

Padwick Wind Farm Scoping Report — consolidated schedule of errors, anomalies and omissions

Priority	Issue	Detail
1	Noise assessment built on superseded guidance	The noise methodology relies throughout on ETSU-R-97, replaced by the DESNZ guidance ARWTN on 19 June 2026 — six days before the Report's cover date. Paragraphs 4.6.32 and 4.6.38 are positively out of date on the Report's own date.
2	No grid connection identified	No cable route, substation or battery storage is identified anywhere, for a 49.9 MW generating station.
3	Traffic & Access scoped out despite major impacts	The chapter acknowledges potentially "major" effects yet recommends the topic be scoped out. In the order of 1,000 ready-mix lorries for the bases, plus turbine components, cranes, waste and workforce, would be required. The Report's trip estimate was also made before the turbine was chosen.
4	Incorrect statement that no further wind farms lie within 45km	Paragraphs 2.2.4 and 4.3.39 state that no further wind farm applications were identified within 45km. This is incorrect: the Garstones Farm proposal approximately 1km north-east (references SMD/2025/0149 and SMD/2026/0232) was confirmed by the Council itself to require EIA on 22 June 2026, three days before the Report's cover date.
5	Material copied from unrelated projects	The site layout drawing carries the title block of a Spanish solar company in Madrid; the LVIA cites Lancashire County Council for the Definitive Map of Rights of Way; private water supply consultation names "Staffordshire Borough Council".
6	Wrong EIA Schedule reference	Paragraph 1.1.2 cites thresholds under "3(j)"; wind farms fall under Schedule 2 paragraph 3(i).
7	Site area inconsistency	Described as approximately 148 ha and also as approximately 1.6 km ² . 148 ha = 1.48 km ² (an ~8% discrepancy).
8	Population & Human Health scoped out	Scoped out while noise, shadow flicker and traffic impacts on residents are scoped in.
9	Peat scoped out prematurely	Scoped out on the basis that a later survey will establish whether peat is present — i.e. before the evidence that would decide it.

Priority	Issue	Detail
10	Peak District National Park Authority not committed as consultee	Not committed despite the Park being ~1.7km away; the strengthened statutory duty toward it is not addressed.
11	Historic England / heritage consultees not committed	Historic England appears only as the author of cited guidance; the scheme is named after a Grade II listed farmhouse, with Sharpcliffe Hall (Grade II*) nearby.
12	RSPB not a consultee	The RSPB does not appear as a consultee despite the Coombes Valley reserve ~1.9km west.
13	Bat and protected-species surveys undefined	Scoped in but with no methodology, visit numbers or survey seasons committed.
14	Rotor diameter never stated	The Report relies on a “ten rotor diameter” shadow-flicker study area it cannot define, and confirms the candidate turbine is unknown.
15	Private tracks / drive labelled “existing road”	Farm tracks and a third party’s private drive (Sharpcliffe Hall) are shown as “existing road”, when parts appear to share the lines of public footpaths (Ipstones 33, 35, 37), making assessable upgrading works appear unnecessary.
16	“Figure 1.2” referenced but missing	Only Figure 1.1 is provided.
17	“Figure 2.2” referenced but missing	The turbine layout cites Figure 2.2; only Figure 2.1 exists.
18	Figure “4.5” used twice	The same figure number is applied to two different figures (a hydrology map and a landscape figure).
19	Missing figures and viewpoint appendix	The published PDF ends at the caption for Figure 4.1; figures 4.1–4.6 and the viewpoint photography appendix are absent, yet the LVIA relies on them.
20	Duplicated turbine label	The site layout shows eight turbines but only seven labels; WTG-04 appears twice and one turbine is unlabelled.
21	Inconsistent rights-of-way lists	The Landscape and Traffic chapters give different lists of public rights of way crossing the site (Ipstones 39 in one; Ipstones 33 and 40 in the other).
22	“Error! Reference source not found.”	Section 4.4.30 contains an unresolved Word cross-reference.

Priority	Issue	Detail
23	Viewpoint distances in kilometres	The LVIA viewpoint table shows distances such as “1,216 km”, “8,720 km” and “18,632 km”, evidently missing decimal points.
24	Incomplete coordinate	Viewpoint 13 is listed as “403225, 359264N”, missing the E prefix used elsewhere.
25	“SMBC” / Borough Council used for the District Council	The Report alternates between District and “Borough” Council and “SMBC”.
26	Incorrect NPPF revision date	Paragraph 3.2.1 states the NPPF was “last revised in February 2025”. The substantive revision was published on 12 December 2024; the 7 February 2025 amendment corrected footnote cross-references only and was expressly not a change of policy. A further revised draft NPPF was issued for consultation on 16 December 2025. The stated date is therefore misleading as to the current framework.
27	Typographical / QA errors	“South Pennine Moorse”, “designated sires”, “bare similarity”, “speciesspecific”, and spacing/formatting faults in quotations, indicating inadequate proof-reading.