One Earth Solar Farm

Consultation Report

Appendices J-1 and J-2: Regard had to statutory consultation responses

[EN010159/APP/5.1]

April 2025

One Earth Solar Farm Ltd.

Contents

Contents 1

Appendix J-1: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(a), (b) and (d) 2

Appendix J-2: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s47 439~~438~~

References 534~~533~~

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Table Copy

Formatted: Table Copy, Tab stops: 5.66 cm, Left

Appendix J-1: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(a), (b) and (d)

This appendix sets out the regard had by the Applicant to responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under section 42(1)(a), section 42(1)(b) and section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). **Table J-1.1** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008 concerning the Proposed Development and the regard had to them by the Applicant. **Table J-1.2** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(b) of PA 2008 concerning the Proposed Development and the regard had to them by the Applicant. **Table J-1.3** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008 concerning the Proposed Development and the regard had to them by the Applicant.

Table J-1.1 - Sum

mary of Section 42(1)(a) responses and regard had by topic

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Alternatives and Need			
JG Pears	NPS EN-3 [REF-1] notes the upper limit of ground mounted solar development is normally 40 years. We therefore query why OESF is opting for a 60 year consent, which will leave the impacts with the local community for 50% longer than is the normal limit, especially when the efficiency of the solar panels decreases over time.	The Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects in the development queue. This is also consistent with the consents granted for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass solar farms, which have all been granted 60-year consents. This would allow for solar panels to be replaced within the life of the Proposed Development, if their efficiency does decrease to a point where it would be economically feasible to replace them. It's important to be clear that EN-3 para 2.10.65 [REF-1] states that "An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time-periods of operation" and does not impost or suggest a 40 year limit is required.	N
JG Pears	The National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3) ("NPS EN-3") [REF-1] states that ground mounted solar development should mainly be on brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade	NPS EN-3 para 2.10.29 [REF-1] states: "*While land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land,*	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	agricultural land, avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" (BMV) agricultural land where possible. However, we note that a significant proportion of the ground mounted solar for OESF will be installed on BMV agricultural land, notwithstanding that there are alternative brownfield sites that could have instead been utilised in the wider area (former Bevercotes Colliery near Ollerton for example). Additionally, JG Pears understands that there is no proposal by OESF to allow for the continued agricultural use of the land upon which the ground mounted solar panels are to be installed. It is clear therefore that should OESF be consented as per its current masterplan, there will be substantial amount of BMV agricultural land that will be lost in the local area. Given the need to protect BMV land to ensure that the UK's food security is not compromised, we request that alternatives to the use of BMV agricultural land are investigated further.	*brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land.*" The policy is clear that brownfield and similarly classified land should be used where possible, as should lower grade agricultural land. However, there is also an acknowledgment in EN-3 [REF-1] that this won't always be possible and that land type should not be a predominating factor in terms of the suitability of site location. Para 2.10.31 of EN-3 [REF-1] states: *It is recognised that at this scale, it is likely that applicants' developments will use some agricultural land. Applicants should explain their choice of site, noting the preference for development to be on suitable brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land.* The Applicant has taken steps to avoid and minimise use of BMV land, however, there does still remain BMV land within the Site. The Applicant has set out its justification for this in the application documents. It is explained within **Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		[EN010159/APP/6.4] that other potential Order Limit locations were not of significantly better BMV profile in comparison to the Order Limits, resulting from detailed ALC survey. As the Order Limits have evolved, some land parcels of ALC Grade 2 have been removed in seeking to avoid and minimise impacts to BMV land. The Applicant has undertaken a site selection process which has resulted in the Order Limits being selected as a suitable site. In terms of brownfield alternatives, this was considered at site selection stage and no suitable and available sites were identified. Bevercoats Colliery is located approximately 15 km to the west and as a small parcel of land, cannot deliver the scale of energy to support the grid connection agreement. During the site selection process, the provisional DEFRA mapping showed that the majority of the land within the Order Limits was Grade 3, with pockets of Grade 2 and 4. With complete avoidance of BMV land not possible in a way that still achieves the objectives of the Proposed Development, a key focus in site selection was on	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		minimising impacts on BMV as much as possible. Please refer to the Site Selection Report appended to the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.3]** for detail of how BMV land was one of the factors influencing site selection, and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** in terms of efforts to minimise use of BMV land within the Site. The **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.3]** also expands upon this point. **Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** includes the updated figures for the ALC grades within the Order Limits: • Grade 1 (BMV land): none present • Grade 2 (BMV land): 19.7% (244.8ha) • Grade 3a (BMV land): 33.6% (416.1ha) • Grade 3b (non-BMV land): 46.7% (579.5ha) • Grade 4 (non-BMV land): none present • Grade 5 (non-BMV land): none present • Non-agricultural land: none present • Urban land: none present.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	In conclusion the Parish regard this 60-year project as • too long and should be reduced to 25-30 years. • outdated because technology is developing rapidly and other energy sources such as nuclear fusion will be preferred.	The Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects that have been recently consented, and allows for the project to replace panels if they lose efficiency such that it would be economically feasible to do so. At the end of the life of the Proposed Development, it would be decommissioned, and could be replaced with newer forms of energy that may have been developed during this period, subject to future planning consent.	N
Thorney Parish Council	Better sources of green energy are available & more are under research. Solar farm projects should be limited for a trial period so the country is not totally covered in them when a better solution arises & / or it is proven that they are not as efficient as the current administration believes. There are serious efficiency concerns. This is largely untested so massive proliferation without this information is folly.	This comment goes to the merits of the National Policy Statements EN-1 [REF-2] and EN-3 [REF-1] which are not issues that can be addressed as part of the determination of a DCO application. The NPS make clear there is an urgent demonstrated need for renewable energy generation, including solar. Solar photovoltaic technology is well tested, and has been used for several decades. Based on the location of the grid connection at High Marnham, this is a good option for renewable energy in this location. Based on the technology that is currently available, the Proposed Development would be	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		able to produce the energy needed to meet the grid connection agreement. The consent that we are seeking is time-limited, meaning that the Proposed Development would be decommissioned at the end of its life and could be replaced by other sources of technology that may become available.	
Thorney Parish Council	This is not necessarily the best source of green energy in this area. A cleaner, longer-lived solution would be to create a nuclear energy plant at the High Marnham site rather than using it for cable routing for solar panels. This would have no additional visual impact, unlike the One Earth proposals.	Small modular reactors (SMRs) are a new technology of nuclear energy that is under development now, but not currently ready for commercial development. To meet the current demands to electricity using renewable sources, solar is a well-tested technology that can be developed now, in line with Government targets for Net Zero and its aspirations for 2030. The Applicant has sought to reduce the visual impacts of the Proposed Development, as described in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]**.	N
Thorney Parish Council	The project is “industrialising” a rural area. It will ruin the landscape unnecessarily. These are not “farms” & would be far more appropriate placed on all industrial buildings, all new builds, disused industrial sites &, maybe, some of the	In order to reduce carbon emissions, a wide range of renewable energy developments are required, and it is considered that solar panels should be proposed on roofs of buildings and brownfield land, it is also required to develop some green field land	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	currently vacant MOD sites that do NOT have heritage projects planned.	for large scale solar development, it is not a case of one or the other. The potential impacts on the landscape have been considered in **ES Volume 2**, **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].** The Applicant notes that the Proposed Development would be a change to the current landscape, however, the design for the Proposed Development, shown illustratively on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7],** has changed significantly throughout the development process in response to community feedback in order to reduce impacts and provide benefits such as the provision of new permissive paths. See also **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]**.	
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	This Statement sets out a number of considerations to ensure that any schemes for ground-mounted solar PV which come forward: • Are adequately justified; • Are of an appropriate scale and location; • Respect local landscape, heritage and visual amenity; • Assess the cumulative impacts.	The location of solar farms is driven by many factors, but one key factor is the availability of capacity in the grid infrastructure, which is why there are often renewable energy projects proposed in proximity to former power stations and existing substations. We have undertaken a site selection process (which draws out these factors further) which has resulted in the Order limits being proposed as a suitable site for large scale solar	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	The government's drive for a zero carbon economy by 2050 is supported by the Parish Council which itself has a set of environment related objectives upon which local decisions are based. The parish council considers that appropriate renewable energy infrastructure and technology form a central part to achieving this goal. However, the parish council also believe that the right balance needs to be achieved between the scale and location of renewable energy infrastructure and losing valued landscapes and biodiversity. Not all of this infrastructure should be provided within a single area. The impacts of such infrastructure should be spread across the country and in areas where it causes the least impacts to the environment and communities. To help manage the impacts of renewable energy developments, Paragraph 155 (a) and (b) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Plans should: • 'provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, while ensuring that	development, see the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].** The Environmental Statement includes a robust assessment of a range of topics, including: • **ES Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4],** • **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9],** • **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10],** • **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11],** and • **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts)" • 'consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development'.		
Saxilby And Ingleby Parish Council	Conclusion: Saxilby with Ingleby Parish Council is in principle not supportive of the installation of a large scale solar farm within the vicinity. Development should be appropriate to the locality and avoid adverse planning and environmental impacts. The parish council does not consider that the need for renewables should automatically override environmental protections and an application will only be supported if the impact is or can be made acceptable. As a preference, the Parish Council supports solar arrays mounted on existing roofs or integrated into new roofs/buildings. Developments on previously developed and/or contaminated and industrial land are also preferable. Community owned projects would be	The Applicant has undertaken a site selection process which has resulted in the Order limits being proposed as a suitable site for large scale solar development, see the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].** Current policy calls for an increase in a range of renewable energy sources, including rooftop solar, however, no single source of energy would be sufficient to meet the Clean Power 2030 targets. Large-scale solar farms, such as the Proposed Development, are needed to produce enough renewable energy to meet future energy needs. As outlined in **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4],** a smaller development would not maximise the grid connection agreement nor would it deliver the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	particularly welcomed. The parish council will not support the development of large scale Solar PV arrays in areas identified for their special character or other importance. The parish council does not support large scale solar PV arrays on sites with ecological importance, archaeological or historic interest, or classified as the best and most versatile grades of agricultural land (1, 2, and 3a). For greenfield proposals outside of protected areas, the parish council expect proposals to demonstrate the landscape's suitability to receive such a development. Proposals must show how the design of the scheme has accounted for landscape character. Developments should avoid both landscape and visual impacts or demonstrate appropriate mitigation. In addition, land management around panels should allow for continued agricultural use and/or encourage biodiversity improvements. In formulating its views on proposals, the parish council has regard to cumulative impacts of	same benefits associated with the current Proposed Development in terms of generation capacity, energy security and climate change benefit, thus not representing a reasonable alternative. This position is in-line with NPS EN-1 [REF-1] paragraph 4.3.23 which states that the decision maker *"…should be guided in considering alternative proposals by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity (including energy security, climate change and other environmental benefits) in the same timescale as the proposed development"*. The Environmental Statement includes a robust assessment of a range of topics, including: • **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4],** • **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9],** • **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10],** • **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11],** and	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	multiple solar arrays on landscape character and visual amenity. The impact from a single development when combined with other impacts from similar developments could have a much wider impact within the area. The consultation and involvement of local communities should be an integral part of the development process and provide clear and meaningful engagement with all sectors of the community.	• **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** Consultation with the community has been an important part of the development process and is detailed further in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. The Applicant has chosen the location of the Site having careful regard to a range of factors, and has, from the start, applied the mitigation hierarchy by seeking to avoid, minimise and mitigate environmental impacts through the siting of the scheme, its design and further mitigation identified through the environmental impact assessment (see the site selection assessment appended to the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]**).	
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	It is not a requirement for solar panels to be located on the doorstep of existing infrastructure, in this case the National Grid substation: the One Earth proposal is simply applying an economic factor. There are panels to the east (Thorney) that are clearly 2/3 times	The planning guidance strongly encourages projects to develop near their grid connection point, in order to reduce the needed cabling and its associated disruption. This is in accordance with national policy in NPS EN-3 [REF-1] which states at 2.10.24 & 25:	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	further away from the substation than those on the west. If the same principle was applied to the western side of the application, i.e. putting panels on land further towards the west, it would significantly reduce the density and therefore negative impact on the villages of Ragnall and Fledborough.	*In either case the connection voltage, availability of network capacity, and the distance from the solar farm to the existing network can have a significant effect on the commercial feasibility of a development proposal.* *To maximise existing grid infrastructure, minimise disruption to existing local community infrastructure or biodiversity and reduce overall costs, applicants may choose a site based on nearby available grid export capacity.* However, in identifying potential land to incorporate, the Applicant must also consider a variety of other conditions, including environmental designations, agricultural land classification, topography, existing infrastructure, and a suite of other factors. Furthermore, the Applicant has sought to include land by voluntary agreement, which results in the order limits that are included for the Proposed Development.	
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton	That brown field sites should be used. There is an old power station site now owned by JG Pears that is being developed in an industrial context. It makes the ideal location for the	The Applicant has undertaken a site selection process which has resulted in the Order Limits being selected as a suitable site. In terms of brownfield alternatives, this was considered at site	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Parish Council	western substation and BESS: the owners should be approached again to lease the land and if necessary, the land compulsory purchased if no agreement can be made. It is understandable that compulsory purchase is not preferred but as a National Significant Infrastructure Project, the option to acquire the land is logical and therefore a primary consideration.	selection stage and no suitable and available sites were identified. The brownfield site surrounding the High Marnham Power Station was considered; however, at the time the landowner was not willing to join the project. They had their own development proposals for the land, with associated Town and Country Planning Applications and so the land was not available for development. As such this parcel of land was discounted. In addition, following initial reviews it was considered that the land was not suitable due to the likely extent of contamination and the identification of potential Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land which is a Habitat Principal Importance. As such, due to environmental considerations and landowner discussions, the Site was discounted. Subsequently, the Applicant contacted the landowners, but it has not been possible to reach an agreement with them to enable this site to be included within the Order Limits for Solar PV Development, although cables are required to cross it to connect to the High Marnham substation. See the **Consultation Report** for further information **[EN010159/APP/5.1].**	
Biodiversity			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	**Paragraph 7.1** Based on the information presented in the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report at this early stage, **Natural England agree that significant environmental effects to ecological features within our statutory remit from the Project are unlikely**. We will further assess the impacts from the Project throughout the Examination phase as more detail and evidence comes to light. Further specific advice on areas within our remit are set out below.	Noted.	N
Natural England	Paragraph 7.87 – Decommissioning. There is no summary of the Decommissioning phase temporal scope. It is Page 3 of 7 noted as 2 years in Volume 1 Chapter 4, paragraph 4.71. Although the details of decommissioning are to be determined, it is important to consider this phase of development throughout the assessment	The Environmental Statement considers all phases of the Proposed Development, including the decommissioning phase. It should be noted that given a time-limited consent of 60 years is being sought, the assessments will be based upon our current understanding of the decommissioning works.	N
Natural England	Where any further pre-consent surveys reveal the need for a licence from Natural England, we recommend using our Pre-Submission Screening Service, whereby we can assess a draft licence application and provide a LoNI	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	(Letter of No Impediment), where we consider there to be no reason that a licence would not be granted post DCO consent. The Planning Inspectorate's advice on this can be found here: Advice Note Eleven, Annex C – Natural England [REF-3] and the Planning Inspectorate | National Infrastructure Planning. Under the Wildlife Licencing Sub-heading and within Appendix I. This would be chargeable under the existing Undefined Scope Contract between the applicant and NE.		
Natural England	Paragraph 7.70 - CEMP Natural England welcome the use of a CEMP and Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP) in embedding mitigation for negative impacts to sensitive ecological features. The indicative measures outlined in Appendix 4-2 appear satisfactory.	Please see the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.4**] and the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.6]**	N
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	The wide open greenfield land supports an abundance of wildlife. The network of waterways, woodlands and hedgerows are home to a number of native species. These habitats are sensitive to change and provide a series of green corridors for animals to move	The Applicant has consulted with Natural England, district and other relevant authorities, as outlined in the consultation report. The impact of the Proposed Development has been assessed at all stages of development, from construction, through operations and decommissioning, following best	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	between habitats. The parish council will not support large scale solar PV arrays on sites with high ecological importance. Solar PV arrays will have implications for habitat loss, fragmentation and modification and for displacement of species. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) [REF-4] sets out the approach to ecology in the planning process through a number of guiding principles. The potential impact from all stages of the development, including construction, operation and decommissioning stages, will need to be addressed. Ecological impact assessments, including specific protected species surveys, may need to be submitted to inform planning decisions. These should follow best practice guidelines and refer to the Natural England Standing Advice. They should also inform and influence the design to ensure potential adverse impacts are mitigated and to maximise biodiversity enhancement opportunities to encourage more wildlife to thrive within the area and protect those species that are endangered. The implementation of an ecological mitigation/management/monitoring plan can	practice and other guidance. Please see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** (**oLEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	result in Solar PV arrays delivering environmental gains such as the creation of enhanced wildlife habitats including wildflower meadows, hedgerows and woodland buffers. However, these may not always be appropriate in terms of landscape character and advice should be sought from the district and other relevant authorities when preparing these plans.		
Biodiversity: Biodiversity Net Gain			
Natural England	Paragraph 7.61 - BNG We welcome reference to the mitigation hierarchy for avoidance of effects and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for maximising environmental gains for nature. We note there is no specified BNG percentage target outlined. We would welcome a 10% target for BNG delivery. We have seen targets well above this being delivered in solar schemes as there are large opportunities for gains through habitat creation and enhancement, enhancements for species and connectivity through the landscape. We acknowledge this is being done within the	The Proposed Development will provide well above the 10% minimum BNG expected. Results of the BNG assessment are provided in ref env measurements in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Project and so a specified target for BNG would be useful to understand the opportunity being delivered		
Biodiversity: Habitats			
Natural England	Paragraph 7.62 - Root Protection Areas In reference to Root Protection Areas around trees and hedgerow, Natural England suggest 15m for ancient / veteran trees, 10m for all other trees, 5m for hedgerow. Please refer to our standing advice on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees.	Root protection areas are recognised and will be managed through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.5].**	N
Natural England	Paragraph 7.64 - Habitat Natural England welcome the opportunities for improved habitat through enhancement and connectivity of the outlined priority habitat and habitat enhancement for species. The regular monitoring ensures flexible and resilient practices suited to the local environment. We do not make official comment on priority habitat throughout Examination, but want to acknowledge the work being done to improve	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	biodiverse habitats in the local scale, through the proposed project.		
Natural England	Paragraph 7.88 - Ecological features. Natural England acknowledge the approach that ecological features are considered as a whole, primarily through the construction phase, with a single conclusion. Operational and decommissioning phases tend to be lower impact for solar farm development, however we would ask they still be fully considered for their own impacts on ecological features and outlined in any conclusions.	The assessment is based on a narrative that describes the different phases of development as necessary. **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N
Environment Agency	Section 7.62 Environmental Measures Bullet Point 1 lists higher value habitats, we would expect to see watercourse in this list and therefore be subject to biodiversity enhancement where appropriate.	Biodiversity enhancements of wet ditches / watercourses is described in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**	N
Forestry Commission	As a Non-Ministerial Government Department, the Forestry Commission provide no opinion supporting or objecting to an application. Rather we provide advice on the potential impact that the proposed development could have on trees	The Proposed Development does not result in the loss of any woodland, and the appropriate standoffs are integrated into the design to ensure root protection zones are adhered to. With regards to fragmentation, the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and woodland including ancient woodland. We can confirm there is no Ancient Semi Natural Woodland within the site area. However there are a number of lowland mixed deciduous woodlands within the site area. Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodlands are on the National Forest Inventory and the Priority Habitat Inventory (England).	shows how habitats such as shelter belts, scrub, and hedgerows ensure woodland is better connected post construction than at present.	
Forestry Commission	They were recognized under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan as being the most threatened, requiring conservation action. The UK Biodiversity Action Plan has now been superseded but this priority status remains under the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006. (NERC) Sect 40 "Duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity" and Sect 41 – "List of habitats and species of principle importance in England" [REF-5]. Fragmentation is one of the greatest threats to lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Woodlands can suffer loss or deterioration from nearby development through damage to soils, roots and vegetation and changes to drainage and air pollution from an increase in traffic, particularly during the construction phase of a development. For any	The Proposed Development has minimised loss of hedgerows and trees at points of access, and the indicative landscape masterplan shows that extensive areas of new tree woodland and scrub planting are to be provided.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	woodland within the development boundary, land required for temporary use or land where rights are required for the diversion of utilities you must take into consideration the Root Protection Zone. The Root Protection Zone (as specified in British Standard 5837) is there to protect the roots of trees, which often spread out further than the tree canopy. Protection measures include taking care not to cut tree roots (e.g., by trenching) or causing soil compaction around trees (e.g., through vehicle movements or stacking heavy equipment) or contamination from poisons (e.g., site stored fuel or chemicals). Two of the areas of lowland mixed deciduous woodland are within the area identified for the potential cable route north of High Marnham. We note from the PEIR that existing trees and woodland will be retained with appropriate buffer zones being implemented with further details being available in the CEMP which will form part of the DCO application. With the Government aspiration to increase tree and canopy cover to 16.5% of land area in England by 2050. The Forestry Commission is seeking to ensure that tree planting is a consideration in		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	every development not just as compensation for loss. However, there are a number of issues that need to be considered when proposing significant planting schemes. Biosecurity of all planting stock needs to be considered. Woodlands need to be climate, pest and disease resilient. Maximise the ecosystem services benefits of all new woodland wherever possible (flood reduction) Planting contributes to a 'resilient treescape' by maximising connectivity across the landscape. Plans are in place to ensure long term management and maintenance of woodland.		
Forestry Commission	Hedgerows, individual trees and woodlands within a development site should also be considered in terms of their overall connectivity between woodlands affected by the development. Perhaps by linking up some of the small fragmented woodlands, to create some larger woodland blocks and using hedgerow/hedgerow trees to ensure maximum gains to increase habitat connectivity and benefit biodiversity across the whole site, not solely in specific areas or just to be used as screening. For example, there is a small section	A full survey programme has been undertaken, and the design has sought to provide habitat protection and enhancement that provides opportunity for a wide range of species including those identified as local conservation priorities. See **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	of lowland mixed deciduous woodland within an area identified for species rich grassland and wildflower meadow along the River Trent, which could potentially be linked with the small plantation & lowland mixed deciduous woodland, just north of North Clifton. The plantation woodland is within an area identified for solar PV panels under planted with a species rich meadow. If the area for solar PV panels could be moved slightly, there is the opportunity to link up these woodlands to maximise the benefits of habitat connectivity for biodiversity.		
Forestry Commission	Similarly there is a small fragmented section of lowland mixed deciduous woodland west of Thorney, within the area identified for solar PV panels and species rich meadow that could potentially be joined with the plantation woodland on the boundary of the site which is approximately 200m away. Also there are two sections of woodland at approximate locations SK 8475 7335 and SK 8463 7304 within the solar PV panel area which were established with the support of public funding in the form of the Farm Woodland Premium Scheme. These woodlands are approximately 200m from each	The **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** includes a setback to allow for a wildlife corridor between this fragmented woodland and the woodland at the boundary of the site as set out in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	other and 110m from a section of lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Plans should also be in place for the long-term management and maintenance of any new and existing woodland, with access needing to be considered for future management.		
Natural England	Table 7-8 - SSSI Natural England agree Spalford Warren Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) can be scoped out of detailed assessment.	The closest statutory protected site is Spalford Warren, SSSI, approximately 2KM south of the Order Limits. The are no potential effects identified associated with the Proposed Development.	N
Natural England	Paragraph 7.16 - River Trent Natural England notes that no Internationally designated sites are present within 10km of the study area. However, we would like to note the importance of the River Trent for migratory lamprey, associated with the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC) / Ramsar. The River Trent is considered to be functionally linked to the Humber Estuary SAC / Ramsar for its importance for breeding lamprey. Table 7-8 notes the use of the River Trent by lamprey. It screens out detailed assessment from the use	The sea and river lamprey associated with the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar site are assessed within **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** Further information is provided in the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) for the cable crossing, which will avoid any direct impacts (including via Electromagnetic Field (EMF) during operation), and the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure that connectivity between and throughout watercourses will be maintained and pollution or runoff will be controlled during construction. Natural England concur with the initial conclusion that impacts are unlikely, however, would recommend that these impact pathways are considered within the project's Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening assessment.		
Natural England	Paragraph 7.18 - Impact Risk Zones Natural England agree with the conclusion there are no nationally or internationally designated site Impact Risk Zones for solar farms triggered within the proposed site boundary.	Noted.	N
Thorney Parish Council	There is serious concern re the issue of wildlife/flora & fauna. No realistic corridor has been provided for protected species of birds, bats, newts, plants etc.	Wildlife corridors typically follow linear vegetated features such as hedgerows, treelines and ditches. The Proposed Development retains these features and increases biodiversity through enhancing these features, with particular focus on the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Fledborough to Harby dismantled railway and the River Trent corridor which is considered to act as a wildlife corridor in the wider landscape.	
South Clifton Parish Council	Biodiversity We welcome the promised enhancements and mitigations within the project that will aid and improve biodiversity. We have consulted with a villager who works in this field and he has suggested the inclusion of the following- Scrub - the One Earth project presents a fantastic opportunity to create more areas of scrub habitat that will help to support declining bird species like turtle dove. At the moment this habitat is concentrated along the Sustrans route and the river corridor (e.g. gravel pits) as it is generally pretty incompatible with arable farmland. As well as tree planting, we ask One Earth to create pockets of scrub across the project area.	Scrub habitats have been included within the indicative landscape design, as have other habitats that could be used by turtle doves. Including tall and wide hedgerows, and field margins sown with a turtle dove friendly seed mix. Chapter 6.7 – Environmental Measures **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N
South Clifton Parish Council	Pond restoration - the efforts to survey ponds were pretty poor given their potential importance for wildlife. Private access was cited as a reason - but this hasn't stopped you developing proposals (for privately-owned land) for the rest	Ponds within the Order Limits will be subject to positive management and new ponds will also be created.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	of the project area. We would like One Earth to restore existing farm ponds across the project area and create new ones.		
South Clifton Parish Council	Tree planting and hedge restoration - every hedge in the project area should be restored e.g. gaps filled, stretches re-laid, if necessary, with occasional trees planted into the hedge. We ask One Earth to abide by the Governments Hedgerow Regulations.	In regard to hedges, all retained hedgerows will be subject to management and enhancement and considerable lengths of new hedgerows will be planted. Please see 6.7 – Environmental Measures in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**.	N
Biodiversity: Watercourses			
Environment Agency	Section 7.62 bullet point 6 discusses watercourse crossings. Any proposed watercourse crossings should be by a clear span bridge design. This will allow free passage for both fish and mammals up and down the watercourse and riparian zone.	Crossings will be designed to minimise impacts using clear span bridges (see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**).	N
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 4 - River Crossings Issue: The Option A cable crossing of the River Trent will go underneath the watercourse using HDD to lay the cable which may create noise and vibration as well as EMF's from the cables	An assessment of the potential effects of EMF and noise and vibration on fish (particularly sea and river lamprey) is provided in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	themselves. Impact: Noise and vibration from the HDD may impact on fish behaviour locally as well as lifecycle migration. Increases in electromagnetic fields may impact on the behaviour and migration of fish. Solution: The Option B cable crossing of the River Trent utilises the existing structure of Fledborough Viaduct. We would therefore support and favour this option to reduce impacts on fish. If Option A is to be taken forward, then an assessment of the impact on fish from noise and vibration from the HDD and EMF's from the cables must be included in the ES and CEMP and submitted with the DCO. Any impacts on fish from EMF's or noise and vibration from HDD, must be screened at Stage 1 of an HRA. Additional explanation: We note that in paragraph 4.64 HDD is proposed at night. There is evidence to suggest that salmonid smolts (brown/sea trout) migrate mostly at night and thus could be more impacted by an increase in noise or vibration. Paragraph 16.39 refers to the HDD being one of the noisiest elements of construction, therefore warranting further assessment of the impact on fish. We note that in paragraph 7.119 it refers to	**Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the HDD avoiding key breeding and migration seasons for protected species, this needs to also include European eel, salmonids, coarse fish, European smelt, allis shad, twaite shad, river lamprey and sea lamprey (unless evidence can prove that these fish species are not present in the local vicinity and will not be impacted by the works). We note that in Table 7-6 the impact on fish from EMF's has been scoped out. However, it only details the impact from heating of the soil. If it is an assumption that magnetic fields will not have an impact on fish due to the depth of cabling, then evidence needs to be presented to support this assumption. The River Trent has functional linkage to the Humber Estuary SAC. Therefore, any designating fish should be screened for at Stage 1 of an HRA where an impact has been found. This is particularly true for both river and sea lamprey which are found in the River Trent in the vicinity of the development.		
Environment Agency	Section 7.65 Embedded Measures bullet point 4 discusses water quality for associated ditches, a minimum 10 meter buffer will allow for a healthy and functional riparian zone.	This buffer distance would be appropriate for the River Trent although may not be suitable for smaller watercourses such as agricultural drainage ditches, especially when they are dry and support	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		little to no aquatic flora or fauna. Stand off distances are described in Chapter 6.7 – Environmental Measures of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**.	
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Section 7.62 - Buffer Zones, Issue: The minimum acceptable buffer zone for watercourses is 10m. This will be for construction, operation and decommissioning phases and will include restrictions on the use of heavy machinery within the buffer zone. Impact: Any development or construction activities within 10m of the bank of a watercourse risks damaging riparian habitat and impacting species such as water vole within that zone. Solution: A 10m buffer zone for all watercourses within the development is recommended to be included as a mitigation measure within the Environment Statement.	This buffer distance would be appropriate for the River Trent although may not be suitable for smaller watercourses such as agricultural drainage ditches, especially when they are dry and support little to no aquatic flora or fauna. Stand off distances are described in Chapter 6.7 – Environmental Measures of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**.	N
Biodiversity: Protected Species			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	During the construction process and the establishment of the panels there will be significant impact on the wildlife. The disruption to deer, badgers, stoats, the extensive range of owls and birds of prey that use the areas for a food source, will be unable to do so and will cause an increase in the rodent population and therefore an in balance in nature. Fencing will restrict the natural movement of deer, badgers, stoats and other animals and will negatively impact on the local animal population.	Construction will be delivered sequentially and not all at once. Fencing will have access points for wildlife see Section 6.7 of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Section 7.1 & 7.12 - Ecological Surveys Issue: Omission of surveys. Impact: A full assessment of habitats, species and likely impacts of this development has yet to be undertaken. There is a risk of agreeing with the current conclusion within the PEIR report of No Likely Significant Effect when there may be a currently unidentified impact within the areas yet to be surveyed. Solution: The PEIR Report and its conclusions should remain as DRAFT until these surveys on the additional land are complete. Additional explanation: Chapter 7 concludes that there is no likely	A full survey programme has been undertaken, and the design has sought to provide habitat protection and enhancement that provides opportunity for a wide range of species including those identified as local conversation priorities. **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** Additional survey is being undertaken in 2025, although this is not critical for concluding a robust assessment.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	significant environmental effects arising from the project on the Ecological Features scoped into the assessment. However section 7.12 states that there are large areas of the development that have yet to be assessed or surveyed as these parcels of land were acquired post surveys. Further surveys are proposed but this we cannot agree with this conclusion until the results have been assessed and considered.		
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Section 7.15 – Great Crested Newts Issue: The report states that due to access restrictions only two of the six ponds on site were sampled. Impact: The ponds and surrounding habitats which were not included in the eDNA sampling may hold unknown populations of Great Crested Newt which in turn may be at risk from this development. Solution: The applicant should consider completing eDNA surveys on these ponds.	There are five waterbodies within the current red line boundary, of these; three have been sampled, one was dry (throughout the year), one was an ornamental pond in a private garden and two have limited access due to dense vegetation. An additional 20 ponds have been identified within a 250m buffer of the current RLB, of these, access was gained to sample eight in 2023.	N
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Section 7.31 & 7.32 – Bats Issue: The report states that due to access restrictions a large area of the site was not surveyed. Impact: A full assessment of the site for bats has not been undertaken. Solution: The	Bat acoustic surveys focussed on land within the Order Limits over the 2023 season. Additional land parcels included within the Order Limits late in 2023 and early 2024 have been incorporated into a second year of acoustic survey, both resurveying	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	applicant should consider undertaking additional surveys on the land which has yet to be surveyed.	areas from 2023 and incorporating those new areas, allowing a comparative study of activity across the site. This includes nighttime walkover survey of the Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS.	
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Preliminary Assessment 7.137-141 - Otter & 7.146-150 Water Vole Issue: We agree with the likely significant effects identified in this section however we expect to see the addition of accidental entrapment of otter and other mammals within construction compounds of trench works during construction. Construction activities on site may also prevent free movement of these mammals within the environment. Solution: Secure and appropriate fencing of all construction compounds and the covering of any trenches overnight. A 10m buffer zone between all watercourses and any construction or development will protect otter, their habitats and allow free passage. Additional explanation: We are pleased to see that potential Biodiversity Net Gain measures will include bankside habitats. To ensure maximum benefit is gained for the environment we recommend you	Water vole and otter surveys were completed in 2024, with presence of both species confirmed. The **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** incorporates best practice during construction activities to avoid direct or indirect impacts on riparian mammals, including appropriate buffer zones to avoid disturbance. The documents highlighted will be referenced to ensure appropriate habitat creation and enhancement strategies are designed.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	consider potential measures identified within the relevant River Basin Management Plan, the Water Framework Directive and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.		
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Further Data Collection 7.150 Issue: We recommend that further eDNA sampling is undertaken for GCN as currently only a small percentage of ponds on site have been sampled. This should include ponds in the newly acquired land. Solution: To establish presence or likely absence of these species and the potential risks the development may bring.	There are five waterbodies within the Order Limits, of these; three have been sampled, one was dry (throughout the year), one was an ornamental pond in a private garden and two have limited access due to dense vegetation. An additional 20 ponds have been identified within a 250m buffer of the current Order limit, of these, access was gained to sample eight in 2023.	N
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, 7.151 Summary of Ecological Features and Likely Significant Effects and Table 7-10 Issue: Pending further surveys, we are unable to agree with the conclusions set out in this table. Please review the conclusions once further data has been collected and analysed. Solution: The current PEIR report should be marked as DRAFT pending this further data.	Details of the field survey programme completed for the Proposed Development is provided in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** The PEIR included preliminary environmental information, and the ES includes updated environmental information.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7, Appendix 7-1 - Salmon and Freshwater Issue: The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 [REF-6] and The Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009 [REF-7] have not been included in the list of legislation that is relevant to biodiversity. The legal responsibility on the developer pertaining to this fish specific legislation has not been considered. Impact: This infers that the impacts on fish from the construction, operation and decommissioning have not been fully considered. Solution: Both pieces of legislation should be listed as relevant in the biodiversity chapter of the ES and submitted as part of the DCO. Additional explanation: Parts of The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 [REF-6] relevant to this type of development and that should be considered, are (but not exhaustive) Part 1, Sections 2 and 4. Parts of The Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009 [REF-7] relevant to this type of development and that should be considered, are (but not exhaustive) Part 4.	The potential effects on fish (particularly sea and river lamprey) are considered within the assessment of potential impacts on the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].** The Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC is an ecological feature of International importance. The effects of noise and vibration during construction would be negative and short-term, however the environmental measures would reduce the scale of effect to Very Low to Negligible. The longer term effects of EMF and heating would be negated by the burial depths of the cables and therefore, the scale of effect would be Negligible. The negative effects on river and sea lamprey of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC would be so small (or absent) that the overall effect of the Proposed Development on this designated site is assessed as not significant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7 - Fish populations Issue: Fish populations have not been included in the baseline data. Impact Local fish populations including protected fish species may have been missed in the baseline data and as such any potential impacts on them have not been assessed. Solution: The desk study within the ES should include freely available Environment Agency local survey data. Records of European eel and river lamprey have been identified (as referred to in Table 7-8) within the ZoI. Details of where this information is from needs to be included within the ES and submitted as part of the DCO.	The potential effects on fish (particularly sea and river lamprey) are considered within the assessment of potential impacts on the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].** The Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC is an ecological feature of International importance. The effects of noise and vibration during construction would be negative and short-term, however the environmental measures would reduce the scale of effect to Very Low to Negligible. The longer term effects of EMF and heating would be negated by the burial depths of the cables and therefore, the scale of effect would be Negligible. The negative effects on river and sea lamprey of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC would be so small (or absent) that the overall effect of the Proposed Development on this designated site is assessed as not significant.	N
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 7 - Ditches Issue: The ditch network associated within the ZoI in our opinion provides suitable habitat for European eel and other fish species, particularly juveniles. Impacts from construction and decommissioning have	The potential effects on fish (particularly sea and river lamprey) are considered within the assessment of potential impacts on the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	not been assessed for fish species that likely reside in this ditch network. Impact: European eel and juvenile fish species may be harmed, disturbed or at worst killed during construction and decommissioning. Solution: We would expect to see targeted fish surveys on the ditch network within the ZoI is completed to understand the fish population. Where fish have been identified then the impacts on fish from construction, operation and decommissioning should be assessed. Where impacts are identified then suitable mitigation should be included to reduce them to an acceptable level. This should be included with the ES and CEMP and submitted as part of the DCO. Additional explanation: The wet ditches hydrologically connected to the River Trent (Fledborough Beck, Old Trent, Sewer dyke, and unnamed channel referred to in paragraph 3.12.8 on phase 1 habitat survey) support habitat suitable for European eel. European eel are listed as critically endangered on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, they are also listed as a species of principal importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural	**Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].** The Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC is an ecological feature of International importance. The effects of noise and vibration during construction would be negative and short-term, however the environmental measures would reduce the scale of effect to Very Low to Negligible. The longer term effects of EMF and heating would be negated by the burial depths of the cables and therefore, the scale of effect would be Negligible. The negative effects on river and sea lamprey of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC would be so small (or absent) that the overall effect of the Proposed Development on this designated site is assessed as not significant.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	communities (NERC) Act 2006 [REF-8]. They are also protected under The Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009 [REF-7]. They are sensitive at all life stages to increased noise, lighting and reduced water quality associated with construction, operation and the decommissioning of the site. There is also much evidence to suggest that juvenile fish use ditch networks that are connected to main rivers as refugia. It is highly likely that juvenile fish will be present in the wet ditches within the ZoI, especially where connected to the River Trent. Where possible, opportunities to improve conditions for European eel and juvenile fish in the ditch network should be taken.		
Environment Agency	PEIR, Chapter 16, paragraph 16.39 - Construction Piling Issue: Concussive piling may be required for the construction of the solar foundations. Concussive piling is understood to be noisy. Impact: Noisy activities such as piling can impact on fish. At certain distances the sound propagation can have behavioural impacts and in extreme cases can cause death. Solution: Silent piling or vibration piling is the preferred method to avoid impacts on fish	The potential effects on fish (particularly sea and river lamprey) are considered within the assessment of potential impacts on the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].** The Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC is an ecological feature of International importance. The effects of noise and vibration during construction would be negative	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	behaviour or harming fish. If this is not possible, then a noise assessment relating to the impact on fish must be included in the ES and submitted as part of the DCO. It may be necessary for any piling activity to avoid key periods of fish migration and spawning. Any impacts from piling that are identified on those fish species residing in the River Trent that have functional linkage to the Humber Estuary SAC, must be screened at Stage 1 of an HRA. Additional explanation: The River Trent has a population of protected migratory species (European eel, river and sea lamprey, allis and twaite shad, European smelt and salmonids) as well as other coarse fish species. Increased noise from piling may have behavioural impacts on fish and at worse cause death. Certain species of fish are more sensitive to noise than others due to their anatomy. Therefore, any assessment on the impact of fish species from piling noise must include all fish species present within the River Trent	and short-term, however the environmental measures would reduce the scale of effect to Very Low to Negligible. The longer term effects of EMF and heating would be negated by the burial depths of the cables and therefore, the scale of effect would be Negligible. The negative effects on river and sea lamprey of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC would be so small (or absent) that the overall effect of the Proposed Development on this designated site is assessed as not significant.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	We cannot agree with the scoping out of Great Crested Newts as stated in table 7-8 as currently a percentage of ponds have not been sampled including any which may be present within the recently acquired land yet to be surveyed.	Assessment of potential effects on great crested newt are described in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** 6.6.39 Regardless of their habitat suitability for great-crested newt, all ponds within and adjacent to the Order limits, where access was available, were sampled for eDNA. All ten ponds sampled for eDNA returned negative results for great-crested newt.	N
Natural England	Paragraph 7.132- Natural England understand Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) are reviewing cumulative impacts to breeding skylark from solar development, due to the loss of open vistas, a preferred nesting habitat for the species. We suggest joining up with the LWT to understand the broader mitigation project and how One Earth Solar Farm project can contribute and mitigate to the loss of skylark breeding habitat from solar development. Natural England have no further comment on this.	Discussions have been held with the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. As discussed with LWT the favoured approach has been to provide mitigation within the Order Limits. This is the approach described within **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	Appendix 7-3: Bat Baseline Natural England welcome the use of the Mitigation Hierarchy to avoid direct impacts to bat roost, and that hedgerows will be retained and enhanced to support foraging and commuting. If any features with bat roosting potential are going to be removed, functionally altered or likely subjected to high levels of disturbance then further assessment will be required.	Based on current illustrative design no loss of trees with bat roost potential is expected. The potential effects on bats is assessed in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N
Natural England	Appendix 7-4: Breeding Bird Baseline. Marsh harrier and goshawk have been recorded on site, effort should be made to identify if they're breeding within or near the red line boundary as they could be subjected to disturbance or for marsh harrier potential loss of nest sites	A breeding bird survey is described within **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** This information has informed the assessment. Further breeding bird survey is to be undertaken in 2025 to address changes to the Order Limits that have occurred due to design evolution.	N
Natural England	Appendix 7-5: Great Crested Newt Baseline It was stated in Section 2.3.2 that additional ponds were identified as requiring eDNA assessment due to the redline boundary expanding. As such Natural England would expect at a minimum, all accessible ponds within 250m should be surveyed to collect a baseline of Great Crested Newt, or likely absence, if there is going to be works that are	Further great crested newt survey is to be undertaken in 2025.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	likely to impact aquatic features and / or neighbouring terrestrial habitat.		
Natural England	Appendix 7-6: Badger, Otter and Water Vole Mammal Surveys Natural England agree that surveys are required for water vole, otter and badger in order to understand what, if any, impact the proposal will have to these species.	The riparian mammal survey was completed in 2024. Coverage of the area for badgers was delivered concurrently with the Habitat Survey, with incidental records provided during any site visits where additional signs were noted.	N
Natural England	Appendix 7-7: Wintering Bird Baseline Nocturnal surveys appear to be absent from the winter bird surveys. Given the seasonally wet, arable composition of areas within the redline boundary and species presently recorded, it is possible that nighttime surveys could assist in assessment of the sites use by wildfowl and waders yet recorded. Whilst Natural England consider the site unlikely to be functionally linked to any European sites, due to physical separation, these surveys may better inform the overall design of the scheme to prevent impacts to wider environment birds.	Nocturnal surveys were completed between September 2024 and March 2025. **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	It is acknowledged that further survey is planned for a number of species, either as a result of the mobility of the species, or changes in the detailed development design potentially impacting upon the species. Our protected species standing advice can be found here.	Noted.	N

