covered in the final ES.

It should also be noted that Gamston Airport, sited to the south of Retford at approximately 11km to the south east of the West Burton 4 site, is within the 15km assessment area proposed within the Scoping Report and should, therefore, be considered in the Assessment.

### **Electromagnetic Fields**

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

### **Light Pollution**

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.

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.

### **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 and 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. It is welcomed that this topic is to be scoped into the ES.

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 District, 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.

### **Telecommunication, Utilities and TV Receptors**

The proposed approach to this chapter is agreed

This forms a response from Bassetlaw District Council on the applicant's scoping opinion for the West Burton 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

Response from BDC Conservation Officer  
Response from Archaeological Advisor  
Response from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust  
Response from Coal Authority

Response from Nottinghamshire County Council  
Response from Nottinghamshire County Council Highways