

This matter is being dealt with by:

**Stephen Pointer**

Reference:

T [REDACTED]  
E [REDACTED]@nottscc.gov.uk  
W nottinghamshire.gov.uk

The Planning Inspectorate  
Examining Authority  
Gate Burton Energy Park

Sent by email to  
[GateBurtonSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:GateBurtonSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

20<sup>th</sup> November 2023

Dear Sir/Madam,

**GATE BURTON ENERGY PARK  
EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S WRITTEN REQUESTS AND REQUESTS FOR  
INFORMATION (ExQ3)**

Nottinghamshire County Council is responding to the following questions which the Examination Authority has asked of the Council (reference numbers as contained in the third list of questions):

**Q3.6.4 Change Request version of draft DCO and additional provisions for streets, works and regulations.**

Nottinghamshire County Council is satisfied with the principle and content of the changes, noting that any temporary restrictions on and closures to the public highway / rights of way network will need to be agreed with the Highway Authority prior to their implementation.

**Q3.13.1 Framework Construction Transport Management Plan (FCTMP) and redesign of retained accesses for operation of proposed development.**

Nottinghamshire County Council is satisfied with the principle and content of the changes within the FCTMP.

**Q3.13.4 Comment on Appendix D to Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs**

NCC concur with the conclusion of the report contained within Appendix D. The considered cumulative impacts of the developments fall well below the 30% threshold defined under Rule 1 of the IEMA, and consequently are not considered significant. We welcome the co-operation agreement between the promoters of the four solar projects and their commitment to joint working to minimise disruption on the local highway through the use shared access points and cable corridors.

**Q3.7.1 Updated Archaeological Mitigation Strategy following the Change Request particularly in respect of the Grid Connection Corridor**

Nottinghamshire County Council was not party to the original development of the AMS, as this was undertaken by Lincolnshire CC as part of their advice to Bassetlaw DC. Some aspects of the archaeological evaluation process look a little "light", in terms of the placing and overall amount of evaluation trenching, but the range of mitigation processes proposed appears generally fit for purpose. County Council archaeological officers prefer not to use the term "watching brief" as it has historical connotations of archaeologists watching the destruction of archaeological remains with only scant recording of the features briefly observed.

Within the updated AMS there are provisions for preservation in situ by avoiding areas of sensitivity within the development. The County Council has seen recent NSIPs which recommend the use of ground anchors for PV arrays and indicate this is an industry approved method of protecting archaeology if the archaeology is within 20cm of the current ground surface. This is disputed. If there has been insufficient archaeological evaluation, there may well be sites, including those of human burials, where the remains will be unknown and potentially far less than 20cm deep.

The updated AMS covers monitoring of work, with the opportunity to increase archaeological involvement if uncovered remains so indicate. The success of this approach will depend very much on County curatorial concerns being properly considered in a timely fashion. While Lincolnshire County Council currently provide curatorial advice for Bassetlaw DC, Nottinghamshire County Council remains the overall curator for the County of Nottinghamshire's archaeology and should therefore be included in relevant consultations going forward.

I trust this is helpful.

Yours sincerely



Stephen Pointer  
Team Manager (Planning Policy)  
Nottinghamshire County Council