Natural England	River lamprey have been recorded in the River Trent. As a migratory species designated within the Humber Estuary SAC / Ramsar, these should be considered and screened appropriately within the HRA	The potential effects on fish (particularly sea and river lamprey) are considered within the assessment of potential impacts on the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010159/APP/5.2].** The Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC is an ecological feature of International importance. The effects of noise and vibration during construction would be negative and short-term, however the environmental measures would reduce the scale of effect to Very Low to Negligible. The longer term effects of EMF and heating would be negated by the burial depths of the cables and therefore, the scale of effect would be Negligible. The negative effects on river and sea lamprey of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site and SAC would be so small (or absent) that the overall effect of the Proposed Development on this designated site is assessed as not significant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Buried and Cultural Heritage			
Historic England	**Chapter 10: Buried Heritage** Paragraph 10.15 refers to 'extensive human activities in the area'. Clarification is sought as to whether this means the 'Buried Heritage Study Area' as shown in Figure 10-1.	**ES Vol 2, Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]**, Paragraph 10.15 of refers to the extensive human activities recorded within the 2km Study Area considered for Non-Designate Heritage Assets.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Historic England	**Isolated findspots** Paragraph 10.30 states that isolated findspots and casual, unstratified finds will not be included in the PEIR, but 'high concentrations' of unstratified finds will be. 'High concentrations' needs clearly defining here and a degree of regional context included, as for some periods even just one unstratified find can be highly significant.	As part of the ES chapter, a detailed assessment of all the information contained in the Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record, of the relevant entries of the Portable Antiquities Scheme database has been carried out as part of the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. This includes any isolated and casual findspots referred to in these sources. The assessment is provided in **ES Vol 3, Appendix 9.3: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Historic England	**Artefact scatters** As stated in paragraph 10.35 a large number of objects have been collected by earlier investigations. However, the amount so far collected is likely to be only a small percentage of the total. Please see p.2 of Historic England's guidance 'Managing Lithic Scatters': Historic England. 2024 [REF-9].. Previous research has suggested that generally no more than 7% of a total assemblage will be visible on the surface (the rest remaining below the surface in the ploughzone or other disturbed deposits). Consequently, there could be significant assemblages remaining in the development area. Being located in the ploughzone means, where scatters are poorly understood, they are a resource whose significance is vulnerable to development. This is particularly the case when the direct impacts are, as is the case here (paragraph 10.129), primarily understood through the lens of direct impacts on in situ features. **Consequently, we would recommend that, following the previously cited guidance, an expert desk-based assessment (undertaken by an appropriately**	A comprehensive archaeological desk-based assessment, aerial photo and LiDAR assessment have been completed to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** The ridge south of the Scheduled Roman fortress (NHLE: 1003608), on the east of the river, has been removed from the Order Limits. A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried in the portions of land adjacent to the Scheduled Roman fortress (NHLE: 1003608) which are included in the Order Limits, to inform the ES chapter and the DCO application. The inclusion of a field walk survey targeting specific parts of the Order Limits will be considered and discussed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England to inform pre-commencement commitments, if required.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	qualified and experienced specialist) of the known and potential lithic resource should be developed (see HE guidance section 2.2, p.11). Also, appropriate field evaluation approaches developed and deployed (see HE guidance section 3.1, p. 16) where the desk-based work highlights the resource to have potential and warrant further investigation. The density of prehistoric finds to the east of the river on the slope, highlights importance of this area of flint scatters and prehistoric potential (as indicated in Figure 10.2). However, in paragraph 10.36 prehistoric finds collected via fieldwalking (predominantly lithics) are suggested to indicate that "any potential archaeological asset or site in this the of collection would have been severely damaged by agricultural activities, such as ploughing". The implication here seems to be that these remains are of limited potential and are not usefully indicative of any surviving below ground archaeology, which it is suggested will have been substantially damaged (or even completely removed) by more recent activities. However, whilst these objects are likely displaced from their original context, one should		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	be aware that scatters can still be associated with in situ features. Furthermore, it should be noted that finds scatters are an important resource in themselves and can provide valuable information about prehistoric periods. This is highlighted in Historic England's guidance 'Managing Lithic Scatters' (see above for link). The importance of understanding prehistoric scatters of artefacts is also identified as a key objective in the East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework (see for instance Neolithic and Early to Middle Bronze Age Strategic Objective 3C).		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Historic England	We would also draw attention to the potential for associated archaeological remains along the ridge that leads south from the Scheduled Roman fortress (NHLE: 1003608), as referred to in paragraph 10.45. The topography suggests that archaeological remains that contribute to the significance of the Scheduled Monument may be retained along this ridge. With regard to the proximity of the Roman military sites to the proposed development we re-iterate our comments made to the Scoping Report as follows: the presence of scheduled Roman military sites (a vexillation fortress and two marching camps) in the immediate vicinity of the scheme indicates the high archaeological potential of the area around the proposal, and there is high potential to harm buried archaeological remains associated with the Scheduled Monument. It should be noted that the area of the Scheduled Monument represents only what was visible from aerial photos at the point in time that the scheduling decision was made, and not the actual extent of the camps or the surviving archaeology. The potential for nationally significant remains at the	The ridge south of the Scheduled Roman fortress (NHLE: 1003608) has been removed from the Order Limits. A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried in the portions of land adjacent to the Scheduled Roman fortress (NHLE: 1003608) which are included in the Order Limits, to inform the ES chapter and the DCO application. The preliminary results of the trail trenching evaluation are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.3: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	site has previously been demonstrated during a 2011-12 program of evaluation for Anglian Water's Hall Reservoir (Gilmour 2012) [REF-10], which discovered a Roman oven containing the remains of Roman bread. This is an exceptionally rare discovery: It will also be very important to develop an understanding of movement along and across this part of the Trent from the Roman through the Early Medieval periods (including Viking).		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Historic England	**Preservation in situ** There is a strong emphasis on preservation in situ throughout the Preliminary Assessment section of Chapter 10 (p. 35-36). When preservation is considered a possible outcome, early pre-application engagement is strongly recommended by Historic England's guidance on the subject: Historic England. 2016. Preserving Archaeological Remains: Decision-taking for Sites under Development [REF-11]. Whilst it is encouraging to see the potential for preservation being engaged with at this early-stage Historic England considers that there is a degree of over-confidence in the level of expected harm. For example in paragraph 10.129 it is stated that "…should a pile location (or even several pile locations) coincide with buried archaeological remains, the quantity of displaced archaeological remains in the case of larger features, such as the in-filled ditches described above, would be insignificant compared to that left undisturbed". Understanding the impact of harm in this scenario requires having an adequate understanding of the in-filled ditch's deposits	Noted. The PEIR included a preliminary review of the buried heritage baseline. A comprehensive archaeological desk-based assessment, aerial photo and LiDAR assessment have been completed to inform the ES chapter. A programme of geophysical survey, trial trench evaluation and geoarchaeological borehole survey has also been completed and the reports provided as appendices to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field evaluation carried out provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits and allowed an informed assessment of the likelihood of the presence of buried heritage assets, their importance, the likely effects of the proposed development and inform the development of both embedded and additional mitigation measures when required.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and the artefacts they contain in sufficient detail to establish their significance, their state of preservation and their susceptibility to adverse impact from proposal. At this point in time that information does not exist and requires evaluation excavations to acquire it. For more detail on this please see section 1.1 ('Pre-determination evaluation') of the previously mentioned guidance. Additionally, it is difficult to know what exactly is being referred to by 'the in-filled ditches described above', as we were unable to locate where these are described in the PEIR text. The collection of a suitably robust evidence base is also strongly encouraged in Historic England's piling guidance (see page 37), and we would recommend that the principles of this guidance (where appropriate) are followed: Historic England. 2019. Piling and Archaeology: Guidance and Good Practice. London: Historic England. [REF-12]	Location, and nature, of the buried heritage assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development has allowed and informed proportionate and appropriate decisions on what is the most suitable mitigation required, including preservation in situ.	
Historic England	**De-watering** In paragraph 10.125 it is stated that: "It is not expected that our Project will permanently alter the geology or the groundwater levels within our Site or in its immediate surroundings, and any	A full assessment of any potential effect arising from de-watering or from any alteration to groundwater levels, has been carried out in **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9],** which is supported by the DBA as technical	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	indirect effects will be temporary and reversible. Therefore, at the current stage of design and based on professional opinion, it is considered there will be no significant indirect impacts on buried heritage deposits within our Site or the wider Study Area. All potential effects would have been already mitigated through the programme of embedded mitigation." The nature of archaeological remains means that, where susceptible, damage caused by temporary de-watering is permanent and not reversible. Therefore, there is the potential for there to be an impact on buried archaeological remains. In the first instance we would recommend that further desk-based work incorporates a Preservation Assessment following Historic England's Preservation guidance (see section 2). This isn't overly onerous or complex and simply involves pulling together the available evidence and understanding on the current state of preservation in a clear and discrete section. Subsequently this can then be quickly updated with further evidence as the project advances. In the event that sensitive remains (such as	appendix. All points raised have been considered in the ES Chapter. An Outline LEMP (oLEMP) is included within the submitted documentation as **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, to ensure that the Proposed Development will be designed, as far as practicable, to avoid or reduce effects on heritage assets. Ditches across the Order Limits will be retained and no development (other than at crossing points) will take place within 5m of the bank top. It is not expected that the Proposed Development will alter temporarily and/or permanently the geology or the groundwater levels within the Order Limits.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	waterlogged deposits) are potentially identified and there is potential for the development to alter the local water environment then we would recommend a staged assessment of the water environment following Historic England's Preservation guidance [REF-13] (see section 4 'Water Availability and Stresses').		
JGP Property Ltd	**5. Historic Environment** NPS EN-3 [REF-1] states that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and that careful consideration should be given to the impact of the project on heritage assets, as this may result in substantial harm. OESF states in its Environmental Impact Assessment that the project will have likely significant impact on a number of heritage assets in the vicinity of OESF. Therefore, OESF will not conserve or enhance a number of heritage assets. As there is likely to be harm to a number of heritage assets, OESF should consider further changes to the masterplan to reduce the level of harm to heritage assets in the local area.	A detailed assessment of effects is provided in **ES Vol 2, Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10]** which identifies less significant and harmful effects on built heritage assets than initially anticipated in the PEIR as a result of detailed assessment work and a number of amendments to the masterplan to reduce effects which have been discussed with key heritage consultees. Where a small number of adverse effects, including significant effects, would arise as a result of the Proposed Development, this needs to be considered in the full context of NPS EN-1 [REF-2] and EN-3 [REF-1] sections on Historic Environment. NPS EN-1 (paras. 5.9.28 – 5.9.36) [REF-2] identified any harmful impact to designated heritage assets requires and clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against the public benefits of the Proposed	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Development. NPS EN-3 para. 2.3.8 [REF-1] places this requirement in context of renewable energy infrastructure: when considering whether public benefits would outweigh loss or harm to value of designated heritage assets, the positive role that large-scale renewable projects play in the mitigation of climate change, the delivery of energy security and the urgency of meeting the net zero target should be taken into account.	
Historic England	**General comments** Broadly speaking we support the approach taken by the applicant towards the historic environment. We note that mitigation measures are presented within both the 'Buried Heritage' and 'Cultural Heritage' chapters and we recommend that all proposed mitigation measures are secured through an appropriate mechanism; the key document would be a suitable worded requirement within the Development Consent Order (DCO) supported by Outline WSI and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) documents. We recommend Historic England is a named party with the DCO and that we are consulted on the DCO wording in due course. Please note that also we	A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field evaluation provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits. The preliminary results of the Trial Trenching Evaluation are provided in **ES Vol 3, Appendix 9.5: Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report [EN010159/APP/6.21].** The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will be secured by a DCO Requirement in Schedule 2 of the **draft DCO [EN010159/APP/3.1]** in accordance	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	recommend further archaeological evaluation is undertaken prior to the submission of the full Environmental Statement (ES) and with enough detail to inform the DCO application, particularly in areas where there is a high archaeological potential.	with EN-1 [REF-2] and the NPPF [REF-4], and which sets out the objectives for the archaeological mitigation and the mechanisms for the appointed archaeological contractors to design and program the fieldwork, undertake evaluation, mitigation, analysis, reporting and archiving. Historic England will be named party with the DCO and that will be consulted on the DCO wording in due course.	
Historic England	**Appendix 4-2: Environmental Register** 'Indicative Measures to be included During Construction' Table 3: Cultural Heritage – Archaeological Deposits – we consider that clarification is needed as to how 'significance' will be determined, and further detail required on determining archaeological mitigation v preservation in situ. Furthermore, it is not clear who will be responsible for determining the level of significance and any consequential mitigation measures. Additionally, we consider that the Environmental Report should develop a strategy to detail the monitoring of the cable route construction, as this could have significant impacts on archaeological deposits.	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents the full assessment of the impact on buried archaeological assets arising from construction. This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable route. The ES chapter is supported by the Archaeological DBA and by the preliminary results of the archaeological evaluation carried to inform the DCO.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Historic England	**General comments** Broadly speaking we support the approach taken by the applicant towards the historic environment. We note that mitigation measures are presented within both the 'Buried Heritage' and 'Cultural Heritage' chapters and we recommend that all proposed mitigation measures are secured through an appropriate mechanism; the key document would be a suitable worded requirement within the Development Consent Order (DCO) supported by Outline WSI and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) documents. We recommend Historic England is a named party with the DCO and that we are consulted on the DCO wording in due course. Please note that also we recommend further archaeological evaluation is undertaken prior to the submission of the full Environmental Statement (ES) and with enough detail to inform the DCO application, particularly in areas where there is a high archaeological potential.	A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field evaluation provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits. The preliminary results of the Trial Trenching Evaluation are provided in **ES Vol 3, Appendix 9.5: Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report [EN010159/APP/6.21].** The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will be secured by a DCO Requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO in accordance with EN-1[REF-2] and the NPPF [REF-4], and which sets out the objectives for the archaeological mitigation and the mechanisms for the appointed archaeological contractors to design and program the fieldwork, undertake evaluation, mitigation, analysis, reporting and archiving.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Historic England will be named party with the DCO and that will be consulted on the DCO wording in due course.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Historic England	**Appendix 4-2: Environmental Register** 'Indicative Measures to be included During Construction' Table 3: Cultural Heritage – Archaeological Deposits – we consider that clarification is needed as to how 'significance' will be determined, and further detail required on determining archaeological mitigation v preservation in situ. Furthermore, it is not clear who will be responsible for determining the level of significance and any consequential mitigation measures. Additionally, we consider that the Environmental Report should develop a strategy to detail the monitoring of the cable route construction, as this could have significant impacts on archaeological deposits.	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents the full assessment of the impact on buried archaeological assets arising from construction. This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable route. The ES chapter is supported by the Archaeological DBA and by the preliminary results of the archaeological evaluation carried to inform the DCO.	N
Climate and Carbon			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
South Clifton Parish Council	**Solar panels** South Clifton Parish Council also wish to reiterate their concern about where the solar panels are manufactured and how they are to reach the project site. We understand this is an ever-changing situation and that more manufacturers, other than China (the present leading supplier) are starting up businesses. We also understand that, because of this, the One Earth team have not yet made a decision as to where to source the panels for the project. We want One Earth to confirm that they will source the panels from as near as possible to the site, in line with their green credentials and also that under no circumstances will they buy panels that have or could have been produced unethically, ensuring that they research thoroughly the source of their purchases.	The Applicant notes that currently the majority of panels are produced in China, however the industry is changing and more providers may be available by the time that the construction period could begin. The Applicant has committed that we want the companies we work with to run their businesses and supply chains free from labour and human rights violations, corruption, and environmental risks. The Applicant has established a Responsible Business Partner Programme (RPP), building on our general human rights due diligence approach to collaborate with suppliers and business partners on improving their adherence to our social, environmental and ethical expectations. This is to protect the environment and all groups of workers and stakeholders in our supply chains, including those that are most vulnerable. The Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and that this is a legal obligation on anyone who has the powers under the DCO. That would be achieved by securing this Plan by a requirement of the DCO. It has therefore proposed an Ethical Procurement	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Policy in the **Volume 7: Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
Community benefit			
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	To support this statement, the parish council has held a public meeting to seek residents' views. The opportunities for community gain are encouraged and should be explored as part of developing projects. Such opportunities can include: • Establishing a Community Benefits Trust with funds being contributed annually by the	The Applicant has committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	developer for local projects for the lifetime of the project. • Local or community ownership of panels. • Local share issue.		
South Clifton Parish Council	The main changes and considerations the Council asked for were: … • The introduction of an annual grants to each village/meeting within zone one, to last the lifetime of the project through to completion of its decommissioning, increasing in line with a set economic mark – to be discussed • Discounted electricity for all consumers within the wider zone area • A dedicated team to liaise with villagers throughout the whole project • The use of local workers on the site, wherever possible	The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		[EN010159/APP/7.5] and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
Consultation			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
NGET	No specific comments but guidance provided and request for information. I refer to your notice dated 27th June 2024 regarding the Proposed Development. This is a response on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET). Due to the proximity of some of our existing or future assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed. Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights. NGET assets form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Please continue to consult NGET in regards to this development. NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the Order.	The Applicant has made a variety of attempts to engage with this consultee. The status of the voluntary access negotiations is included in **Appendix B of Volume 4, Statement of Reason [EN010159/APP/4.1**]. The Applicant anticipates being able to negotiate and agree appropriate protective provisions with NGET in order to address its concerns and ensure protection of its assets.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
JGP Property Ltd	We understand that OESF requires a cable to be laid across land owned by JG Pears to be able to connect to the existing substation at High Marham. Despite this being the case, OESF has not made any attempts to secure an easement with JG Pears in this regard. Whilst JG Pears notes that previous discussions were held with PS Renewables regarding developing solar on our land, no subsequent communication has been forthcoming about how an easement across our land would be acquired. Notwithstanding this experience, JG Pears had hoped that the formation of OESF would have resulted in there being a more positive engagement, but to date no meaningful engagement/negotiations have taken place. JG Pears would welcome discussions with OESF in this regard and hope this will be forthcoming. We understand that changes have been made to the masterplan of OESF since the first round of consultation was carried out. However, JG Pears still consider there to be a number of concerns around OESF that have not yet been satisfactorily addressed.	The Applicant has made a variety of attempts to engage with this landowner and will continue to do so. The status of the voluntary access negotiations is included in **Appendix B of Volume 4, Statement of Reason [EN010159/APP/4.1**].	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Anglian Water	**Engagement** Anglian Water would welcome the instigation of discussions with Ørsted and PS Renewables, in line with the requirements of the 2008 Planning Act and guidance. Experience has shown that early engagement and agreement is required between NSIP applicants and statutory undertakes during assessment and design and in advance of submission of the draft DCO for Examination. 5 Continued engagement would serve to enable pre-submission agreement on Protective Provisions for those assets within the proposed order limits, and the submission of an agreed Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water. This in turn reduces the Examining Authority questions for statutory undertakers and removes the possible need for changes to the project during Examination. We would recommend discussion on the following matters: □ The Draft DCO Order including protective provisions specifically to ensure Anglian Water's services are maintained during construction. □ Impact of development on Anglian Water's assets and the need for mitigation. □ The design of the project to	The Applicant has made a variety of attempts to engage with this consultee. The status of the voluntary access negotiations is included in **Appendix B of Volume 4, Statement of Reason [EN010159/APP/4.1**]. The Applicant anticipates being able to negotiate and agree appropriate protective provisions with Anglian Water in order to address its concerns and ensure protection of its assets.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	minimise interaction with Anglian Water assets/ critical infrastructure and specifically to avoid the need for mitigation works and diversions which have associated carbon costs. Pre-construction surveys. Requirement for potable and raw water supplies. Requirement for water recycling (surface water/ foul drainage) connections (if any).		
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	The parish council consider that adequate public consultation should take place. The developers have not met with the parish council. The parish council considers that community involvement should be an integral part of the development process. The local community should be consulted by the developer at the conceptual stage with more than just a couple of meetings, ideally utilising local exhibitions and presentations where community views can be sought and recorded.	The Applicant offered to meet with the parish council in the email sent at the launch of the statutory consultation on 15 May 2024, detailed in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1],** but the parish council did not respond. The Applicant held two rounds of consultation, the first non-statutory consultation was on the initial proposals, which included a series of public information events, as well as individual meetings with local residents in Autumn 2023. The Applicant held a second round of consultation which was statutory, and included another series of public information events, meetings with individual residents and parish councils. This approach to consultation was detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation, which was informed by consultation with the local authorities, and	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		confirmed in the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone, detailed in **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].** On this basis, the Applicant considers it has consulted with the local community in a way that has been appropriate and meaningful.	
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	We need confirmation that issues raised by individuals are taken on board. This must be a genuine acknowledgement that very important points are being raised by residents of Ragnall and Fledborough which need to be addressed and those detailed comments reflected in your modified application.	The Applicant has reviewed and considered all of the feedback received through the consultation. The individual issues raised and the Applicant's response to them are detailed in this section. The Consultation Report details the meaningful changes to the Illustrative Masterplan that have been included in response to the feedback from the community, including significant changes around individual properties and between the villages, after each stage of consultation. Please see the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8].**	N
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton	We need to have another consultation before the plans are submitted, with a revised map being provided at least two weeks before the meeting. Clearly there have been several	The Applicant met with the parish council after the statutory consultation to show them how the Illustrative Masterplan had evolved in response to feedback from the statutory consultation. While this did not entail another formal round of consultation,	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Parish Council	modifications requested, we need to see how that has impacted on the proposal.	this additional meeting did allow the parish council to review the updated design and provide further feedback, which is detailed in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].**	
EIA			
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Paragraphs 4.60, 4.69 * Appendix 4-2 Environmental Management Plans** Issue: The information about the proposed Environmental Management Plans does not make it clear about what will be included. Impact: It is unclear what will be included within the CEMP, for instance, assessments for activities that may pose a risk to controlled waters (eg HDD, foundation works risk assessment, BESS drainage) so we do not know whether mitigation incorporated into the design will be adequate Solution: Confirm what will be included within	The DCO application includes outline management plans, including the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** and **Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) [EN010159/APP/7.10].** These management plans consider the measures which will protect groundwater such as the undertaking of a piling risk assessment before the start of piling works and the provision of a Water Management Plan (to be included as part of the CEMP) which will provide the details to protect the water environment during construction. Further	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the EMPs. For groundwater protection we want assurances that the chosen construction methods will be risk assessed.	details are also included in **ES Vol 2, Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**. To ensure clarity as to how the Environmental Measures are secured, a Commitments Register has been included within the submission (see **Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.15]**). This Register follows PINS Guidance and will identify how commitments will be secured and implemented, to ensure potential environmental effects arising from the project are mitigated as far as possible, in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy, and as set out in the technical assessments detailed in the ES. It is noted that the Commitments Register is a 'live' document that will be updated throughout the NSIP planning process.	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, no reference in report - Sequential Test** Issue: No evidence of the Sequential Test having been applied. Impact Failure to properly apply the Sequential Test could lead to aspects of the development being put at risk of flooding where lower flood risk alternative sites are available, which could also increase the reliance on measures such as flood defences. Failure to	Paragraph 5.8.23 of EN-1 [REF-2] sets out that where a scheme would be located within, or partially within, Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3, reasonable alternatives must be considered. In this case the Sequential Test should be undertaken. **ES, Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/APP/6.7]** references the Sequential Test, the details for which are included in the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	apply the Sequential Test would put the development in breach of Paragraph 161 and 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework [REF-4]. Solution: Evidence of the Sequential Test having been applied should be provided.	The Planning Statement details how a sequential approach to the development layout has been taken and there will be no built development located within Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain), and where land within this area has been included in within the Order Limits, it will only be used for enhancements and/or mitigation (ecological enhancements for example). With regards to areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3a, discussions have been undertaken with the Environment Agency and agreement made in terms of the heights of the solar PV array which includes a 300mm freeboard above ground level for the design flood event. The power conversion systems will also be raised above the design flood level on raised platforms, providing a freeboard of 300mm.	
JGP Property Ltd	**6. Grid Capacity** NPS EN-3 [REF-1] notes that it is critical that the local grid connection has the capacity to accept the likely output from an energy generation project. OESF states that there is capacity at High Marnham substation, however, as time passes, available capacity can	The Applicant has secured a connection agreement with National Grid which would allow export and import of up to 740 megawatts (MW) of electricity to the National Grid High Marnham Substation, and as such there is no likely change to available capacity. Please see the **Grid Connection Statement [EN010159/APP/7.2]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	significantly change. This is especially relevant in the area where OESF is proposed to be located, where significant energy generation development is currently being brought forward. We therefore query whether OESF have any contingency in place should there not be sufficient capacity to the grid available, should OESF receive consent.		
Canal and River Trust	**Glint & Glare** Chapter 12, Volume 1 of the PEIR clarifies that: "Glint and glare resulting from our Project has potential to contribute to landscape and visual effects. Consideration of glint and glare will therefore be incorporated into the magnitude of effects in preparation of the Environmental Statement (ES)." As outlined in our previous response, we request that the Glint and Glare Assessment consider boat users using the navigation n to address potential navigational safety concern, as well as other users of the river corridor.	A Glint and Glare assessment is included in **Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.16]** and show there is no potential likely significant effect for glint and glare occurring to sensitive receptors within the locality. Boat users have not been considered as the river is unlikely to receive solar reflexions due to their lower position in relation to the ground.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Canal and River Trust	**Lighting** Chapter 12 also confirms “Further detail regarding the baseline nighttime conditions across the study area, based on CPRE’s England’s Light Pollution and Dark Skies map, and any associated change that would contribute to magnitude of change, will be provided in the ES”. We note that the PEIR clarifies that at this stage permanent lighting is unlikely during the operational phase except in the event of emergency, access and exit of site or for occasional maintenance. It also acknowledges that lighting used in construction will be used only during working hours (unless in the case of emergency or occasional overnight quiet working). Generally, we would seek to avoid light spill onto the river corridor, where there would be detrimental impacts on its biodiversity values. Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of the PEIR acknowledges that the river corridor provides valuable commuting and foraging habitats for nocturnal species sensitive to lighting, and that construction and decommissioning impacts will be addressed in the oCEMP and DMP. We request that	The lighting design for the Proposed Development will seek to limit impacts upon sensitive receptors and will be directional, orientated internally, away from the surrounding environment (including ecological habitats), and will be fitted with features to minimise light spillage. No external lighting will be permanently operated as part of the Proposed Development. The details of lighting and the commitments to ensure there are no likely significant effects are included in **Volume 7, Other Documents: oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], Volume 7, Other Documents: oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** and **Volume 7, Other Documents: oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5**]. Specific commitments on lighting and the protection for biodiversity is included within **Chapter 8: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.8]** in particular Commitment C8 sets out how the oECMP and oCEMP will include emergency lighting in line with principles set out in guidance from the Institution of Lighting Professionals and the Bat Conservation Trust to ensure there are no likely significant effects.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	mitigation measures are included in the oCEMP and DMP to avoid detrimental impacts, from lighting, on the biodiversity values of the river corridor.		
Thorney Parish Council	Responses of the residents of Thorney to the One Earth Solar Farm Proposals: Residents of the Parish of Thorney have been given the opportunity to respond directly with their views to Thorney Parish Council regarding the proposal by One Earth to install solar farms across the local area. We understand many residents have already responded directly to One Earth. Resident responses indicate that they are not merely NIMBYS. They acknowledge the need for alternative sources of energy & the benefits solar energy could bring to our area, but on a much smaller scale. They do however have very genuine concerns re the scale of One Earth's proposal when linked to the known adjoining projects for this area of Lincolnshire & Nottinghamshire that are already	Noted. As shown in the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** the Work Orders have been amended and no longer include development around Thorney**.** **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]** considers the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development with other NSIP project. This includes the proposed substation (Reference ID 26 in Chapter 18) with regards to the cumulative effects to the technical aspects.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	in the planning stages. The Secretary of State has already given approval to the Gate Burton Solar Farm project nearby to us. They are concerned about the effects of these developments on the community & the wider area & this goes far beyond the obvious worries of ruined views & devaluation of their properties.		
South Clifton Parish Council	The main changes and considerations the Council asked for were: … • A change in construction hours, particularly at weekends • Annual impact and environmental assessments, to include health assessments, for the length of the project	The likely significant environmental effects of the construction phase (including construction hours) have been considered in each of the chapters in **Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.6-6.18].** No likely significant effects are predicted relating to construction hours and therefore the assessment shows there is no environmental need to change the construction hours. The proposed working hours for the construction phase are in line with other projects and schemes of this nature. **Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** considers the effect of the Proposed Development on human health during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
General			
Marine Management Organisation	Work on crossing the bridge, would be vertically above the tidal range, so would be licensable. Directional drilling, under the river, if at no point does it breach the surface in the tidal area, would not be licensable. If you need more formal pre-application advice/meeting etc you would be advised to submit a formal enquiry (ENQ) via the MMO's online system, which would be chargeable.	The Applicant has eliminated the option for the cable to cross the River Trent via the Viaduct, and is only considering using directional drilling.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	Natural England do not make comment on the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). We are currently reviewing the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report as part of the section 42 statutory requirement to the developer. As such, Natural England has no comments to make on this application.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Vodafone	High voltage single core cables of 1000 V and above shall have a minimum clearance from Company Apparatus of 500 mm. High voltage multi-core cables of 1000 V and above shall have a minimum clearance from Company Apparatus of 350 mm. In exceptional circumstances where the above clearances cannot be maintained, the separating distance may be reduced to a minimum of 175 mm. Low voltage cables of less than 1000 V shall have a minimum clearance from Company Apparatus of 180 mm. In exceptional circumstances where the above clearance	Protective provisions for the protection of operators of electronic communications code networks are included in the **Draft DCO [EN010159/APP/3.1]** in order to ensure protection for these assets.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	cannot be maintained, the separating distance may be reduced to a minimum of 75 mm. Street furniture such as lamp posts, traffic posts and other such ancillary electrical apparatus shall have a minimum clearance of 150 mm from underground Company Apparatus and 600mm clearance from above ground Company Apparatus. High pressure gas mains shall have a minimum clearance of 450 mm from Company Apparatus. Other undertakers' plant and equipment which runs in parallel with Company Apparatus shall have a minimum clearance of 200mm. The Other Party or Contractor should note that the minimum depths of cover for Vodafone apparatus shall be maintained together with specified separation requirements. Where the minimum depths of cover specified by Vodafone cannot be maintained, the Other Party or Contractor shall at their own expense, carry out the instructions of Vodafone requirements for the protection or diversion of their apparatus.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Ministry of Defence	No objection.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
NATS	No comments.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Thames Water	No comments - we do not provide water services in the area and therefore are unable to comment on the planned works. The water service provider is Anglian Water, who will be best placed to assist with any queries.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
The Coal Authority	No comment.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	No specific comments but advice on Byelaws given.	Noted by the Applicant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Northamptonshire Police	My role is to comment on planning matters which impact on resources and response times relating to the above emergency services and seek developer contributions where appropriate for sites within Northamptonshire. I therefore have no comments to make in respect of this proposal, unless there is anything specific that you feel we should be aware of.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Lloyds Bank	No specific comments	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Ministry of Defence	I can confirm that, following review of the application on documents, the proposed development falls outside of MoD safeguarded areas and does not affect other defence interests. The MOD, therefore, has no objection to the development proposed.	Noted by the Applicant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
NATS	NATS operates on infrastructure within 10km of the proposal's site. Accordingly it anticipates no impact from the development, and has no comments to make on the Consultation.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Thames Water	Please be advised that we do not provide water services in the area, and therefore are unable to comment on the planned works. The water service provider is Anglian Water, who will be best placed to assist with any queries.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Witham and Humber Drainage Board	We have reviewed the proposed location of the project and can confirm that the project lies outside of the Witham and Humber drainage boards districts and extended areas. This puts the project outside of the board's areas of operation.	Noted by the Applicant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service	No comments.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	**The cumulative impact** This application does not put into context all the changes that are occurring in this project area. There has been no reference to the other massive changes that will be happening in this small farming area: Great North Road – solar panels Sturton le Steeple – renewable project Cottam – solar panels West Burton – solar panels West Burton – nuclear fusion plant Gate Burton – solar panels Tillbridge – solar panels North Clifton – substation and BESS Skegby – BESS Cottam – BESS National Grid – new substation 6 times bigger National Grid – new power lines and pylons High Marnham – hydrogen plant High Marnham – ammonia splitting plant	The Long List has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment. This takes into account the DCO submissions. The cut-off date for the Long List of Other Developments was 14 January 2025 to allow for the assessment to be undertaken. Details are included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	High Marnham – processing plant • Many, if not all, bring cumulative impact of increased traffic. • The cumulative effect of having many BESS facilities located relatively close together needs to be assessed, particularly in consideration of the possibility attending multiple fires. c) The cumulative effect of several large-scale developments in a rural area must be considered, especially on the metal health of local residents.		
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	We need to be clear who is accountable for this project. Will One Earth exist as a company if the plans are approved? Once contracts are issued to deliver/install the panels, who will ensure that our agreements are delivered/enforced? A Development Consent Order provides statutory permission and overrides normal planning consents etc. so accountability or responsibility cannot rest with the planning authority, so who will it be?	It is the Applicant's intention that if the Proposed Development is consented, Orsted would become the sole owner and operator of One Earth Solar Farm Limited. The DCO would include requirements to complete the outline management plans, in consultation with the local authorities and other stakeholders, which would be enforceable requirements. If for any reason the Proposed Development were to be sold to another entity, those legal requirements would pass to the new owner and operator. The management plans would be enforceable by the relevant local authority, as	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		outlined in the Planning Act 2008, and failure to comply with requirements would be a criminal	
Thorney Parish Council	The size of the proposed development(s) is far too large for the nature of the area.	The project has been sized to meet the capacity at High Marnham substation. Substantial offsets from villages, houses and public rights of way have been embedded in the project to mitigate associated impacts.	Y
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	The Parish Council totally object to this proposal.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Vodafone	Optic fibre cables are very susceptible to damage from excavation tools. They are not electrically conductive and cannot be located by radio induction methods. Once an approximate location is known, the exact location must be ascertained by means of hand dug pilot holes. All excavations adjacent to Vodafone apparatus are to be carried out by hand until the extent	Noted, the project will be following the requirements of PAS128 to understand and uncover any utilities in a safe and controlled way. The project will liaise with Vodaphone during construction to verify the location of assets before construction activities around the asset.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and or location of the Vodafone apparatus is known.		
Anglian Water	Anglian Water would want to ensure the location and nature of these assets is identified and protected. To reduce the need for diversions and the attendant carbon impacts of those works, ground investigation would enable the promoter to design out these potential impacts and so also reduce the potential impact on services if construction works cause a pipe burst or damage to all supporting infrastructure. Anglian Water's preference is to work with the applicant during the pre-application phase to reach agreement on design changes, mitigation and protection measures in the application prior to submission. We would welcome such engagement to ensure that Anglian Water and the project have reached agreement on the approach to assets and connections in order that these matters are not drawn out during the Examination. Utilities searches should, therefore, be undertaken to establish the extent	Discussions around protective provisions are ongoing.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	of Anglian Water's assets within the scheme's application boundary. These should be mapped to establish interactions with assets and the scheme designed to avoid impacts upon those assets. We welcome the intention to produce a Construction Management Plan (CEMP) and Decommissioning Management Plan. These should include steps to remove the risk of damage to Anglian Water assets from plant and machinery (compaction and vibration during the construction phase) including any haul and access roads and crossings.		
Human Health			
Health and Safety Executive	No comments	Noted	N
UK Health Security Agency	**Human Health and Wellbeing - OHID** No comments at this stage.	Noted	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	There are also health impacts associated with such schemes where lithium battery storage facilities are being proposed such as fire, noise and air pollution.	Please see **Chapter 13: Air Quality [EN010159/APP/6.13]** which includes an assessment of the potential impacts on air pollution, and **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.15]** which assesses the potential noise impacts. This indicates that there will be operational noise from the proposed battery storage, and that properties closest to the facilities are likely to experience the greatest noise impacts. Additional mitigation (for example orientating the facilities to make sure, as far as is practical, that the main noise and vibration generating elements are facing away from nearby residential properties). will be required in order to reduce noise levels. See also the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.11]** regarding potential management of risks, including fire, related to the battery units. Detection and suppression systems have been incorporated into the scheme design, along with sufficient spacing and location of units to avoid the possibility of fires spreading between units. With these measures in place, there are not expected to be any significant effects from unplanned emissions or air pollution impacts from the battery storage facilities.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
South Clifton Parish Council	**Health**- The effects on the health of villagers is another area that is important, especially as many of the 'Health and Well Being' concerns raised by your survey, according to your PEIR, will not be significantly affected by the construction, operation or decommissioning of the One Earth project and some will be positively affected. You also seem to believe that most effects on health will be short term or temporary. Can we ask how you came to these conclusions and see your relevant research?	The details of the assessment and period of assessment are set out in the methodology section of **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16].** During the construction phase, the assessment looks at impacts on physical activity; community identity, culture, resilience and influence; employment and income; climate change, mitigation and adaptation; radiation; Wider societal infrastructure and resource; and Health and social care services. These effects are considered temporary, as disruptions to public rights of way and employment opportunities will only occur during the construction period. Furthermore, there will be no short- or long-term effects on climate change, mitigation, adaptation, radiation, or wider societal infrastructure, as no electricity will be generated during this phase. There will be a key change to the visual landscape of the area, as outlined in **Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11]**. This could exacerbate community anxiety and stress, with the impact on mental wellbeing was raised during the extensive programme of community engagement. These impacts are expected to be most significant during the 2 year construction phase. However, once	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		operational, as the landscaping vegetation matures and the solar farm is screened from the public and green infrastructure provided, the impacts of our Project on anxieties to the community will be reduced.	
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	**Well Being** a)- The issue of the mental health impact has been significantly under played. b)- Using Wider Impact Areas for assessment is not logical and has no bearing on the development of this project. c) - Panels erected in the centre of villages as well as surrounding villages will create isolated properties and disconnect between Ragnall and Fledborough. This is both a visual cutting off as well as a social and emotional disconnection.	The Wider Impact Area was chosen as it represents the appropriate statistical boundaries, and aligns with the socio-economic assessment. 16.6.53 of **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** considers the effects on mental health of the visuals relating to the Proposed Development. The **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** has changed significantly at each stage of consultation, to remove panels around the villages to ensure communities were not isolated or cut-off. After the statutory consultation, major changes were included around Ragnall and Fledborough. See the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]** for more information.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
South Clifton Parish Council	The mental health of all villagers is of particular concern and it is clear that, even in this consultation phase, your project has been having an adverse effect. The shock and dismay felt when the One Earth Solar Farm proposal was made public was tangible, which is why it is imperative that the One Earth team take seriously the Councils requests. Again, the projected profit levels for the multinational companies involved with this project, should not dictate or override how the villages and villagers are considered in its' implementation and operation."	The assessment methodology and outcomes are set out in the chapter, including recommendations on mitigations where necessary. Section 16.6.57of **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** concludes that: Overall, the likely effect on the community identity, culture, resilience and influence determinant of human health during the operation and maintenance phase is assessed to be a long-term effect in the Local Study Area of minor adverse significance (not significant). The profitability of the Applicant and of the Proposed Development are not a factor, as the Applicant is committed to developing the Proposed Development in a sensitive manner.	N
Thorney Parish Council	Access to rural areas is a known benefit to health. Millions were spent on the Sustrans development to give people from the whole area, including Lincoln & Newark, an open area to enjoy, to walk, cycle, ride horses etc. We are appalled at the plans so close to this facility which is used by many residents, accessed at Thorney Bridge.	Ability to access and use the network of public rights of way (including bridle paths) is a key matter considered as part of the 'physical activity' determinant of health. Of which, the mental and physical health effects are assessed within Section 16.6 of **Chapter 16 Health [EN010159/APP/6.16].** An **oCEMP [EN010159/7.7]**, an **oCTMP [EN010159/7.12]** and an **oDEMP [EN010159/7.9]** have been prepared to minimise disruption.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
UK Health Security Agency	**Environmental Public Health** Regarding the discussion on the electromagnetic fields (EMFs) produced by electricity cables associated with the site (PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 7 Human Health, p25), UKHSA request a more detailed assessment based on the following voluntary code of practice which sets out key principles for complying with the ICNIRP guidelines: DECC report [REF-14] Otherwise, we have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm that we are satisfied with the approach taken in preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the conclusions drawn.	Electro-magnetic fields are a determinant of health assessed in Section 16.6 of **ES Vol 2, Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16].** At the distances proposed, the Proposed Development would not exceed the permitted reference levels set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection. Section 16.6.70 of **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** includes the detailed assessment of the ICNIRP guidelines [REF-14].	N
Hydrology and Hydrogeology			
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Paragraph 8.38 – Considers residual flood risk and states that breach scenario unlikely.** Issue: There is limited consideration of the existing flood defences, specifically how the flood defences will remain fit for purpose for the lifetime of the development.	All defences within the Order Limits are classified by the Environment Agency (EA) as being in a fair to good condition. This is also the case for defences in the vicinity of the Order Limits, with the exception of the Fledborough Embankment which is shown to have a poor condition rating. This section however, does not lie within the Order Limits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Impact: A large section of the site benefits from the presence of flood defences, without which there would be a greater risk of flooding. Failure to consider the current and future condition of these defences may result in an underestimation of flood risk to and from the proposed development, particularly within the modelled breach scenario which has been referenced. If the residual risk is not fully understood, then mitigation of this risk may be insufficient. This could put the development in breach of paragraph 5.8.7 of National Policy Statement EN-1 [REF-2], which states that new energy infrastructure should be designed and constructed to remain operation in times of flood. Solution: The site's reliance on the flood defences warrants consideration of asset location, standard of protection, condition and investment. The applicant should ensure the lifetime of the flood defences is commensurate with the lifetime of the development. Where this is not the case, the applicant should consider opportunities to upgrade and maintain the flood	The Standard of Protection (SoP) of the flood defences varies from 1 in 5 years through to 1 in 100 years. The northern areas of the western bank provide a higher SoP (1 in 100 year) with the remaining defences providing a lower SoP (1 in 5 year). The above has been set out within **ES Vol 2, Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **ES Vol 3, Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Given the condition of the defences within the Order Limits (fair to good) and on the understanding that the EA undertake regular inspections and maintenance of these defences, they are considered to be fit for purpose for the Proposed Development. Minimum offsets of 16m are provided between built development and the flood defences ensuring that access can be maintained for inspections and maintenance works.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	defences. Additional explanation: No mention of asset location, condition or standard of protection.		
Environment Agency	**Document Reference(s): PEIR, Chapter 8, Paragraphs 8.33 - 35 - Freeboards** Issue: More information is required on where solar panels are achieving certain freeboards. In particular, we expect to be consulted on where a 600mm freeboard above the design flood level is not being achieved, and what the minimum freeboards will be. Impact: If a sufficient freeboard is not achieved between the bottom of the solar panel and the design flood level then there is a risk that solar panels may not be able to remain operational in times of flooding; be damaged by flood waters and floating debris; and result in a blockage, which could reduce the amount of flood storage available and interrupt essential flood flow routes. Solution: The Environment Agency's position is for a 600mm freeboard to be sought wherever	The approach to freeboards was further discussed with the EA and it was agreed that the original approach was acceptable (i.e. 300mm across the majority of the Site with some localised flooding to the base of the panels). This was on the basis that the planning documentation will clearly illustrate where reduced freeboard would be provided, where flooding to the base of panels would be experienced and confirming that a maintenance plan would be put in place for the removal of any potential debris that could accumulate. For further information, please see **Volume 7, Other Documents: oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5].** The above has been discussed, illustrated and set out within **ES Vol 2, Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **ES Vol 3, Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	possible (with 300mm accounting for model uncertainty and 300mm accounting for any trapped debris in flood water). Although we accepted the approach to freeboard set out in the MS Teams meeting between the EA and the applicant in February 2024, there is still a need to ensure adequate mitigation is in place to reduce the risk of flooding and damage to the solar panels wherever a 600mm is not achieved. As part of this, we would like to see details of the minimum freeboards proposed and where these will be located.		
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, no reference in report - Flood Zone 3b** Issue: The PEIR submission has not considered the presence of Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain). Impact: Failure to consider the location of Flood Zone 3b could result in a misrepresentation of flood risk within the site boundary, with these high-risk areas not being avoided where possible and insufficient flood risk mitigation being proposed.	Flood Zone 3b has been identified and referred to within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** To be conservative, the 1 in 30 year (3.3%) floodplain extent has been considered to represent the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) and it is confirmed that there will be no electrical infrastructure located within Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain), and where land within this area has been included in within the Order Limits,	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Solution: The local authority's SFRA should define the extent of Flood Zone 3b. However, it is defined within the Planning Practice Guidance for Flood Risk and Coastal Change [REF-15] as 'land having a 3.3% or greater annual probability of flooding'.	it will only be used for enhancements and/or mitigation (ecological enhancements for example). For more information see the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].**	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, paragraph 8.40 - Floodplain Compensation** Issue: The PEIR submission only references level-for-level floodplain compensation being provided, but any floodplain compensation should also be on a volume-for-volume basis. Impact: If insufficient floodplain compensation storage is provided for any increase in built footprint or raising of ground levels within the 1 in 100yr, plus an allowance for climate change, floodplain, then it would impede flood flow and reduce the flood storage capacity, thereby increasing flood risk elsewhere. Solution: In order to compensate for flood storage loss, an area of floodplain must be	There are no proposals to land raise within the design flood extents. However, following discussions with the EA in a meeting, it was requested that a high level quantified assessment of the impact that the proposed panels could have on floodplain storage and flood levels be undertaken. A conservative assessment has now been undertaken and it is concluded that the panel frames could in theory displace 617.7m3 of floodwater which equates to an increased flood depth less than 1mm when considered across the design flood extent within the Order Limits. This is within the 5mm standard tolerance that the EA referred to in the meeting and it has been agreed that floodplain compensation is not required	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	recreated to mimic the area, shape and volume of the section of floodplain that is being lost to the development. Level-for-level and volume-for-volume compensation is the expected method of mitigation. However, for this to be achievable it requires land on the edge of the floodplain and above the 1% annual probability flood level with an appropriate allowance for climate change, to be available.	The above has been discussed and set out within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, paragraph 8.30 - Climate Change Scenario** Issue: A maximum credible climate change scenario for fluvial flood risk needs to be assessed. Impact: Without the sensitivity test of the maximum credible scenario, it has not been assessed how sensitive the proposal is to changes in the climate for different future scenarios. Therefore, it is unclear if the development could be adapted to large-scale climate change over its lifetime. Solution: The Flood Risk Assessment should evaluate the impact of an Upper End Climate	The maximum credible scenario (i.e. upper end climate change - 1 in 100 year plus 62% climate change scenario) has been assessed within the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** It is concluded that the differences in extent of flooding and freeboard achieved are not significant when compared to the design flood event.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Change Scenario (62%) as a sensitivity test for the site in line with guidance regarding credible maximum scenarios for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects [REF-16].		
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.19 – Pluvial Flood Risk** Issue: The PEIR mentions that "The EA Flood Risk from Surface Water mapping indicates the majority of the site is at very low risk of flooding from fluvial sources". This is not correct. Impact: This is a minor reporting error and will have limited impact but to avoid confusion should be corrected. Solution: Please update this section of the report to reference pluvial rather than fluvial sources.	This is addressed within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** This has no impact on the conclusions relating pluvial flood risk.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.5 – The EA Hydraulic Model for the River Trent** Issue: There are several models for the River Trent. Please make it clear which model you are using within the PEIR and subsequent Flood Risk Assessment. Impact: This is a minor reporting comment and will have limited impact but to avoid confusion the report should be updated to detail which model is being used. Solution: Please make it clear which model you are using within the PEIR and subsequent Flood Risk Assessment. Based on the climate change uplifts presented within the PEIR, this would suggest that the Tidal Trent (Jacobs, 2023) model [REF-17] is being used which is a good basis for assessing flood risk from the River Trent, nonetheless it would be useful if the PEIR and FRA could make this clear.	Reference now made to the Tidal Trent 2023 Model [REF-17] within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.26 Future Predicted Results and Section 8.30 Fluvial Embedded Measures** Issue: We agree that the 1% (1 in 100) plus	The design event is considered to be the 1 in 100 year plus 39% climate change scenario and this is the event assessed when considering any required mitigation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	39% (higher central 2080's epoch) climate change scenario should be used as the design event although the Flood Risk Assessment should also consider a credible maximum scenario as a sensitivity test to help understand the resilience of the development to future climate change. Impact: The development may be less resilient if climate change uplifts were to come in higher than expected. Solution: The Flood Risk Assessment should evaluate the impact of an Upper End Climate Change Scenario (62%) as a sensitivity test for the site in line with guidance regarding credible maximum scenarios for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects [REF-16]	The maximum credible scenario (i.e. upper end climate change - 1 in 100 year plus 62% climate change scenario) has been assessed within the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** It is concluded that the differences in extent of flooding and freeboard achieved are not significant when compared to the design flood event.	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.40 - Land Raising** Issue: The impact of land raising and solar panel upstands on flood risk should be quantified. Impact: Flood risk impacts from the proposed development.	There are no proposals to land raise within the design flood extents. However, following discussions with the EA, it was requested that a high level quantified assessment of the impact that the proposed panels could have on floodplain storage and flood levels be undertaken.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Solution: Where any land raising is proposed it would be sensible to test the impact of this within the Tidal Trent (2023) hydraulic model [REF-17]. Similarly, it would be sensible to test the impact on flood risk of the solar panel upstands within the hydraulic model. It is appreciated that the Tidal Trent model grid resolution is large which would prohibit explicitly representing the solar panel upstands within the model, however, the impact of the upstands could be approximated by using roughness patches for the solar panel areas or using flow constriction layers within Tuflow.	Rather than undertake hydraulic modelling, a conservative volume assessment has been undertaken and it is concluded that the panel frames could in theory displace 617.7m^3 of floodwater which equates to an increased flood depth less than 1mm when considered across the design flood extent within the Order Limits. This is within the 5mm standard tolerance that the EA referred to in the meeting and the approach to the assessment has been discussed and agreed with the EA. The above has been discussed and set out within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.19 Pluvial Flood Risk** Issue: The PEIR provides some information on flood risk from ordinary watercourses such as Fledborough Beck, using the Risk of Flooding from Surface Water maps as a proxy for fluvial flood risk and flood depths. The Risk of Flooding from Surface Water maps do not consider climate change.	Where flood risk from ordinary watercourses in the west (i.e. Fledborough Beck and unnamed ordinary watercourse to the south) could form the dominant flood risk, a ReFH2 Flow Comparison Assessment has been undertaken. This confirms that using the low risk pluvial flood extent is a conservative estimate for the design fluvial flood event.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Impact: Flood risk could be underestimated for some of the smaller ordinary watercourses which cross the site. Solution: Where ordinary watercourses are the dominant flood risk source and not the River Trent, it would be prudent to evaluate future flood risk including the effects of climate change. This is to ensure there will be sufficient freeboard in a design flood event, and to establish if any mitigation is required, for example level for level compensation. This could be achieved by undertaking detailed flood modelling for ordinary watercourses where they are the dominant flood risk source or the provision of evidence to demonstrate that the Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping is a reasonable proxy for fluvial flood risk.	The above has been discussed and agreed with the EA and is set out within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.16 & Section 8.38 Residual Risk from Breaching** Issue Breach 36 just sits to the north of the development red line boundary. There are no breaches within the existing Tidal Trent (Jacobs, 2023) model [REF-17] on the left bank of the River Trent within the red line boundary for the development. Impact: Flood risk from breach of flood defences could be underestimated. Solution: It would be sensible to add a breach on the left bank of the River Trent within the Red Line boundary for the site to check that flood risk does not increase significantly when compared to the depths from Breach 36.	An assessment of different breach locations on the east and western banks of the River Trent has been undertaken based on the in channel defended design flood levels (to be conservative) for the River Trent. This assessment confirms that the sensitive electrical equipment (BESS and substation) can be located outside of the breach flood extents. The above has been discussed and agreed with the EA and is summarised within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.46 Construction and Decommissioning Phase Impacts & Section 8.53 Operational Phase Impacts - Quantitative Methodology** Issue: The PEIR mentions that there is no specific quantitative methodology that allows the flood risk and drainage impact to be assessed. Determining impacts is based on professional	Quantitative approaches to flood risk have been agreed with the EA and set out within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** With regards to impacts as a result of the solar panel masts, a volume assessment rather than	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	judgement and is therefore qualitative. Impact: Minor point of clarity. Solution: Fluvial flood risk impacts during the construction and operating phases could be determined using hydraulic modelling, for example any areas of land raising could be incorporated into the River Trent (2023) hydraulic model [REF-17]. The impacts of solar panel masts could be assessed within the hydraulic model by using roughness or flow constriction layers. This would allow the impact on floodplain flow routes and any increases in off-site flood risk to be quantified.	hydraulic modelling has been undertaken, as agreed with the EA.	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.7 - Baseline Water Quality** Issue: No description of the baseline environment for water quality has been provided. Sections 8.7 and 8.8 simply state that there is a Main River and some ordinary watercourses within the site boundary. Impact: Without identifying the baseline conditions of the water environment, it is unclear	Baseline conditions of existing water environment to be assessed based on WFD classifications and are summarised within a WFD Screening Assessment. This is included as an appendix to **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	how water quality impacts can be accurately determined and appropriately mitigated against. Solution: The baseline conditions of watercourses in the area should be described in greater detail. This should include an indication of the likely water quality within these watercourses, through either direct monitoring or surveys, or through surrogate data such as WFD classification within the relevant River Basin Management Plan.		
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.45 – 8.52 - Water Quality During Construction** Issue: The sections dedicated to effects on water quality during construction do not identify the waterbodies that could be impacted, the likely magnitude of effects to these waterbodies or provide significant detail on the proposed mitigation measures to minimise these effects. Impact: The justification for determining no significant effects is therefore unclear. Solution: Greater detail on the assessment	**OCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** outlines mitigation measures that will be put in place to ensure that the quality of surface water runoff during construction is adequately treated prior to discharge to any surrounding watercourses/waterbodies. These mitigation measures will be embedded within the construction and are therefore considered when determining the significance of effect. Furthermore, a WFD Screening Assessment has been prepared which considers activities that will be screened in for construction and operation. This	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	needs to be provided within the Environmental Statement.	is included as an appendix to the **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.70 - Watercourse Sensitivity** Issue: This section states that the sensitivity of watercourses within and adjacent to the site is outlined in section 8.48. However, section 8.48 simply provides a loose description of the methodology that will be used to determine sensitivity. Nowhere within this chapter is the sensitivity of the specific waterbodies within the study area described. Impact: If the sensitivity of waterbodies is not assessed, then it is unclear how the significance of effects can be determined. Solution: The Environmental Statement should break down which watercourses could be	Baseline conditions of existing water environment are assessed based on WFD classifications and summarised within a WFD Screening Assessment. This is included as an appendix to **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	impacted by the development and then the specific sensitivity for each of these watercourses. Justification should be provided so that it is clear how the sensitivity of each watercourse has been determined.		
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.71- Magnitude of potential effects** Issue: This section provides a description on how effects have been defined but does not actually describe the potential effects or their likely magnitude. Impact: Without determining the magnitude of a potential effect, it is unclear how its significance can be derived. Due to this, it is also unclear whether the impacts of firewater from the BESS and substation compounds have been assessed as requested by the Environment Agency and PINS in response to the Scoping Report. Solution: More detail should be provided on the likely potential effects. The impacts of firewater from the BESS and substation compounds needs to be considered so that appropriate mitigation can be secured.	The nature of effect and its magnitude is concluded against each receptor within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7].** Chapter 7 makes clear that firewater runoff from the BESS and substation compounds have been considered and mitigation provided appropriately within the design. This includes providing an impermeable lining to SuDS features and a penstock shut off valve prior to outfall to prevent potentially contaminated fire water from infiltrating to the ground or discharging to the surrounding watercourses.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.72 - Water Quality Mitigation Measures** Issue: This section states that mitigation measures will be embedded into the design of the project to sufficiently manage impacts to surface water quality. Very little information is provided in the PEIR regarding what these mitigation measures will involve, other than the mention that SuDS will be used. Impact: Without any further details regarding the mitigation measures that will be relied upon to minimise impacts to water quality, the Environment Agency does not have confidence that these impacts will be sufficiently managed. Although SuDS have been referenced, it is unclear when or how the applicant plans to assess the suitability of these SuDS at preventing or minimising water quality impacts. Solution: Greater detail needs to be provided regarding the proposed mitigation measures. If they are yet to be developed there should be an appropriate mechanism securing their development within the DCO.	This is addressed in further detail within the Drainage Strategy section of **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** SuDS in the form of permeable surfacing, swales and detention basins are proposed to serve the BESS and substation compounds in particular. These features will provide conveyance, water quality and biodiversity benefits and will include an impermeable lining to prevent potential infiltration of contaminants (particularly in the event of a fire). A quantified assessment of water quality and treatment from the BESS and substation compounds has been set out within the FRA which confirms that the SuDS proposed will provide sufficient treatment. Furthermore, specific measures are outlined with regards to the containment of polluted water from fire runoff.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Chapter 8, Section 8.74 - Surface Water Runoff** Issue: This section states that there will be no likely significant effects in the quality and quantity of surface water runoff. Given the lack of detail described above, it is difficult to see how this conclusion has been reached. Impact: Without further details on the sensitivity of receptors, the magnitude of potential impacts and the effectiveness of any potential mitigation, we are unable to support the conclusion that there will be no significant impacts to water quality. Solution: The detail requested above should be provided so that the justification for determining no significant impacts can be clearly understood.	A quantified assessment of water quality and treatment from the BESS and substation compounds has been set out within the FRA which confirms that the SuDS proposed will provide sufficient treatment. Furthermore, specific measures are outlined with regards to the containment of polluted water from fire runoff. Runoff from the BESS and substation compounds will be restricted to the greenfield (Qbar) rate for all events up to an including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change scenario. With this in mind, there will be no negative impact on the receiving watercourses with regards to water quantity or runoff rate. The Drainage Strategy sets out in further detail in **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Impacts to existing watercourses as a result of surface water runoff have been assessed within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Appendix 4-2 Environmental Register Table 2 - Drainage System Design** Issue: The fourth bullet point in this table states that a drainage system will be implemented to "prevent runoff contaminated with fine particles / construction waste / debris / wash water from entering surface drains." From this description it is unclear whether this system will prevent runoff completely or treat it prior to discharge. Impact: Preventing runoff completely is not feasible. If runoff is contaminated or requires treatment prior to being discharged to surface water, then an environmental permit will be required. Solution: The Environmental Register should make it clear which activities it will seek environmental permits for, and then it should secure the application and adherence to the condition of those permits to ensure that impacts to water quality are minimised.	The drainage system will not completely prevent runoff and treatment will be provided through the inclusion of SuDS, as set out within **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Should the fire suppression system be activated at the BESS and Substation locations, a penstock valve downstream of the attenuation features would be triggered to prevent potentially contaminated runoff from entering the surrounding watercourses. Any contained runoff in this scenario would be tankered away. Discussions are being held with the EA and IDB to agree the disapplication of flood risk activity permits and ordinary watercourse consents on the basis that protective provisions are to be provided. For further information, please see the **oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.11]**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Appendix 4-2 Environmental Register Table 2 - oCEMP** Issue: Section 8.28 of Chapter 8 states that greater detail of mitigation measures included with the oCEMP would be provided in this Appendix. However, this appendix does not go into great detail regarding the contents of the oCEMP, the specific mitigation measures that will be implemented, how those mitigation measures will be monitored and how adherence to the oCEMP will be secured. Impact: The current level of detail provided for mitigation measures and the contents of the oCEMP does not provide us with confidence in their effectiveness. Solution: Greater detail needs to be provided in the DCO submission. The production of the oCEMP should be in line with available guidance, such as IEMA Practitioner Volume 12: Environmental Management Plans (2008).	The contents of the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** has been expanded and considers mitigation measures and how they will be implemented in greater detail. A final CEMP will be submitted and approved prior to commencement of construction. The **Commitment Register [EN010159/APP/7.15]** provides details of how this will be secured.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Canal and River Trust	**Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy** The PEIR provided confirms that a Flood Risk Assessment with proposed surface water drainage strategy, and an Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (oCEMP) and a Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP) will be developed. It also confirms that: potential effects related to changes in the quality of surface water run-off will be addressed in the surface water drainage strategy; and "the oCEMP and DMP will outline any temporary measures that will be put in place to control surface water runoff (such as through temporary attenuation features) and reduce the risk of polluted surface water from discharging to ground or entering the ordinary watercourses on Site (such as through the use of environmental capture techniques and silt traps)". In our previous response we recognised that water flows and changes in flood levels have the potential to affect navigation and suggested several measures that could be used on site to reduce risks from surface water run[1]off, excavated material and pollutants that could be	As set out within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21],** there will be no increase in flood risk as a result of the development. This means there will be impact to flood levels and therefore navigation. Table 3.5 of the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** sets out details and measures associated with flood risk, drainage and surface water. Furthermore, similar information during demolition is available within the **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	incorporated in the oCEMP and DMP. We will review these documents when made available to ensure any potential risks are addressed.		
Anglian Water	**Water Resources and Water Supply** Chapter 9 'Land, Soils and Groundwater' of the PEIR (section 9.34, p. 9) refers to five groundwater abstractions points close to the River Trent. Anglian Water has 2 two groundwater abstraction sites at Newton and Newton (Dunham Bridge). Portions of the proposed solar development lie within SPZ 2 of these sources. It is considered that the risk of contamination to the Sherwood Sandstone is potentially low due to significant thicknesses (c.200 metres) of low permeability superficial cover. The two water treatment works serve the Newton Boosters Distribution Zone within the Central Lincolnshire Water Resource Zone (WRZ) and specifically the Newton Besthorpe Distribution Management Area (DMA) to the east of Trent. To the west of the Trent is the Grove/ Sturton Le Steeple Distribution Management Area in the Nottinghamshire WRZ. 3 The development lies along the course of the river Trent and is predominantly upstream of our	The use, management and storage of any contaminants (including chemicals and silt/sediment runoff) are outlined within the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4].** As set out within **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21],** potentially contaminated runoff from the BESS areas in the event of a fire will be contained within the detentions basins and will be tankered away. Chemicals are not proposed for the cleaning of the panels, this will be through the use of potable water brought to site. The Applicant is currently engaging with Anglian Water on protective provisions to protect their apparatus and resources.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	surface water abstraction point feeding Hall WTW – and its associated storage reservoir. Activities which might contribute contaminants to the Trent, both during the construction and operational phase, should be notified to Anglian Water and impacts mitigated insofar as is possible. Such activities may include: · Fuel/chemical spills from storage points and machinery during construction and operation phases; · Enhanced sediment loading to watercourses from direct and indirect surface water runoff during construction phase; · Chemical runoff from the solar farm once in operation (cleaning products and panel coatings*); · Contamination from ancillary equipment, such as transformers and energy storage, once in operation; and · Grazing of land beneath panels for grass/weed suppression, once in operation. *We ask that details are provided of chemicals which may be used in the future cleaning of panels, and chemical coatings present on the panels (including PFAS). We reserve the right to comment on any products which we believe may adversely affect raw and treated water		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	quality at our Trent abstraction point and Hall WTW.		
Anglian Water	In view of the guidance in the National Policy Statements, we welcome reference to water supply and water resources in the PEIR and specifically in Chapter 8 'Hydrology and Hydrogeology' (Sections 8.88 – 8.91). This states that further details on water consumption will be provided, and potable water demand will be quantified, and discussions will be held with Anglian Water and Severn Trent Water to determine any capacity concerns. The PEIR (p. 58 Chapters 1- 6) refers to the BESS compound will have fire tanks for fire suppression. The above should confirm any water supply requirements for these facilities. Anglian Water has a statutory duty to supply water for domestic purposes. This means we are legally obliged to supply water to all household	The Applicant is currently engaging with Anglian Water regarding water supply and capacity.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	properties as well as any domestic requirements (e.g., drinking water, hand-basins, toilets and showers) of non-household properties. In many cases, domestic demand will be the only requirement for non-household properties (e.g., schools, hospitals, offices, shops and hairdressers). Non-domestic demand refers to water use for industrial processes, (e.g., agri-food production or car washes), and there is no legal requirement for us to supply for this type of water usage where it might put at risk our ability to supply water for domestic purposes. Anglian Water advises through its non-Domestic Water Requests Policy - July 2024 (copy attached) that new non household water supply requests (construction and operational phases) may be declined as these could compromise our regulatory priority of supplying existing and planned domestic growth. The flows needed to fill water storage tanks for example (if the promoter decides not to use rainwater harvesting on site to meet this non potable demand) will need to be assessed by Anglian Water to advise whether a supply is feasible when assessed in terms of the potential to		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	jeopardise domestic supply or at a significant financial or environmental cost.		
Anglian Water	Although Anglian Water does not have a statutory obligation to supply for non-domestic purposes in these circumstances, we factor this into our Water Resources Management Plan and we do everything we can to support businesses in the region, with the help of the water retail market. However, the situation is now changing, due to water supply being squeezed by abstraction reduction, climate change and a fast-growing population. Therefore, where new and 4 unplanned non-domestic requests are received, which exceed 20,000 litres per day (0.020 Ml/d) (this may be less dependent on the availability of water in that area) or where there is a cumulative impact from a significant number of smaller requests, there might be the need to decline to protect	The Applicant is in negotiations with Anglian Water on water supply and capacity.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	existing supplies and the environment. To assess these requests, we require a Water Resource Assessment to be submitted as part of our planning process setting out a daily demand for each stage of the project and whether this is for domestic or non-domestic uses. Water use during construction means that the promoter will need to confirm that concrete production, for example, would be offsite and so not require an on-site supply. Where feasible, we will work to explore innovative solutions to meet these requests. Further advice on water and wastewater capacity and options can be obtained by contacting Anglian Water's Pre-Development Team.		
Anglian Water	**Water Recycling (surface water/foul drainage)** The Scoping Opinion issued by the Planning Inspectorate requires the Environment Statement (ES) to confirm the method of disposal for foul water and demonstrating this would not result in a likely significant effect, particularly regarding existing capacity of wastewater treatment facilities either from existing infrastructure or if unconnected from the	There will be no proposed connections to the public sewer foul or combined mains. Foul water generated during the construction stage will be contained within portacabin type toilets and will be removed by the contracting company. Foul water generated during operation will be stored within cesspits and it is anticipated these will only need to be emptied every 20 weeks.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	mains. The ES should also demonstrate agreement with the relevant consultation bodies. Table 8-2 of Chapter 8 'Hydrology and Hydrogeology' has concluded that at the construction stage of the project the associated welfare facilities will be unconnected to the mains and there would be only very limited foul flow increases. The potential for increases during the operation stage are also limited as there will be a small number of people and will only comprise a limited maintenance regime for the repairs and cleaning of the panels and associated infrastructure. If any water recycling/sewerage services are required for the operation of the scheme, then this needs to be discussed with Anglian Water. Chapter 8, Section 8.42 – 8.43 - We consider that SuDS and the potential for rainwater harvesting to serve any non-potable water requirements, should be used. Notwithstanding the lead roles of the Lead Local Lead Local Flood Authority, the Environment Agency and the Internal Drainage Boards, Anglian Water would welcome clarification that the use of and consequent impacts on the local drainage/	Negotiations are being held with Severn Trent to ensure they have capacity within their wastewater treatment works to accommodate the volume of foul water at the intervals set out above.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	sewerage network will be designed out of the scheme given that there will be no mains foul connection and SuDS will be used for both construction and operational stages.		
JGP Property Ltd	**3. Flood Risk** NPS EN3 [REF-1] provides that flood risk needs to be mitigated against and whilst it is noted that OESF has increased the minimum height of the proposed solar panels, there has been flooding in this area, which has occurred more regularly in recent years. Therefore, even though the proposed minimum height of the panels has been increased to 1.8m, we understand that in some parts of the OESF this height increase will not be sufficient to ensure that blockages of flood flows can be avoided. Further mitigation measures should therefore be considered. A significant part of OESF will be located on land within flood zone 2 and flood zone 3, which is at medium to high risk of flooding and further details on how this will be effectively managed should be provided.	Mitigation measures have been discussed and agreed with the EA. Full details of the proposed flood mitigation and justifications are provided within **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Maintenance measures will include the clearance of any debris collected on fences, paths, roads and between panel supports along with inspection of panel supports and fences to ensure structural integrity. Should any issues be observed, then remediation measures will be implemented. Furthermore, the panel supports will be designed to withstand impact from debris.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Land and Soils			
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Section 9 Paragraph 9.46 and Table 1 in Appendix 9-2 - Aquifer Sensitivity** Issue: The sensitivity assigned to the aquifers underlying the site is not adequate. It has been classed as low. Parts of the site are underlain by Secondary A aquifers which are capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers. Impact: If the correct sensitivity is not assigned to the groundwater in the aquifers beneath the site it is vulnerable to pollution from inadequate mitigate measures being adopted. Solution: Reassess the sensitivity and vulnerability of the aquifers and groundwater beneath the site to ensure sufficient mitigation to pollution is incorporated into the design. Additional explanation: There are also a group of groundwater abstraction boreholes within and adjacent the site boundary. This abstracts from the Triassic Sandstone which is confined by the Mercia Mudstone at this location. This abstraction has an associated Source Protection Zone 1c,2c & 3c (where c represents	**ES Vol 2, Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** includes a revision to aquifer sensitivity. Based on the criteria provided in Table 8.2 (Receptor importance for groundwater), the aquifers across the site are classified as of medium importance. With respect to the groundwater abstraction boreholes referenced in the Comment, these are no longer within the Order Limits, and so there are no areas of the Site that are within areas of higher groundwater importance than medium.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	that the sandstone is confined by the mudstone) and these zones are within the development boundary.		
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Section 8 & 9 Private Water Supplies - Private Water Supplies** Issue: The PEIR does not mention private water supplies. Impact: Private water supplies may exist within the study area that can be vulnerable to contamination. If they are not included as a receptor they are vulnerable to being overlooked. Solution: Contact the Local Authority for an up-to-date list of their private water supplies and include them in future assessments.	The water abstractions points that are present within the Order Limits are assessed within **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**. Details of locations of surface water and groundwater abstractions are presented in **ES Vol 3, Appendix 8.2: Preliminary Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]**. These private water supplies are included as a receptor and have been assessed for the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.28 - Soil association data** Natural England acknowledge the presentation of soil association data however, due to the scale or the proposal, without a GIS dataset we are unable to confirm its accuracy.	Data from site-specific surveys have been completed for the Order Limits, which provides a more detailed dataset that presents improved information compared to the soil association data. The dataset from the site-specific ALC survey is used to inform the assessment presented within the ES chapter. Full details of the ALC grades are presented within **ES Vol 3, Appendix 8.3: Agricultural Land Classification survey report [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.30 - Survey Methodology** Natural England notes and supports the survey methodology presented in principle. When the full results for Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) are collated, Natural England will provide further comment following consultation	Consultation with Natural England relating to the approach to surveying soils has been held as the project has progressed. Agreement has been reached with Natural England over the approach to the survey methodology, in addition to the contents of the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** (27 January 2025). The oSMP covers procedures to minimise soil compaction. The 3 principal measures are: only work when the soils are dry and friable, use low ground pressure/vehicles/plant and avoid trafficking by using designated haul roads.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	**Figure 9-2** The use of 'preliminary' may cause some confusion with other larger (1:250,000) scale provisional mapping available.	This data is no longer provisional, therefore this comment is not included on any drawings relating to soil and ALC grades.	N
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.41 - oSMP** Natural England welcomes the embedded environmental measures to minimise soil impacts, and the proposal to prepare an Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) containing soil mitigation measures in line with the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Development Sites [REF-18]. We would like clarity on whether the Development Consent Order (DCO) will be submitted with a full SMP. We would recommend the full SMP being submitted where the information is available preconsent. Natural England would suggest the Environmental Statement and associated SMP needs to clearly demonstrate how the ALC Grades and soil types will inform soil handling and restoration, setting out the site specific mitigation measures with reference to the best practice guidance (Defra Construction Code of Practice for the	Further consultation has been undertaken with Natural England on the contents of the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and agreement has been reached with Natural England on this document (27 January 2025).	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites) [REF-18], i.e. secondary mitigation measures. The British Society of Soil Science has published the Guidance Note Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction [REF-19] which also contains useful guidance.		
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.42 - oSMP** Natural England largely agree with the scoped out aspects of the assessment (soil loss and land loss during Operation, maintenance and decommissioning). However, it should be noted that during the operational lifetime of the proposed cable route, there is a potential for additional disturbance (excavation) of soil resources to occur during any maintenance or remedial works which may be required. Although the scale and extent of these works would be significantly less than required for initial construction, being confined to the specific areas of cable where maintenance is required, it would be worth acknowledging this in the Environmental Statement (ES) and oSMP.	**Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** and the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** include mention of the fact that some disturbance of soils may occur during operational or maintenance works, and that these works should be governed by the methods detailed within the oSMP to ensure that damage to soils is minimised or avoided. This includes restricting any excavation to times when the soil is sufficiently dry to avoid the risk of soil compaction, other than in cases of emergency maintenance. This also includes removing topsoil and placing it to the side of the trench in order to replace it after the maintenance works.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.51 - SPM** The SMP should include the type and volume of each soil type to be stripped; the nutrient status of the soil units to inform the potential suitability for biodiversity enhancement (where soils cannot be reinstated where excavated); and where required, the location of soil storage and restoration, derived from the soil survey. For areas of temporary development, the ALC grade determined from the soil survey should be used to inform the restoration criteria, with temporarily disturbed Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land returned to the same quality to minimise loss. In order to retain the long-term potential of the temporarily disturbed land and to safeguard soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the whole development, it is important that the soil is able to retain as many of its important functions and services (ecosystem services) as possible through careful soil management during the construction phase and restoration. The ALC and soil survey should also inform potential soil re-use opportunities when direct replacement is not possible (i.e. the permanent land take areas).	The **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** has been drafted in order to protect the soils and return them to the same quality or better after the temporary development. Generally, the moisture and consistency of the soil have been considered in the soil handling, however, this relates back to the ALC grade. Further consultation has been undertaken with Natural England on the contents of the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and agreement has been reached with Natural England on this document (27 January 2025). Soil bunds will be labelled with their historic land use, volume and soil type. In the areas for the substations, BESS compounds, and PCS, typically the soil will be removed prior to construction and stored *in situ.* Hard surfaces will be removed during decommissioning, and the soils will be decompacted where necessary.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.63 - Parameter plan** Having reviewed the current parameter plan (Volume 1, Chapters 1-6) there is scope for adjustments in design/location of permanent construction, i.e. location of substations and BESS, to ensure minimal disturbance to BMV soils in accordance with the embedded (primary) mitigation measures in Appendix 9-3. Natural England would welcome adjustments to avoid BMV land; justification should be provided where BMV land cannot be avoided by permanent infrastructure	During the site selection process, the Applicant applied specific environmental search criteria, including agricultural land grade to find appropriate land which would be able to deliver its objectives. According to the provisional ALC mapping (Defra and Natural England), this area (i.e. in proximity to the point of connection) of Nottinghamshire and to a lesser extent, Lincolnshire, has a mixture of largely Grade 3 with small pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 4, making complete avoidance of BMV impossible for development of the scale proposed. The Natural England predictive mapping also shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV with one swathe of high likelihood between North and South Clifton (which was subsequently removed so only a small parcel remained). On this basis, the Order Limits was considered favorable, based on predictive mapping at site selection stage and avoided the swathes of Grade 2 to the east and west. Consideration was given as to whether alternative land could be found with less	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics. Further information is provided in the Site Selection Report at Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]** The **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]** explains the evolution of the masterplan throughout the development of the Proposed Development, including how BMV has been avoided when possible. The Design Approach Document explains in greater detail how design measures were incorporated and changes were made during design development in relation to the Proposed Development. It explains that based upon initial survey results, 84acres of BMV land was removed from the Order Limits between non-statutory and statutory consultation. This specifically focused on the removal of land between North Clifton and South Clifton.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Following on from the above, a further 161acres of BMV land was removed from the Order Limits between statutory consultation and submission.	
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.69 - soil displacement** The temporary displacement of soil as a result of the underground cable installation and temporary haul and access roads/construction compounds can result in permanent land quality change and soil damage if undertaken inappropriately. Therefore, Natural England support the commitment to consider these impacts in the oSMP/SMP. This is required for consultees and decision makers to understand the extent (ha) and likely longterm impacts on agricultural land quality (ALC grade). All soils should only be handled in a dry and friable condition, and it is expected that soil handling will be confined to the drier summer period (April through September) to minimise risk of soil damage. This would minimise the need to recondition soils, which requires additional space and time. This is particularly important for land to be restored to agricultural use. Soil	Further consultation has been undertaken with Natural England on the contents of the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and agreement has been reached with Natural England on this document (27 January 2025). This has included agreement with Natural England for a qualified soil specialist to provide onsite training with regards to the supervision of soil operations. As well as regular inspections throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning phases to identify any areas of specific remediation work required, and that any such remediation work has been completed successfully. An example agreed with Natural England includes looking for any areas of subsoil compaction that has developed where service vehicles have been used off the access track routes, specifying appropriate subsoil cultivation and assessing the effectiveness of that cultivation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	handling methods should normally be as specified as in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites (including accompanying Toolbox Talks). [REF-18]		
Natural England	**Paragraph 9.74** As mentioned above there are opportunities to reduce the temporary impacts of the BESS and substation by locating them on non-BMV agricultural land. Where ecological compensation areas or similar 'soft' land uses are proposed on areas of BMV agricultural land, the design principles should also allow this land to maintain or return to its original physical characteristics (ie to retain its ALC grade) as far as practicable to minimise the loss of BMV capability of this land in the longer term.	The **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** includes procedures to ensure that the ALC grade of land will not deteriorate during the lifespan of the Proposed Development. After decommissioning, land will revert to the ALC grade that it had prior to the presence of the project.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	Appendix 9-1: The National Planning Policy Framework, 2023 [REF-4] National Planning policy relevant to agricultural land and soils is set out in paragraph 180(a), 180(b) and 181 (footnote 62) of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that: 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: NPPF 180(a)protecting and enhancing […] soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); NPPF 180(b)recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.' NPPF 181 Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework… Footnote 62: Where significant development of agricultural land is	The assessment of availability of agricultural land is presented in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8],** with consideration of cumulative effects provided in **ES Vol 2, Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]** of the ES. During the site selection process, the Applicant applied specific environmental search criteria, including agricultural land grade to find appropriate land which would be able to deliver its objectives. According to the provisional ALC mapping (Defra and Natural England), this area (i.e. in proximity to the point of connection) of Nottinghamshire and to a lesser extent, Lincolnshire, has a mixture of largely Grade 3 with small pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 4, making complete avoidance of BMV impossible for development of the scale proposed. The Natural England predictive mapping also shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV with one swathe of high likelihood between North and	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development.	South Clifton (which was subsequently removed so only a small parcel remained). On this basis, the Order Limits was considered favourable, based on predictive mapping at site selection stage and avoided the swathes of Grade 2 to the east and west. Consideration was given as to whether alternative land could be found with less impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics. Further information is provided in the Site Selection Report at Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].** It is also noted that in December 202, NPPF footnote 65 [REF-4] was amended removing the need to consider the availability of agricultural land for food production, and this is no longer a material consideration under that paragraph.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Natural England	**Appendix 9-3: Environmental Measures** We note there is no assessment of the decommission process on soils (including BMV land). However we note there is a commitment to decommissioning and a Decommissioning Environment Management Plan (DEMP) will be secured and submitted as part of the DCO submission. There should be more attention given to the latter stages of project lifecycles (i.e. decommissioning), ensuring that mechanisms for environmental mitigation, restoration and enhancement that are built in at the design stage are secured well into the future. The spatial distribution of ALC grades determined from a detailed ALC survey are necessary to inform the reinstatement criteria, which allows the area of each ALC Grade temporarily disturbed to be returned to the same quality as far as practicable to minimise potential loss. Soils should only be handled when in a dry and friable condition, soil handling should normally be avoided during October to March inclusive, irrespective of soil moisture conditions, because it will generally not be possible to establish green cover over winter to	Further consultation has been undertaken with Natural England on the contents of the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and agreement has been reached with Natural England on this document (27 January 2025). The **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.6]** is included in the DCO application and includes mechanisms for environmental mitigation and restoration. Along with the SMP, the oDEMP includes measures to protect soils and mitigate damage.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	help dry out soils and protect them from erosion. A field suitable method for assessing whether soils are in a dry and friable condition based on plastic limits set out in Part One (Explanatory Note 4 – Table 4.2 provided below in Annex 1) of the Institute of Quarrying's Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Working [REF-20], and this approach together with the associated rainfall protocols should be adopted. Where topsoil is proposed to be stripped, typically for construction compounds, access tracks and laying cabling, the soil handling methodology (movement, storage & replacement) and soil protection proposals are reviewed to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to allow for the restoration of the land to the baseline ALC Grade. Plans of the detailed ALC grades should be provided in a SMP to be prepared and submitted with the ES. The SMP should include an aftercare programme which would enable a satisfactory standard of agricultural after-use to be reached, with regards to cultivating, reseeding, draining or irrigating, applying fertiliser, or cutting and grazing the site. Where soils are being		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	reinstated, we would welcome the commitment to reinstate soils to their pre-development agricultural use. Where topsoil is proposed to be stripped, typically for construction compounds; access tracks; battery storage and laying cabling, the soil handling methodology (movement, storage & replacement) and soil protection proposals are reviewed to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to allow for the restoration of the land to the baseline ALC Grade.		
Natural England	**Paragraph 19.22 BMV agricultural land** BMV agricultural land is a national dataset and therefore cumulative impacts should be considered against the national BMV figure. This IEMA guidance: A New Perspective on Land and Soils in EIA (February 2022) [REF-21], is described as a "work in practice", and as such it has no formal standing. However, this guidance is recognised by Natural England, and it sets out parameters for the assessment of cumulative impacts, based on some current informal practice.	A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, with consideration of cumulative effects provided in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. It also comments on the quantities of BMV land on a national scale, compared to the land take for the Project, to give	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		an indication of the percentages of BMV within England that are being discussed.	
Natural England	**Chapter 19 - Cumulative Effects - Table 19-3** When considering land use change, the permanency of the impact on soils is an important consideration. Particular care over planned changes to the most potentially productive soil is needed, for the ecosystem services it supports including its role in agriculture and food production. Natural England advise cumulative effects should be assessed in relation to the aforementioned National Policy. In particular when assessing impacts during the operational period developers should pay attention to footnote 62 [REF-4]; 'The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework' In light of this policy Natural England do not concur with the assertion that 'there are no likely cumulative significant effects' as a result of operational activities	A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, with consideration of cumulative effects provided in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. The inter-project cumulative effects are considered minimal due to their temporary nature.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
JGP Property Ltd	This would take much needed BMV land out of action for a whole lifetime, as well as affecting the landscape and heritage assets for such substantial period.	**Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** provides a detailed assessment of the impacts due to the lack of availability of agricultural land over the lifespan of the Proposed Development. The cumulative effects on agricultural land use are also assessed within **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. These adverse effects will need to be considered against the other impacts from the Proposed Development to determine if the need for the Project outweighs the identified adverse impacts.	
JGP Property Ltd	**Use of BMV Land** The National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3) [REF-1] states that ground mounted solar development should mainly be on brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land, avoiding the use of “Best and Most Versatile” (BMV) agricultural land where possible. However, we note that a significant proportion of the ground mounted solar for OESF will be installed on BMV agricultural land, notwithstanding that there are alternative brownfield sites that could have instead been utilised in the wider area	At this stage we have not ruled out the use of land within the solar infrastructure for agriculture (such as grazing). We have consulted with Natural England on BMV land on the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10**] that will be implemented to ensure soils are protected. Agreement has been reached with Natural England on the contents of the oSMP on (27 January 2025).	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	(former Bevercotes Colliery near Ollerton for example). Additionally, JG Pears understands that there is no proposal by OESF to allow for the continued agricultural use of the land upon which the ground mounted solar panels are to be installed. It is clear therefore that should OESF be consented as per its current masterplan, there will be substantial amount of BMV agricultural land that will be lost in the local area. Given the need to protect BMV land to ensure that the UK's food security is not compromised, we request that alternatives to the use of BMV agricultural land are investigated further.		
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	Our objection to your proposal is not an in-principle objection to solar panels: it is the inappropriateness of the size/scale and density of this project in an agricultural area providing wheat, sugar beet, oil seed rape etc. grown on Grade 1 to 3a land which constitutes over 50% of the land being appropriated.	A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, with consideration of cumulative effects provided in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. The inter-project cumulative	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		effects are considered minimal due to their temporary nature.	
Thorney Parish Council	The use of good quality agricultural land is inappropriate & should be avoided. It will have an adverse effect on food security which is even more vital in the current unstable World situation. The money would be far better spent on bolstering agriculture, replacing the value of lost EU subsidies & valuing farmers so they don't feel they have to "diversify."	A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, with consideration of cumulative effects provided in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. The inter-project cumulative effects are considered minimal due to their temporary nature.	N
South Clifton Parish Council	Decommissioning We understand that One Earth have leased the land for the solar farm from local landowners and we have been told that the solar farm will have 60 years to be constructed, operational and decommissioned. Can you tell us what will	The assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on soil and agricultural land use is completed within **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**. This is based on the 60 year design life for the Proposed Development, which is secured in the DCO Requirements (Schedule 2): Decommissioning and Restoration.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	happen at the end of the 60 years and who will have the final decision, the landowner or One Earth? We understand that once the land has been used for this industrial purpose it is not classified as farmland and cannot be used as such. Please comment on this? Can One Earth confirm that ALL panels, cabling, batteries, inverters, fencing and associated non -natural objects will be removed from the site – below ground as well as above ground level and the sites returned to a natural environment?	The land can be returned to an agricultural land use after the Proposed Development has been decommissioned. The final Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will ensure that the land is returned with the same Agricultural Land Classification, and that no deterioration in soil quality has occurred. With respect to decommissioning, all infrastructure will be removed from the Site, including panels, batteries, inverters and other above-ground infrastructure. Below-ground cables at greater depth than 1m will remain in situ, as this causes fewer impacts than removing them, while still allowing agricultural land use to be reverted to.	
Thorney Parish Council	Residents have specific concerns about the construction, particularly re concrete. They worry about the long-term effects on the land, which are unknown. Decommissioning is uncertain – the land could be depleted of its original fertility, water table etc & contaminated by concrete, batteries etc &, therefore, not able to be fully reinstated.	The design for the Proposed Development will include defined types of concrete, that will be appropriate for the ground conditions. There is industry guidance to ensure that concrete positioned below ground will not degrade and release contaminants, and the processes within the guidance will be followed to ensure that the correct concrete class is used for any below ground structures (Building Research	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Establishment Special Digest 1: Concrete in aggressive ground, 2005). The management plans for the different project phases will ensure that soil quality, and the agricultural land classification grade, is not adversely affected during construction, operation or decommissioning works. The management plans will also ensure that significant changes to existing groundwater levels do not occur. The battery infrastructure is constructed in such a way that release of contamination to the environment (to the soil or groundwater) will not be allowed to occur. This aspect will also be managed by procedures within the **Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and the **Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.12**]. The Environmental Management Plans will also require that full reinstatement is undertaken (for some areas, after temporary use during the construction phase, and elsewhere, for final restoration after the decommissioning phase). The **Soil Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.10**] presents specific measures to ensure that areas of	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		agricultural land will be returned to the pre-development state after use.	
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	This part of Lincolnshire provides a significant contribution towards food production for the wider economy. In fact, Lincolnshire is widely known as the 'Bread Basket' of the UK due to the quantity (12%) of food produced and the quality of its agricultural land. Agriculture forms the backbone of the local economy and contributes significantly towards the rural character of the parish and wider area. The proposed loss of this agricultural land across the area which is mostly Grade 1, 2 and 3a will ultimately change agricultural practices and the agricultural history of the parish and wider area forever. Grade 1, 2 and 3a farmland is in itself a major renewable energy resource as well as supporting the supply of food, and is defined as being 'the Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land in the NPPF [REF-4].	During the site selection process, the Applicant applied specific environmental search criteria, including agricultural land grade to find appropriate land which would be able to deliver its objectives. According to the provisional ALC mapping (Defra and Natural England), this area (i.e. in proximity to the point of connection) of Nottinghamshire and to a lesser extent, Lincolnshire, has a mixture of largely Grade 3 with small pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 4, making complete avoidance of BMV impossible for development of the scale proposed. The Natural England predictive mapping also shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV with one swathe of high likelihood between North and South Clifton (which was subsequently removed so only a small parcel remained).	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	It is undesirable to take one renewable energy resource out of effective use in order to develop another. Poorer quality land, brownfield land or retrofitting existing building roof-space should be used in preference to higher quality land, and the BMV agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a) should be avoided. Where possible and viable, agricultural activity and other environmental/land management services should be able to continue.	On this basis, the Order Limits was considered favorable, based on predictive mapping at site selection stage and avoided the swathes of Grade 2 to the east and west. Consideration was given as to whether alternative land could be found with less impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics. Further information is provided in the Site Selection Report at Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].** These issues have been considered within the ES, with a full assessment of the impacts on soil and agricultural land within **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, and an assessment of cumulative impacts across Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The ES documents as a whole present an explanation as to why this Proposed Development would be beneficial overall, despite the adverse impacts that will occur in relation to the availability of agricultural land.	
Thorney Parish Council	These proposals take good land out of food production which will cause price rises for grain, flour, vegetables etc plus crops such as sugar beet with its wide uses. The project will diminish our country's agricultural output & financially benefit our competitors & countries like China which produce many panels & their components – a long-term threat to our national security.	Regarding food production/benefit to China. The land included within the Order limits is minimal compared to the total land used to grow these crops. Furthermore, commodity prices are set on a global scale, and would not be impacted by the Proposed Development.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Landscape and Visual Impact			
Natural England	**Chapter 12 - Landscape** Paragraph 180 of the NPPF [REF-4] highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes through the planning system. This application may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes, including any local landscape designations. You may want to consider whether any local landscape features or characteristics (such as ponds, woodland, or dry-stone walls) could be incorporated into the development to respond to and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness, in line with any local landscape character assessments. Where the impacts of development are likely to be significant, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be provided with the proposal to inform decision making. Natural England do not make	**ES Vol 2, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** includes a review of published landscape character assessments and defines Local Landscape Character Areas identified specifically with reference to the Proposed Development. Key characteristics found to be representative of the Site and surrounding landscape have been integrated into the proposed landscape design, as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7],** including features such as hedgerows, trees, woodlands, beetle banks, habitat piles, gabion baskets, bat and bird boxes and otter holts.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	specific comment on local landscapes. We refer you to the Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [REF-22] for further guidance.		
Natural England	**Green Infrastructure** Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework provides evidence-based advice and tools on how to design, deliver and manage green and blue infrastructure (GI). GI should create and maintain green liveable places that enable people to experience and connect with nature, and that offer everyone, wherever they live, access to good quality parks, greenspaces, recreational, walking and cycling routes that are inclusive, safe, welcoming, well-managed and accessible for all. GI provision should enhance ecological networks, support ecosystems services and connect as a living network at local, regional and national scales. Development should be designed to meet the 15 Green Infrastructure Principles. The GI	The approach to delivering new green infrastructure is documented in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** In particular, the Proposed Development has sought to contribute to the following of Natural England's Green Infrastructure Principles: - Principle Why 1: Nature rich beautiful places, through the introduction of wildflower meadows and species rich grassland. - Principle Why 2: Active and healthy places, through the introduction of a new permissive path network for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. - Principle Why 5: Resilient and climate positive places, by maximising the volume	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Standards can be used to inform the quality, quantity and type of GI to be provided. Major development should have a GI plan including a long-term delivery and management plan. Relevant aspects of local authority GI strategies should be delivered where appropriate. GI mapping resources are available here and here. These can be used to help assess deficiencies in greenspace provision and identify priority locations for new GI provision	of clean energy produced and improving biosecurity across the Site. - Principle What 1: Multifunctional, through delivering an improved green infrastructure network through new planting. - Principle What 2: Varied, by incorporating a diverse range of species that have been selected in response to local conditions and character. - Principle What 3: Accessible, by creating new links, where previously absent, through the permissive path network to existing long distance routes. - Principle What 5: GI should respond to an area's character, through specifying species and planting typologies in response to published landscape character assessment and observations gained through field work. - Principle How 1: Partnership, through engagement with local communities and Parish Councils.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
JGP Property Ltd	**2. Visual Amenity and proximity to dwellings** NPS EN-3 [REF-1] states that utility scale solar farms such as OESF have a significant zone of influence and that visual amenity and glint and glare are some of the main factors to consider in relation to sensitive receptors. Due to the scale of OESF, in addition to the substantial existing solar development within the wider area (10-15 miles radius), the landscape and visual amenity impacts, both alone and cumulatively of OESF cannot be underestimated. If consented in accordance with its current masterplan, OESF will result in a continual corridor of solar arrays, which will have a significantly detrimental impact on local people, who live and work in the area. This will result in local people feeling overwhelmed and all encompassed by utility scale solar farms. Whilst changes to the masterplan for OESF have tried to reduce impacts on residential visual amenity, there remains a number of villages that will feel almost surrounded by solar development and this will have an adverse impact on residential visual amenity. The scale of OESF is not appropriate and will not protect or enhance the	**Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4]** details the reasons for site selection. Mitigation planting has been designed and located in response to several factors, specifically including consideration of glint and glare. The extent of the Order Limits is proportionate to the 740MW grid connection. The iterative design process has sought to minimise the impact of the Proposed Development on the character of local villages and people's views, with specific reference to residential views. This iterative process is detailed within the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and has included the inclusion of substantial offsets from villages, residential properties, public rights of way and roads to mitigate impacts on landscape character and visual amenity. Cumulative impacts have also been considered and assessed within **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	quality of the landscapes on which it is proposed to be installed, especially when considered cumulatively with the existing solar development in the wider area. This wide-ranging industrialisation of the landscape will result in detrimental impacts to all those living and working in the area. Again, JG Pears suggest that other locations could be more appropriate for such development and should be considered by OESF.		
Thorney Parish Council	The size of the proposed development(s) is far too large for the nature of the area. The project is “industrialising” a rural area. It will ruin the landscape unnecessarily. These are not “farms” & would be far more appropriate placed on all industrial buildings, all new builds, disused industrial sites &, maybe, some of the currently vacant MOD sites that do NOT have heritage projects planned.	The size of the Proposed Development has been considered in **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4]** and the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]** to justify the land needed to generate enough energy for the grid connection agreement. The potential visual impacts are assessed in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].** Land located west of Thorney at Statutory Consultation has now been removed from the Proposed Development. The potential for impacts on Thorney are still considered in the LVIA.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	We require parity with those communities on the east of the Trent that form part of this proposal, North and South Clifton. Those communities have been granted much greater buffer zones around their villages and around individual dwellings, sometimes isolated properties. There needs to be a minimum buffer zone around all affected homes and villages.	Further changes have occurred to the Proposed Development as shown on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3]** and **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** around Fledborough in response to consultation feedback, to create a similar sense of openness. This has included the removal of land adjacent to Fledborough Viaduct to retain a clear line of sight, recognising the structure's contribution to the village. Further offsets have also been embedded adjacent to residential properties and roads and the village of Ragnall. This is detailed fully in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]**. (See also the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1**]). These changes were discussed with the Parish Council via in person meetings between Statutory Consultation and DCO submission. Appropriate development offsets together with utilisation of existing landform and vegetation to screen visibility of the Proposed Development have been embedded in the design, as shown on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	Mitigation to boundaries and public thoroughfares/areas. • Panels should be set back and have reduced height next to the road running through Ragnall, next to Far Hill Lane, within Ragnall and Fledborough, and be screened. • Panels be removed from the field between Fledborough (Sweetapple Lane) and the embankment to preserve the view of the Viaduct. • Panels from within the villages should be removed to avoid isolation. • Planting should begin before the solar panels are on site. • Communities to be consulted on the choice of trees to be planted. That will be in such close proximity to residencies and communities as a whole • The field north of Fledborough House Farm should have the panels immediately in front of the farm removed to provide a more open environment. The boundary line running east-west of Fledborough House Farm should be extended right across to the projects' most easterly	Regarding the points raised: - Further offsets from the roads listed was subject to discussion through consultation post statutory consultation and are secured via the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3].** - Panels have been removed to preserve the view of the Viaduct, as detailed in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8].** - Further offsets from villages have been included in response to feedback. - An indicative list of tree species appropriate for the local area are provided in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, which will include final specification and species, will be reviewed and approved by requirement post consent. - Further offsets to solar panels have been embedded in the Proposed Development around Fledborough House Farm. Further details are provided in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	boundary, south of Fledborough. This would provide the village with a greater sense of open space and help reduce the density factor.	See also the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1**].	
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	Solar farms will impact nearby residents and the wider local community hosting the development. Concerns about loss of amenity, visual impact including glint and glare from panels, and linked to this road safety, will need to be appropriately considered as part of determining the acceptability of the development.	Appropriate development offsets together with utilisation of existing landform and vegetation to screen visibility of the Proposed Development have been embedded in the design, as shown on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3].** A glint and glare assessment has been provided in the DCO submission.	N
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	The fields immediately next to the Ragnall to Sutton Road should be removed thus avoiding the sense of driving through a tunnel and maintaining the sense of openness that currently exists. NB replicating the openness One Earth have planned between North and South Clifton.	The offset from Ragnall was extended post statutory consultation and subject to discussion through consultation with the Parish Council. This is reflected on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3]** and illustrated on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]**. See also the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1**].	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Thorney Parish Council	The size of the proposed development(s) is far too large for the nature of the area. The project is “industrialising” a rural area. It will ruin the landscape unnecessarily. These are not “farms” & would be far more appropriate placed on all industrial buildings, all new builds, disused industrial sites &, maybe, some of the currently vacant MOD sites that do NOT have heritage projects planned.	The size of the Proposed Development has been considered in **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4]** and the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]** to justify the land needed to generate enough energy for the grid connection agreement. The potential visual impacts are assessed in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].** Land located west of Thorney at Statutory Consultation has now been removed from the Proposed Development. The potential for impacts on Thorney are still considered in the LVIA.	N
Canal and River Trust	**Landscape and Visual Impacts** The promoter’s landscape consultant engaged with the Trust prior to this consultation to discuss the assessment of landscape and visual impacts, which is much appreciated. Having reviewed Chapter 12, Volume 1 of the PEIR that deals with Landscape and Visual Impact, we consider that the LIVIA methodology is acceptable and includes provision for assessment of users of the river navigation and associated footpaths. In terms of the proposed cable river crossing this should ideally be	The crossing of the River Trent has been confirmed as to be via underground cable. No further response required.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	underground to minimise landscape and visual impacts close to the river. If the option of using the Fledborough Viaduct is to be pursued, this should be sensitively designed and located to minimise impacts, i.e. installed within the viaduct deck or appropriately located on inside faces of parapets, rather than using external façade attachments. We look forward to the LVIA to be provided as part of the ES.		
Masterplanning			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
NGET	Looking at the most recent masterplan I would like to confirm the following; NGET's preference is for no panels to be positioned underneath our conductors. There looks to be multiple areas where panels are planned underneath our overhead lines. NGET require a minimum of a 15m stand off around our towers and advise any conductive materials within 30m of a tower are adequately earthed. The developer must have a valid connection agreement with us and use the use of NGET land process to agree a cable easement on NGET land. The necessary safe clearances from our conductors must be maintained at all times. We can assist with profile clearance drawings and guidance for this. Any existing National Grid easements must be acknowledged and not conflicted with unless agreed to by NGET.	The location of panels in relation to NGET's conductors is controlled by the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9]** which state that a "5.3m minimum clearance shall be maintained in still and conductor swing from the National Grid 400kv or 275kv Overhead Line (OHL) to the highest point of the PV tables". The offset from towers is to be controlled through the inclusion in Protective Provisions. The Applicant has a grid connection agreement as explained in **Grid Connection Statement [EN010159/APP/7.2].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Thorney Parish Council	The area of the proposed plans around Westwood Park, Westwood Farm & Hawthorne Hill Farm, at the extreme top right of the plan, seems totally out on a limb & it is a concern to many, as to why it has been seemingly "tagged on" to the overall proposal. It is a tiny percentage of the whole proposal & we would request its removal from it. This would also remove an issue of compulsory purchase of land.	The masterplan has been updated to remove the panels near Thorney in response to consultation feedback, please see the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]** and as secured on the **Works Plans (Volume 2: Plans/ Drawings/ Sections [EN010159/APP/2.3]**	Y
South Clifton Parish Council	The main changes and considerations the Council asked for were: 1. The removal of panels in fields around specific houses along Moor Lane and the A1133. 2. Wider bridleways, footpaths and by-ways with panels 60m from screen hedging/trees 3. Mitigations including tree, hedging and other shrubs/natural flora planting to enhance the above and to, hopefully, encourage outdoor activity. 4. The joining up of existing and new rights of way to create circular walks/rides.	1. Further offsets were embedded in the design post statutory consultation, including around properties on Moor Lane and the A1133. Details are provided in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]**. 2. Offsets from public rights of way have been maximised across the Order Limits, ranging from 15m to 130m. 3. Mitigation planting is included across the Order Limits, as detailed in the O**utline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP)) [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. 4. Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	5. All panels to be 60m from screening along all roads 6. An access point/crossing created on Wheatholme Lane/Sustrans track junction 7. The removal of One Earth access point on Moor Lane 8. The repositioning of BESS storage away from the proposed footpath 9. The inverter and substation positioning away from dwellings and consideration of noise levels in an already very quiet environment 10. The creation of a car park/picnic area on Church Lane/Sustrans access 11. Orchards/tree planting to enhance views and aid biodiversity	paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. 5. Visual screening in the form of new planting is proposed across the Order Limits. Offsets from roads range from 15m to in excess of 60m. 6. The proposed permissive path network, as shown in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, connects to the Sustrans route. 7. No access point has been proposed on Moor Lane 8. BESS will not be located within 100m of public rights of way, as controlled by the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9].** 9. Substations would not be located within 300m of residential dwellings. PCS (which house inverters) would not be located within 100m of residential dwellings without acoustic mitigation to ensure appropriate noise levels as per the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9]**. 10. The potential for a car park was considered but was not considered appropriate for inclusion within the Proposed Development.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.7]** includes provision for planting of individual trees as part of the wider mitigation strategy.	
Saxilby and Ingleby Parish Council	The opportunities for community gain are encouraged and should be explored as part of developing projects. Such opportunities can include:… • Investment in green infrastructure such as public rights of way provision and management.	New permissive paths are proposed across the Order Limits as detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	Y
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	There are 3 properties sited close to the National Cycle Track that have no buffer zone applied to their properties. A buffer zone should be applied like the isolated properties on the eastern side of the River Trent.	Bespoke offsets have been applied to all residential properties as shown on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3]**. A narrative explaining the approach to offsets is provided within the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8].** See also the **Consultation Report, [EN010159/APP/5.1].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	If the substation is not built on the brown field site of the old High Marnham Power Station, then it should be sited on the field south of Far Hill Lane with significant planting to mitigate the view from the public footpath.	The western substation is proposed on land south of Far Hill Lane. **The Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3]** and the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.7]** secure mitigation planting around this field.	Y
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	Far Hill Lane currently has a Modification Order reinstating this track as a public footpath therefore panels planned right up to the footpath edge should be removed and reduced in height.	Panels would be offset between 10-15m from Far Hill Lane.	Y
Noise			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Vodafone	It is the responsibility of the Other Parties or Contractors to undertake adequate plant location procedures. These may include searches for metallic cables which must be performed by actively inducing a signal in a cable conductor via a transmitter. A passive search is not considered sufficient.	Discussions around protective provisions are ongoing.	N

Thorney Parish Council	This kind of noise is also proven to have adverse effects on horses. Our parish is very equestrian & has several businesses that revolve around it. This is a real cause of concern. It could well be impossible to ride near these panels & they are adjacent to some of these businesses.	The Applicant notes the concerns regarding the potential impact of noise on horses. There are no specific standards that set acceptable levels of noise for equestrian activities, however we have considered appropriate methods of assessing this and include a discussion of the likely effects of noise on equestrian activities **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.15]**. It should be noted that the panels would not generate noise as they do not move to track the sun (and therefore do not have motors) and do not have integrated inverters. The sources of noise are therefore the Power Converter Stations, the substation equipment and the battery storage equipment. These would be located to minimise effects on sensitive receptors.	N

Thorney Parish Council	Residents are concerned about effects of the panels on health, both physical & mental. The noise emitted by solar panels during daylight hours can be damaging & the incessant hum can be detrimental to mental well-being.	The Applicant the concerns of the residents, and **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.15]** includes an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the proposed development on residents. To clarify, the panels that are proposed for this project do not generate any noise, as they do not move to track the sun (therefore do not have motors) and do not have integrated inverters. The sources of noise are therefore the Power Converter Stations, the substation equipment and the battery storage equipment. This equipment will be located as far as is practical from residential properties and the noise assessment will consider the likely impacts of noise from these sources. If necessary, noise mitigation measures will be incorporated into the design where required to reduce noise at residential properties. **Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010159/APP/6.16**] includes an assessment of potential noise and vibration impacts on health. No significant effects are expected from noise on human health.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Safety and Security			
Environment Agency	**PEIR, Paragraph 4.48 Battery Safety Management Plan Issue - BESS compounds** Limited details have been supplied regarding the proposed drainage arrangements at the BESS compounds. Impact: Without detail regarding the drainage strategy we are not able to confirm whether it is sufficiently protective of controlled waters. Solution: Provide a draft scope of the Battery Safety Management Plan. Additional explanation: Paragraph 4.48 states that the potential areas for location of the BESS compounds will be subject to further environmental and design works. We would like confirmation that a drainage strategy will be part of these works or included in the operational Environmental Management Plan. As stated in our Scoping response, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) have the potential to pollute the environment. Applicants should consider the impact to all environmental receptors during each phase of development. Particular attention should be applied in advance to the impacts on groundwater and surface water from the escape	Noted. We are happy to continue to consult with the Environment Agency on the **oBMSP [EN010159/APP/7.11]**, as well as the drainage design for the BESS and substation compounds.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	of firewater/foam and any contaminants that it may contain. Suitable environmental protection measures should be provided including systems for containing and managing water run-off. The applicant should ensure that there are multiple 'layers of protection' to prevent the source-pathway-receptor pollution route occurring. Table 9-2 states that during the operation phase there are predicted to be no likely significant effects with the adoption of an OSP, Operational Environmental Management Plan and a set of best-practice measures to control pollution. It is not clear whether a drainage strategy for the BESS sites that ensures controlled waters are not at risk from pollution will be included in this plan.		
Lincolnshire Fire Rescue	Provided a list of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Authority requirements relating to access for fire appliances and firefighting water supplies, BESS Requirements. No specific comments on the health and safety of the project at this stage.	Noted, the Applicant has ensured that the **Works Plan [EN010159/APP/2.3]** and the **oBSMP [EN010159/APP/7.11]** adhere to these requirements.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Nottinghamshire Police	Nationally, solar farms and their infrastructure are increasingly susceptible to attack and criminal gangs are becoming increasingly sophisticated in their methods. It would be helpful to discuss the site plans in more detail and suggest protective measures. In addition, would you be able to confirm that the Fire & Rescue Service are also being consulted.	Understood. The Applicant acknowledges the relevant authority's right to consult further and will ensure appropriate consultation to inform risk management and emergency response planning. The Applicant also consulted Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service..	N
South Clifton Parish Council	**BESS Storage** We understand the life of the batteries in the BESS storage is ten years only. Can One Earth confirm this and inform us how this will be managed and the depleted batteries disposed of? Can they also comment on the problem of fires within the storage site and the inability to douse them, resulting in harmful gases being released into the surrounding areas for as long as they are burning, which we understand is at least 3 days?	The average life of lithium-ion batteries can range from 10 – 20 years depending on the supplier, degradation, state of health of batteries and usage patterns. Battery degradation can be accounted for in the design and selection process, ensuring optimal performance over the system's lifespan. The removal, disposal, and recycling of depleted batteries is addressed in the Appendix 2.3, **Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Battery suppliers provide end-of-life management services, including recycling to ensure proper disposal under the mandate of Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) Directive 2012/19/EU [REF-23] and the Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 [REF-24]. These	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		regulations require producers to take responsibility for the collection, recycling, and environmentally sound disposal of electrical and electronic waste, with specific requirements for separate handling, recovery and treatment of batteries A layered safety approach will be used to reduce risks and ensure safety. This includes choosing safe chemistries, ensuring BESS compliance with relevant standards like NFPA 855, conducting tests such as UL 9540a, battery management systems, fire detection and suppression systems, enclosure design, maintaining safe separation distances to prevent propagation, and other measures outlined in the **oBSMP [EN010159/APP/7.11**]. This shall be followed up in detailed design stage with the development of an emergency response plan (ERP) in consultation with the local FRSs. This will include information to assist operators and firefighters in an effective fire response. A risk management plan shall also be developed along with the ERP. Although BESS fires have the potential to release harmful gases, these risks can be effectively	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		managed. A plume assessment has been conducted to assess the potential impact to air quality in the unlikely event of unplanned emissions to the air from the BESS. It demonstrates there will not be any adverse effects at a specific distance which aligns with the separation distance from the BESS to residential areas. This shall be re-run at detailed design to confirm the effects will not be worse than the original assessment. Fire responders will stay a safe distance from the smoke plume until it's confirmed to be safe, using gas detectors and air quality monitoring. We will also include plans to handle post-incident hazards as part of our pre-fire planning and recovery process.	
Socio-Economics			

Thorney Parish Council	These proposals take good land out of food production which will cause price rises for grain, flour, vegetables etc plus crops such as sugar beet with its wide uses.	The amount of land included in the Proposed Development is minimal compared to the total land used in the UK to produce these crops. Commodity prices are set on a global level, and therefore impact of removing this land from production is not significant.	N

Thorney Parish Council	The project will diminish our country's agricultural output & financially benefit our competitors & countries like China which produce many panels & their components – a long-term threat to our national security.	The largest threat to agriculture is climate change, which is already having a significant impact on crops across the UK. To meet our national targets for renewable energy would only require 0.3% of the total land in the UK, creating a minimal impact on food production. However, energy security is a national priority, which is why the current government policy is to achieve Clean Power by 2030, and to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.	N

Thorney Parish Council	Removing so much productive land will force land rental prices up, making some farms unviable & further reducing the production of crops.	There is no evidence or reason to believe that landowners would change the rental prices for their farmland due to the Proposed Development. Instead, by offering an option for landowners to diversify their finances, being a part of the Proposed Development will allow them to continue farming in other fields.	N

Thorney Parish Council	These developments offer absolutely nothing to the local community to mitigate their concerns. They could actually take jobs away from locals who work in agriculture, turf, horses & sugar. This risks adding to the problem of rural poverty rather than offering increased employment opportunities. The only people who will benefit are the landowners who lease out their land.	**Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]** includes a detailed assessment of the following components: First, existing employment within the site, including employment in agriculture to establish a clearer basis for examining any net change in jobs once operational. Second, further detail on the number of construction jobs over the duration of the life of the Proposed Development. It confirms the estimated construction jobs created by the Proposed Development to be a peak of 750, with an average of 554 full time jobs over the two year construction period. Additional site-specific information is also presented regarding the existing jobs, based on landowner surveys, which was confirmed to be 7.75 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs. During operation, the net change in direct employment was estimated to be 7.25 FTE and 9.75 indirect FTE. The Applicant has committed to creating a community benefit package, to ensure that there are local benefits to the project. The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help identify skills gaps and use local labour whenever possible,	N

described the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**

Thorney Parish Council	The use of good quality agricultural land is inappropriate & should be avoided. It will have an adverse effect on food security which is even more vital in the current unstable World situation. The money would be far better spent on bolstering agriculture, replacing the value of lost EU subsidies & valuing farmers so they don't feel they have to "diversify."	The issue of the use of BMV agricultural land is considered in detail in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. This details the amount of BMV land take (both permanent and temporary) by the Proposed Development, against a backdrop of the BMV land present within both Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, and the BMV land take to occur due to other proposed developments. These details put the use of BMV land by this Proposed Development into a local and county-wide context.	N

South Clifton Parish Council	House Prices The effect on house prices in the zone one area is difficult to assess as there are no other solar farms operational of this size and scale in the United Kingdom and no smaller ones that engulf so may small villages. The One Earth Solar Farm will be the largest planned solar farm in Europe but there has been little or no research into the economic impact on the housing market, so, we cannot understand how you can be sure that there will be no detrimental change, as you stated in our recent meeting. We would like to see your research into this as well as how local populations are affected by solar panels surrounding villages.	The EIA assesses a variety of economic impacts in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]**. These assessments are conducted in accordance with regulations and guidance as well as the Scoping Opinion that specify which topics to assess and the methodology to use. The potential impact to house values is not included in this assessment in part because there are numerous factors that affect house values and little evidence to show a direct impact due to living near a solar farm. Furthermore, although we understand that it is an important issue to the community, the potential impact on house values is not considered to be a material consideration in the planning process by the government. Instead it is a matter that is usually considered after development consent has been granted, at such time that an impact which gives rise to compensation has occurred. These are typically physical impacts, such as noise, not visual impacts. However, as noted above, we do not consider that this would be the case as the scheme has been designed carefully to take account of the potential for impacts on people's homes.	N

Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	**Economy** The transformation of the rural countryside into an industrial zone will have a significant Impact on local businesses that support the agricultural industry. It will also remove any possibility for the development of/diversification into leisure or tourism and as a result, will have a cumulative impact on the local economy. The area will not be an attractive option for families to choose and therefore there will also be a negative impact on house values. To mitigate the above there needs to be series of investments that need to be made to offset the negative impact. • For individuals the compensation might involve offering 2/3 options for people who would not benefit from any one option to be equally compensated. This could be a choice of money off energy bills, provision of solar panels and battery storage or contributions to council tax. • Property owners should be compensated for reduced property prices and the fact that houses might become unsellable.	The potential impacts on the local economy, leisure and tourism have been assessed in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17].** The potential visual impacts to the countryside have been assessed in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11**] Potential impacts on local tourism have been assessed in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17].** There are a number of recreation facilities and tourist attractions, including caravan/camp sites and pubs in the Study Area, but not within the Order Limits. This chapter also considers the impacts on public rights of way and the Sustrans route which crosses over the viaduct. The potentially sensitive receptors have been identified, and most are more than several hundred metres from the Order Limits, and thus the impacts are considered to be relatively low. The Applicant has committed to a community benefit package, which could include a mix of several benefit programmes in order to address various interests and needs. We will continue to work with the parish council and others to develop this proposal and consider the suggestions listed, however, direct compensation to compensate for a	N

- Ongoing funding should be provided for resources to preserve the community and potentially attract people to live/remain. These include the school, Fledglings pre-school and the village hall (to employ a village hall manager to organize events) as ongoing recipients, as well as a managed fund to allow local groups and the Parish Council the potential to apply for specific local community projects.

d) To include an outreach/community engagement function allowing local schools/learning disability mental health groups to volunteer/engage/learn from the work needed to manage the land and environmental mitigation projects. (Cottam Power Station had an excellent model of how this could be done successfully).

perceived impact to house values is not something within the project scope.

Outreach to schools and other educational institutions is included as a focus area in the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**

Transport and Access

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
National Highways	**Site Access and Boundary** It is noted that the site will not be accessed directly from the SRN and is located far enough from the SRN that there should be no physical impacts to our network. Access to the various site access points/ gates will be via the local road network. Consequently, we have no comments regarding site access or boundary matters.	This approach has been agreed by the Applicant and the Transport Assessment was undertaken on the basis that access to the site access points would be via the study area road network.	N
National Highways	**Operational Phase – Trip Generation** One Earth will require a team of engineers and ground workers to maintain and ensure the solar farm is running optimally including occasional maintenance. It is anticipated that during normal operations there will be no more than 15 to 20 full time staff on site daily. In addition, it is anticipated that there could be up to 10 LGV trips per day to cater for cleaning and general site maintenance. In view of this, we are unlikely to have any concerns relating to traffic impacts on our network once the site is operational.	During the operational phase, up to 10 LGV trips per day, on average, are predicted to cater for cleaning of panels and general Site maintenance. When longer term maintenance of battery units or panels is required, HGV access will be necessary with up to 12 HGV trips potentially per day as a worst case scenario. The number of vehicle trips occurring during this phase will be well below the number of movements assessed for the construction phase and significantly below the overall IEMA guidance thresholds. As such, no further assessment and mitigation is considered necessary.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
National Highways	**Construction Phase – Traffic Impact (staff)** The construction phase of the project is considered to have the greatest impact in terms of transport and potential impacts on the SRN. The construction period is estimated to take approximately 2 years, beginning in 2027 and completion in 2029. The Transport Assessment states construction staff will be located in the local area and will access the scheme from the local road network. The maximum daily trip generation is stated to be 220 vehicle trips (two-way trips) per day during the peak of staff requirements. National Highways will require an hourly breakdown of two-way trips on the SRN for construction staff. A proposed staff travel plan is said to help reduce single occupancy car journeys. The travel plan aims to ensure 80% of staff arrive to the site by minibus, 10% by LGV and 10% by car. National Highways will require further information on the predicted number of workers during the construction period, where they are likely to be commuting from, and how the proposed mini-bus service would be operated.	**ES Vol 3, Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** includes an hourly breakdown on peak construction traffic as requested by National Highways. **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** illustrates how development trips have been established. These are on a first principle basis, given the nature of the Project in the construction phase. Construction staff will be subject to a contract requiring the use of a Staff Travel Plan. The Travel Plan as a requirement of the Construction Traffic Management Plan and would be secured via the DCO and National Highways would be consulted in its drafting.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
National Highways	**Construction Phase - Traffic Impacts (materials/deliveries)** Construction traffic for material delivery is proposed to be split between the west and east development areas. The east development area is proposed to be accessed and materials sources from local quarries via the A1133 corridor. The western area will source materials from local quarries and supplies via the A1(M)/Markham Moor Junction. Electric components, plant and general deliveries are likely to originate along the A1(M) from Lincoln. Whilst the above is clear, to understand which route(s) to the site will be the most utilised we would need to see evidence of how HGVs and non-HGVs are likely to distribute on the SRN (A1/M). The Transport Assessment states that at the peak of construction there will be 554 HGV Journeys (for both east and west development sites). Conversely, the Consultation Booklet states that at the peak of construction there will be 272 HGV movements. National Highways therefore seeks clarification on HGV construction traffic numbers to be routed via the SRN. 4 To identify any potential	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** provides the traffic generation for the Project during the construction phase. DfT data for the A1 in 2023, suggests that the road accommodates 43,080 vehicles per day AADT**.** The traffic impact of the development on the A1, if all A57 west of Dunham traffic (381 vehicles per day) enters the A1 would be 0.88%. This level of additional traffic is considered not to have any detrimental impact on the operation of the trunk road network. **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** includes an hourly breakdown on peak construction traffic as requested by National Highways, including both HGVs and non-HGVs on the SRN. The breakdown to hourly flows is provided, in 2 way flows per vehicle class.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	impacts on SRN junctions, HGV trip generation should be broken down into hourly two-way HGV trips, and in turn, the number of two-way HGV trips through any SRN junction.		
National Highways	**Recommended Transport Assessment Methodology** In light of the above comments, it is advised that further evidence be presented to demonstrate how construction trip generation has been estimated and distributed on the SRN. Hourly trip generation figures should be presented with further detailed assessment of the network AM and PM peaks to be determined. National Highways would also wish to be consulted on the Construction Worker Travel Plan.	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** illustrates how development trips have been established. These are on a first principle basis, given the nature of the Proposed Development in the construction phase. The Transport Assessment includes an hourly breakdown on both AM and PM peak construction traffic as requested by National Highways. The Travel Plan would be secured via the DCO through the Construction Traffic Management Plan and National Highways would be consulted in its drafting.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
National Highways	**Abnormal Loads** It is proposed that abnormal loads, particularly for the west development site will utilise the A1(M). The Outline CTMP states that a detailed Abnormal Indivisible Load assessment is being prepared giving a breakup of the movements of the loads. We welcome this approach and look forward to receiving more information to review.	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** identifies the potential routes for abnormal load deliveries. The RSR includes separate routes to both the western and eastern areas of the Project and details the load characteristics, proposed routes, swept path assessment results and a weight review.	N
Natural England	Natural England have no specific comments on Transport and Access, however we would suggest the consideration of the below points in the design of the Project.	Noted with responses to points raised by Natural England below.	N
Natural England	**Access and Recreation** Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help improve people's access to the natural environment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths, together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways should be considered. Links to urban fringe areas should also be explored to strengthen access networks, reduce	Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** These will improve people's access to the natural environment.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	fragmentation, and promote wider green infrastructure.		
Natural England	**Rights of Way, Access land, Coastal access and National Trails** Paragraphs 104 and 180 of the NPPF highlight the important of public rights of way and access. Development should consider potential impacts on access land, common land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the any nearby National Trails. The National Trails website www.nationaltrail.co.uk provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts.	Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** Offsets from public rights of way have been maximised across the Order Limits, ranging from 15m to 130m. No impacts on National Trails are expected.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Canal and River Trust	**Transport and Access** The River Trent is a commercial waterway, where the transport of equipment and materials may be possible which could help to minimise the need to utilise the Highway Network. Chapter 13, Volume 1 of the PEIR, and the Transport Assessment5 addresses the use of the river navigation for freight stating: "A review of the potential for access to our Project site using the river has been undertaken and is reported in Appendix 13-1: Transport Assessment. Our Project site does not feature any suitable river quay facilities to offload materials and it is considered that the movement of bulk materials is not feasible. The river will however be used for the movement of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) associated with our Project, wherever possible"; and that "it is expected that AIL associated with the transport of transformer components will commence from the quay at Gunness on the River Trent". We note that the Trust is not the navigation authority for the river at Gunness. As outlined in in our previous response, we would have concerns if heavy vehicles were routed	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** identifies the potential routes for abnormal load deliveries. This includes separate routes to both the western and eastern areas of the Project and details the load characteristics, proposed routes, swept path assessment results and a weight review. No structures owned or maintained by the Canal & Rivers Trust will be crossed on the proposed access routes. Full consideration of river quay facilities has been considered in the routing options.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	over narrow Trust canal bridges, in the wider area including those on the Chesterfield Canal. However, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan provided in Chapter 13 clarifies that construction traffic routing would be via the A57 to land parcels on the western side of the river, and from the A1133 for land to the east. We understand that a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be developed through the DCO process. We request that: construction traffic routing with the CTMP avoids narrow and weight restricted bridges owned by the Trust; and the use of the river for the movement of AIL is considered as the project develops and discussed in the ES.		
Vodafone	Prior to commencing any work or moving heavy plant or equipment over any portion of the site, the Other Parties or Contractor shall notify Vodafone of their intentions. This may be done by contacting Vodafone via the contact list in Appendix B. Upon receipt of this notification, Vodafone will identify if their apparatus is affected. If any Vodafone apparatus is affected by the works	Arrangements will be made with the contractors to make contact with Vodafone prior to site works commencing. Relevant protective provisions will be agreed with Vodaphone if required.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	then they will arrange for the necessary records to be provided and confirm details of Vodafone apparatus and network operated within the affected area or adjacent to the proposed work site.		
JG Pears	NPS EN-3 [REF-1] states that were possible all public rights of way ("PROW") should be kept open, where possible, across the development site throughout construction and the lifetime of the development. Development should also protect infrastructure such as PROW to ensure that the public can continue to utilise these PROW for commuting and leisure purposes, so that the countryside is accessible to all and is able to be enjoyed. We understand that it is proposed that all rights of way will be kept open, subject to minor temporary diversions/closures during construction of OESF. However, JG Pears request additional details of such diversions/temporary closures and what procedures will be undertaken in the event any unexpected PROW closures are required.	Access to and from JG Pears land during the construction process to all active travel routes is described in **Streets, rights of way and access plans [EN010159/APP/2.4]**. The Applicant's approach to managing construction traffic is set out in the **oCTMP [EN010159/APP/7.9]**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	Access to footpaths/developing permissive paths. • Permissive paths should connect to existing rights of way (RoW) in a way that allows for circular routes and improve access between villages. • To link the village of Newton on Trent to the Sustram Cycle Track. • To create a car park opposite the Marnham site, next to the agricultural buildings, to allow walkers and cyclists to park their cars safely when accessing the cycle track. d) Not all requests/suggestions can be made at this point without an up-to-date map therefore it will be necessary to establish further details at a later meeting with One Earth.	Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** The proposed permissive path network, as shown in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7],** connects to the Sustrans route. The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to include a car park as part of proposed enhancements to the PRoW network.	N
Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	• There should be no traffic through the villages. • The railway connection should be used to bring in materials.	Traffic routing is described in **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**. Traffic routing has been restricted to the main A and B class roads wherever possible. The main	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		site access junction in the western area of the development allows all traffic from the A57 to bypass Ragnall. HGV traffic has been minimised as far as is possible through Dunham, with bulk deliveries to either side of the River Trent being routed to stay with each side of the river. Traffic at Darlton is restricted solely to the A57. A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan has been provided to demonstrate the approved access routes and how traffic will be restricted to these routes.	
Thorney Parish Council	Access to rural areas is a known benefit to health. Millions were spent on the Sustrans development to give people from the whole area, including Lincoln & Newark, an open area to enjoy, to walk, cycle, ride horses etc. We are appalled at the plans so close to this facility which is used by many residents, accessed at Thorney Bridge.	There are no proposals to close access to the Sustrans National Cycle Network route. Access during the construction process to all active travel routes is described **in Streets, rights of way and access plans [EN010159/APP/2.4]**	No

Table J-1.2 - Summary of Section 42(1)(b) responses and regard had by topic

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Air Quality			
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 14 – Pg 2 onwards Air Quality** In respect of Air Quality, it is noted that the PEIR seeks to screen out many of the impacts in relation to the construction, operational and decommissioning phases. In doing so, reliance is placed upon the following: Dust Management Plan (DMP) Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan. As these reports are not currently available and have not been subject to review, limited reliance can be placed upon them for the purpose of screening out such impacts. As is mentioned throughout this response, NSDC would welcome the early opportunity to review all draft management plans, prior to the DCO submission, so that we can confirm their adequacy. This is particularly important where they are proposed for use as a tool to screen out the necessity for further assessment and/or where they are being relied upon for mitigation purposes.	The risk of effects from dust emissions has been assessed in line with the methodology set out in the relevant Institute of Air Quality Management guidance, and is set out in **ES Vol 2, Chapter 13: Air Quality [EN010159/APP/6.13].** Mitigation measures from the guidance that are commensurate with the risks identified have been set out in the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** With these measures in place, there will be no significant effects as a result of dust emissions during construction or decommissioning. The potential air quality effects during the construction and decommissioning phases that are being referred to are amenity and human health effects arising from dust/particulate emissions. Due to the timing of the preparation of the CEMP (and, as acknowledged by NSDC, that document's reliance on the outcome of the EIA) there has not been time to share the CEMP ahead of submission	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		of the Application. However, the Applicant is keen to engage with the Council post submission in relation to the proposed mitigation measures. A meeting is scheduled for 25 February 2025 with the Applicant and all the host authorities to discuss DCO requirements, and whilst the timing of that meeting will not allow changes to be made to the draft DCO that is submitted with the Application, the Applicant will look to incorporate agreed amendments in the next revision of the DCO.	
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 14: Air Quality** It is noted that the general conclusion of this section is that the main pollutants of concern relate to the construction and decommissioning activities (dust and PM10). It is also noted that the ES will contain an air quality computer dispersion model which will be used to quantify the impacts that road traffic emissions will have on air quality receptor locations	The risk of effects from dust emissions has been assessed in line with the methodology set out in the relevant Institute of Air Quality Management guidance and is set out in **Chapter 13: Air Quality [EN010159/APP/6.13].** The significance of effects arising from road traffic emissions have been assessed using dispersion modelling and the assessment details and results are presented in **Chapter 13: Air Quality [EN010159/APP/6.13].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	**Air Quality** LCC supports comments made by WLDC in respect of air quality as pollution control authority.	Noted.	N
Alternatives and Need			
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 4: Our Project** Para's 4.20- 4.35 The justification for the approach to site selection is noted in principle. Solar energy requires a point of connection to the grid, and it also requires certain topographical and land constraints in order to achieve a site area of sufficient size to make a development viable. However, WLDC do not necessarily agree with the following statement within this Chapter. *4.31. Our Site was chosen as there are relatively few residential properties in immediate proximity to our Site and the impact on those that are can*	The Applicant has reduced the potential impacts to local properties by creating offsets around these properties and then proposing sensitive landscaping to help screen panels, when needed. This is described further in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].** The potential visual impacts are fully assessed in the **ES, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11]** based on the proposed maximum heights of the panels.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	be effectively mitigated through measures such as offsets and sensitive landscaping. There are numerous residential properties/settlements which adjoin the north site boundary within the West Lindsey District, which would be impacted by the proposals. In particular the dwellings at Newton on Trent as well as those to the north of the A57 (Park Farm Lane/Cottages). In our scoping consultation response we raised concerns that the panel heights had not been confirmed. Para 4.37 states that; The final option, as presented in our Project, includes the bottom of the flood panels to be raised up to 1.8m above ground level. This includes a 300mm freeboard (i.e. gap between the flood level and base of the panels) to allow for debris in the event of flood to pass beneath the solar panels. The Parameter Plan details that maximum heights of the panels will be 3.8m AGL (max within Flood Zones Areas). Other areas outside of the Flood Zones show panels at 1 3.5m height.		

Mansfield District Council	The application boundary which relates to the proposed development is located a considerable distance from the administrative boundary of Mansfield (in excess of 20 kilometres). Transboundary impacts and cumulative effects associated with the proposed development cannot be discounted but given the nature and location of the proposal, it is not considered that it would be likely that the development would have a material impact on our District. The main consideration from our perspective in our statutory role as the Local Planning Authority, the main consideration that we would highlight is the Mansfield District Local Plan (2013-2033) [REF-25] which was adopted in September 2020. Although the MDLP should be treated as a material consideration in the determination of the aforementioned NSIP, the level of weight afforded to the policies within the MDLP will likely reflect the geographic distance from our District.	Impacts in terms of cumulative effects have been assessed in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18**], however the Local Development Plan documents for the neighbouring authorities have not been included within the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]**. There is only a requirement to consider Development Plan documents that we consider to be relevant to the Proposed Development, due to the distance from the Order Limits we do not consider that the MDLP has bearing on the proposals. The National and Local Policies we do consider of relevance have been assessed in the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.3].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Biodiversity			
Lincolnshire County Council	LCC is of the opinion that survey work undertaken to date employs appropriate methods and appears to have been undertaken to a good standard. LCC notes that the information provided does not comprehensively cover the full extent of the development boundary. This is stated as being due to access limitations and boundary changes since the original surveys were carried out. The Applicant states that additional ecological survey work will be undertaken to cover areas not previously incorporated. This should include potential cable routes linking to the High Marnham substation. LCC will be happy to provide additional comments when the results of this additional work are available. The Applicant has undertaken a data search against records held in the Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre hosted by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (GLNP). This has ensured that sites protected or important at international, national and local levels have been correctly identified. LCC welcomes the Applicant's intention to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as a result of the development. Whilst this is not currently	The survey programme for the One Earth Solar Farm project continued following the submission of formal consultation. The data gathered is described in and underpins the assessment described within **ES, Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** Mitigation, compensation and enhancement (including as Biodiversity Net Gain) are described in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** The **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]** provides information on the types of habitats to be delivered as part of the Proposed Development. The detailed design of these will be agreed with the relevant planning authorities through review and approval of the LEMP.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	mandatory for NSIPs it is good practice. LCC advises that the delivery of BNG should be quantified by employing Defra's Statutory Biodiversity Metric [REF-26]. LCC notes the content of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) and welcomes approaches to the establishment and management of ecological mitigation and enhancement measures set out therein. Little information is currently presented about the potential design and layout of ecological mitigation and enhancement, but LCC notes the Applicant's intention to continue to develop the design as the environmental assessment work progresses. LCC welcomes the Applicant's commitment to the development mitigation and enhancement measures to various species and species groups but advises that the applicant should ensure clarity around measures are mitigation and which are genuine enhancement. 3 LCC advises that Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping has been produced by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership and a Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Greater Lincolnshire is currently being developed. These		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	documents will provide useful guidance when considering the design of new habitats. LCC would welcome the opportunity to provide further input to the detailed design of new habitats to be established on site at the appropriate stage.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. Introduction, EIA, Description of Site and Surrounding Area, Our Project and Methodology for the PEIR. We have reviewed these chapters and have no observations to make.	Noted.	N
Lincolnshire County Council	Cumulative effects: There are several development proposals of varying scales in the vicinity of this proposal. A detailed assessment of the cumulative impacts of these proposals on sensitive ecological receptors in the area should be undertaken in the ES. This should include habitat change, as well as the magnitude of change, that will result from conversion of arable	Cumulative effects comment is noted and welcomed. Cumulative effects were discussed with relevant consultees and details are set out and assessed within **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN10159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	farmland to a solar farm, alongside other solar NSIP projects in the area. LCC's Infrastructure Ecologist will be happy to work with the Applicant, their consultants and other stakeholders throughout the EIA process to ensure that ecological elements of the application are properly addressed, and that scheme secures the maximum potential benefits for biodiversity.		
Biodiversity: Biodiversity Net Gain			
West Lindsey District Council	It is recognised that the 10% BNG for NSIP proposals will become mandatory in November 2025. The Chapter states that the ES will include the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric Calculator [REF-26], this is welcomed. We would expect a scheme of this scale to be providing a minimum of 10%, which is also required by Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan [REF-27]. More precise comments re BNG are not possible at this stage. Many solar schemes are capable of achieving substantially higher levels of net gain which will become important due to the substantial scale of the project and the impacts	We are aware that some of the surveys were incomplete due to the stage of development at consultation within an evolving scheme. Survey work in 2024 included habitat classification of additional land parcels included later on in 2023, reptile survey, water vole and otter survey, and acoustic bat survey and monitoring. Survey work in 2025 comprises fish habitat surveys at crossing points, additional breeding bird survey and additional great crested newt survey. Biodiversity Net Gain well in excess of 10% is to be delivered as part of the Proposed Development –	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	identified, alongside the cumulative impact associated with the other NSIPs. Para 7.12. It is noted that the site boundary has changed a number of times over the duration of the survey site visits and new areas were incorporated. On Figure 7-2 it appears that there are large areas of land that have not been included within the Phase 1 survey, instead studying of aerial images has been carried out. It is appreciated that the site layout has changed, involving new land owners etc. and that recent flooding events did not allow for some survey walk to be carried out. Nevertheless there are some concerns with this, we would have at least expected a walk over survey of these areas at this stage. It is noted that Table 7-10 shows that there would be no significant or adverse impacts on the identified ecological features.	see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	
Bassetlaw District Council	Summary/Suggested Conditions Whilst the core of the site may largely be of low biodiversity value, there are aspects of the site which are of local significance and habitats such as the River Trent which hold regional significance. Undoubtedly ongoing survey work will reveal the assemblages on site and where mitigation and	The Proposed Development incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan designed to achieve an uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and deliver other landscape benefits as described within the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. This plan prioritises enhanced ecological connectivity and aligns with local conservation priorities, ensuring a	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	compensation are to be targeted but it is expected this compensation will be befitting of a nationally significant project and not simply aimed at achieving a numerical gain, which, given the habitats currently present, would be simple.	positive contribution to the surrounding environment. The design process has been informed by extensive field survey data, enabling a targeted approach to habitat creation, enhancement, and management. See **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	
Bassetlaw District Council	There remains a requirement to deliver a net gain in biodiversity in line with para. 180(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework [REF-4] and Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan [REF-28]. It is however considered that generating a net gain from the numerical values of floral diversity alone on a project of this size is inadequate. Bassetlaw District Council will be looking for, as indicated in the literature supplied thus far, an holistic approach to compensation whereby existing species are provided with habitat of increased quality, connectivity and in some cases quantity. Existing wildlife thoroughfares that are identified through the ongoing survey work, such as the River Trent for example, must be bolstered and shielded from the potentially negative impacts of solar parks such as the interference with the breeding success of winged aquatic invertebrates, herbicide use and lighting. It is	The Proposed Development incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan designed to achieve an uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and deliver other landscape benefits as described within the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. This plan prioritises enhanced ecological connectivity and aligns with local conservation priorities, ensuring a positive contribution to the surrounding environment. The design process has been informed by extensive field survey data, enabling a targeted approach to habitat creation, enhancement, and management. See **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	hoped that compensation will be qualitative as well as quantitative and create/install features that might ordinarily be left out of commercial schemes where BNG metric scores are paramount.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Likely significant (negative and positive) effects. The emerging ecological assessment identifies that it is not expected there would be any likely significant negative effects on the ecological features scoped into the assessment as these would mostly occur during the construction phase and would be mitigated by measures set out in the outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan. However, likely positive significant effects are equally important and the PEIR indicates that the project is expected to deliver likely significant positive effects "…resulting from habitat creation and enhancement delivered through embedded measures and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)." Whilst this is expected, and welcomed, caution is raised in respect of BNG. In our response of 10/04/2024 we brought to the applicant's attention that since our initial comments of 01/12/2023, NSDC had adopted an interim BNG policy	Noted. Please see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** where Newark and Sherwood District Council policies on BNG are referenced in Section 6.2.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	regarding 'strategic significance' [REF-29]. We note that this policy has not been included in Appendix 7-1: Key Policy and Legislation of the PEIR under the 'Local Policy' Section. We consider it should have been included as this is a relevant local planning policy. If the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not been published by the time that any BNG calculations relating to land falling within the Newark and Sherwood District are undertaken, we consider that this policy should be followed.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Likely significant (negative and positive) effects. Practitioners of BNG are aware that the process has the potential to be somewhat restrictive and can constrain some innovative habitat creation and enhancement proposals. Large scale projects like this provide opportunities for innovative biodiversity enhancements. Therefore, whilst the proposal for the project to voluntarily provide at least a measurable 10% BNG is welcomed, we would suggest that beyond 10% gain, proposed habitat creation and habitat management measures should not be entirely steered by the desire to generate an even higher percentage	The design of environmental measures has been careful to both deliver Biodiversity Net Gain as measured by the Statutory Biodiversity Metric, as well as deliver specific elements for local conservation priorities. The approach has been described to and discussed with stakeholders to ensure that the Proposed Development can maximise opportunity. See **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	gain, and as a result, potentially stifle innovation. Within our own district, beyond a 10% gain, we would potentially give more merit to some proposed biodiversity measures based on what is being proposed, rather than the BNG they would generate. This could be particularly important in relation to ensuring that proposed biodiversity measures take into full consideration local nature conservation priorities, which is something that has been highlighted by many consultees during the consultation process to date. One area where this could apply relates to non-statutorily designated Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). The single LWS that falls within the proposed Site, and four of the seven LWS that are immediately adjacent to the proposed Site, are within the Newark and Sherwood District. Because of the non-statutory nature of the LWS designation, there is no legal obligation on the owners of LWS to manage them in any specific way, but they are a material consideration within the planning process. If the owners of these LWS's were agreeable, the project could consider their current condition (e.g., do they still meet the LWS selection criteria, are they currently being managed favourably		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	etc.?) and consider supporting the owners in terms of future management of these sites, along with the creation of appropriate buffering habitats and creation of habitats linking these sites to other features.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecological Effects - If the land is used for biodiversity, it would not be available for agriculture. However even if it is available for some form of cutting or grazing it is unlikely that the ALC grade will change significantly during the lifetime of the project. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Further to this, there is the possibility that where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important, this could be recognised through environmental designations, which limit its return to active agricultural use. Chapter 10 – Pg 2 onwards.	The Proposed Development would be decommissioned in accordance with the **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** as secured in the **dDCO [EN010159/APP/3.1].** Prior to start of decommissioning, a Soil Management Plan (SMP) following the guidance at the time will be prepared (secured through DCO Requirement). This will be based upon the **Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and the SMP prepared for the construction phase. Soil handling operations will be appropriately supervised to ensure compliance with the SMP to ensure soils are suitable for re-use within the Proposed Development. The appropriate management of soil resources will maintain soil volumes and quality to prevent loss/lowering of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade at decommissioning and	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		thus potential loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) status.	
Biodiversity: Habitats			
Lincolnshire County Council	Botanical interest: The PEIR only contains limited reference to botanical interest on the site. The applicant should ensure that they have undertaken sufficiently detailed and appropriately timed botanical survey work to be confident that the presence of any scarce arable plant species occurring on the site are detected.	A summary of the habitat survey information is provided in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**, with further details in Appendix 6.3. This information has been updated since the issue of PEIR and includes information necessary to undertake the assessment robustly.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	Ancient woodland: LCC advises that ancient woodland data for the county is currently being updated by the GLNP. The Applicant may already have access to this data but should ensure that the most up to date information including from field surveys is being used to assess impacts.	Comment regarding ancient woodland is noted and the desk study has been updated using the information available from the Ancient Woodland Inventory. Please see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** for more detail.	N
Bassetlaw District Council	It is recognised that the core of the site is predominantly open and exposed intensively managed arable land. However, this land will at times be fallow, in ley or sewn with crops beneficial to wildlife such as those used in agri-environment schemes and these variables allow the otherwise intensive arable land to offer seasonal value to a range of wildlife. There are also networks of hedges, scrub and tree cover, ponds and, ditches within this landscape that offer value to fauna as standalone features but critically, are likely to provide thoroughfares and links through the landscape to wildlife. The River Trent corridor bisects the site and is a significant habitat, link through the landscape and likely focal point for a large assemblage of species. Bassetlaw District Council is aware of Open	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land within the boundary of the proposed site, as well as areas dominated by plants listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) [REF-30].		
Bassetlaw District Council	There is only one statutory protected site within reasonable proximity to the site and at >1000m it is effectively isolated, thus there are unlikely to be any significant effects or considerations. Numerous non-statutory sites are within proximity to the site and providing effective mitigation is employed during the construction and operational phases it is likely these sites will benefit from the absence of farming inputs, connectivity and faunal abundance a well-considered scheme might bring.	The closest statutory protected site is Spalford Warren, SSSI, approximately 2KM south of the Order Limits. The are no potential effects identified associated with the Proposed Development.	N
Biodiversity: Protected Species			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Bassetlaw District Council	Numerous protected, red listed and rare species are likely to be recorded during the ongoing surveys of the site and it is expected that comprehensive survey effort will help guide much of the mitigation and compensation for the proposal and ensure success. It is on balance envisaged many species groups could benefit from the proposals.	A full survey programme has been undertaken, and the design has sought to provide habitat protection and enhancement that provides opportunity for a wide range of species including those identified as local conversation priorities. Additional survey work is being undertaken in 2025, although this is not critical for concluding a robust assessment.	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Assessment of likely significant effects on foraging bats. In previous comments made to the applicant, NSDC raised concern regarding the scope and extent of the survey work undertaken to assess potential impacts on foraging bats. This was also discussed during the meeting in March and included in the April response by NSDC. Section 7.150 of the PEIR has confirmed that additional surveys are being undertaken in relation to the activity of bats within the Site. In our response of 11/04/2024 we requested clarification regarding the design/scope of the proposed additional bat activity surveys, but we are not aware that this has been provided.	Bat surveys undertaken in 2023 and 2024 are detailed in Appendix 6.4 of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** These have been discussed with Newark and Sherwood District Council.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Assessment of likely significant effects on riparian mammals (Otter and Water Vole). In our comments at the EIA scoping stage, we noted the limited survey work that had been undertaken for these priority species but acknowledged that the scoping report indicated that additional survey work for water vole and otter would be done in 2024. The PEIR has confirmed that additional survey work is being undertaken so we look forward to that survey work being considered within the Environmental Statement.	Noted. Otter and water vole surveys undertaken in 2024 and results are detailed in Appendix 6.7 of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Assessment of likely significant effects on common reptiles, specifically grass snake.** In our comments on the scoping report, we considered there should be some assessment via targeted survey work for reptiles, particularly grass snake. The PEIR has confirmed that additional survey work is being undertaken in 2024 (specifically for grass snake), but this will be via sampling surveys rather than survey of all riparian/bankside habitat within the Site. Whilst this is likely a proportionate approach, we would expect the Environmental Statement (or supporting appendix) to provide a rationale and methodology for determining sample size and	Noted. Reptile survey information can be found in Appendix 6.9 of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	sample locations. We also note and welcome that reptiles are scoped in (Table 7-8 Defining Importance of Ecological Features within the PEIR).		
Lincolnshire County Council	Bats: LCC notes the detection of both serotine and barbastelle bats during surveys in 2023. As previously advised, these records are highly significant in a Lincolnshire context. The serotine record is particularly significant as there have only been a handful of records across the county.	Initial reference to an acoustic serotine record was assessed by Neil Middleton (Managing Director of Batability – a recognised UK bat expert) who advised that it was likely a Nyctalus using only the fm call. The bat baseline has been updated to reflect this. The barbastelle calls are highly distinctive, and we are confident in these records. An assessment of bats is provided in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** The overall effect on bats of the Proposed Development is assessed as not significant.	N
Lincolnshire County Council	Breeding birds: LCC notes the detection of three Schedule 1 species during field surveys. The presence of these species should be taken into account during construction to avoid offences potentially being committed.	Environmental measures for breeding birds are described in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** The overall effect on skylark of the Proposed Development is assessed as not significant. The overall effect on other breeding birds of the Proposed Development is assessed as Significant Beneficial.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	Great crested newt: As previously advised, given the proximity of pond 11 to the site boundary and the previously confirmed presence of GCN both in pond 11 in 2006, LCC believes it would be advisable to undertake eDNA surveys in pond 11 to confirm whether the species is still present in the area as the species may be using terrestrial habitat on parts of the development site. Failure to do so may result in an offence being committed or unforeseen delays to construction should the species' presence be identified at a late stage.	The assessment includes waterbodies within the draft Order Limits and a 250m buffer, but pond 11 is outside of this buffer. See **Appendix 6.6: Great Crested Next Baseline [EN010159/APP/6.21]**.	N
Lincolnshire County Council	Badger, Otter and Water vole: LCC notes that additional surveys for these species are planned due to changes in the site boundary. Invasive non-native species (INNS): LCC welcomes the commitment to the production of an Invasive Species Management Plan. This should set out details of appropriate controls and working methods aimed at preventing the spread of INNS.	Survey information for badger, otter and water vole from 2024 is provided in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N
Lincolnshire County Council	**Ecological Effect** If the land is used for biodiversity, it would not be available for agriculture. However even if it is available for some form of cutting or grazing it is unlikely that the ALC grade will change	The Proposed Development would be decommissioned in accordance with the **ODEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** as secured in the **dDCO [EN010159/APP/3.1].** Prior to start of decommissioning, a Soil Management Plan (SMP)	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	significantly during the life of the project. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Long term, where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important there is the possibility of land becoming assigned with environmental designations, such as SSSI status, though generally this has not so far occurred on other solar sites. Consultation Ongoing consultation with Natural England as the appropriate authority is anticipated and encouraged.	following the guidance at the time will be prepared (secured through DCO Requirement). This will be based upon the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and the SMP prepared for the construction phase. Soil handling operations will be appropriately supervised to ensure compliance with the SMP to ensure soils are suitable for re-use within the Proposed Development. The appropriate management of soil resources will maintain soil volumes and quality to prevent loss/lowering of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade at decommissioning and thus potential loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) status. The Applicant has engaged with Natural England on both soils and biodiversity. Agreement has been reached with Natural England on the contents of the oSMP on (27 January 2025).	
Buried and Cultural Heritage			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage** It is recognised that a desk-based assessment has been completed. Study Area- 11.9.- It is noted that the assessment is based on a 2km radius around the site. The Roman Vexillation Fortress (Scheduled Monument) lies within the West Lindsey District and is included as an important receptor. This Scheduled monument will be within an area labelled as a Biodiversity Enhancement Area. Substantial setbacks have been incorporated around the Roman Vexillation Fortress Scheduled Monument to mitigate effects to appreciation of its likely historic functionality and strategic role as a military installation, and its present role in the landscape. There is no development is proposed on or directly adjacent to the two Scheduled Monuments within the site boundaries. It is noted that Table 11-3 states that there would be a Significant Adverse (Temporary, Indirect) impact upon designated heritage Assets within a 1km radius. During the operational phase it has been concluded that the impact would not be significant for all remaining designated heritage assets within 1km (apart from those explicitly stated)	A detailed assessment of effects, including on the Roman Vexillation Fortress Scheduled Monument, is provided in **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10]**. There is no potential for any direct likely significant effects on designated assets within 1km of the Order Limits during construction. Effects arising during the construction stage will be temporary, limited to the construction period only and reversible. All effects will be local and indirect, unless otherwise specified.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage** It is recognised that a desk-based assessment has been completed. Study Area- 11.9.- It is noted that the assessment is based on a 2km radius around the site. The Roman Vexillation Fortress (Scheduled Monument) lies within the West Lindsey District and is included as an important receptor. This Scheduled monument will be within an area labelled as a Biodiversity Enhancement Area. Substantial setbacks have been incorporated around the Roman Vexillation Fortress Scheduled Monument to mitigate effects to appreciation of its likely historic functionality and strategic role as a military installation, and its present role in the landscape. There is no development is proposed on or directly adjacent to the two Scheduled Monuments within the site boundaries. It is noted that Table 11-3 states that there would be a Significant Adverse (Temporary, Indirect) impact upon designated heritage Assets within a 1km radius. During the operational phase it has been concluded that the impact would not be significant for all remaining designated heritage assets within 1km (apart from those explicitly stated)	A detailed assessment of effects, including on the Roman Vexillation Fortress Scheduled Monument, is provided in **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10]**. There is no potential for any direct likely significant effects on designated assets within 1km of the Order Limits during construction. Effects arising during the construction stage will be temporary, limited to the construction period only and reversible. All effects will be local and indirect, unless otherwise specified.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	We are concerned with the approach put forward for archaeology on this NSIP and the lack of archaeological baseline evidence provided at this stage of the NSIP. The Preliminary Environmental Impact Report should describe in detail how they intend to achieve what is required for a competent and robust Environmental Impact Assessment. No desk-based assessment has been submitted yet; it would normally be expected as the first step in archaeological evaluation. This along with geophysical survey and a robust trenching programme constitute the standard suite for archaeological evaluation. The results of all these stages are required as baseline evidence to inform reasonable mitigation of the developmental impact across the redline boundary, including the cable route, as the range of proposed developmental impacts on a landscape scale will damage and destroy currently unknown surviving archaeology. We understand the geophysical survey is ongoing, and there are currently discussions to arrange a meeting to discuss the applicant's	A preliminary review of the buried heritage baseline was carried out to support the PEIR. A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and it constitute the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]**. This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable route. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** includes a review of the environmental measures and likely archaeological mitigation that will be implemented as part of the Proposed Development. A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. The Applicant considers the combination of the assessments undertaken as part of the DBA, the geophysical survey, and the field evaluation carried	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	approach to trial trenching which apparently will cover only a few selected sites. It will only be these areas, if sufficient trenching is undertaken to adequately identify the archaeological potential, which will have sufficient baseline evidence be able to move forward into reasonable and informed mitigation which is proportional to the significance of the archaeology and to the impact of the development.	out to date a robust, proportionate and appropriate baseline collection to inform the DCO.	
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	The lack of detail on site-specific evaluation does not align with the total mitigation of virtually all developmental impacts suggested by **Table 10-7.** **The Buried Heritage Chapter** concludes with a table with 'Preliminary Assessment of likely significant effects, after mitigations/environmental measures' which states that piling will cause 'No likely significant effects (Negligible),' and indeed every other developmental impact including plant movement and hard landscaping is either negligible or minor adverse. For this minimal post-mitigation impact level to be achieved as detailed	A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and it constitute the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable routing. A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	in Table 10-7, field evaluation would need to be virtually total. This approach, while laudable, is virtually impossible. The whole of the redline boundary would need intensive intrusive evaluation work to identify every surviving archaeological feature in the impact zone. The more usual and more workable approach is to undertake reasonable proportionate evaluation across the redline boundary to have sufficient understanding of the locations, extent, depth and significance of archaeologically sensitive areas and to move through an appropriate fit for purpose mitigation strategy to ensure that significant archaeology is preserved either in situ or by record. The rest of the site is then subject to development.	evaluation provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** includes a review of the environmental measure and likely archaeological mitigation that will be implemented as part of the Proposed Development.	
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	As archaeologists we are aware that 3 to 5% trenching as recommended in emerging regional guidance will identify some but not all of the surviving archaeology, but it needs to pass the test of reasonableness. The PEIR submission states this is a development over 1500ha (Volume 1, Chapter 1-	The Applicant considers the extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance by providing the required evidence to inform the DCO application whilst limiting the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	6). There will be hundreds of thousands of piles and many kilometres of cable trenches over the 965ha proposed solar array area (multiplied by the number of refits over the proposed 60-year lifetime of the scheme) all going below the depth of any surviving archaeology.	The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 4.50 in Chapter 1** cites the Rochdale Envelope and its guiding NSIP Advice Note Nine [REF-31]. We would like to point out the Advice Note states that 'Implementation of the Rochdale Envelope assessment approach should only be used where it is necessary and should not be treated as a blanket opportunity to allow for insufficient detail in the assessment. Applicants should make every effort to finalise details applicable to the Proposed Development prior to submission of their DCO application. Indeed, as explained earlier in this Advice Note, it will be in all parties' interests for the Applicant to provide as much information as possible to inform the Pre-application consultation process.' (5.2) Where the developer proposes the Rochdale Envelope in dealing with their application, it is essential that a full understanding of the archaeological resource is achieved in the EIA to allow for informed and appropriate mitigation of the unknown/undecided elements of the development at a later date. This can only be achieved through evaluation of the full impact zone._**Section 4.69 in Chapter 1** concludes with	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	‘the aim of restoring the land to its pre-construction condition following the temporary construction use and at the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development, after decommissioning.’ This is not possible for archaeology, which as stated in NPPF [REF-4] is ‘an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.’ (para 195) Impacts to archaeology are permanent and irreversible, and significance can only be determined with adequate baseline evidence obtained through sufficient evaluation.	Noted on the irreplaceability of the archaeological resources.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	We note that there are several references in the PEIR to **habitat creation and enhancements such as PEIR Chapter 7: Biodiversity section 7.129** which states that 'Habitat enhancements proposed as part of the design and delivering BNG.' These areas need to be included in the evaluation work along with hard and soft landscaping measures as many of the mitigation measures will impact any surviving archaeology. Tree planting for example can be very destructive; the root structures of mature trees can be deep and cover areas several times the size of the tree canopy. The roots can damage and destroy surviving archaeological features and change soil chemistry and hydrology, there can be uprooting from storm damage and when a tree dies the roots whither and leave voids which collapse. These and other mitigation measures including scrapes, lake creation and wildlife ponds can damage or destroy any surviving archaeology.	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 8: Landscape and Ecology. The Proposed Development will include ecological mitigation and enhancement areas for green infrastructure, which will remove areas from the current agricultural use (and therefore from the detrimental effects arising from ploughing, traffic of heavy machinery, excavation of sumps and drainage for farming) to be used for habitat creation, grassland, and visual screening. It is expected that the only impact arising from Work no. 8 will relate to soil stripping, resulting in the localised removal (in whole or partial) of any buried heritage assets within the footprint of that specific activity. However, considering the location and relatively small extent of the areas included in Work No. 8, and that only a fraction of that area will actually be subject to soil stripping, it is expected that overall, the impact arising from Work No. 8: Landscape and Ecology, will be medium across the areas effected within the Order Limits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9] also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies applicable.	
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.101** states that 'An Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OOEMP) will ensure that any area of heritage value will be protected during operation and maintenance, and no further ground disturbance is anticipated to occur during this stage or, where non practicable adequate mitigation measures will be implemented prior to this.' If this is being offered as preservation in situ mitigation the full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of monitoring throughout the construction, operation and the decommissioning phases, and there will	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents an assessment of impacts on all buried heritage assets likely to be affected within the Order Limits, outlining the proposed environmental measure and mitigations. Areas of Archaeological Constraint (AAC) will be identified prior to construction in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and Historic England. In these areas, where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	be no ground disturbance whatsoever which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The fencing will need to remain in place and be maintained throughout the lifetime of the scheme including decommissioning and refits. There will need to be an Archaeological Clerk of Works and the management strategy for the preservation in situ areas will need to be included in all their management plans to ensure the protection measures stay in place throughout the development.	by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact. Where preservation in situ is the preferred strategy, the AAC will be demarcated by fencing to avoid accidental entry and disturbance of archaeological remains during the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The selection of each AAC will be informed by the results of the DBA and geophysical survey, with the extent of each area guided by the results of the trial trench evaluation. Each AAC Site will be defined to include a reasonable buffer to avoid impacts to the buried archaeological remains or extant earthworks. An Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) will be appointed for the Construction Phase who will be reviewing and monitoring all works in the Order Limits. Requirements will be set out in the Mitigation Strategy and compliance with measures regularly recorded via an appropriate method to be determined in the CEMP.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	Regarding **Decommissioning, section 10.103** states that 'it is expected that the decommissioning phase will not have any additional impacts compared to the construction phase.' There is no information on the specific ground impacts of how infrastructure and the solar arrays will be removed or information regarding the impacts of refits throughout the 60-year lifetime of the scheme.	An **outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP)** in **Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.6]** has been prepared to mitigate the adverse effects during the Decommissioning Phase. The measures to reduce likely significant effects are included within the oDEMP, secured through a DCO Requirement. A well-designed decommissioning process would not cause any ground disturbance in excess of the construction phase, and any element associated with the Proposed Development will be removed using methods and extents similar to that of the construction phase. As a result, buried archaeological remains already removed during construction would not experience any further effects as a result of decommissioning. The specific method of decommissioning is uncertain at present as the engineering approaches to decommissioning will evolve over the operational life of the Proposed Development. Potential harm to buried archaeological features unknown at the time of writing will be discussed with stakeholders and taken into consideration	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		during the archaeological fieldwork and design to reduce impacts.	
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.106** states that *'The archaeological mitigation scope and method statement, the Project Design and WSI will be discussed and agreed **where possible** with the relevant stakeholders…'* Please be advised that mitigation works should not be undertaken until the WSI is agreed. Failure to do so may mean that the mitigation measures are insufficient or inappropriate to deal with the developmental impact or the archaeological significance.	Noted. All Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs) will be agreed in advance with the LPA's Archaeological Advisory Teams and Historic England.	N
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.107** includes *'Geoarchaeological deposit modelling/profiling (coring) in areas of paleo-environmental potential'* as mitigation. We would expect this to be included instead in the evaluation phase as it provides baseline data rather than being a method of avoiding harm.	The geoarchaeological deposit model has been carried out as part of the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and informed the results of **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** as part of the programme of evaluations carried out to inform the DCO	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.113** makes reference to Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire city councils, as does Appendix 10-6, please clarify as this seems to be a conflation with the city and the county councils.	Noted and amended to correct these references.	N
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.117** lays out the basis of impact assessments progressing from an understanding of the buried heritage assets, understanding the degree of impact, assessing the potential for currently unknown archaeological assets and for determining their significance. We stress again the necessity for the completion of a full competent desk-based assessment and programme of evaluation trenching across the full impact zone. please be advised this will need to include not only trenching across known or suspected archaeology to determine their presence or absence, depth, extent and significance but also across the 'blank' areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified	A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and constitutes the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable routing. The trial trenching evaluation included both trenches targeted on features identified by the geophysical survey as well as trenches within apparently 'blank' areas; in this way, the results of the geophysical survey will be objectively ground-truthed, providing a reasonable basis on which the Proposed Development-wide geophysical survey	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	archaeological remains. This is required to get a full understanding of the archaeology which will be impacted across the full impact zone and will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy which must be undertaken as part of the EIA. Significant areas of archaeology have been identified in these blank areas in every other NSIP across Lincolnshire, for Heckington Fen for example most of the mitigation areas were only identified during the trenching phase.	can be used to extrapolate the likely archaeological potential of untrenched areas. Of the 527 trenches carried out for the evaluation, 387 were designed to investigate areas where neither the DBA nor the geophysical survey suggested the presence of archaeology.	
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.125** states that 'It is not expected that our Project will permanently alter the geology or the groundwater levels within our Site or in its immediate surroundings, and any indirect effects will be temporary and reversible (9). Therefore, at the current stage of design and based on professional opinion, it is considered there will be no significant indirect impacts on buried heritage deposits within our Site or the wider Study Area. All potential effects would have been already mitigated through the programme of embedded mitigation.' Any changes to ground water levels regardless of duration can result in permanent impacts to surviving archaeology.	A full assessment of any potential effect arising from de-watering or from any alteration to groundwater levels, has been carried out in **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9],** which is supported by the **ES Vol 3, Appendix 9.3: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment [EN010159/APP.6.21]** as technical appendix. All points raised have been considered in the ES Chapter.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**10.126** Direct impacts related to construction activities are not expected to have any detrimental effect on buried heritage assets outside of the footprint of these activities, as the excavations will be localised and will not exceed the parameters. Please clarify, as there would be impacts for example machines tracking to particular sites.	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 7: Highway Works, and the general potential compression or partial removal from traffic of plants and machinery. The Applicant does not consider that traffic or access of heavy machinery (such as plants) and the associated weight loading/ vibration for the construction operations for the Proposed Development may cause impacts on buried heritage assets that are in excess of the impacts arising from the current agricultural activities within the Order Limits, including the use of farm/agricultural machines. Also considering the location and relatively small extension of the areas included in Work No. 7 and access tracks within the Site, which will mostly follow the current roads and access points it is expected that any impact arising from such works will be negligible across the areas effected within the Order Limits. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		and mitigation strategies applicable. Relevant to Work no. 7 and access tracks across the Site, the use of gravel and track matts to distribute the weight of heavy machinery, will mitigate the impact arising from ground loading on any buried heritage assets.	
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Piles** **Section 10.128** states that 'The installation of the Mounting Structures (sometimes known as piles) will involve very minimal disturbance of the subsoil through effects as truncation, displacement, and vibration.' We do not agree that piling will cause only minimal disturbance. The scheme will result in having hundreds of thousands of impacts within the solar area coupled with service trenches, other infrastructure and heavy construction activity that will lacerate and puncture the archaeological resource without clarity and without understanding the nature of the resource it is impacting upon. In the case of some sensitive archaeological remains (for instance human burials) piling will have an extraordinarily high impact and many of these features do not show	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 1: Solar PV Infrastructure. The Solar PV Modules will be fixed to a mounting structure, which itself will be mounted into the ground. The installation of the Mounting Structures (sometimes known as piles) will involve very minimal disturbance of the subsoil through effects as truncation, displacement, and vibration. It is expected that Solar PV Infrastructure will cause a negligible impact on any buried heritage deposits withing the Order Limits. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies, if applicable. Areas of	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	up on geophysical survey alone. According to Historic England in their Piling and Archaeology guidance and good practice (revised 2019) 'a general estimation (based on laboratory studies and on-site observations) is that driven displacement piles can damage an area twice the width of the pile cross section (and so four times the area).' [REF-12] **Section 10.129** states that 'Should a pile location (or even several pile locations) coincide with buried archaeological remains, the quantity of displaced archaeological remains in the case of larger features, such as the in-filled ditches described above, would be insignificant compared to that left undisturbed. For discrete or less robust buried features such as pits, post holes or stake holes, the probability that piles would be aligned in such a way that any more than a tiny percentage of the features would be affected is very low, and complete avoidance is the most likely outcome. This paragraph is sweepingly dismissive and	Archaeological Constraint (AAC) will be identified prior to construction in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and Historic England. In these areas, where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	deliberately reductive in terms of potential impact: 'displaced' means destroyed and the unexamined unrecorded archaeology may be 'ditches' or may be 'inhumations'. To decide that impacts on unevaluated archaeology will be 'insignificant' is arbitrary and to assume that piles would magically avoid significant archaeology is an unprofessional and fundamentally unsound approach to effective mitigation. If unevaluated unknown archaeology must be assigned a value it should be High until sufficient work is undertaken to determine it is not.		
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.130** states that 'It is not considered, at the time of the writing, that traffic or access of heavy machinery (such as plants) and the associated weight loading/ vibration for the construction operations of our Project may cause impacts on buried heritage assets that are in excess of the impacts arising from the current agricultural activities on our Site, including the use of farm/agricultural machines. The use of gravel and track matts to distribute the weight of heavy machinery, will mitigate the impact arising from ground loading.'	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 7: Highway Works, and the general potential compression or partial removal from traffic of plants and machinery. The Applicant does not consider that traffic or access of heavy machinery (such as plants) and the associated weight loading/ vibration for the construction operations for the Proposed Development may cause impacts on buried heritage assets that are in excess of the impacts arising from the current	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	On another NSIP when trenching commenced unexpected Saxon skeletons were found within 20cm of the ground surface which would be destroyed without recording as a result of the above measures, so our concern is that currently there will be unidentified unexamined archaeology which will be damaged or destroyed by the development process. Mitigation requires sufficient baseline evidence for site-specific mitigation measures to be deployed effectively in an appropriate and reasonable way. This is currently not possible where trenching has not been undertaken across the impact zone.	agricultural activities within the Order Limits, including the use of farm/agricultural machines. Also considering the location and relatively small extension of the areas included in Work No. 7 and access tracks within the Site, which will mostly follow the current roads and access points it is expected that any impact arising from such works will be negligible across the areas effected within the Order Limits. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies applicable. Relevant to Work no. 7 and access tracks across the Site, the use of gravel and track matts to distribute the weight of heavy machinery, will mitigate the impact arising from ground loading on any buried heritage assets.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.131** states that 'The embedded buffer around the Scheduled Monuments and some of the medieval villages would mitigate or remove any adverse effect on any known buried heritage assets included in the buffer areas.' The area outside the buffer zone will need to be informed by full evaluation including robust trenching to determine the extent of archaeology which will certainly extend beyond the scheduled areas.	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	**Section 10.132** states that 'Based on our current understanding and our professional judgment and considering the above preliminary assessment and the Environmental Measures discussed from paragraph 10-94, it is considered that with the implementation of adequate mitigation measures there will not be significant residual effects on buried heritage assets arising from our Project. The Detailed Scope of Assessment in Appendix 10-5 illustrate the preliminary Magnitude of Effects on buried heritage assets arising from the effects discussed above and the Residual Risk after the application of the mitigation measures outlined in Paragraph _.' Please see our comments on Table 10-7 above. We are concerned as sections 10.132 to 10.136 all state that there will be no archaeological impacts from development works. If the redline boundary has been mitigated following comprehensive evaluation informed by an intense level of trenching, then this may be possible. If on the other hand the more limited standard evaluation approach, as laid out in other sections of the Buried Heritage Chapter, are	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	followed then we do not agree that the development works will have no direct or indirect impacts. We are also concerned as much of the rest of the Buried Heritage Chapter is very vague in terms of the degree of the site-specific evaluation work which will be undertaken and when. Sufficient field evaluation is an essential aspect of effective project management, particularly as unevaluated areas of unknown archaeological potential leaves a high degree of risk to the development given the potential for archaeology to have significant impacts on work programmes and budgets. Failure to adequately evaluate the site at the application stage could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided and may ultimately lead to a scheme which is undeliverable. There is no public benefit in the destruction of unknown heritage assets.	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the potential for unknown buried heritage deposits, and of the impact potentially arising as part of the Proposed Development. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies applicable.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Joint response from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Councils	We note that Historic England, Piling and Archaeology guidance and good practice (revised 2019) [REF-12] has not been included in Appendix 10-1: Buried Heritage Legislation, Policy and Guidance, nor indeed has it been used to effectively guide the approach or process of this Buried Heritage chapter of the PEIR. Please be advised that in accordance with Historic England's revised Piling and Archaeology guidance 'The applicant will need to provide sufficient information demonstrating an adequate understanding of the significance of the archaeological site and assessment of potential harm to that significance arising from the development.' (p2) In conclusion, the EIA will require the full suite of comprehensive desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact. 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	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)) [REF-32], National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8) [REF-2] , and the National Planning Policy Framework [REF-4]. The EIA will need to contain sufficient baseline evidence 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 [REF-32] which 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))		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Bassetlaw District Council	Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Council have produced a joint response and highlighted concerns relation to the consideration to the buried heritage within and around the application site. Their full comments have been attached to this letter and they have concluded the following: The PEIR has presented limited baseline information to date. Some archaeological assessment work is underway which is welcomed, however there are concerns that the proposed programme seems to fall short of providing the necessary data to inform an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy for the DCO application. EIA will require the full suite of comprehensive desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact area. 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	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	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.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 10 – Pg 2 onwards. Buried Heritage** NSDC have received external advice from Lincolnshire County Council on matters of buried heritage and this detailed advice is presented below. Currently there is limited provision of archaeological baseline assessment normally expected at this stage of the NSIP. In the absence of this assessment, the PEIR should present an appropriate methodology and describe in detail how the applicant intends to provide this data to inform their DCO application and an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy (AMS). A summary of the Historic Environment Record data has been presented in Chapter 10, however a full Desk-Based Assessment (DBA)	A preliminary review of the buried heritage baseline has been carried out to support the PEIR. A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and it constitute the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable route. The baseline information gathered as part of the DBA exercise, and the results of the targeted trenching evaluation allowed the identification of groups of buried heritage assets and an informed assessment of their sensitivity. This has been compared against the magnitude of impact arising from the different Works associated to the Proposed Development,	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	has not yet been undertaken and would normally be expected as the first step in archaeological assessment. This along with geophysical survey and a robust programme of trial trenching constitute the standard suite for archaeological evaluation which should be undertaken prior to submission of the DCO application. The results of all these stages are required as baseline evidence to inform reasonable mitigation of the developmental impact across the redline boundary, including the cable route, as the range of proposed developmental impacts on a landscape scale will damage and destroy currently unknown surviving archaeology. We understand the geophysical survey is ongoing which is welcomed, and we await the full results in due course. Arrangements for a meeting to discuss the applicant's approach to trial trenching are underway, however the initial approach appears to be to investigate a very limited number of selected sites. This is concerning and our position is that the full impact area within the redline boundary must be subject to trial trench evaluation with between 3% to 5% coverage to ensure sufficient evaluation has been undertaken	and the identification of appropriate mitigation measures when required. A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field evaluation provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	to allow for an appropriate assessment of the development's impact on buried archaeology.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	The lack of detail on site-specific evaluation does not align with the total mitigation of virtually all developmental impacts suggested by Table 10-7. To achieve this aim as presented, would require an intensive programme or trial trenching that is not currently presented in the PEIR. The PEIR submission states this is a development over 1500ha (Volume 1, Chapter 1- 6). There will be hundreds of thousands of piles and many kilometres of cable trenches over the 965ha proposed solar array area (multiplied by the number of refits over the proposed 60-year lifetime of the scheme) all going below the depth of any surviving archaeology. Section 4.50 in Chapter 1 cites the Rochdale Envelope and its guiding NSIP Advice Note Nine [REF-31]. We would like to point out the Advice Note states that	A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and it constitute the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable routing. The baseline information gathered as part of the DBA exercise, and the results of the targeted trenching evaluation allowed the identification of groups of buried heritage assets and an informed assessment of their sensitivity. This has been compared against the magnitude of impact arising from the different Works associated to the Proposed Development, and the identification of appropriate mitigation measures when required.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	'Implementation of the Rochdale Envelope assessment approach should only be used where it is necessary and should not be treated as a blanket opportunity to allow for insufficient detail in the assessment. Applicants should make every effort to finalise details applicable to the Proposed Development prior to submission of their DCO application. Indeed, as explained earlier in this Advice Note, it will be in all parties' interests for the Applicant to provide as much information as possible to inform the Pre-application consultation process.' (5.2) Where the developer proposes the Rochdale Envelope in dealing with their application, it is essential that a full understanding of the archaeological resource is achieved in the EIA to allow for informed and appropriate mitigation of the unknown/undecided elements of the development at a later date. This can only be achieved through evaluation of the full impact zone. Section 4.69 in Chapter 1 concludes with 'the aim of restoring the land to its preconstruction condition following the temporary construction use and at the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development, after decommissioning.' This is not possible for archaeology, which as stated in	A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field evaluation provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	NPPF is 'an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.' (para 195) Impacts to archaeology are permanent and irreversible, and significance can only be determined with adequate baseline evidence obtained through sufficient evaluation. We note that there are several references in the PEIR to habitat creation and enhancements such as PEIR Chapter 7: Biodiversity section 7.129 which states that 'Habitat enhancements proposed as part of the design and delivering BNG.' These areas need to be included in the evaluation work along with hard and soft landscaping measures as many of the mitigation measures will impact any surviving archaeology.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.101 states that 'An Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OOEMP) will ensure that any area of heritage value will be protected during operation and maintenance, and no further ground disturbance is anticipated to occur during this stage or, where non practicable adequate mitigation measures will be implemented prior to this.' If this is being offered as preservation in situ	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents an assessment of impacts on all buried heritage assets likely to be affected within the Order Limits, outlining the proposed environmental measure and mitigations. Areas of Archaeological Constraint (AAC) will be identified prior to construction in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and Historic England.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	mitigation the full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined through evaluation and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of periodic monitoring throughout the construction, operation, and the decommissioning phases. There will be no ground disturbance which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The fencing will need to remain in place and be maintained throughout the lifetime of the scheme including decommissioning and refits. This will require monitoring by an appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) and the management strategy for the preservation in situ areas will need to be included in all their management plans to ensure the protection measures stay in place throughout the development.	In these areas, where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact. Where preservation in situ is the preferred strategy, the AAC will be demarcated by fencing to avoid accidental entry and disturbance of archaeological remains during the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The selection of each AAC will be informed by the results of the DBA and geophysical survey, with the extent of each area guided by the results of the trial trench evaluation. Each AAC Site will be defined to include a reasonable buffer to avoid impacts to the buried archaeological remains or extant earthworks. An Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) will be appointed for the Construction Phase who will be reviewing and monitoring all works in the Order	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Limits. Requirements will be set out in the Mitigation Strategy and compliance with measures regularly recorded via an appropriate method to be determined in the CEMP.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Regarding Decommissioning, section 10.103 states that 'it is expected that the decommissioning phase will not have any additional impacts compared to the construction phase.' There is no information on the specific ground impacts of how infrastructure and the solar arrays will be removed or information regarding the impacts of refits throughout the 60-year lifetime of the scheme.	An **outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP)** in **Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.6]** has been prepared to mitigate the adverse effects during the Decommissioning Phase. The measures to reduce likely significant effects are included within the oDEMP, secured through a DCO Requirement. A well-designed decommissioning process would not cause any ground disturbance in excess of the construction phase, and any element associated with the Proposed Development will be removed using methods and extents similar to that of the construction phase. As a result, buried archaeological remains already removed during construction would not experience any further effects as a result of decommissioning.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The specific method of decommissioning is uncertain at present as the engineering approaches to decommissioning will evolve over the operational life of the Proposed Development. Potential harm to buried archaeological features unknown at the time of writing will be discussed with stakeholders and taken into consideration during the archaeological fieldwork and design to reduce impacts.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.106 states that 'The archaeological mitigation scope and method statement, the Project Design and WSI will be discussed and agreed where possible with the relevant stakeholders…' The mitigation works should not be undertaken until the AMS and all WSIs are agreed in full by the relevant planning authority. Failure to do so may mean that the mitigation measures are insufficient or inappropriate to deal with the developmental impact or the archaeological significance and any associated DCO Conditions are unenforceable.	Noted. All Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs) will be agreed in advance with the LPA's Archaeological Advisory Teams and Historic England through the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.107 includes 'Geoarchaeological deposit modelling/profiling (coring) in areas of paleo-environmental potential' as mitigation. We would expect this to be included instead in the evaluation phase as it provides baseline data rather than being a method of avoiding harm.	The geoarchaeological deposit model has been carried out as part of the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and informed the results of **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** as part of the programme of evaluations carried out to inform the DCO	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.117 lays out the basis of impact assessments progressing from an understanding of the buried heritage assets, understanding the degree of impact, assessing the potential for currently unknown archaeological assets and for determining their significance. We stress again the necessity for the completion of a full competent desk-based assessment and programme of evaluation trenching across the full impact zone. This will need to include not only trenching across known or suspected archaeology to determine their presence or absence, depth, extent, and significance but also across the 'blank' areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains.	A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and it constitute the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable routing. The trial trenching evaluation included both trenches targeted on features identified by the geophysical survey as well as trenches within apparently 'blank' areas; in this way, the results of the geophysical survey will be objectively ground-truthed, providing a reasonable basis on which the Proposed Development-wide geophysical survey	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		can be used to extrapolate the likely archaeological potential of untrenched areas. Of the 527 trenches carried out for the evaluation, 387 were designed to investigate areas where neither the DBA nor the geophysical survey suggested the presence of archaeology.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.125 states that 'It is not expected that our Project will permanently alter the geology or the groundwater levels within our Site or in its immediate surroundings, and any indirect effects will be temporary and reversible (9). Therefore, at the current stage of design and based on professional opinion, it is considered there will be no significant indirect impacts on buried heritage deposits within our Site or the wider Study Area. All potential effects would have been already mitigated through the programme of embedded mitigation.' Any changes to ground water levels regardless of duration can result in permanent impacts to surviving archaeology.	A full assessment of any potential effect arising from de-watering or from any alteration to groundwater levels, has been carried out in the Buried Heritage ES chapter, which is supported by the DBA as technical appendix. All points raised have been considered in the ES Chapter. An oLEMP is included within the submitted documentation in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]** and will provide the framework requiring the development of measures in the LEMP to ensure there will be no surface water run-off impacts from scour, on any alteration to the geology or the groundwater levels.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	10.126 Direct impacts related to construction activities are not expected to have any detrimental effect on buried heritage assets outside of the footprint of these activities, as the excavations will be localised and will not exceed the parameters. This requires clarification, as direct impacts from plant are demonstrable on buried archaeological remains, especially in wet condition such as close to the river Trent.	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 7: Highway Works, and the general potential compression or partial removal from traffic of plants and machinery. The Applicant does not consider that traffic or access of heavy machinery (such as plants) and the associated weight loading/ vibration for the construction operations for the Proposed Development may cause impacts on buried heritage assets that are in excess of the impacts arising from the current agricultural activities within the Order Limits, including the use of farm/agricultural machines. Also considering the location and relatively small extension of the areas included in Work No. 7 and access tracks within the Site, which will mostly follow the current roads and access points it is expected that any impact arising from such works will be negligible across the areas effected within the Order Limits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9] also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies applicable. Relevant to Work no. 7 and access tracks across the Site, the use of gravel and track matts to distribute the weight of heavy machinery, will mitigate the impact arising from ground loading on any buried heritage assets.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.128 states that 'The installation of the Mounting Structures (sometimes known as piles) will involve very minimal disturbance of the subsoil through effects as truncation, displacement, and vibration.' We do not agree with the assumption that piling will cause minimal disturbance. The scheme will result in having hundreds of thousands of impacts within the solar area coupled with service trenches, other infrastructure and heavy construction activity that will lacerate and puncture the archaeological resource without clarity and without understanding the nature of the resource it is impacting upon. In the case of some sensitive archaeological remains (for instance human burials) piling will have an extraordinarily high impact and many of these features do not show	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 1: Solar PV Infrastructure. The Solar PV Modules will be fixed to a mounting structure, which itself will be mounted into the ground. The installation of the Mounting Structures (sometimes known as piles) will involve very minimal disturbance of the subsoil through effects as truncation, displacement, and vibration. It is expected that Solar PV Infrastructure will cause a negligible impact on any buried heritage deposits withing the Order Limits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	up on geophysical survey alone. Historic England state in their Piling and Archaeology guidance and good practice (revised 2019) 'a general estimation (based on laboratory studies and on-site observations) is that driven displacement piles can damage an area twice the width of the pile cross section (and so four times the area).' [REF-12]	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies, if applicable. Areas of Archaeological Constraint (AAC) will be identified prior to construction in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and Historic England. In these areas, where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.129 states that 'Should a pile location (or even several pile locations) coincide with buried archaeological remains, the quantity of displaced archaeological remains in the case of larger features, such as the infilled ditches described above, would be insignificant compared to that left undisturbed. For discrete or less robust buried features such as pits, post holes or stake holes, the probability that piles would be aligned in such a way that any more than a tiny percentage of the features would be affected is	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 1: Solar PV Infrastructure. The Solar PV Modules will be fixed to a mounting structure, which itself will be mounted into the ground. The installation of the Mounting Structures (sometimes known as piles) will involve very minimal disturbance of the subsoil through effects	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	very low, and complete avoidance is the most likely outcome. This paragraph is worryingly dismissive and deliberately reductive in terms of potential impact: 'displaced' means destroyed, and the unexamined unrecorded archaeology may be 'ditches' or may be 'inhumations.' To decide that impacts on unevaluated archaeology will be 'insignificant' is arbitrary and to assume that piles would somehow avoid significant archaeology is an unprofessional and fundamentally unsound approach to effective mitigation. If unevaluated unknown archaeology must be assigned a value, it should be High until sufficient work is undertaken to determine it is not.	as truncation, displacement, and vibration. It is expected that Solar PV Infrastructure will cause a negligible impact on any buried heritage deposits withing the Order Limits. **ES, Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies, if applicable. Areas of Archaeological Constraint (AAC) will be identified prior to construction in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and Historic England. In these areas, where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.130 states that 'It is not considered, at the time of the writing, that traffic or access of heavy machinery (such as plants) and the associated weight loading/ vibration for the construction operations of our Project may cause	**Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the impact on buried heritage deposits arising from all the work packages part of the Proposed Development, including Work No. 7: Highway Works, and the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	impacts on buried heritage assets that are in excess of the impacts arising from the current agricultural activities on our Site, including the use of farm/agricultural machines. The use of gravel and track matts to distribute the weight of heavy machinery, will mitigate the impact arising from ground loading.' The above measures may be appropriate, but only once the nature of any buried remains below the protective matting has been fully understood through appropriate evaluation. A recent NSIP evaluation encountered unexpected Saxon skeletons/burials within 20cm of the ground surface which would still be impacted as a result of the above measures.	general potential compression or partial removal from traffic of plants and machinery. The Applicant does not consider that traffic or access of heavy machinery (such as plants) and the associated weight loading/ vibration for the construction operations for the Proposed Development may cause impacts on buried heritage assets that are in excess of the impacts arising from the current agricultural activities within the Order Limits, including the use of farm/agricultural machines. Also considering the location and relatively small extension of the areas included in Work No. 7 and access tracks within the Site, which will mostly follow the current roads and access points it is expected that any impact arising from such works will be negligible across the areas effected within the Order Limits. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies applicable. Relevant to Work no. 7 and access tracks across the Site, the use of gravel and track matts to distribute the weight of heavy machinery, will mitigate the impact	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		arising from ground loading on any buried heritage assets.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.131 states that 'The embedded buffer around the Scheduled Monuments and some of the medieval villages would mitigate or remove any adverse effect on any known buried heritage assets included in the buffer areas.' Significant remains associated with the scheduled areas are likely to extend well into the impact zone, even with the proposed buffer areas. Sufficient evaluation will be necessary to identify the extent and nature of this to provide an appropriate mitigation strategy.	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Section 10.132 states that 'Based on our current understanding and our professional judgment and considering the above preliminary assessment and the Environmental Measures discussed from paragraph 10-94, it is considered that with the implementation of adequate mitigation measures there will not be significant residual effects on buried heritage assets arising from our Project. The Detailed Scope of Assessment in Appendix 10-5 illustrate the preliminary Magnitude of Effects on buried heritage assets arising from the effects discussed above and the Residual Risk after the application of the mitigation measures outlined in Paragraph.' Please see our comments on Table 10-7 above. The currently proposed level of evaluation will not provide the level of baseline information necessary to deliver the level of mitigation promised in this section of the chapter. The rest of the Buried Heritage Chapter	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	is very vague in terms of the degree of the site-specific evaluation work which will be undertaken and when. Sufficient field evaluation is an essential aspect of effective project management, particularly as unevaluated areas of unknown archaeological potential leave a high degree of risk to the development given the potential for archaeology to have significant impacts on work programmes and budgets. Failure to adequately evaluate the site at the application stage could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided and may ultimately lead to a scheme which is undeliverable. There is no public benefit in the destruction of unknown heritage assets. Historic England's, Piling and Archaeology guidance and good practice (revised 2019) [REF-12] has not been included in Appendix 10-1: Buried Heritage Legislation, Policy, and Guidance, nor indeed has it been used to effectively guide the approach or process of this Buried Heritage chapter of the PEIR. Please be advised that in accordance with Historic England's revised Piling and Archaeology	completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** presents a full assessment of the potential for unknown buried heritage deposits, and of the impact potentially arising as part of the Proposed Development. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** also presents the relevant environmental measures and mitigation strategies applicable. The Design of the Proposed Development has been considered to avoid, reduce or mitigate any significant effect on the known buried heritage assets, and to make allowances to adapt to and mitigate any effect on currently unknown buried heritage assets, if required. Measures include setbacks, use of trenchless techniques for taking cables across the Trent and adoption of an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	guidance 'The applicant will need to provide sufficient information demonstrating an adequate understanding of the significance of the archaeological site and assessment of potential harm to that significance arising from the development.' (p2)		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Conclusion The PEIR has presented limited baseline information to date. Some archaeological assessment work is underway which is welcomed, however there are concerns that the proposed programme seems to fall short of providing the necessary data to inform an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy for the DCO application. The EIA will need to consider the full suite of comprehensive desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact area. 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	The Applicant considers that approach to baseline collection is robust and sufficient for the purposes of the ES and to inform the DCO. The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between the required evidence to inform the DCO application and reducing the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The trial trenching scoping also utilised the results of the geophysical survey of the site to target anomalies and test blank areas. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits, it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	known and potential heritage assets is required by the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)) [REF-32], National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8) [REF-2], and the National Planning Policy Framework [REF-4]. This is also set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 [REF-32] which 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)).	can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole.	

West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 10: Buried Heritage** It has been noted that no desk-based assessment has been submitted yet. Such an assessment is usually the first step in any archaeological evaluation. We would expect a geophysical survey and a trial trenching programme are standard documents/information for archaeological evaluation. WLDC would defer to the specialist comments of the Historic Environment Officers at Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County Council in regards to buried heritage and the exact needs to help them provide an informed response to the ES.	A preliminary review of the buried heritage baseline has been carried out to support the PEIR. A full archaeological desk-based assessment has been carried out and it constitute the technical appendix to **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** This includes a thorough review of potential archaeological significance and the mitigation measures to ensure there are no likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including cable route. **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** includes a review of the environmental measure and likely archaeological mitigation that will be implemented as part of the Proposed Development. A proportionate trial trenching evaluation has been carried to inform **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9]** and the DCO also targeting the areas of high archaeological potential. Together with the DBA and the geophysical survey, the field evaluation provided a robust baseline collection for the Order Limits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Carbon and climate change			
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 15 – Carbon and Climate Change** In respect of Carbon and Climate change and the Greenhouse Gas Assessment (GHG) the significant potential beneficial effect on climate change as set out within table 15-9 (due to zero carbon electricity generation) is noted and welcomed. In respect of the Climate Change Resilience Assessment (CCR) it is noted that this part of the assessment will be developed further with additional design detail beyond this preliminary assessment. Furthermore, it is also acknowledged that the CCR will also consider the specific impacts aligned to the stages of the project (construction, operation, and decommissioning) separately, including any specific risks and impacts related to final agreed options for BESS and substation locations, alongside the river cable crossing. As with other work presented within the PEIR, NSDC look forward to considering the full extent of the Environmental Statement at the next stage	The full assessment is included in **ES Vol 2, Chapter 14: Carbon and Climate Change [EN010159/APP/6.14],** this includes the climate resilience assessment which assesses the climate risks & mitigation during the construction, operation & decommissioning phases.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 15: Carbon and Climate Change** The contents of this Chapter are noted.	This has been noted by the Applicant.	N
Nottinghamshire County Council	Wouldn't a solar farm generating clean electricity not have a something of positive impact on climate change?	Yes. The Proposed Development will contribute to the UK's transition to net zero carbon by producing renewable energy that allows the reduction in reliance on fossil fuels (primarily natural gas) for electricity generation. Climate change impacts and benefits from the Proposed Development have been assessed in full and have been detailed in **Chapter 14: Carbon and Climate Change [EN010159/APP/6.14]**. It must though be recognised that whilst the project will generate zero-emission electricity, there are carbon emissions associated with its construction, operation and decommissioning, for instance due to the manufacturing of the components and repair and maintenance of the Proposed Development. The climate change assessment therefore quantifies the lifetime carbon emissions associated with it, and quantifies the overall benefits of the project in terms of carbon reductions from renewable energy production.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Consultation			
Bassetlaw District Council	Dunham on Trent Parish Council has commented: The Council has already sent off its view to the consultation, the One Earth Solar consultation is going ahead as detailed in the documents written by One Earth and they are also pro-actively contacting residents to meet face-to-face to discuss the plans further."	Yes, Dunham Parish Council submitted its feedback directly to the Applicant, which is included in **Table J-1.1.**	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Conclusion -** NSDC have identified a number of areas within the PEIR and associated material (available as part of the statutory consultation), whereby further work is necessary, or is to be undertaken. In order to ensure that a robust DCO	The Applicant has continued to engage with the local authorities to keep them informed of the changes to the illustrative masterplan that have resulted from consultation feedback, as well as next steps in the development process. These	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	application is prepared, NSDC would welcome the opportunity for further informal consultation and engagement as further work is undertaken and prior to the submission of the application to the Planning Inspectorate. In this regard, we would welcome a programme of activities on further areas of engagement, so that we can plan our resources accordingly and to support our ongoing active engagement, at the pre-application stage.	ongoing engagement activities are listed in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].** The Applicant has also continued with its environmental assessment and other work since the statutory consultation and this is reflected in the full suite of application documents now submitted, including the Environmental Statement.	
EIA			
Bassetlaw District Council	The PINS scoping opinion was issued on the basis that the operational life span of the scheme would be 40 years and the PIER is now exploring an operational life span of 60 years this should be clarified and explored within the Environmental Statement. For likely significant effects to considered in the ES it should provide an assessment over the anticipated life of the development, as far as reasonably possible, so that the full impact of the development can be understood.	The DCO is seeking time limited consent, and the Proposed Development will be operational for up to 60 years, after which time it will be decommissioned. All phases of the Proposed Development (construction, operation for up to 60 years and decommissioning) have been assessed in the ES.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 2- Environmental Impact Assessment** We agree that the development falls under paragraph 3(a) of Schedule 2. We believe that the development is likely to have significant effects on the environment and would qualify as "EIA Development", and agree with the applicant's intention that they will voluntary submit an Environmental Statement with their application. We agree with the Chapters to be included within the ES and note the details are in accordance with the PINS EIA Scoping Opinion.	Noted.	N
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 3: Description of our Site and Surrounding Area** We agree with the description of the site and its location adjacent to nearby villages and settlements. It is noted that the villages of Laughterton and Thorney have not been explicitly mentioned, however they are located close to the north and east boundaries of the site limits (within West Lindsey and Newark and Sherwood, respectively).	Thorney is listed in **ES Vol 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Site and Surrounding Area [EN010159/APP/6.3]**. Given Laughterton is approximately 1.5km to the north of the Order Limits, this has not been listed as a nearby village.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	It is noted that the location of the BESS sites have not yet been confirmed (para 4.38.). The worst-case scenario is that there will be two BESS locations (up to 20ha in size). One to the east and one to the west, within the site limits. The eastern one (within WLDC's boundary) is located within close proximity to a pipeline, it is understood that if this was to become the site for the BESS then the batteries would not be placed directly over the pipeline. Appendix 4-1 gives technical dimensions of the BESS- sites will consist of a series of battery units with dimensions of around 9.5m x 1.8m x 2.6m (LxWxH) with BESS inverters with dimensions of around 12.5m x 2.5m x 3.5m. There will be a ratio of 8 battery units to every BESS inverter. The substations (which would be on the same potential sites for the BESS) will have a worst-case scenario height of 13.5m. This height does raise some concern, they would be a significant intrusion into the landscape. significant intrusion into the landscape. The BESS and substations have the potential to have significant environmental effects including landscape and visual – the ES will need to be clear as to the	**ES Vol 1, Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5]** provides a description of the Proposed Development. The physical characteristics of the development are described alongside the key activities that will be undertaken during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning. The highest structure within the eastern BESS and substation compound is the substation being 13.5m above ground level, as well as a lightning rod at 25m above ground level. As per the Rochdale Envelope, the maximum height parameter has been assessed as part of the environmental aspects (including landscape and visual and cultural heritage) and environmental measures included to mitigation likely significant effects. Such measures include new tree belts which will provide screening as part of the mitigation strategy in relation to visual impacts, as well as respond positively to the prevailing landscape character and enhancing ecological connectivity across the Order Limits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	extent of development proposed, including the number of battery units, applying a “Rochdale Envelope” worst case scenario. Para 4.40- River Crossing Options- It is noted that that the options for how the cable routes would cross the River Trent. This would either be by HDD- 5m under the riverbed of the River Trent or using the existing Fledborough viaduct. We would expect the ES to state which option will be used. The discounted options for alternative connection options are noted. Para- 4.50- We note the use of the Rochdale Envelope approach to the environmental assessments. Figure 4-3 Shows an Operational Parameter Plan- It would be useful, not only for the LPA's, but for the public to have a site layout plan which details where the relevant host District authority boundaries lie. Operational Phase of Project- 4.61. The project will be operational for 60 years, which is broadly in line with other on-going NSIP projects within the WLDC district. The ES will be expected to detail deconstruction and removal of the development beyond its lifetime. The ES should however detail the environmental effects that are likely to arise for maintenance and repair	The cable crossing of the River Trent includes trenchless crossing (a type of HDD). No optionality has been included and the technical aspects have included an assessment for trenchless crossing for the cable crossing only. An **Illustrative Masterplan** is included within the DCO Submission **[EN010159/APP/2.7].** All phases of the Proposed Development (construction, operation for up to 60 years and decommissioning) have been assessed in the ES. **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5]** provides details on the replacement of components based on the life expectancy of equipment and on decommissioning activities. This has been assessed in the ES. **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]** considers the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development with other NSIP projects. The list of cumulative schemes has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	throughout the lifetime of development. i.e. what are the failure / replacement rates for the solar PV panels, batteries, and other equipment. Construction Phase- 4.63. The ES will need to consider the cumulative environmental effects of constructing development, alongside the construction of other NSIP projects that are currently within the PA2008 process. One of which has now been consented (Gate Burton Energy Park- 12/07/2024).		
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 5: Legislative and Planning Policy Context** The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan [REF-27] was adopted in April 2023 and is the Development Plan for the West Lindsey District. It does not appear that there are any relevant made neighbourhood plans or neighbourhood plans in preparation either adjoining or adjacent parishes to the site boundaries within the West Lindsey District. Despite raising this in our previous consultation response it appears that there is no reference to part of the site within the West Lindsey District being within a Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area. Policy M11 of the Lincolnshire County Council Minerals and Waste	Noted. Each Aspect topic considers the latest relevant planning guidance. A Minerals Safeguarding Assessment, demonstrating how impacts to Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been addressed, is presented in the **Minerals Safeguarding Assessment [EN010159/APP/7.3]**. This is also referenced in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management policies is relevant. Lincolnshire County Council are the minerals authority and we would defer to them in this regard.		
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 6: Methodology for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report** The contents of this Chapter are noted and we would agree with the Methodology.	This has been noted by the Applicant.	N
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 19: Cumulative Effects** It is noted that the NSIP proposals within the West Lindsey District are noted within Table 1-Longlist of other existing Development and/or Approved Development, along with other nearby planning applications within our District. The status of these projects will need to be updated, as many have now progressed. One of which (Gate Burton Energy Park) has now been granted	The longlist has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment. Details are included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	a DCO by the SOS on 12th July 2024. We would expect the updated status of the larger NSIP projects to be further considered within the ES.		
Lincolnshire County Council	**Cumulative Effects** Chapter 19 of the PEIR document considers the interaction of effects and cumulative effects. LCC notes the 15km zone of influence (ZOI) as identified within the methodology of the cumulative effects, which includes several other NSIP proposals including North Humber to High Marnham, Fosse Green Energy, West Burton Solar Project, and the Great North Road Solar Park. LCC is pleased to see the consideration of projects that have not yet been approved and are still in the application process. There are several other NSIP applications currently proposed within Lincolnshire, whilst the principal sites are located outside of the proposed 15km ZOI wider implications, particularly traffic and transport may have some interactivity and cumulative impact.	The longlist has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment. Details are included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Consideration should be given to the geographical scale of the other NSIP projects within Lincolnshire and in adjacent authority areas. The cumulative assessments of these projects and their impacts should be kept under review.		
Lincolnshire County Council	There are several other NSIP applications currently proposed within Lincolnshire, whilst the principal sites are located outside of the proposed 15km ZOI wider implications, particularly traffic and transport may have some interactivity and cumulative impact. Consideration should be given to the geographical scale of the other NSIP projects within Lincolnshire and in adjacent authority areas. The cumulative assessments of these projects and their impacts should be kept under review	The cumulative impact of other projects has been assessed in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** The longlist has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment and includes schemes outside of the 15km ZOI. In particular the impact on BMV has been considered regionally.	n
Lincolnshire County Council	**Waste** LCC notes the proposed project timeline of 60 years and the intension for solar PV panels to be replaced once during this time period. LCC also notes the intension to provide estimates of the likely type and quantity of waste produced from site during the operational stage as well as the	The longlist of cumulative schemes has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment. Details are included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** The impact of Cumulative Waste is considered in **ES Vol 3, Appendix 2.3: Materials and Waste**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	proposed measures to reduce waste within the ES. LCC considers that the ES should be accompanied by a detailed waste management strategy (WMS). This WMS should encompass all stages of the proposed project (construction, operational and decommissioning) as well as and potential cumulative impacts. 27 Currently there are 11 other proposed NSIP solar projects located within Lincolnshire at various stages within the DCO process. All the infrastructure required for these projects, if approved, would be constructed during a similar timescale which would put significant pressure on the County's waste facilities. LCC would highlight that local facilities for recycling solar waste do not exist at present, and there is no certainty that they will in 60 years' time. This has the potential to become a significant issue as a result of the cumulative solar waste quantities that might arise from solar projects in the county and region. These factors need to be taken into account as part of any decommissioning plan. Further consideration and more detailed assessment of the likely waste streams and how they will be managed will be required in respect of construction and operation	**Impact Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]**. An outline Site Waste Management Plan is submitted as part of the DCO Application (see **Outline Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) [EN010159/APP/7.12]**) which sets out the likely effects and commitments to reduce the generation of waste and to divert waste from landfill during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. It is noted that the Applicant is committed to recycling 100% of the Solar PV panels, which is detailed in the SWMP.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	waste particularly in light of: • the panel turnover forecasted for other sites, • the current lack of facilities locally for processing end of life panels, and • The cumulative arising from all solar NSIPs Operational waste could also be a significant waste stream which needs careful consideration. LCC notes that Table 6: carbon and climate change indicates the recycling of construction waste and local disposal of waste where possible, LCC welcomes the principles of the Waste Hierarchy and proximity principle, this should be elaborated upon further within the ES and WMS. The developer should aim to minimise and reuse waste wherever possible in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy. The waste management proposals need to ensure that the Waste Hierarchy principles are followed and more detailed plans should demonstrate how this will be achieved.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 5 – Pg 37 Legislative and Planning Policy Context** At paragraph 5.13, reference is made to each of the adopted development plans for the 'host' authorities. In the case of Newark and Sherwood District Council (hereafter referred to as NSDC) reference is made to the Amended Core Strategy (2019) and the Second Publication Amended Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2023) (ADMDPD) [REF-33]. The applicant does not make reference to the current version of the ADMDPD as adopted in July 2013. This also remains as being part of the Development Plan, until such time that it is replaced by the emerging and amended version of the ADMDPD). Accordingly, it should be taken into account as part of the EIA for the scheme as part of the local planning policy context. We would ask for a thorough review of the PEIR, as we note in other technical chapters, no specific reference is made to any NSDC local plan policies. These are noted as being relevant material considerations in the consideration of this NSIP project and should be given proper consideration in the Environmental Statement and	Noted. Each Aspect topic considers the latest relevant planning guidance as an Appendix to each ES Chapter. The **Policy Compliance Document [EN010159/APP/5.6]** provides detailed evidence of compliance with relevant national and local policy documents	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	other key documents, including (but not necessarily limited to) the Planning Statement.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Appendix 4-2 Environmental Register** It is noted that Table 1-9 set out some 'indicative' measures for how impacts are proposed to be mitigated during the construction stage. We acknowledge that these are outline proposals at this stage, but NSDC would welcome the opportunity for an early review of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Whilst is noted that this may be contingent on completion of the EIA and production of the ES, many of the mitigation measures for construction projects of a scheme of this nature are typically relatively standardised, to allow for the early production of the CEMP. Related to this, NSDC would also welcome early discussion on 'requirements' so that the means to which mitigation measures can be secured (as part of the DCO itself) are agreed.	Noted. Due to the timing of the preparation of the CEMP (and, as acknowledged by NSDC, that document's reliance on the outcome of the EIA) there has not been time to share the CEMP ahead of submission of the Application. However, the Applicant is keen to engage with the Council post submission in relation to the proposed mitigation measures. A meeting is scheduled for 25 February 2025 with the Applicant and all the host authorities to discuss DCO requirements, and whilst the timing of that meeting will not allow changes to be made to the draft DCO that is submitted with the Application, the Applicant will look to incorporate agreed amendments in the next revision of the DCO.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Cable Routes** At the present, it is noted that the cable routes have not been surveyed in detail, but once clearly identified this should be undertaken. The cable route will be a temporary construction feature with soils reinstated. The soil management plan should also consider the cable route in order to minimise the impact on soil structure, land drainage and ultimately soil quality. The route passes across and will be buried under mainly open countryside that is largely arable farmland. Two key groups of impacts have been identified elsewhere for the purpose of defining receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude: • Land use and tenure: these are the potential impacts on human activity, including landowners, occupiers, local communities, and other land users • Agriculture: these are potential impacts on the soil resource, the surrounding environment, and the agricultural productivity of the land. Whilst we agree with these key impacts, we would also confirm that any assessment should include land drainage impact during construction and restoration of cable trenches.	Details of the cable corridor to the proposed National Grid High Marnham substation are detailed in the **Volume 7, Other Documents: Export Cable Route Concept Method Statement [EN010159/APP/7.13]** this provides details on the route, construction method, indicative duration and control mechanisms to avoid effects. The cable crossing details have been considered in ES Volume 2, Aspect Chapters and with the environmental measures included, as secured by **Volume 7, Other Documents: oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4].** Consequently no likely significant effects are predicted. **Volume 7, Other Documents: oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** includes specific details with regards to temporary drainage during the construction phase to ensure the surrounding land, including agricultural productivity are mitigated. The impacts on land owners are considered in **Chapter 17: Socio-economics [EN010159/APP/6.17].** An oSMP, the content of which have been agreed with Natural England, is submitted as part of the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		DCO Application [**EN010159/APP/7.10]**. This includes details on the protection of soils during all phases of the Proposed Development such that no likely significant effects are predicted.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 19 – Cumulative Effects** NSDC have previously identified (at EIA Scoping stage) that the cumulative assessment should consider all relevant types of projects and not simply be limited to solar farm projects. We have also previously advised that The Environmental Statement (ES) should consider whether regional scale likely significant effects could occur with other large scale solar projects e.g., arising from changes in land use and disposal of waste. Furthermore, we have also previously stated that this should be agreed with all the authorities. The information has not thus far been presented to NSDC for consideration. Whilst it is noted that the cumulative assessment has had regard to Advice Note 17, there is no detailed justification and/or methodology for how a long list has been created	The longlist has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment. Details are included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and a short list established. NSDC would recommend that the applicant in particular make use of Appendix 1: Matrix Identification of 'other development' for CEA, which is an Appendix to Advice Note 17. The text associated with Appendix 1 notes that 'It can be It can be used to demonstrate that a systematic approach to identifying development for inclusion in CEA has been adopted.' NSDC consider that further detailed work and justification is paramount to ensure that the cumulative assessment undertaken as part of the ES is both robust and thorough. We look forward to further explanation of that and the opportunity to agree those schemes that should be captured within the cumulative assessment.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 20 – Conclusions of Preliminary Significance** NSDC notes that the preliminary assessment identifies a number of topic areas with likely significant adverse effects, including LVIA and Cultural Heritage. Whilst it is accepted that a detailed assessment will be presented within the ES, informed by the detailed design for submission purposes, NSDC expect a full and	**Chapter 19 – Summary of Significant Environmental Effects [EN010159/APP/6.19]** presents the summary of significant effects across the suite of environmental topics based on the full EIA which is presented in the ES. . Specific environmental measures relevant to the technical aspects have been identified and have been considered as part of the assessments (i.e.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	robust ES that quantifies and clearly explains the significance of effects across all topic areas, including the extent of residual effects once mitigation is applied.	the assessments of likely significant effects have been undertaken with the inclusion of the environmental measures, as these measures form part of the Proposed Development). The technical aspect specific design interventions can be found in the Environmental Measures sections of Volume 2: Aspect Chapters.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**EIA Scoping Consultation.** Pg 2 Onwards. Scoping Report and PINS Adopted Scoping Opinion. NSDC note that Volume 2 Contains a Copy of the EIA Scoping Report and the PINS Response to that formal request. NSDC would not wish to make any further comments on Volume 2, other than to request that these previously made comments by NSDC continue to be taken into account in the formulation and finalisation of the ES.	Noted. **Appendix 2.2 of the ES** [**EN010159/APP/6.21**] summarises PINs Scoping Response and how the ES has considered these comments. Where the consultees' comments have resulted in inclusions to the technical assessment methodologies, these specific consultation details have also been included within Chapters 6 to 17 of Volume 2, Aspect Chapters.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**PEIR Report Non-Technical Summary** In respect of the Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the PEIR, NSDC would encourage the applicant to consider whether this could be further simplified and summarised in a more targeted way. We note that the Annex to Advice Note 7 – Presentation of the Environmental Statement [REF-34] states the following: 'The Planning Inspectorate advises that the ES should be laid out clearly avoiding (where possible) over-reliance on detailed and technical terminology. The ES should provide a clear, objective, and realistic description of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. Information should be presented so as to be comprehensible to the specialist and non-specialist, alike. The Planning Inspectorate recommends that the ES be concise with technical information placed in appendices as appropriate.' Noting that the PEIR is not the finalised version of the ES, NSDC would encourage the applicant to consider whether the NTS could be more focussed, which at 52 pages long, is an extensive document in its own right and noting the advice as referred to above and to	Noted. The **NTS** [**EN010159/APP/6.22**] has been refined to include further illustrations such that the document is focused and clearly sets out the impact of the Proposed Development in non-technical language.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	ensure that a key summary document for the ES is accessible and comprehensible.		
Bassetlaw District Council	EIA should include reference to land contamination. Preferably sources of historic land contamination and methods of reducing future land contamination	**Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** considers historic land contamination and mitigation measures during construction.	N
Nottinghamshire County Council and Bassetlaw District Council	**Waste** To reflect the Inspectorate comments to the Scoping Consultation in relation to waste, the applicant has stated within Chapter 4 of the Preliminary Environmental Report that the future Environmental Statement will detail the likely estimates, types and quantities of waste generated during the construction phase. Reduction measures for waste will also be	Noted. The impact of Cumulative Waste is considered in **ES, Volume 3, Appendix 2.3: Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	detailed. The Councils would welcome a waste assessment which provides a forecast of expected waste arisings but believes this should cover the construction, operational and decommissioning phases. Any arising figures should then be considered against Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire's capacity forecasts set out in the authority's Waste Needs Assessment [REF-35]. Since this proposed development is one of many large solar farm developments in the area, all with a similar timescale, any waste assessment should also consider the cumulative impact of this proposal with other developments on waste capacity in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire.		
Nottinghamshire County Council and Bassetlaw District Council	**Minerals** The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) [REF-36] and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), along with the adopted Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021) [REF-37], form part of the development plan for the area. As such, relevant policies in these plans need to be considered.	**Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** considers the impact on minerals. In addition, a **Volume 7, Other Documents: Minerals Safeguarding Assessment** is submitted as part of the **DCO Application [EN010159/APP/7.3].** The emerging Waste Local Plan (March 2024) [REF-38] has been assessed in the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.3],** Due to changes to the Order Limits since statutory consultation, Girton Quarry is now located	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Please note that the Pre-Submission Version (August 2023) of the emerging Waste Local Plan, which has been submitted for examination (March 2024) [REF-38], should also be given weight as a material consideration. Minerals As noted in paragraph 9.25 of Chapter 9 of the Preliminary Environmental Report, the site falls within the Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Area for sand and gravel with the permitted Girton quarry 350m from the site boundary. Paragraph 9.27 then continues that a Mineral Assessment has not been provided at this time but will be within a future Environmental Statement once further information has been obtained and further engagement with the authorities undertaken. In relation to a forthcoming mineral assessment, this should address and show compliance with Policy SP7: Minerals safeguarding, consultation areas and associated minerals infrastructure in the Minerals Local Plan and National Policy. Policy SP7 requires developments within the minerals safeguarding area to demonstrate it will not needlessly sterilise minerals nor hinder future extraction and where this cannot be	approximately 1.5km to the south of the Order Limits, as such no impacts are expected in regards to the safeguarding or operations of the site.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	demonstrated, and there is a clear need for non-mineral development, prior extraction will be sought where practical. The Council would welcome further engagement and would also encourage the applicant to engage with Tarmac, the operator of Girton quarry, to ensure this permitted site is safeguarded.		
Lincolnshire County Council	We welcome the design changes made to mitigate Significant Negative effects on Landscape and Visual, and the comprehensive chapter on this. We feel this will need further consideration through emerging design and landscaping to maintain pleasant views and to prevent a sense of enclosure. From the site plans some residential receptors, including entire villages and hamlets, still look to be encircled by panels from the site plans and will, therefore, have a view of two-metre fencing feeling like it is enclosing them and not the site. Where feasible and it would not affect construction or operation, a commitment to new planting as early in the project phases as possible, so that trees and hedgerows can establish, would be encouraged. We note the suggestion that it may still be	The design of the Proposed Development has evolved in response to feedback received and now incorporates: • A break in the arrays at the northeastern boundary, allowing The Woodland Trust access to Road Wood and to retain ecological connectivity. • Removal of arrays to maintain visual connectivity between the Fledborough Viaduct and Fledborough Village. • Setbacks to the south of Ragnall Village and offsets of up to 50 metres from Main Street. • Land between North Clifton and South Clifton removed from the Proposed Development to maintain perceived connectivity between the villages.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	possible for land around and under the panels to be used for food production. Where this is not feasible consideration should be given to the possibility of alternative land uses such as grazing land or wildflower meadows.	• Bespoke buffers and setbacks to individual properties based on the home visits and consultation responses. • Solar panels offset by at least 15 metres and up to 180 metres from PRoWs. At this stage a construction contractor has not been appointed and as such phasing of the Proposed Development, including the planting of trees and hedgerows early can not be confirmed. **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4]** considers alternative agricultural use and provides details on why commercial grazing and growing crops under the solar PV modules has been discounted. It is noted that under the panels a shade tolerant seed mix, incorporating woodland species, will be selected. Should it be possible (based on availability of graziers), conservation grazing will be implemented to maintain this grassland mix.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
General			
West Lindsey District Council	**General cumulative impact** It is noted that the NSIP proposals within the West Lindsey District are noted within Table 1-Longlist of other existing Development and/or Approved Development, along with other nearby planning applications within our District. The status of these projects will need to be updated, as many have now progressed. One of which (Gate Burton Energy Park) has now been granted a DCO by the SOS on 12th July 2024. We would expect the updated status of the larger NSIP projects to be further considered within the ES.	The Long List has been agreed with the Host Authorities prior to the assessment. This takes into account the DCO submissions. The cut-off date for the Long List of Other Developments was 14th January 2025 to allow for the assessment to be undertaken. Details are included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Community Consultation** We have reviewed the project leaflet and have no specific comments to make.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Consultation Booklet** We have reviewed the project booklet and have no specific comments to make.	Noted by the Applicant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**SOCC** NSDC have previously responded to the formal consultation on the SOCC from the applicant and therefore have no further comments to make, beyond those originally made.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
City of Doncaster Council	No comment.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
East Lindsey District Council	No comment.	Noted by the Applicant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 1- Introduction** The contents of this chapter are noted.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 20: Conclusions of Preliminary Significance** The summary of preliminary significance is considered to be helpful. We would broadly agree with the conclusions on the preliminary likely significant impacts being adverse for Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Visual Impacts, Carbon and Climate Change, Health and Socio Economics. We would, in particular, appreciate further discussion to be included in the ES around the loss of BMV and Agricultural Land. We also consider that the ES should reflect the recent Supreme Court judgement findings in R (Finch) v Surrey CC & Others [2024] UKSC 20 [REF-39]. It should address any direct or indirect "downstream" environmental impacts, i.e. "scope 3 emissions". It should also address "upstream"	Noted. With regards to the loss of BMV and agricultural land, **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** considers the likely significant effect. The impact on the regional amount of BMV is also included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** The ES takes into account the known likely direct and indirect significant effects of the Proposed Development; this includes indirect activities such as the transport of solar infrastructure and the carbon emissions from the manufacturing and travel distance of material. As detailed in **Chapter 14: Carbon and Climate Change [EN010159/APP/6.14]** the carbon assessment has	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	effects - for instance, where and how will the solar PV equipment be manufactured and transported to the sit, and the environmental effects that may be expected to arise as a consequence.	considered the direct effects in relation to embedded carbon emissions from the manufacture of the equipment to be used during operation (e.g. the solar PV modules) as well as the transport carbon emissions from the supply of goods.	
City of Doncaster	Having considered the proposal details and location, I can advise that CDC does not wish to make any detailed comment on this proposal.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
East Lindsey District Council	Thank you for consulting East Lindsey District Council on your proposed solar farm/battery storage - One Earth Solar Farm. I can advise that this authority has no comments to make.	Noted by the Applicant.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
North Lincolnshire Council	I can confirm after consulting with consultees within North Lincolnshire Council, that no objections have been raised in respect of the proposal.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Peterborough City Council	The proposal site is remote from Peterborough and as such, the Local Authority has no comments to make.	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Human Health			
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 17 – Human Health** We have no specific comments to make on this chapter.	Noted	N
Lincolnshire County Council	**Human Health** LCC considers that the human health chapter of the PEIR has brought together all potential positive and adverse health effects successfully. LCC are pleased to see that Public Health responses and feedback on the Scoping	Noted	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Consultation have been considered in the preparation of this chapter.		
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 17: Human Health** The contents of this Chapter are noted. We would advise that a Health Impact Assessment is carried out as required by Policy S54 (Health and Wellbeing) of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan [REF-27]. Criteria b) requires developments of over 5ha or more to submit a fit for purpose Health Impact Assessment as part of an application. We would expect a development of such a significant scale to provide this.	**ES Vol 2, Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** is considered to meet the requirements of Policy S54 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. IEMA (2022) 'Effective Scoping of Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment' confirms that where an EIA is undertaken and there is also a requirement for Health Impact Assessments (HIA), projects should normally meet the HIA requirement through the EIA Report health chapter.	N
Nottinghamshire County Council	**Public Health** Appendix 1 sets out the Rapid HIA checklist for the One earth Solar Farm project, having taken into consideration Chapter 17 Human Health and the conclusions of Preliminary Significance Chapter 20. The rationale for this approach by	Nottinghamshire County Council have provided their own HIA for the proposal finding positive and neutral effects. **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** has considered Nottinghamshire County Council's response on this	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	assessor Landscape and Visual Impacts (see Chapter 12); Carbon and Climate Change (see Chapter 15); Health (see Chapter 17); and Socio-Economic (see Chapter 18) where significant effects are noted. The details of the significant effects are detailed in Table 20-1 are significantly and indirectly linked to Human health	topic as a whole and cross-refers to the other technical chapters where relevant.	

Lincolnshire County Council	LCC appreciates the applicant's consideration of Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) and assessment as not significant and note that EMF from the operation will be below exposure levels specified in health protection guidelines from the International Commission on NonIonizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) [REF-14]. However, LCC would propose that the cumulative effect of existing overhead electricity distribution infrastructure in the area should also be considered within this assessment. LCC also considers that further assessment and consideration …of the effect on pacemakers will be helpful and should be considered. Until LCC are assured of these concerns, LCC considers that electromagnetic fields should be considered as a potential Significant Negative effect, until further consideration and assessment has been undertaken.	Electro-magnetic fields are a determinant of health assessed in Section 16.6 of **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16].** At the distances proposed, the Proposed Development would not exceed the permitted reference levels set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection. Regarding pacemakers, research indicates that the impact on pacemakers is negligible so an assessment was not undertaken.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Human Health: Mental Health			
Lincolnshire County Council	LCC also considers that further assessment and consideration of the adverse mental health impacts throughout the community engagement process… In addition, LCC deems there is more to be done on mitigating the overall potential mental health effect on the local communities through the ongoing engagement efforts.	The assessment of the Environmental Statement includes potential impacts during the project's construction, operation and decommissioning stages, therefore impacts in advance of the project's consent are outside of the scope of the EIA. However, the approach undertaken by the Applicant has been to maximise community engagement at all stages of the development, enabling local communities to positively influence the design evolution of the Proposed Development. The design has changed significantly in response to feedback received concerning assets and environmental matters which are considered to be important locally. As a consequence, a participatory approach can increase the sense of control within a community and result in various embedded mitigation measures and enhancement areas being secured. Adverse mental health effects will be mitigated by several factors including numerous offsets from individual properties and community assets. Taking	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		into account the anticipated physical and mental health effects for this determinant, the magnitude of effect is assessed as low due to the short-term duration, temporary nature and accounting for the embedded design measures. The Applicant has also undertaken efforts to communicate with the local community throughout the development period, to help inform them about updates to the Proposed Development in response to their feedback, and explain the next steps in the development process to help reduce anxiety caused by a lack of information. The assessment methodology and outcomes are set out in the chapter, including recommendations on mitigations where necessary. **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]**	
Human Health: Other			
Lincolnshire County Council	LCC notes that some of the effects proposed to be scoped out of the human health chapter might not be considered to represent a potential significant negative effect but could be an opportunity for positive enhancement. For example; offsetting energy costs for residents could be targeted at households living in fuel	The Applicant appreciates that there are potential health benefits from the application of the Community Fund and welcomes further consultation with LCC on its potential uses.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	poverty; land not used for solar PV panels could be made available for community growing which would contribute to good diet and nutrition and access to green space and nature; finally, the proposed Community Fund households could contribute to these and other health improvement agendas. LCCs Public Health team would like to be involved in the allocation of the future Community Fund.		
Hydrology and Hydrogeology			
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 8 — Pg 2 onwards. Hydrology and Hydrogeology** NSDC note that the Environment Agency are the key statutory consultee in respect of this topic area and are therefore best placed to offer commentary on this technical topic area. Notwithstanding this, NSDC note that at paragraph 8.4 it is stated that it is difficult to define a study area with confidence, but that 'consideration of the impacts that occur in the wider area has been made. There does not appear to be any evidence of how the wider area has been defined and considered.	Study area has been clearly defined within **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7].** In the absence of any specific guidance relating to solar developments and in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 113 (2020), a 1km buffer has been considered appropriate, as sufficient distance is provided to encompass catchments associated with the Order Limits and to enable the deposition of silts in overland flows and dilution of any concentrated pollutants.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 8: Hydrology and Hydrogeology** The proposed approach to Hydrology and Hydrogeology is broadly agreeable. We note that the risk from surface water has now been included. It is disappointing to see that the details of an FRA have not been included within this chapter with para 8.56 stating that this will be submitted as part of the DCO application. Given the sites location within areas at medium to high risk of flooding we would have expected this to be provided now. We would expect discussions to be on going with the Environment Agency, and Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils as Lead Local Flood Authorities to be on going as well as with any relevant Internal Drainage Boards.	It was not appropriate to prepare an FRA at the stage of submitting the PEIR and this is only available once all data and coordination is undertaken. **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]** has now been prepared. This has been produced in consultation with the EA and LLFA(s) through a number of meetings. Meeting minutes are included within the appendices of the FRA.	N
Nottinghamshire County Council	**Flood Risk Management** Having reviewed chapter 8 of the PEIR, this appears to appropriately consider flood risk and follow all the relevant policy and legislative guidelines and appropriately consider flood risk and drainage at this stage Due to the nature of the proposals these do not appear to seek to significantly increase the impermeable area of the site, and as such the LLFA would only like to	Runoff from the BESS and substation compounds will be restricted to the greenfield (Qbar) rate for all events up to an including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change scenario. With this in mind, there will be no negative impact on the receiving watercourses with regards to water quantity or runoff rate and therefore no increase in flood risk.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	comment that surface water runoff from the site should not be exacerbated. Any increased runoff from the site, such as from any hardstanding/small buildings, should be appropriately managed on site to prevent increasing runoff from the site and therefore prevent increasing the risk of flooding the surrounding area of the site.	Runoff from the solar farm areas (i.e. the panels themselves) has not been quantified on the basis that this will simply discharge to ground and mimic the undeveloped scenario (i.e. no increase in flood risk). It is proposed however, that SuDS features are incorporated wherever feasible to encourage natural infiltration (include swales, filter drains and detentions basins). This has been assessed in **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	
Nottinghamshire County Council	Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) Due to the nature of the proposals these do not appear to seek to significantly increase the impermeable area of the site, and as such the LLFA would only comment that surface water runoff from the site should be prevented from being increased. Any runoff from any hardstanding/small buildings on the site should be captured on site, to prevent increasing runoff from the site.	Runoff from the BESS and substation compounds will be restricted to the greenfield (Qbar) rate for all events up to an including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change scenario. With this in mind, there will be no negative impact on the receiving watercourses with regards to water quantity or runoff rate and therefore no increase in flood risk. Runoff from the solar farm areas (i.e. the panels themselves) has not been quantified on the basis that this will simply discharge to ground and mimic	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		the undeveloped scenario (i.e. no increase in flood risk). It is proposed however, that SuDS features are incorporated wherever feasible to encourage natural infiltration (include swales, filter drains and detentions basins). This has been assessed in **Chapter 7: Hydrology and Hydrogeology [EN010159/6.7]** and **Appendix 7.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	
Lincolnshire County Council	**Hydrology and Hydrogeology** LCC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the PEIR and have the following comments to make. Flood risk to the development from all sources has been considered and LCC notes that large areas of the proposed site are located within flood zones 2 and 3. The development site has medium to high risk of flooding from fluvial and tidal sources, however, risk of flooding from surface water is very low based on Environment Agency (EA) flood mapping. This is adequately addressed within chapter 8 of the PEIR. LCC considers that hydrology and hydrogeology have been considered suitably and welcomes the embedded	The **Flood Risk Assessment** is provided in **Appendix 7.2 of Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Engagement has been undertaken with LCC within two meetings, minutes of which are provided within the appendices of the FRA.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	measures proposed. LCC notes the intension to prepare a Flood Risk Assessment as proposed within paragraph 8.59 and welcomes further engagement on the design of the project relating to flood risk and drainage design as mentioned within paragraph 8.67.		
Land and Soils			
Bassetlaw District Council	Chapter 9 Land, Soil and Groundwater It is noted that that an Agricultural land Survey within the PEIR has been carried out on the main sites but not in areas that are assigned to cable route options. The Local Planning Authority would request that all areas are surveyed in order to assess the soil quality to fully understand how much of the best and most versatile agriculture land would be lost to a project that would occupy the site potentially for over 60 years. The PEIR also identifies that of a total land area of 1,263 Hectares has been surveyed to date and the Agricultural land Survey categorise the land within the best and most versatile	An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey of the Order Limits has been undertaken, with site work completed from June 2023 to April 2024, in line with industry best practice and Natural England guidance TIN049. The survey work involved using an auger to assess soil types (topsoil and subsoil) to depths up to 1.2m (approximately one sample per hectare), with some additional larger trial holes (also to 1.2m depth). The ALC survey covers the Order Limits, with a total surveyed area of 1240 hectares (ha). The results of the ALC survey are summarised in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, with reference to **Figure 8.5 (ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.20])**. The full ALC survey report	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	agriculture land to be lost as follows Grade 1: None present Grade 2: 19.2% (243 Ha) Grade 3a: 36.0% (455 Ha) Grade 3b: 44.8% (565.9 Ha) Grade 4: None present. This proposal would develop 698 hectares of grade 2 and grade 3a of the best and most versatile agriculture land for the period of in excess of 60 years. The Environmental Statement should provide a robust consideration of this matter and all land should be surveyed.	is presented as **Appendix 8.3 (ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]**. The ALC and Best Most Versatile (BMV) land is as follows: > Grade 1 (BMV land): none present > Grade 2 (BMV land): 19.7% (244.8ha) > Grade 3a (BMV land): 33.6% (416.1ha) > Grade 3b (non-BMV land): 46.7% (579.5ha) > Grade 4 (non-BMV land): none present > Grade 5 (non-BMV land): none present > Non-agricultural land: none present > Urban land: none present. Land that is classified as BMV land (ALC grade 2 and grade 3a) occupies a total area of 660.9ha, which is 53.3% of the surveyed land, or 46.8% of the land within the Order Limits. The ES provides a robust assessment of this data, with all land now having been surveyed. Following recommendations in the oSMP on decommissioning there should be no deterioration in land quality. Depending on cropping on the land prior to development soil health may be improved e.g. the organic matter content of land that was under arable cropping may increase.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		However, during the site selection process, the Applicant applied specific environmental search criteria, including agricultural land grade to find appropriate land which would be able to deliver its objectives. According to the provisional ALC mapping (Defra and Natural England), this area (i.e. in proximity to the point of connection) of Nottinghamshire and to a lesser extent, Lincolnshire, has a mixture of largely Grade 3 with small pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 4, making complete avoidance of BMV impossible for development of the scale proposed. The Natural England predictive mapping also shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV with one swathe of high likelihood between North and South Clifton (which was subsequently removed so only a small parcel remained). On this basis, the Order Limits was considered favorable, based on predictive mapping at site selection stage and avoided the swathes of Grade 2 to the east and west. Consideration was given as	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		to whether alternative land could be found with less impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics. Further information is provided in the Site Selection Report at Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].**	
Bassetlaw District Council	Tuxford Parish Council commented that cannot support solar schemes on productive arable or farming land. Benefits to the community need to made clear.	A full assessment of the impacts on the availability of agricultural land is provided in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8].** Consideration of the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development alongside other possible developments is provided in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** NPS EN-3 acknowledges that solar development is not prohibited on BMV land, and it is recognised that at scale, developments may use some	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		agricultural land. During the site selection process, the use of BMV was considered by the Applicant using the Natural England predictive mapping. This shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV. While the Applicant sought to avoid BMV generally, it was not possible to avoid BMV entirely. There was one swathe of high likelihood probability between North and South Clifton, but it has since been removed during design development, so only a small amount remained. As such, during the site selection process, the Applicant sought to avoid BMV using the information available at the time. The Applicant has committed to a Community Development Package, and will continue to consult with the community and other stakeholders as the Proposed Development continues through the development process. The items that were suggested through the consultation include reduced energy bills, a fund to support local projects, and jobs and skill programmes, which are all being considered.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 9 – Pg 2 onwards. Land and Soils** The Land and Soils Chapter has been reviewed by NSDC'S externally appointed advisor on Agricultural Land Classification. As such, we would wish to offer the following observations on this chapter. Section 9.28 under the heading of 'Soil' describes soil composition. In this regard, we note that land drainage is a key factor in assessing both land classification and also land restoration. This impact is particularly paramount along any cable or grid connection route, where trenches are dug and/or where soils are stripped, even on a temporary basis. As detailed later in the Chapter, the land within the Order Limits has been subject to an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Survey, although it is noted that full access to land has not yet been achieved for a number of land parcels and therefore the work to date is not complete. NSDC would seek to comment on this issue once the full survey is complete and a full understanding is provided on the implications of the loss of BMV agricultural land. We would also add that at present there is no accepted consensus, as to whether the long term (temporary) use of land should be considered as	Noted. Further consultation has been undertaken with Natural England on the soil sampling, results and the BMV. Further consultation has also been undertaken with Natural England on the contents of the **oSMP [EN010159/APP/7.10]** and agreement has been reached with Natural England on this document (27 January 2025). The oSMP indicates any that land drains broken during trenching operations will be marked and reinstated. Generally the oSMP outlines operating methods to avoid soil compaction and drainage issues with remedial measures if necessary.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	'not significant' and therefore the loss of any BMW over the 20-hectare threshold may still be considered a 'significant' impact. In respect of the ALC Survey Methodology, the Soil augering of the site should be undertaken in line with TIN 049 and the MAFF 1988 Guidelines [REF-42], one auger point per hectare and with occasional soil pits particularly where soil types vary. On a site of this size the amount of augering should be around 1,600+ auger holes and probably 10 to 20 pits to verify the soil profiles – more if there are significantly different soils. Turning to Soil structure, it should be noted that during the construction phase of development of this nature, the movement patterns of heavy vehicles associated with the works when soils are wet can cause considerable damage. Whilst there is a means to remedy some of the impacts post construction, not all of this impact can be mitigated, leaving long term drainage issues with the soil structure as a result.		
North Kesteven District Council	Our primary interest is in relation to **PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 9. 'Land, Soil and Groundwater'.** We note from paragraph 9.30 thereof that results of soil surveys indicate the following ALC	Information that was provided relating to ALC grades has been updated within **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, where full details of the ALC grades within the Order Limits is	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	proportions (on the basis of a total land area of 1,263 Ha surveyed to date): Grade 1: none present Grade 2: 19.2% (243 Ha) Grade 3a: 36.0% (455 Ha) Grade 3b: 44.8% (565.9 Ha) Grade 4: none present Paragraph 9.66 then summarises that 19.2% of soils are classified as grade 2 and would have 'very high' sensitivity and that 36.0% of soils are classified as grade 3a and would have 'high' sensitivity.	included, along with sensitivity classifications as defined by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance.	
North Kesteven District Council	**Appendix 9-1: Key Legislation and Policy of Chapter 9** discusses agricultural land policy considerations in the context of EN-1 [REF-2] and EN-3 (2023) [REF-1] and the CLLP [REF-12] amongst others, however the submission version documents should also take account of the Written Ministerial Statement UIN HCWS466 (15 May) [REF-40] relating to solar development, food security and agricultural land considerations noting the specific reference to 'geographical clustering of proposed solar developments in some rural areas, such as in Lincolnshire'; ergo that cumulative impacts should be considered.	This additional document has been reviewed, and referred to within **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**. The Applicant notes that a cumulative assessment of potential impacts on soil and agricultural land is presented within **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**, which finds that there is no significant effect due to the temporary nature of the developments. The Written Ministerial Statement UIN HCWS466 (15 May) [REF-40] has been discussed in the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.3],** however it is considered that this is somewhat outdated, as the updated NPPF December 2024	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		[REF-4] amended footnote 65 to remove reference to food security which is no longer a material consideration under that policy. In terms of the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development this is assessed robustly in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN01059/APP/6.18**].	
North Kesteven District Council	**Table 19.3 of Chapter 19** then sets out **cumulative assessment** proposals on a topic-by-topic basis, including in relation to land use and soils, noting that 'there is the potential for cumulative effects on land, soils or groundwater receptors to occur for other existing development and/or approved developments that fall within 1km of our Project' . Figure 19-1: 'Existing Development and/or Approved Development within 15km of Our Project' and Table 1 then identify a 'longlist' of other existing or approved development against which cumulative impacts will be assessed.	In terms of soils and agricultural land, the cumulative assessment, as presented **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, considers the other proposed developments within both counties (Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire), not just within 1km of the Order Limits. This is to ensure that a clear assessment of BMV use by the Project has been made, giving due consideration to other developments that could either permanently or temporarily reduce the availability of agricultural land. The cumulatlve impacts are considered in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN01059/APP/6.18**] which finds that there is no significant impact.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
North Kesteven District Council	**Cumulative Assessment Zone** Clearly, in light of the WMS and precedent adopted by other solar NSIP projects elsewhere in Lincolnshire (including those within North Kesteven District), the cumulative impacts arising in relation to land and soils should be expanded to a county-wide level, meaning that the proposed cumulative assessment zone in Chapter 19 is insufficient as currently proposed.	The cumulative impact in relation to soil and agricultural land use considers other developments on a county-wide basis, therefore incorporating other projects within Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. This assessment is present in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8 also considers impacts to soil.	
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 9: Land and Soils** Paras 9.25-9.27- Mineral safeguarding has been recognised in this chapter. However, para 9.26 states that the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Plan [REF-41] do not show any minerals sites within the site boundary or the study area. The site does lie within a Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area. We would expect this to be addressed in the Minerals Assessment, para 9.27. states that this will be reported in the ES. We would again advise that Lincolnshire County Council are the minerals authority and would defer to them in this regard. Para 9.29- 9.32- Agricultural land- The ALC identifies that much of the site is Grade 3a (565.9ha- 36%) and Grade 3b (455- 44.8%) with Grade 2 representing 19.2%	**Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** provides a full assessment of the impacts of the Project on soil and availability of agricultural land. There is also further assessment of the use of agricultural land on a wider scale in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]** which finds that there is no significant impact**.**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	of the site. It is noted that auger testing has been done at a max depth of 1.2m, approx.1 sample per hectare. Some survey work is still yet to be carried out due to access restrictions and was anticipated to complete by June. We expect the confirmed land gradings to be within the ES. The lack of any significant discussion around BMV land is concerning, this is an important issue for the District as well the other host authorities for this DCO application. It would be expected that this is further reflected in the ES given that food security is as important to the country as energy security. On the basis of the findings within the ALC it would result in the loss of 565.9ha of BMV land. It is concerning that Table 9-2 details that there would be “no likely significant impacts”. impacts upon soil and agricultural land during, construction, the operational phase and decommissioning. Whilst the scheme may ultimately be “temporary”- it will be in operation for a significant amount of time. It would result in the loss of 565.9ha of BMV land for up to 60 years. The effects of this need to be properly assessed and addressed in the Environmental Statement. It should consider the socio-economic		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	implications for removing significant areas of agricultural land out of circulation - what are the expected impacts upon the farming industry.		
Lincolnshire County Council	**Land and Soils** Landscape consultants have reviewed the One Earth Solar Farm PEIR, on behalf of LCC and have the following comments to make. Key Points • A detailed base line ALC is expected, subject to Natural England consultation, it is likely to cover the whole area and be in detail at a standard density of 1 auger bore per hectare. • It is likely that 55% of the overall site will be BMV quality, based on a preliminary survey. There is slightly more BMV in Lincolnshire than Nottinghamshire based on the preliminary survey. • A Soil Management Plan is also expected and should include construction, management and decommissioning. • The PEIR suggests that the cable and grid connection routes will not be scoped into the ES, but with land drainage issues	NPS EN-3 acknowledges that solar development is not prohibited on BMV land, and it is recognised that at scale, developments may use some agricultural land. During the site selection process, the use of BMV was considered by the Applicant using the Natural England predictive mapping. This shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV. While the Applicant sought to avoid BMV generally, it was not possible to avoid BMV entirely. There was one swathe of high likelihood probability between North and South Clifton, but it has since been removed through the design process. See the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** in terms of the approach to the design and layout of the Site, including how the size of the site has evolved, and see the Site	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	on site, it is considered that this should be reconsidered, particularly if the route is mostly BMV. • At the moment the cable routes have not been surveyed in detail, but once clearly identified this should be undertaken. 5 • Although not mentioned specifically, consideration should be given to the production of a soil health assessment, input to loss of land for food production and the impact on any agricultural holdings affected. PEIR Chapter 9: Land, Soils and Groundwater sets out the main topics to be considered for scoping in, including Soils and Agriculture. Land drainage is a key factor in assessing both agricultural land classification and the impact on land restoration particularly along any cable or grid connection route, where trenches are dug, or where soils are stripped, even temporarily. The PEIR report confirms that the site has been appraised for ALC and maps and some details are provided (Appendix 2), however, the main information is awaited. Surveyors have undertaken preliminary advice, including a provisional survey. At present there is no settled consensus as to whether a long-term temporary use of land should be considered as	Selection Assessment appended to the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].** An ALC survey of the Order Limits has been completed, which is presented in Appendix 8.3: Agricultural Land Classification survey report. The updated figures for the ALC grades within the Order Limits are: > Grade 1 (BMV land): none present > Grade 2 (BMV land): 19.7% (244.8ha) > Grade 3a (BMV land): 33.6% (416.1ha) > Grade 3b (non-BMV land): 46.7% (579.5ha) > Grade 4 (non-BMV land): none present > Grade 5 (non-BMV land): none present > Non-agricultural land: none present > Urban land: none present. Land that is classified as BMV land (ALC grade 2 and grade 3a) occupies a total area of 660.9ha, which is 53.3% of the surveyed land or 46.8% of the land within the Order Limits. The ES provides a robust assessment of this data, with all land now having been surveyed.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	not significant and therefore the loss of any BMV over the 20 hectare threshold may still be significant.	The cable and grid connection routes, which are within the Order Limits, were included in the ALC survey. The contents of the **Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) [EN010159/APP/7.10]** have been agreed with Natural England. However, during the site selection process, the Applicant applied specific environmental search criteria, including agricultural land grade to find appropriate land which would be able to deliver its objectives. According to the provisional ALC mapping (Defra and Natural England), this area (i.e. in proximity to the point of connection) of Nottinghamshire and to a lesser extent, Lincolnshire, has a mixture of largely Grade 3 with small pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 4, making complete avoidance of BMV impossible for development of the scale proposed. The Natural England predictive mapping also shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV with	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		one swathe of high likelihood between North and South Clifton (which was subsequently removed so only a small parcel remained). On this basis, the Order Limits was considered favorable, based on predictive mapping at site selection stage and avoided the swathes of Grade 2 to the east and west. Consideration was given as to whether alternative land could be found with less impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics. Further information is provided in the Site Selection Report at Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].**	
Lincolnshire County Council	**ALC Survey Methodology** The soil augering of the site should be undertaken in line with TIN 049 and the MAFF 1988 Guidelines [REF-42], one auger point per	Natural England have been consulted by the Applicant in relation to both the survey works relating to the soils assessment, and in preparation of the **Outline Soil Management Plan**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	hectare and with occasional soil pits particularly where soil types vary. On a site of this size the amount of augering should be around 1,600+ auger holes and 10 to 20 pits to verify the soil profiles, more if there are significantly different soils. The anticipation with this site is that it will be mostly, but not all BMV. A soil management plan is proposed, this is welcomed. Soil Structure Soil structure can be significantly damaged during the construction phase. There would be a lot of trafficking of vehicles on the land to erect the PV panels and if this work is undertaken when soils are wet, there can be significant damage. Much of this damage can be remedied post construction but not all and it is possible that long term drainage issues occur on the site due to the construction.	**[EN010159/APP/7.10]**. Agreement has been reached with Natural England on the contents of this document (27 January 2025). This ensures that Project documentation relating to protecting soil resources will be in line with the necessary guidelines that are required by Natural England as the key consultee relating to soil management.	
Lincolnshire County Council	**Cumulative ALC Impact**s There are a number of Solar PV schemes in both Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, with others planned or proposed. There are many known solar NSIP schemes; specifically in relation to impacts on agricultural land. The situation is a moving picture as new proposals come forward. Most of these sites are proposed on farmland.	An in-depth cumulative assessment of the use of agricultural land is presented in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**, which presents information relating to the BMV land use of the Project, alongside BMV land take for other known developments in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. This finds that there is no significant	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	The local area in particular is an agricultural area with substantial amounts of land within the BMV category. It is thought that for a project of this scale and duration (60 years) the impact upon BMV land would be reasonably large and therefore we would expect the impact to be significant.	impact at a cumulative level due to the temporary nature of these developments.	
Lincolnshire County Council	**Cable Routes** The cable routes have not currently been surveyed in detail. Once the cable routes have been clearly identified this surveying should be undertaken. The cable route will be a temporary construction feature with soils reinstated. The soil management plan should also consider the cable route in order to minimise the impact on soil structure, land drainage and ultimately soil quality. The route passes across and will be buried under mainly open countryside that is largely arable farmland. Two key groups of impacts have been identified elsewhere for the purpose of defining receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude: • Land use and tenure: these are the potential impacts on human activity, including landowners, occupiers, local communities and other land users. • Agriculture:	Noted. The Applicant has been in discussions with Natural England in relation to the assessment and surveying of soils, and have been liaising with them in drafting documents such as the **Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.10]** for the Proposed Development. Agreement has been reached with Natural England on the contents of this document (27 January 2025).	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	these are potential impacts on the soil resource, the surrounding environment and the agricultural productivity of the land. Additional concerns include land drainage impact during construction and restoration of cable trenches. Consultation Ongoing consultation with Natural England as the appropriate authority is anticipated and encouraged.		
Landscape and Visual Impact			
Bassetlaw District Council	**Landscape Architect Manager Comments General comments on the submitted information** It is clear the applicant has put extensive effort into pulling together a comprehensive set of documents to explain and evaluate the proposed development. In general the methodology, analysis, evaluation and presentation of the information is clear and accurate, giving a clear sense of what is proposed, what the impacts are likely to be, how these impacts are planned to be mitigated and consideration other developments within the surrounding area. At this stage of the application we have restrained our comments to	The ZTV is based on the maximum height parameters for each element, including 13.5m AGL for substations and 3.8m for solar panels. The ZTV methodology is provided as part of the wider LVIA methodology included in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**. Whilst it is possible that the Proposed Development may be visible beyond 2km, the intervening distance and surface features (buildings and vegetation) are such that significant adverse effects are unlikely. The study area has therefore been defined at 2km. The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council,	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	specific points we have identified as unclear, inaccurate, missing or that we do not agree with. These are set out in the sections below. **Supporting documents** The applicant has provided a substantial range of supporting documents for the LVIA chapter in line with what would normally be expected for this scale of project. These include • LVIA methodology • Zone of Theoretical Visibility Plan • Viewpoints plan – number and location of viewpoints not agreed with LPA • Annotated Viewpoint photographs (to LVIA type 1) • Photo-visualisations (provided as interactive 3D model with set fly-throughs) • Summary landscape analysis tables • Summary visual analysis tables Comments on these supporting documents are made within the relevant sections below. **Assessment methodology** Appendix 12.2 sets out a comprehensive and complete methodology which references and follows best practice outlined in Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024. The methodology has been refined to distinguish between users of local PRoW and those of promoted routes such as National Trails or National Cycle Network Routes, on the assumption that users of promoted routes typically have a relatively heightened interest in the landscape. The very low category has been maintained as it provides balance to the very high category included. The methodology, including susceptibility of visual receptors, was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	(GLIVA3) Third Edition published by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Managers and Assessment (April 2013). While this document is clear and thorough there are a few points we wish to raise: 1. Selection of visual envelope & ZTV 2. Table 8 - Visual Susceptibility Criteria 3. Table 10 – Landscape Magnitude of Effect		
Bassetlaw District Council	**Selection of visual envelope & ZTV** The selection of a 5Km initial study is described within the LVIA referring to the generally low topographical levels of the area, this has then been focused in to a 2km study area following the production of the ZTV (Figure 12.1). It is unclear what height of proposed infrastructure the ZTV has been based upon. This should be clarified. While this plan does show a majority of the areas identified as having higher potential visibility endor fade out at the 2km boundary there is still a reasonable swathe of moderate potential visibility to the west of the site beyond this. If the ZTV has not taken into account the considerable heights above ground stated for the BESS sites then the area of higher potential visibility is likely to be greater than shown.	The ZTV is based on the maximum height parameters for each element, including 13.5m AGL for substations and 3.8m for solar panels. The ZTV methodology is provided as part of the wider LVIA methodology included in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**. Whilst it is possible that the Proposed Development may be visible beyond 2km, the intervening distance and surface features (buildings and vegetation) are such that significant adverse effects are unlikely. The study area has therefore been defined at 2km. The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	In addition, we feel that given the massing and significant monoculture extents of this development, the initial search for potential high viewpoints should have been wider, looking for key vantage points such as the Lincoln ridge along the B1398. While this is just over 10Km distant the scale of this project could well still be visible and when taken into consideration with other surrounding solar farm project could have a significant cumulative effect. Table 8 - Visual Susceptibility Criteria In Table 8 - a High Visual Susceptibility is described as: 'People whose attention or interest is focused on their view or it is a key reason for visiting the location' The descriptions then go on to highlight this would include users of PROW within an ANOB, National Park or similar designated landscape. The table then identifies criteria for Medium Visual Susceptibility and lists users of PROW outside designated landscape areas. We believe that a very high proportion of all PROW users would	The methodology has been refined to distinguish between users of local PRoW and those of promoted routes such as National Trails or National Cycle Network Routes, on the assumption that users of promoted routes typically have a relatively heightened interest in the landscape. The methodology, including susceptibility of visual receptors, was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	fulfil the description given for High Susceptibility in that their- 'attention or interest is focused on their view and or it is a key reason for visiting the location' Therefore it is our view that all PROW users should be considered as having a High Visual Susceptibility. Table 10 – Landscape Magnitude of Effect We would question the use of the Very Low category as this does not appear to provide any significant difference to the description for the Low Category. Recommend remove the Very Low category from the assessment methodology.		
Bassetlaw District Council	**Landscape Resources** The nature of the proposed development generally has limited impact upon landscape resources as there will not be large scale removal of woodland, hedgerow, changes to existing topography or diversion of watercourses. What it will do is remove a large area of agricultural land from operational use for a 60+ year period although this can be viewed as a temporary and reversible action with no significant harm. The BESS sites and some other construction/operational elements will have a	The BESS included within the Proposed Development will be removed. Details of the footprints of the BESS and Substations is provided in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9**]. The scale of these elements has been considered in the assessment of landscape and visual effects; however, the BESS will be removed as part of decommissioning, as set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	more permanent removal of landscape resources, but at this stage their extent is overstated to provide a worse case scenario. Therefore any calculation of volume and value of landscape resources lost would be excessive. This evaluation will need to be carried out at a later stage of the design and consultation/evaluation process when greater certainty of impacts can be given.	**Plan [EN010159/APP/7.6]**, and therefore its presence considered long term, but reversible.	
Bassetlaw District Council	**Chapter 12 Landscape and Visual Amenity** 12.10 - 12.13 Study Area As highlighted above we would like some further evaluation of the extent of the study area and identification of potential high visibility locations beyond the 2Km boundary. Based on the current mapping we have identified an additional 2 locations that should be included within the detailed scoping of viewpoints. These are: • A6075 Tuxford to Darlton by Darlton Gaps, • Marnham Road out of Tuxford – between Park cottage & Merryfields farm Should the impact from taller BESS sites amend the ZTV mapping then a further review of potential additional locations will be required. 12.14 In relation to potential views outside the	Further discussion regarding visual receptors was undertaken with all host authorities through consultation. The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024. **Appendix 11.5 of Chapter 11 – Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** details the review of the potential for visual effects beyond 2km. A comprehensive visual baseline and assessment has been submitted with **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** in **Appendix 11.4 [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	2km zone of the reduced visual envelope the LVIA states - 'Where our Project would be visible it was found that visibility would be limited and unlikely to result in significant landscape or visual effects.' We would recommend that these locations mentioned should be included within the assessment to demonstrate they clearly do not have any significant visual impact. 12.27 Vegetation patterns This point identifies that the wider site has occasional field boundary hedgerows, highlighting that these are not a obligatory uniform feature within this landscape. This supports one of the key visual elements of this location, its open extensive views over successive fields. Where hedgerows are located these generally appear to be relatively low and managed. 12.27 & 12.28 These two points appear to describe similar elements but do not wholly align. Recommend review and clarify. 12.42 Landscape Sensitivity within published LCA's Applying a generalised sensitivity assessment across such a swathe of land could	Regarding consideration of potential impacts on Thorney, the land previously proposed for development close to Thorney has since been removed from the Order Limits. The potential impact on the character of the village is still considered in the LVIA through assessment of effects on 'LVCA: Thorney'.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	easily undermine the particular characteristics of specific character areas / policy zones or portions thereof. This approach should be reviewed and a more sensitive area specific evaluation applied. 12.44 Village Assessments In stark contrast to the generalised approach of 12.42 above, the applicant has undertaken bespoke village assessments which is beneficial. 12.46 Visual Baseline Similar to comments on point 12.42 above – the assessment of the visual baseline is very short and general. This needs expanding on to provide more baseline context to help evaluate the impact of the proposed changes. 12.48 Table 1 Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints The list of Residents of Villages is in our view incomplete. The list includes Dunham on Trent, South Clifton and Low Marnham all ranging from 500m to 1500m from the edge of the development site. The village of		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Thorney on the eastern edge of the site is not include despite being adjacent to the development boundary. The village of Thorney needs to be included within this list and associated assessments.		
Bassetlaw District Council	**Evaluation of Figure 12- 8 Viewpoint** Plan Haviung made a thorough review of the viewpoints identified on Figure 12-8 we recommend the following additional viewpoints are explored to ensure completeness and no significant impacts are missed. • A57 between Ragnall and Whimpton House looking south - Site adjacent & open • PROW Fledborough footpath 1, just south of Woodcotes looking south - Site within 120m • VP16 poorly positioned view towards site blocked by residence & vegetation – suggest relocate or provide additional VP approx. 400m further north up the A1133 looking west. • PROW – On Ragnall Bridleway 3 just west of where Ragnal footpath 4 joins it – panels located to the north and south with potential sites for BESS facilities. Most of the numbered viewpoints are identified under one or more of the headings given in Table 1 Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints. However there are	Suggested visual receptors have been reviewed and either scoped in or out with appropriate justification provided. See **Appendix 11.5 (see ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21])** Regarding the points raised: - A57 between Ragnall and Whimpton House: this viewpoint was not captured due to safety implications of working adjacent to A57, however viewpoints 46 and 59 record of views from the A57 west of the River Trent. - PROW Fledborough footpath 1: included as viewpoint 63. - VP16: has been reorientated to face north. Its location is specific to not only people driving on the A1133 but also 'The Chase' an adjacent residential dwelling.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	several VP numbers that are not listed at all, these being VP's 6, 15, 21, 32, 38, 44. It would be helpful to clarify why these viewpoints are included in the study and what they demonstrate.	- PROW on Ragnall Bridleway 3: included as viewpoint 58a and 58b. The Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoint table has been reviewed and updated for DCO submission.	
Bassetlaw District Council	12.52 Published guidance This point refers to guidance given in National Character Area 48: Trent and Belvoir Vales in regard of environmental opportunities, SEO1, SEO2, SEO3 and SEO4. It is unclear how opportunities SEO1, SEO3 and SEO4 are being realised within the project and the applicant should make it clearer how these recommendations are being manifest within the Landscape mitigation proposals. 12.61 Construction Landscape effects It is acknowledged that construction activity will not extend over an entire Landscape Character Area, however it will significantly cover several individual policy zones having a significant magnitude of effect at policy zone scale. The applicant should reconsider this approach in the	Regarding the reference to the SEOs in National Character Area 48, the Proposed Development has responded positively to - SEO1 through the enhancement of ecological networks through the landscape proposals secured in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, which result in a substantial biodiversity net gain. - SEO 2 by the planting of: a) Over 9km of species-rich native hedgerow with trees (including existing hedgerow enhancement); b) Approximately 6km of species-rich native hedgerow;	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	LVIA to ensure effects are appropriately considered at all scales. 12.66 Operation Year 1 Landscape Effects While the proposed ecological enhancement and landscaping areas respond positively to guidelines for NCA 48 and the policy zones, (particularly in regard of improving the vegetation cover and opportunities for biodiversity), they will change the sense of openness currently experienced. By increasing vegetation cover, mostly through hedgerows managed to 3m height, (12.70), that provide essential screening for the development, it will create significantly more enclosure and shortening of views, substantially changing the experience and perception of users and residents alike.	c) Approximately 1,240ha of species-rich grassland accounted for across the Order Limits in hedgerow and field margins, riparian zones, wildflower meadows and tussock mixes beneath solar panels; d) 4.2ha of woodland and native tree belts; e) Individual trees; and f) Agricultural field margins. - SEO3 through the reinstatement of coastal grazing marsh on the flood plain adjacent to the River Trent - SEO4 through a detailed review of elements that contribute to local distinctiveness and protection of them through embedding offsets and visual screening. Points relating to landscape character are addressed in **ES Volume 3: Appendix 11.3 [EN010159/APP/6.21].** The impact arising from the introduction of new planting across the Order Limits has been included in the consideration of impacts and resultant landscape and visual effects.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Bassetlaw District Council	**Appendix 12.3: Landscape Character Areas and Likely Landscape Effects** **Appendix 12.4: Likely Preliminary Significant Visual Effects 2** Both of the above tables provide a clear and helpful summary of the respective effects on specific elements. These are generally accepted but taking into account the points made above in review of the written Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter.	The Applicant is aligned with Bassetlaw District Council on the approach taken with these points, with responses to other specific points made outlined above.	N
Bassetlaw District Council	**Appendix 12.5: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** Unless otherwise stated below, the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, (OLEMP), is considered appropriate and helpful at this stage of the process. The right to provide further comment on this at it develops along with the wider scheme is reserved Existing retained trees & shrubs Removal of trees and woodland should be avoided at all costs unless they are dead, diseased or dying. There should be sufficient locations within the wider site where access can be gained through hedgerows for construction and servicing routes and as such, trees and woodland should not need to be	Full details of proposed planting is provided in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. The Proposed Development has sought to minimise vegetation removal. This has been achieved through: - Utilising existing field access points for new access tracks - Managing the height of existing hedgerows for the implementation of essential visibility splays, rather than proposing vegetation removal. These measures are reflected on the Vegetation Removal Plan provided in Appendix C of the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	cleared. Retained trees and woodland should have root protection fencing installed where construction activity could fall within their root protection area. A construction activity plan along with access routes across the site will be required. This will then inform the extent of any additional arboriculture survey to determine sensitive locations and extent of root protection zones. Root protection fencing should be installed in line with BS5837 guidance. As mentioned previously hedgerows managed to 3m height is not in keeping with the local landscape but it is understood this is required for screening purposes. Wherever possible new introduced hedgerows not required for screening should be managed to a lower height in keeping with the current practice. 7 Implementation Species lists given within the OLEMP should be cross referenced against and brought into line with published species lists appropriate to the separate identified Landscape Character Areas. Any desire to select species outside of these lists should be agreed with the NCC County Ecologist.	An arboricultural survey was completed (provided in **ES Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**). The survey included mapping of root protection areas that have been protected throughout the design process through the securing of the following parameters in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9]**: - Hedgerows: 5m - Trees: 15m - Woodland: 25m Regarding the species proposed as part of new planting, the Local Planning Authorities, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust will be consulted in preparation of the detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to input to the species list proposed to respond to current priorities at the time of implementation.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Bassetlaw District Council	**Appendix 12.5: Photosheets** This appendix provides full panoramas for all viewpoints listed in the document. These have been prepared to Type 1 in line with The Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals, 2019 [REF-43]. Issues identified with selection or placement of viewpoints is dealt with in the Landscape and Visual Amenity section above. In addition we have the following comments about specific viewpoint photos identified below: • VP 16 – image is looking west away from the development area which is north and east of this location. Clarify the purpose of this or correct if an error. If correcting VP will need to move north along A1133. • VP 25 & 26 – Photographs taken with parapet railings dominating the horizontal line of sight, as such detracting for the wider extent of the landscape, and therefore preventing clear sight of the development in the visualisations shown in the consultation booklet. Photographs should be retaken closer to the parapet to allow clear line of sight of the	The photosheets were revised and updated as part of the final ES submission: **ES Volume 3]: Figure 11.12: Baseline photography [EN010159/APP/6.20].** In response to the specific points raised: - VP16 has been reorientated to face north. Its location is specific to not only people driving on the A1133 but also 'The Chase' an adjacent residential dwelling. - VP25 & 26: The photos have been captured form the path to be representative of people's experience travelling over the viaduct. - VP26: Location of viewpoint on viewpoint plan has been corrected. - VP27: southerly aspect has been included to show the relationship to Fledborough Viaduct. 27b is orientated towards the Order Limits. - VP28: orientated south and east which includes land within the Proposed Development, providing consideration of the potential change in the setting to Fledborough.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	surrounding landscape. Images also do not show extent of development site. This should be marked on the updated images. • VP 26 – Location marked up incorrectly on the viewpoint map as this should be west of the River Trent. • VP27 – View stated as looking south and south west which would be away from the development, (more west & north west at this location). Clarify the purpose of this or correct if an error. • VP28 – View stated as looking south and east from Fledborough footpath 10 away from the development. Impact from the development is more immediate to the north and west of this location. Clarify the purpose of this or correct if an error. • VP46 - View direction should read view east along A57, not A1133. Correct. Given the number of errors above and requested adjustments or new viewpoint images, it is recommended the viewpoint imagery and viewpoint assessment is completely reviewed and updated to ensure information presented is accurate and representative showing both areas where	VP46: Updated to read ‘along A57’.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	potential views are discounted and areas where views are significantly impacted.		
Bassetlaw District Council	**Chapter 19 Cumulative Effects** Given the number and extent of solar farm projects within the identified 15km surrounding area of this development proposal, it would be beneficial to expand this section of the documentation. This should provide more detailed mapping and analysis of the extents of other projects in relation to this scheme, and their location within identified Landscape Character Areas and Policy zones to enable a clear and comprehensive evaluation of the true cumulative effects.	See Cumulative Assessment provided with DCO submission: **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]**. A 2km Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) study area has been defined as a proportionate and representative geographic area to identify significant landscape and visual effects, which has been agreed with the host authorities during consultation. This is based on an initial review of ZTVs up to 5km and then verified through fieldwork. **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects: Figure 18.5 [EN010159/APP/6.18].** The location of each cumulative development considered with respect to landscape character areas and policy zones is referenced in the text	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		supporting the conclusions in 'Table 19.3 Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Assessment' as set out in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects: Figure 18.5 [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	
Bassetlaw District Council	**Conclusion Summary** As mentioned earlier, at this stage of the application we have restrained our comments to specific points identified now. We anticipate there will be several further rounds of consultation following revisions and new iterations of the scheme as the consultation responses are digested and responded to. Going forward we would welcome the opportunity to investigate evolving issues and options directly with the developers Landscape team through a workshop process as has been done with other NSIP solar farm schemes. We have found this process to be helpful in discussing the issue and clarifying each others understanding and viewpoint, often leading to a successful resolution or acceptance of a particular point.	Consultation workshops specific to landscape and visual matters were held virtually with all host authorities in November 2024. Details of discussions and agreements is provided in **ES Volume 3: Appendix 11.5**. **[EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Bassetlaw District Council	The study area will be kept under review as the project develops and will be the subject of ongoing consultation with Landscape Officers of Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council and West Lindsey District Council (collectively referred to as the 'host authorities) until the preparation of the version of the Environmental Statement for submission. Cumulative Landscape and visual effects with other schemes should be assessed as the project progresses, particularly in regards other NSIP or renewable energy projects. The visual assessment should take account of the worst case scenario in terms of winter views and effects associated with landscape mitigation at the operational phase (year 1), residual phase with planting having established (typically 15 years) and at the decommissioning phase. The LVIA should ensure that all elements associated with the development are considered and assessed, such as battery storage systems and boundary fencing, which may be more visible	The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024. The landscape and visual cumulative assessment includes consideration of the scheme's mentioned (namely the Hydrogen Production Plant and the proposed 400kV substation). The full list of cumulative schemes considered is as follows: - **23/00801/FUL** Proposed Construction and Operation of An 8 MW Electrolytic Green Hydrogen Production Plant, with Associated Infrastructure - **20/02225/ELE** Proposed sub station - **21/01577/FULM** Installation of a solar farm and battery storage facility with associated infrastructure. - **EN020034** North Humber to High Marnham - **24/00717/SCR**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	than the panels due to height and mass. The developer is encouraged to assess the cumulative impact on the landscape of this proposal and all other proposals with planning permission. In particular the concentration of development proposed at High Marnham including the Hydrogen Production Plant and the proposed 400kv substation. Comments by Via East Midlands were shared with Bassetlaw District Council on 12th July 2024. A full copy of these comments are attached and will be incorporated into the full response submitted by Nottinghamshire County Council.	Screening Opinion - Proposed Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Substation and Associated Infrastructure and Works - **24/00735/SCR** Proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and Associated Plant and Equipment - **24/01240/SCR** Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) - **24/01138/FUL** Battery Energy Storage System, Substation, Associated Infrastructure and Works **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** considers: > Peak construction activity in winter; whereby existing deciduous vegetation is not in leaf > Year 1 of operation; whereby the Proposed Development is fully built out and operational (including for maintenance), in winter with new planting low in height and deciduous vegetation not in leaf; > Year 15 of operation, in winter; reflecting the Year 1 assessment above, but accounting for the establishment of the proposed planting across the	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Order Limits, such that it is taller in height. Where there would be a difference in level in effect in summer conditions, i.e. when all deciduous vegetation is in leaf) then a separate summer scenario is assessed; and > Decommissioning, in winter; whereby the Proposed Development is removed from the Order Limits and the existing land uses are reinstated albeit the new trees and hedgerows would be retained.	
Bassetlaw District Council	The approach to assess the likely significant effects of the project appear reasonable. However in some cases for topics such as Landscape and Visual Impacts there is a substantial gap on assessing the impacts between the period of time of year 1 and year 15 of operational development. This should be more assessed more frequently.	**Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** considers: > Peak construction activity in winter; whereby existing deciduous vegetation is not in leaf > Year 1 of operation; whereby the Proposed Development is fully built out and operational (including for maintenance), in winter with new planting low in height and deciduous vegetation not in leaf; > Year 15 of operation, in winter; reflecting the Year 1 assessment above, but accounting for the establishment of the proposed planting across the Order Limits, such that it is taller in height. Where there would be a difference in level in effect in summer conditions, i.e. when all deciduous	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		vegetation is in leaf) then a separate summer scenario is assessed; and > Decommissioning, in winter; whereby the Proposed Development is removed from the Order Limits and the existing land uses are reinstated albeit the new trees and hedgerows would be retained. These scenarios were discussed in landscape consultation prior to DCO submission. Inclusion of an interim assessment scenario was considered (e.g. year 10), however this was not progressed since the effectiveness of mitigation planting cannot be relied upon until year 15 (the industry standard). By year 15 it is reasonable to consider the planting to be established to a degree sufficient to provide mitigation and therefore inform the assessment of effects. Before that, we have assumed in assessing effects that it will provide no mitigation (even though in reality it will provide an increasing degree of mitigation as it grows).	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Bassetlaw District Council	Glint and Glare has not been considered under Landscape and Visual Impact and it is recommended that this is considered along with glint and glare on the users of PROW and the highway and this should be used to inform other relevant sections of the ES.	A **Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010159/APP/7.16]** has been prepared and considered as part of visual effects where appropriate.	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 12 – Pg 2 onwards. Landscape and Visual** In respect of Landscape and Visual, NSDC have received advice from its externally appointed advisors and as such would wish to make the following comments. Overview Paragraph 4.36 commences a consideration of the design progression following the consultation process. A range of changes and amendments have been made to the project layout. This includes the removal of panels between north and south Clifton. Land adjacent to the village of Thorney has been removed from the development to protect the setting of the village. The design evolution is welcome, however we believe that the extent of impact during construction, re-construction (it is stated that during the lifetime of	Consultation with Newark and Sherwood's landscape advisors was undertaken in preparation of **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**. Detail is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21].** With reference to the specific points raised: - A fuller assessment of effects during construction and decommissioning is provided in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**. - Consideration of the operational scenario now includes reference to the replacement of panels and other equipment, in line with the indicative design life of each feature	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the project, the panels will be replaced at least once, it is not explained in detail the process of this renewal) and decommissioning have not been fully considered in the PEIR, for example the volume and scale of traffic on local roads and the vegetation loss to enable the delivery of the lorry loads on to the site. We also believe that there can be improvements to the masterplan by careful and strategic placement of mitigation planting so that blanket hedgerows which do not necessarily fit the character of the area are avoided. Given the continuing evolving nature of the project, the design is not fixed and consequently the Rochdale Envelope principle is applied to the PIER. Paragraph 4.53 considers a set of broad design principles which include climate and the sensitivity of the local environment, the impact of local communities, supporting the natural and built environment, as well as enriching the ecosystem and identifying opportunities to add value to the local community. As the design evolves, we welcome opportunities to discuss the assessment parameters including viewpoint selection and proposed mitigation. The design parameters must be clearly identified	provided in **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5].** - Further consideration of the placement of mitigation planting has been given since proposals provided as part of Statutory Consultation. The planting proposed aims to provide screening where required for mitigation of adverse visual effects, whilst retaining the openness of views. This has been achieved principally through embedding substantial offsets between visual receptors and the proposed screening. This is shown on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7].** The LVIA has assessed the parameters as set out on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3**] and Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9], with reference also made to management plans, principally the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	within the ES, and subsequently it must be clear and transparent within the LVIA those parameters that have been assessed. This should include not only the height and size/mass of elements of the scheme, but also areas or zones they will be located, such as on works or parameter plans		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	The project will be operational for 60 years, and it is an expectation that the panels will be replaced once during the operational period. It is not stated whether this would be a phased replacement over a number of years or a task to be completed over a period of time comparable with the construction phase of the project, which is currently predicted to span 2 years. The effects predicted during construction, for example the lorry movements within the local road network and the need for wider access points at various locations across the Site, would be replicated to accommodate the reconfiguration of the panels. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) will be issued as part of the DCO Application, but as stated earlier in this response we would welcome an early opportunity to	Panel replacement has been considered as part of **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**, as detailed in **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5]**. Consideration of the operational scenario now includes reference to the replacement of panels and other equipment, in line with the indicative design life of each feature provided in **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5].** The 60 year duration of the operational phase has been considered as temporary but long term in the LVIA, largely since the effects are reversible which is a key aspect when considering magnitude.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	consider this and other management plans in advance of the DCO submission. Given the stated operational time of 60 years, there is the question of reversibility and duration. Taking account of GLVIA3 and other related guidance, it is clear that this project is long term. Given that 60 years is comparable to two generations as a minimum, there is some strength to the consideration that this would amount to a permanent project, especially considering the average lifespan of building design is circa 50 years. There is clearly potential for significant landscape and visual impacts, especially considering that in this timescale, the panels will be replaced. It is stated in the PEIR that this would be once, but given the pace of technology, it should be considered if it is likely that the panels could be replaced on numerous occasions. At this stage we would need additional information regarding the phases of replacements in order to consider whether there is one single construction stage, or a series of staged re-construction stages.	The oCEMP will be reviewed and agreed via requirement post consent.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Decommissioning is considered from paragraph 4.71. This will include all aspects of the project with the exception of the two substations, which we understand would be retained at the decommissioning phase. Permissive paths are proposed to be removed, but underground cables may remain. Figure 4.5 clarifies the access points to the Site, which will be used during all phases of the project. These will be accessed from existing and upgraded strategic points on the public road network. At this stage the impact of the access points appears vague and would need to be clarified further as the design evolves, we welcome further dialogue on this matter.	Access points are detailed on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** which are within the controls of Work Area 7: Highway Works, as set out on the The location of access points was not specifically addressed in subsequent landscape and visual consultation. The location of these points has been primarily informed by seeking to minimise vegetation removal, maintaining offsets from residential and recreational receptors, technical requirements and road safety.	N
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Access is an important consideration, given the potential for vegetation removal, road reconfiguration and the large vehicles on a local road network. Figure 4.5 identifies a number of access points, and we note that some of these directly correlate with selected viewpoints. Continuing on-Site assessment and dialogue will be useful as the design evolves. The masterplan in the current iteration highlights numerous access points and compounds, however the chapter is light on the extent of vegetation loss	A vegetation removal plan is provided as part of the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** The location of access points and internal access tracks, as shown on the vegetation removal plan, have been selected to minimise vegetation loss, making use of existing field access points where practical. Consideration of the operational scenario now includes reference to the replacement of panels	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	expectant of the movement of large and numerous vehicles over a significant period of time. Similarly, as mentioned previously, the anticipated panel replacement is lightly explained; the potential to change a significant proportion of the development throughout the 60-year lifespan of the development would recreate an unexplained proportion of the construction period at least once and possibly more given the pace of technological development. We would anticipate that, as the design evolves towards the DCO submission, that the impact of the reconstruction, the mitigation measures to be implemented and the number of reconstructions anticipated throughout the lifespan of the development is clarified fully.	and other equipment, in line with the indicative design life of each feature provided in **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5].**	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Appendix 4.1 describes the project and introduces the concept of 'good design,' and that this is a consideration that has influenced the design from onset; influencing the siting, sustainability, and appearance of the project. The iterative process of the masterplan has resulted from on-going consultation. We have contributed to the consultation and will continue this as the project evolves. Four project principles are	Landscape mitigation has been designed to be sensitive to the site and its existing character. The mitigation proposed is shown on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** and detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** Mitigation planting has typically been set back from receptors in order to retain the openness of views	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	directing the design, these are climate, people, place, and value. These principles have led to design decisions including offsets from features including trees, woodlands, hedgerows, PRoWs, and rivers/ waterbodies. Such principles are welcomed and will be tested through onsite investigations, deskbased reviews, and viewpoint/ photomontage appraisals. Through ongoing dialogue, we expect these principles to be utilised within the masterplan to further minimise, or reduce, adverse visual effects. We welcome the mitigation measures; however, we expect the mitigation to reflect the character of the study area and not blanket the site with planting simply to screen. We look for a masterplan that enhances the existing grain of planting whilst respecting long to medium range views. For example, mitigation along the river needs to be carefully sited to respect long range views.	that is currently characteristic of the locality. Substantial offsets from the River Trent have been embedded, in part in response to visual amenity but also due to flood risk and ecological considerations. These offsets negate the need for extensive screening along the river.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	The description of the project components, including a breakdown of construction tasks is useful within appendix 4.1. Table 2 breaks the tasks and quantifies likely timescales for the completion of those tasks. This is useful in determining the extent and period of landscape and visual impacts. Management plans will be submitted as part of the DCO application, and we welcome ongoing dialogue as these develop prior to the application submission. Table 4 repeats the process of assessment by considering the decommissioning of the project. As stated above, the mitigation measures need to be carefully designed to respect the existing grain of the site. However, we also need to have a robust management plan that ensures maximum success rate in the establishment of the mitigation planting. Climate change has resulted in an environment that can be harsh for plant establishment with long dry springs and summers. We would wish to see a management plan that carefully itemises the number of visits, the actions during those visits, the process of replacing lost plants and ongoing longterm management to ensure the vegetation thrives and	Establishment practices and maintenance is detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. Further detail, as identified by Newark and Sherwood District Council, would be provided in the detailed LMEP, prepared following consent and approved via requirement. The oLEMP does detail the function, implementation, establishment maintenance, and long term maintenance for each form of vegetation proposed. The establishment maintenance descriptions include the key principles and outline prescriptions required to be undertaken.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	enhances the character of the study area. We would also expect any management plans cover an establishment period up to 15 years as a minimum, to cover landscape and visual effects up to the residual phase, but also that the management plans be reviewed and updated regularly to cover the 60- year project period.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Detailed Comments The study area has evolved from an initial 5km range, it is stated in para 12.11 that it is unlikely that the project would result in significant landscape and visual effects beyond the 2km range from the Site. This assumption alongside the fieldwork undertaken has resulted in the adoption of a 2km study area for assessment. While we agree with this in principle, and the ZTV does appear to broadly support this, we do have some reservations. We agree that the development of a large-scale solar farm on rural landscape would likely result in significant landscape and visual effects at all stages within the study area of 2km. We do believe that some areas beyond the 2km extent there is the potential for significant impacts especially during	The 2km Study Area was subject to further discussion and consultation with the host authorities. **ES Vol 3, Appendix 11.5: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21]** details a study undertaken providing views from beyond the 2km study area. Following review of this study it was agreed with the host authorities that the 2km study area was appropriate via meetings held in November 2024. The **ES Vol 3, Appendix 11.3: Landscape Baseline and Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]** builds on the assessment provided in the PEIR, providing further detail regarding elements that contribute to landscape character.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	construction, the early years of operation and decommissioning, and areas beyond 2km should not be discounted in any assessment. For example, the traffic movement to and from the site will have during construction, reconstruction, and decommissioning impacts beyond 2kms. Given the evolving design, with many unconfirmed design parameters, it is conceivable that visual impacts will be noticeable beyond 2kms in certain areas. Similarly, as a consequence of the programme for the replacement of panels, this may result in impacts comparable with construction during the operational phase of the project. Within the landscape, construction traffic will have a broad range impact. To determine this fully we welcome the range of selected viewpoints, and we provide comment on the viewpoints in section C, below. The ZTV does illustrate, on a bare earth basis, that some visibility is possible beyond the 2km extent. The selection of viewpoints beyond the 2km extent is important, for determining the accuracy of the generated models and fully scrutinising the assumption that significant effects will not be experienced beyond the 2km extent.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	This is important as the design evolves, and the true extent of the development is confirmed. At present there are no viewpoints beyond 2km assessed, and we consider this to be an omission, as well as a leap of faith given the full parameters of the design are not yet fixed. The baseline landscape analysis conforms with best practice, analysing the landform and topography, the land use and infrastructure, vegetation coverage, PRoW's, and designations. The PEIR then considers the national and regional character areas of the Site as well as village character areas. The assessment proceeds to assess the strategic national designations before moving towards the fine-grain local character, which is a best-practice approach we welcome and it is important that the subsequent LVIA consider the elements and features that make up the landscape character of the Site and Study Area so the effects of development upon these can be fully understood. The visual baseline is analysed with receptor groups identified in Table 1. The table is useful in		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	that the receptors are identified in relation to representative viewpoints. It is also useful that it is split between villages, isolated properties, PRoW users and road network users, which will likely have differing levels of susceptibility to change. The receptors identified are comprehensive within the 2km study area, however, given all of the points raised above, we should not discount receptors beyond the 2km boundary, especially as the design evolves. We would need to see the assessment of some receptors beyond the 2km range, even if to simply scope out.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Figure 12.8 shows the selected viewpoints in the context of the Site. However, no viewpoints are located beyond the 2km boundary. It would be useful to have a list of representative viewpoints that have been scoped out of the project assessment. As mentioned previously, while it is a fair assumption that beyond 2kms visibility is significantly reduced, it should be proven within the documentation. We would welcome a section in the LVIA that justifies the scoping out of viewpoints that were initially selected. The chapter emphasises that the design has evolved	As referenced above, **ES Vol 3, Appendix 11.5: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21]** details a study undertaken providing views from beyond the 2km study area. Following review of this study it was agreed with the host authorities that the 2km study area was appropriate via meetings held in November 2024. With regard to the design of mitigation in response to field work and coordination with relevant disciplines, an explanation is provided in the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	through compliance with stated design principles, these were discussed in the above section. The environmental opportunities as set out in the NCA 48 document [REF-44], alongside guidance from the Landscape Institutes Infrastructure Technical Guidance Note [REF-43] are both referenced as drivers for the design principles. Paragraph 12.54 provides a description of the embedded environmental measures that have been included in the masterplan. While the NCAs provide good overarching information and guidance, the key design parameters should evolve from the dissemination of the information provided in published local character assessments, field work and coordination with relevant disciplines such as ecology, heritage, or civil engineers (flooding and land form). This is particularly relevant in carefully and sensitively positioned mitigation planting. The design evolution has been an iterative process and has responded to feedback both from NSDC and other parties in the stages preceding the PEIR.	**Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Methodology is considered from paragraph 12.55 and also Appendix 12.2. At this stage, the detail of many elements is not fixed and as a result the worst-case scenario is considered. The methodology follows best-practice assessment methodologies by identifying construction, operational and decommissioning effects. Operational is assessed based on year 1 and year 15, but it does not identify in sufficient detail the magnitude of effect due to replacement of panels, which it is stated will occur once in the lifecycle of the project. Appendix 5 covers the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan; this details the mitigation proposals and begins to address the important aspect of ensuring that the planting thrives and matures in order to achieve the maximum output in regards minimising the landscape and visual effects of the project in the landscape. The list of species proposed to be planted, alongside planting protocols is useful, however the appendix is light on the methodology for ensuring maximum success rate of planting. It is also light on the impact of the construction, reconstruction, and decommissioning processes on existing	Establishment practices and maintenance is detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, including detail regarding the function, implementation, establishment maintenance, and long term maintenance for each form of vegetation proposed. The establishment maintenance descriptions include the key principles and outline prescriptions required to be undertaken for successful establishment. Further commentary regarding the impact of replacement of elements across the Proposed Development has been provided in the assessment of landscape and visual effects, beyond that which was provided in the PEIR. Further detail, as identified by Newark and Sherwood District Council, would be provided in the detailed LMEP, prepared following consent and approved via requirement.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	vegetation – both retention and removal. We would welcome the development of this appendix as the project progresses to DCO and will be happy to provide further advice on our expectations of this document.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	We welcome the approach to continued design evolution to refine areas where significant effects have been identified. The changes to the design to date have been part of the consultation process and this is an approach we would continue towards DCO submission. To aid this we would welcome speedy resolution to the currently unconfirmed aspects of the project. Appendix 12.6 provides imagery of each of the selected viewpoints, the images conform to best practice and generally are clear and well selected. We consider the viewpoints most directly relevant to the Newark and Sherwood district are 9 to 25 inclusive. Given the scale of the project and the open character of the landscape other views beyond the 2km study area are possible. At present no viewpoints have been selected	As referenced above, **ES Vol 3, Appendix 11.5: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21]** details a study undertaken providing views from beyond the 2km study area. Following review of this study it was agreed with the host authorities that the 2km study area was appropriate via meetings held in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	beyond the 2km study area, but as stated above, we believe this needs to be tested to scope out. This is particularly relevant in areas where the ZTV does show potential for visibility. The viewpoints have covered a wide range of receptors, including PRoW, Sustrans route, roads, residential receptors. Some views such as viewpoint 9 are split in to two with a view to the north extending beyond the scope of a single view sheet. The images are clear, photographed during dry clear spring conditions and the Site is clearly identified alongside key locations such as farms and key landscape features.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Viewpoint 12, along the Sustrans route, needs to be reconsidered as it is located within woodland and the merit of the view is therefore diminished. Likewise, viewpoint 18, which is from footpath 153/3/1 is dominated by a hedgerow in the foreground, and we would suggest a more carefully selected view, which captures the same receptor experience but provides a wider context than an enclosed route due to the hedgerows. An alternative view could be from South Clifton looking south. Viewpoint 19 is not well sited, and alternatives around the settlement of South	Discussion regarding the micro-siting of viewpoints and the distribution of photomontages has formed part of consultation. The location of viewpoint 12 remained as positioned in the PEIR but should be reviewed in conjunction with the other viewpoints located on the Sustrans route, namely VP10, 11, 12, 25, 26, 34a and 34b. These viewpoints have been selected to show the variety of views experienced along the Sustrans route, including open and enclosed views.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Clifton should be considered. The view here is blocked by the residential property and a wider context view from the edge of the settlement would be more appropriate. At present no viewpoints have been developed into photomontages. We understand that this will evolve as the design evolves. We wish to be involved in the selection process for this to maximise the benefit of the process	Viewpoint 19 has been located to show views from the edge of South Clifton. As shown on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3]** the Order Limits are no longer close to South Clifton such that no viewpoint location within the area would lead to significant adverse visual effects. 16 viewpoints were identified to be supported by photomontages. The location of these photomontages was discussed in landscape meetings with the host authorities.	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Conclusion** The design is evolving, and consequently there are significant gaps in the information provided. We understand and expect this at this stage of the process, and we have provided commentary on these and trust that the applicant will engage with relevant stakeholders and interested parties to enhance the DCO package. There are omissions which need addressing and are independent of the design evolution, for example the omission of viewpoints beyond 2kms from the development, even to if only to confirm the assumption that there will be no significant	An arboriculture survey has been submitted to accompany the ES. An offset of at least 25m has been embedded to all woodlands. Appendix 11.6. Appendix 11.5 details a study undertaken providing views from beyond the 2km study area. Following review of this study it was agreed with the host authorities that the 2km study area was appropriate via meetings held in November 2024. Establishment practices and maintenance is detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, including detail regarding the function, implementation, establishment maintenance, and	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	impacts beyond 2kms. The management and establishment of the mitigation planting is only considered on a broad level and not in detail within the oLEMP. Mitigation should not be used without careful consideration of the character of the open landscape. Simply filling views with planting will diminish receptor experiences. Generally, the viewpoints are well considered, there are some exceptions where more selective locations could have been found while still conveying the message. It is not useful to see hedgerow or woodlands as the key focus of the view when the point was to capture the receptor experience in the wide context of the landscape. As mentioned previously, the lack of viewpoints beyond 2km is an omission as the design is not fixed. Finally, this Chapter has also been reviewed by NSDC's Tree Officer and we would also wish to make the following observations. a. P 12:27 "there is no ancient woodland within our site" this statement is not supported by data and as such is suggested to be misleading. Going directly to	long term maintenance for each form of vegetation proposed. The establishment maintenance descriptions include the key principles and outline prescriptions required to be undertaken for successful establishment. Mitigation planting has been designed in response to existing landscape character (through the species proposed and location of planting) and existing views. As a result, mitigation planting has typically been set back from receptors in order to retain the openness of views that is currently characteristic of the locality. With regard to ancient woodland, the arboricultural report provided as an appendix to **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** confirms firstly that no ancient semi natural woodland are recorded in the survey area. However, in response to the comment regarding ancient woodland smaller than 2ha., the Proposed Development has taken a precautionary approach by embedding a 25m offset from all woodlands, exceeding Natural England's standing advice of a 15m offset from Ancient Woodland.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	government guidance Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions with specific reference to" Ancient woodland smaller than 2 ha, may not appear on these inventories." "You should use this guidance for all ancient woodlands and ancient veteran trees whether there on the inventory's or not." As such without a specific detailed survey it is not possible to say whether there is or is not ancient woodland, or veteran trees, or ancient trees within the application site. The premise suggested /information required is that all trees and all woodlands are either veteran or ancient unless proven otherwise. Evidence required in the guidance is stated as fieldwork and historic maps, BS5837 survey, as it appears absent the supposition that the ancient woodland et cetera not present is suggested as false. Given the level of impact from either an ancient woodland or veteran tree or ancient tree is suggested that this is a critical error.	This offset is secured in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** The reasoning behind the ZTV being set at 2km is noted (para 12.13). This is mainly due to the baseline conditions showing that the theoretical visibility of the Project becomes fragmented beyond 2km north of the site due to intervening vegetation and topography. Whilst we would usually expect a ZTV of between 3km and 5km, it would be useful to see at least some viewpoints at a 3km- 5km distance to provide some further justification for reducing the ZTV. We are concerned that there appears to be no real consideration of any potential cumulative landscape and visual impacts that may arise in combination with the other proposed West Burton and Cottam NSIP projects. The Gate Burton Energy Park has also recently (12/07/2024) been granted a DCO by the SOS. We would at the very least expect to see a section within this Chapter of the ES that acknowledges and addresses this. Magnitude of Visual Effects- Relationship to Glint and Glare Assessment- It is noted that Glint and Glare has not yet been assessed and will be included into the magnitude of effects in preparation of the ES. It is also noted that the	The ZTVs have been prepared up to 5km based on the maximum height parameters for each element, including 13.5m AGL for substations and 3.8m AGL for solar panels. The ZTV methodology is provided as part of the wider LVIA methodology at in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: LVIA Methodology [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Further to the ZTV, field work was completed beyond the 2km buffer from the site to consider potential visibility. This is presented in **Appendix 11.5 of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11].** Following discussion of this study with the host authorities, the 2km Study Area was agreed as acceptable. Field work beyond the 2km study area also confirmed that there would not be intervisibility with the proposed DCO scale solar farms at West Burton and Cottam. These have therefore not been included in the cumulative assessment presented in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	potential effects from lighting throughout the project will be included. We welcome that the magnitude of effects will be considered for each receptor. The ES should detail when lighting will be used from construction to decommissioning, including any motion light sensors. Appendix 12.1- Policy and Legislation- Within the Local Planning Policy section the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan [REF-12= and Policy S66 (Trees and Woodlands) is mentioned. It is concerning as to why Policy S53 (Design and Amenity) is not included here, given it contains criteria that development proposals should be assessed against in terms of character and design. The ES should refer to this policy. The preliminary findings on Landscape Visual Impacts for the areas within West Lindsey detailed in Appendices 12.3 and 12.4 are noted.	Lighting will be used within working hours during construction. No permanent lighting will be used during operation. Details of the lighting proposed is provided in the following management plans: - Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.4] - Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.5] - Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (inc restoration) [EN010159/APP/7.6] Relevant policies from the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan [Ref-12] are provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1: Summary of Relevant Legislation, Policy and Technical Guidance [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
West Lindsey District Council	It is noted that the location of the BESS sites have not yet been confirmed (para 4.38.). The worst-case scenario is that there will be two BESS locations (up to 20ha in size). One to the east and one to the west, within the site limits. The eastern one (within WLDC's boundary) is located within close proximity to a pipeline, it is understood that if this was to become the site for the BESS then the batteries would not be placed directly over the pipeline. Appendix 4-1 gives technical dimensions of the BESS- sites will consist of a series of battery units with dimensions of around 9.5m x 1.8m x 2.6m (LxWxH) with BESS inverters with dimensions of around 12.5m x 2.5m x 3.5m. There will be a ratio of 8 battery units to every BESS inverter. The substations (which would be on the same potential sites for the BESS) will have a worst-case scenario height of 13.5m. This height does raise some concern, they would be a significant intrusion into the landscape. The BESS and substations have the potential to have significant environmental effects including landscape and visual – the ES will need to be clear as to the extent of development proposed,	Details of the footprints of the BESS (and Substations) is provided in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9]**. The scale of these elements has been considered in the assessment of landscape and visual effects. It is correct that the proposed BESS would not be located directly over the pipeline referenced. This is secured via Protective provisions which will be included in Schedule 14 of the **Draft DCO [EN010159/APP/3.1]** which will ensure appropriate protection for utilities and other apparatus owned by statutory undertakers.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	including the number of battery units, applying a "Rochdale Envelope" worst case scenario.		
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	Assessment methodology Appendix 12.2 sets out a comprehensive and complete methodology which references and follows best practice outlined in Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLIVA3) Third Edition published by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Managers and Assessment (April 2013) [REF-45]. While this document is clear and thorough there are a few points we wish to raise: 1. Selection of visual envelope & ZTV 2. Table 8 - Visual Susceptibility Criteria 3. Table 10 – Landscape Magnitude of Effect Selection of visual envelope & ZTV The selection of a 5Km initial study is described within the LVIA referring to the generally low topographical levels of the area, this has then been focused in to a 2km study area following the production of the	The ZTV is based on the maximum height parameters for each element, including 13.5m AGL for substations and 3.8m for solar panels. The ZTV methodology is provided as part of the wider LVIA methodology included in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**. Whilst it is possible that the Proposed Development may be visible beyond 2km, the intervening distance and surface features (buildings and vegetation) are such that significant adverse effects are unlikely. The study area has therefore been defined at 2km. The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	ZTV (Figure 12.1). It is unclear what height of proposed infrastructure the ZTV has been based upon. This should be clarified. While this plan does show a majority of the areas identified as having higher potential visibility end or fade out at the 2km boundary there is still a reasonable swathe of moderate potential visibility to the west of the site beyond this. If the ZTV has not taken into account the considerable heights above ground stated for the BESS sites then the area of higher potential visibility is likely to be greater than shown. In addition, VIA feel that given the massing and significant monoculture extents of this development, the initial search for potential high viewpoints should have been wider, looking for key vantage points such as the Lincoln ridge along the B1398. While this is just over 10Km distant the scale of this project could well still be visible and when taken into consideration with other surrounding solar farm project could have a significant cumulative effect.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	Table 8 - Visual Susceptibility Criteria In Table 8 - a High Visual Susceptibility is described as: 'People whose attention or interest is focused on their view or it is a key reason for visiting the location' The descriptions then go on to highlight this would include users of PROW within an AONB, National Park or similar designated landscape. The table then identifies criteria for Medium Visual Susceptibility and lists users of PROW outside designated landscape areas. We believe that a very high proportion of all PROW users would fulfil the description given for High Susceptibility in that their- 12 'attention or interest is focused on their view and or it is a key reason for visiting the location' Therefore it is our view that all PROW users should be considered as having a High Visual susceptibility.	The methodology has been refined to distinguish between users of local PRoW and those of promoted routes such as National Trails or National Cycle Network Routes, on the assumption that users of promoted routes typically have a relatively heightened interest in the landscape. The methodology, including susceptibility of visual receptors, was agreed with the host authorities November 2024.	N
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	Table 10 – Landscape Magnitude of Effect VIA would question the use of the Very Low category as this does not appear to provide any significant difference to the description for the Low Category. Recommend remove the Very Low category from the assessment methodology.	The very low category has been maintained as it provides balance to the very high category included. The methodology, including susceptibility of visual receptors, was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	**Landscape Resources** The nature of the proposed development generally has limited impact upon landscape resources as there will not be large scale removal of woodland, hedgerow, changes to existing topography or diversion of watercourses. What it will do is remove a large area of agricultural land from operational use for a 60+ year period although this can be viewed as a temporary and reversible action with no significant harm. The BESS sites and some other construction/operational elements will have a more permanent removal of landscape resources, but at this stage their extent is overstated to provide a worse case scenario. Therefore, any calculation of volume and value of landscape resources lost would be excessive. This evaluation will need to be carried out at a later stage of the design and consultation/evaluation process when greater certainty of impacts can be given.	The BESS included within the Proposed Development will be removed. Details of the footprints of the BESS and Substations is provided in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9**]. The scale of these elements has been considered in the assessment of landscape and visual effects; however, the BESS will be removed as part of decommissioning, as set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.6]**, and therefore its presence considered long term, but reversible.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	**Chapter 12 Landscape and Visual Amenity** 12.10 - 12.13 Study Area As highlighted above we would like some further evaluation of the extent of the study area and identification of potential high visibility locations beyond the 2Km boundary. Based on the current mapping we have identified an additional 2 locations that should be included within the detailed scoping of viewpoints. These are: • A6075 Tuxford to Darlton by Darlton Gaps, • Marnham Road out of Tuxford – between Park cottage & Merryfields farm Should the impact from taller BESS sites amend the ZTV mapping then a further review of potential additional locations will be required. 12.14 In relation to potential views outside the 2km zone of the reduced visual envelope the LVIA states - 'Where our Project would be visible it was found that visibility would be limited and unlikely to result in significant landscape or visual effects.' VIA would recommend that these locations mentioned should be included within the assessment to demonstrate they clearly do not have any significant visual impact. 13 This point identifies that the wider site has occasional field boundary hedgerows, highlighting that these are	Evidence of consideration of detailed suggestions on proposed viewpoint including other views beyond 2km is provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Landscape consultation included discussion of potential additional viewpoints. Agreement on the location of viewpoints and the 2km study area was reached in November 2024 with the host authorises.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	not a obligatory uniform feature within this landscape. This supports one of the key visual elements of this location, its open extensive views over successive fields. Where hedgerows are located these generally appear to be relatively low and managed. 12.27 & 12.28 These two points appear to describe similar elements but do not completely align. Recommend review and clarify.		
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	12.42 Landscape Sensitivity within published LCA's Applying a generalised sensitivity assessment across such a swathe of land could easily undermine the particular characteristics of specific character areas / policy zones or portions thereof. This approach should be reviewed and a more sensitive area specific evaluation applied. 12.44 Village Assessments In stark contrast to the generalised approach of 12.42 above, the applicant has undertaken bespoke village assessments which is beneficial. 12.46 Visual Baseline Similar to comments on point 12.42 above – the assessment of the visual baseline is very short and general. This needs expanding on to provide more baseline context to help evaluate the impact of the proposed	Further discussion regarding visual receptors was undertaken with all host authorities through consultation. The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024. **Appendix 11.5 of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]** details the review of the potential for visual effects beyond 2km. A comprehensive visual baseline and assessment has been submitted with **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11] as** in	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	changes. 12.48 Table 1 Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints The list of Residents of Villages is in our view incomplete. The list includes Dunham on Trent, South Clifton and Low Marnham all ranging from 500m to 1500m from the edge of the development site. The village of Thorney on the eastern edge of the site is not include despite being adjacent to the development boundary. The village of Thorney needs to be included within this list and associated assessments.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.4: Visual Baseline and Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]** Regarding consideration of potential impacts on Thorney, the land previously proposed for development close to Thorney has since been removed from the Order Limits. The potential impact on the character of the village is still considered in the LVIA through assessment of effects on 'LVCA: Thorney'.	
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	**Evaluation of Figure 12- 8 Viewpoint Plan** Having made a thorough review of the viewpoints identified on Figure 12-8 we recommend the following additional viewpoints are explored to ensure completeness and no significant impacts are missed. • A57 between Ragnall and Whimpton House looking south - Site adjacent & open • PROW Fledborough footpath 1, just south of Woodcotes looking south - Site within 120m • VP16 poorly positioned view towards site blocked by residence & vegetation – suggest relocate or provide additional VP approximately 400m further north up the A1133 looking west. • PROW – On	Suggested visual receptors have been reviewed and either scoped in or out with appropriate justification provided. See **Appendix 11.5 (see ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21])** Regarding the points raised: - A57 between Ragnall and Whimpton House: this viewpoint was not captured due to safety implications of working adjacent to A57, however viewpoints 46 and 59 record of views from the A57 west of the River Trent.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Ragnall Bridleway 3 just west of where Ragnal footpath 4 joins it – panels located to the north and south with potential sites for BESS facilities. 14 Most of the numbered viewpoints are identified under one or more of the headings given in Table 1 Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints. However there are several VP numbers that are not listed at all, these being VP's 6, 15, 21, 32, 38, 44. It would be helpful to clarify why these viewpoints are included in the study and what they demonstrate.	- PROW Fledborough footpath 1: included as viewpoint 63. - VP16: has been reorientated to face north. Its location is specific to not only people driving on the A1133 but also 'The Chase' an adjacent residential dwelling. - PROW on Ragnall Bridleway 3: included as viewpoint 58a and 58b. The Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoint table has been reviewed and updated for DCO submission.	
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	12.52 Published guidance This point refers to guidance given in National Character Area 48: Trent and Belvoir Vales in regard of environmental opportunities, SEO1, SEO2, SEO3 and SEO4. It is unclear how opportunities SEO1, SEO3 and SEO4 are being realised within the project and the applicant should make it clearer how these recommendations are being manifest within the Landscape mitigation proposals. 12.61 Construction Landscape effects It is acknowledged that construction activity will not extend over an entire Landscape Character Area,	Regarding the reference to the SEOs in National Character Area 48, the Proposed Development has responded positively to - SEO1 through the enhancement of ecological networks through the landscape proposals secured in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, which result in a substantial biodiversity net gain. - SEO 2 by the planting of:	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	however it will significantly cover several individual policy zones having a significant magnitude of effect at policy zone scale. The applicant should reconsider this approach in the LVIA to ensure effects are appropriately considered at all scales. 12.66 Operation Year 1 Landscape Effects While the proposed ecological enhancement and landscaping areas respond positively to guidelines for NCA 48 and the policy zones, (particularly in regard of improving the vegetation cover and opportunities for biodiversity), they will change the sense of openness currently experienced. By increasing vegetation cover, mostly through hedgerows managed to 3m height, (12.70), that provide essential screening for the development, it will create significantly more enclosure and shortening of views, substantially changing the experience and perception of users and residents alike.	g) Over 9km of species-rich native hedgerow with trees (including existing hedgerow enhancement); h) Approximately 6km of species-rich native hedgerow; i) Approximately 1,240ha of species-rich grassland accounted for across the Order Limits in hedgerow and field margins, riparian zones, wildflower meadows and tussock mixes beneath solar panels; j) 4.2ha of woodland and native tree belts; k) Individual trees; and l) Agricultural field margins. - SEO3 through the reinstatement of coastal grazing marsh on the flood plain adjacent to the River Trent - SEO4 through a detailed review of elements that contribute to local distinctiveness and protection of them through embedding offsets and visual screening. Points relating to landscape character are addressed in **ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]:**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Appendix 11.3. The impact arising from the introduction of new planting across the Order Limits has been included in the consideration of impacts and resultant landscape and visual effects.	
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	**Appendix 12.3: Landscape Character Areas and Likely Landscape Effects Appendix 12.4: Likely Preliminary Significant Visual Effects 2** Both of the above tables provide a clear and helpful summary of the respective effects on specific elements. These are generally accepted but taking into account the points made above in review of the written Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter. **Appendix 12.5: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** Unless otherwise stated below, the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, (OLEMP), is considered appropriate and helpful at this stage of the process. The right to provide further comment on this at it develops along with the wider scheme is reserved. Existing retained	Full details of proposed planting is provided in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. The Proposed Development has sought to minimise vegetation removal. This has been achieved through: - Utilising existing field access points for new access tracks - Managing the height of existing hedgerows for the implementation of essential visibility splays, rather than proposing vegetation removal. These measures are reflected on the Vegetation Removal Plan provided in Appendix C of the **oLEMP.**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	trees & shrubs Removal of trees and woodland should be avoided at all costs unless they are dead, diseased or dying. There should be sufficient locations within the wider site where access can be gained through hedgerows for construction and servicing routes and as such, trees and woodland should not need to be cleared. Retained trees and woodland should have root protection fencing installed where construction activity could fall within their root protection area. A construction activity plan 15 along with access routes across the site will be required. This will then inform the extent of any additional aboricutural survey to determine sensitive locations and extent of root protection zones. Root protection fencing should be installed in line with BS5837 guidance. As mentioned previously hedgerows managed to 3m height is not in keeping with the local landscape but it is understood this is required for screening purposes. Wherever possible new introduced hedgerows not required for screening should be managed to a lower height in keeping with the current practice. Implementation Species lists given within the OLEMP should be cross	An arboricultural survey was completed (provided in **ES Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010159/APP/6.11]**). The survey included mapping of root protection areas that have been protected throughout the design process through the securing of the following parameters in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN010159/APP/5.9]**: - Hedgerows: 5m - Trees: 15m - Woodland: 25m Regarding the species proposed as part of new planting, the Local Planning Authorities, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust will be consulted in preparation of the detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to input to the species list proposed to respond to current priorities at the time of implementation.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	referenced against and brought into line with published species lists appropriate to the separate identified Landscape Character Areas. Any desire to select species outside of these lists should be agreed with the NCC County Ecologist.		
East Midlands Ltd on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council	**Appendix 12.5: Photosheets** This appendix provides full panoramas for all viewpoints listed in the document. These have been prepared to Type 1 in line with The Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals, 2019 [REF-43]. Issues identified with selection or placement of viewpoints is dealt with in the Landscape and Visual Amenity section above. In addition, VIA have the following comments about specific viewpoint photos identified below: • VP 16 – image is looking west away from the development area which is north and east of this location. Clarify the purpose of this or correct if an error. If correcting VP will need to move north along A1133.	The photosheets were revised and updated as part of the final ES submission: **ES Volume 3, Figure 11.12: Baseline photography [EN010159/APP/6.20].** In response to the specific points raised: - VP16 has been reorientated to face north. Its location is specific to not only people driving on the A1133 but also 'The Chase' an adjacent residential dwelling. - VP25 & 26: The photos have been captured form the path to be representative of people's experience travelling over the viaduct. - VP26: Location of viewpoint on viewpoint plan has been corrected.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	• VP 25 & 26 – Photographs taken with parapet railings dominating the horizontal line of sight, as such detracting for the wider extent of the landscape, and therefore preventing clear sight of the development in the visualisations shown in the consultation booklet. Photographs should be retaken closer to the parapet to allow clear line of sight of the surrounding landscape. Images also do not show extent of development site. This should be marked on the updated images. • VP 26 – Location marked up incorrectly on the viewpoint map as this should be west of the River Trent. • VP27 – View stated as looking south and south west which would be away from the development, (more west & north west at this location). Clarify the purpose of this or correct if an error. • VP28 – View stated as looking south and east from Fledborough footpath 10 away from the development. Impact from the development is more immediate to the north and west of this location. Clarify the purpose of this or correct if an error. • VP46 - View direction should read view east along A57, not A1133. Correct.	- VP27: southerly aspect has been included to show the relationship to Fledborough Viaduct. 27b is orientated towards the Order Limits. - VP28: orientated south and east which includes land within the Proposed Development, providing consideration of the potential change in the setting to Fledborough. VP46: Updated to read ‘along A57’.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Given the number of errors above and requested adjustments or new viewpoint images, it is recommended the viewpoint imagery and viewpoint assessment is completely reviewed and updated to ensure information presented is accurate and representative showing both areas where potential views are discounted and areas where views are significantly impacted.		
Lincolnshire County Council	We welcome the design changes made to mitigate Significant Negative effects on Landscape and Visual, and the comprehensive chapter on this. We feel this will need further consideration through emerging design and landscaping to maintain pleasant views and to prevent a sense of enclosure. From the site plans some residential receptors, including entire villages and hamlets, still look to be encircled by panels from the site plans and will, therefore, have a view of two-metre fencing feeling like it is enclosing them and not the site. Where feasible and it would not affect construction or operation, a commitment to new planting as early in the project phases as possible, so that trees and hedgerows can establish, would be encouraged. We note the suggestion that it may still be	Appropriate development offsets together with utilisation of existing landform and vegetation to screen visibility of the Proposed Development have been embedded in the design (as shown on the **Works Plans [EN010159/APP/2.3]**). Mitigation planting has typically been set back from receptors in order to retain the openness of views that is currently characteristic of the locality. Substantial offsets from the River Trent have been embedded, in part in response to visual amenity but also due to flood risk and ecological considerations. These offsets negate the need for extensive screening along the river. Land under the solar panels will be seeded with species rich grassland, as detailed within the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	possible for land around and under the panels to be used for food production. Where this is not feasible consideration should be given to the possibility of alternative land uses such as grazing land or wildflower meadows.	**OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. This land may be used for sheep grazing.	
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual AAH Consultants have reviewed the One Earth Solar Farm: PEIR, on behalf of LCC, in relation to Landscape and Visual matters. Information downloaded from: Document library - One Earth Solar Farm and the documents that have been referenced, are as follows: • Chapters 1-6: Introduction, EIA, Site Description, Project Description, Legislative & Planning Policy, PEIR Methodology. • Chapter 12: Landscape & Visual: ▪ Appendix 12.1 Key Policy & Legislation ▪ Appendix 12.2 Assessment Methodology ▪ Appendix 12.3 Landscape Character Areas- Preliminary Landscape effects 14 ▪ Appendix 12.4 Preliminary Visual effects ▪ Appendix 12.5 Outline Landscape & Ecology Management Plan ▪ Appendix 12.6 Viewpoint Photo sheets The review takes into account	Noted – no response required with any further feedback from LCC welcome through the next phases of the Proposed Development.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	previous AAH comments (Refer to AAH TM01 Technical Memo), as well as meetings/workshops held with the Applicant team and any subsequent meeting minutes. The comments provided are intended to assist in guiding the next stage of the development process, refinement of the content of the subsequent LVIA chapter of the ES and the overall development proposals. As the design of the scheme is evolving and not fixed at this stage, it is not a final review of the preliminary findings or initial assessments.		
Lincolnshire County Council	**Main Overarching Comments on the PEIR:** 1. Chapters 1-6 of the PEIR succinctly introduce the project, the site and the legislative context. The project is proposed to generate 740MW of energy, which will be exported to the High Marnham substation. Comprising approximately 1500Ha of land located within both counties of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. 2. The PEIR is prepared in advance of submission of the DCO, forming part of the preapplication process, and follows on from consultation periods. AAH Consultants have subsequently provided consultation feedback to	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	both the applicant and LCC. With only part of the project falling within the LCC boundary, it should be noted that AAH Consultants are also representing, and providing Landscape and Visual support to, Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC) for the project, and subsequently have a wider understanding of the project and landscape it is located within beyond that effected within the LCC area.		
Lincolnshire County Council	3. The process of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is detailed from para 2.5 and summarised in Figure 2.1. The PIER is the publication of initial findings considering the preliminary likely significant effects of the project. Feedback from the PIER will then inform the preparation of the final Environmental statement (ES) which will be submitted as part of the DCO application. Our response to the PIER will be used to assist in the delivery of the final ES, and we welcome additional opportunities to consult with the applicant throughout the process, which may include collaborative site visits to finalise viewpoint selections or further design workshops.	Noted. Subsequent consultation was held through until late 2024. Key discussion and agreements are recorded in **ES Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Appendix 11.5 [EN010159/APP/6.11]**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	4. The landscape and visual sections of the PEIR comply with best-practice principles by undertaking a baseline study, before identifying the potential environmental constraints alongside opportunities, which are used to inform the design evolution of the project to minimise and mitigate adverse effects as well as identifying opportunities to enhance the environment. The final stage of the PEIR utilises technical environmental assessments to determine the potential environmental effects across all of the project life stages construction, operation and decommissioning. However, as stated previously, as the design of the scheme is evolving and not fixed at this stage, we have not reviewed the preliminary findings or initial assessments	Noted.	N
Lincolnshire County Council	5. The Site is described in detail in Chapter 3, with the Site boundary highlighted in figure 3.1, encompassing land within the boundaries of both Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. A number of villages alongside isolated properties and hamlets are identified as receptors. The list is comprehensive and covers the properties, within the study area, however there is no analysis of properties beyond 2kms, and considering the	Evidence of consideration of other views beyond 2km is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21].** The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	design is evolving, it needs to be clear that the project will not have a detrimental impact on properties beyond 2km. Key transport features encompassing strategic roads as well as Sustrans routes, public rights of ways and the Trent Valley Way are also identified. Existing features of the Site are briefly described including the site of the former High Marnham power stations, which now accommodates a National Grid 400Kv and 275Kv substation. The energy produced will connect to the National Grid at this substation. A feature within the localised site boundaries are numerous pylons and overhead power lines		
Lincolnshire County Council	6. The project is considered briefly in Chapter 4, providing an overview before stating the need to decarbonise energy production amid the global context. The connectivity to High Marnham National Grid substation provides justification for the locality of the proposed development. Land within 10km of the substation was considered in determining the location. The chapter progresses to describe the National Character Areas (NCA) Trent and Belvoir Vales which the site is located	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	within. Paragraph 4.29 identifies environmental designations within a 10km study area.		
Lincolnshire County Council	7. Paragraph 4.36 commences a consideration of the design progression following the consultation process. A range of changes and amendments have been made to the project layout. This includes the removal of panels between north and south Clifton. Land adjacent to the village of Thorney has been removed from the development to protect the setting of the village. The design evolution is welcome, however we believe that the extent of impact during construction, re-construction (it is stated that during the lifetime of the project, the panels will be replaced at least once, it is not explained in detail the process of this renewal) and decommissioning have been under-played in the PEIR, for example the volume and scale of traffic on local roads and the vegetation loss to enable	The Proposed Development has been designed in accordance with the project specific design principles, environmental constraints and opportunities, and in response to feedback received from stakeholders through non-statutory and statutory consultation. The overarching aim of the iterative design process has been to embed good design from the outset. A full account of this iterative design process is set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the delivery of the lorry loads on to the site. We also believe that there can be improvements to the masterplan by careful and strategic placement of mitigation planting so that blanket hedgerows which do not necessarily fit the character of the area are avoided.		
Lincolnshire County Council	8. Given the continuing evolving nature of the project, the design is not fixed and consequently the Rochdale Envelope principle is applied to the PEIR. Paragraph 4.53 considers a set of broad design principles which include climate and the sensitivity of the local environment, the impact of local communities, supporting the natural and built environment, as well as enriching the ecosystem and identifying opportunities to add value to the local community. As the design evolves, we welcome opportunities to discuss the assessment parameters including viewpoint selection and proposed mitigation. The design parameters must be clearly identified within the ES, and subsequently it must be clear and transparent within the LVIA those 16 parameters that have been assessed. This should include not	The Proposed Development has been designed in accordance with the project specific design principles, environmental constraints and opportunities, and in response to feedback received from stakeholders through non-statutory and statutory consultation. The overarching aim of the iterative design process has been to embed good design from the outset. A full account of this iterative design process is set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]**. These measures are secured within the **Commitments Register [EN010159/APP/7.15]**, which ensures implementation of measures through a securing mechanism, including the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7], Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	only the height and size/mass of elements of the scheme, but also areas or zones they will be located, such as on works or parameter plans	[**EN010159/APP/7.4**], **Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.6]** and the BNG Plan, during detailed design, procurement, construction, operation and decommissioning.	
Lincolnshire County Council	9. The project will be operational for 60 years, and it is an expectation that the panels will be replaced once during the operational period. It is not stated whether this would be a phased replacement over a number of years or a task to be completed over a period of time comparable with the construction phase of the project, which is currently predicted to span 2 years. The effects predicted during construction, for example the lorry movements within the local road network and the need for wider access points at various locations across the Site, would be replicated to accommodate the reconfiguration of the panels. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) which will be issued as part of the DCO Application, we welcome opportunities to liaise with the application team as	Consideration of the operational scenario now includes reference to the replacement of panels and other equipment, in line with the indicative design life of each feature provided in **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5].** The detailed CEMP will be subject to review and approval throughout detailed design.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the project progresses towards the application stage.		
Lincolnshire County Council	10. Given the stated operational time of 60 years, there is the question of reversibility and duration. Having reviewed the sections relating to this from GLVIA3 [REF-45]and other related guidance, it is clear that this project is long term. Given that 60 years is comparable to two generations as a minimum, there is some strength to the consideration that this would amount to a permanent project, especially considering the average lifespan of building design is circa 50 years. There is clearly potential for significant landscape and visual impacts, especially considering that in this timescale, the panels will be replaced. It is stated in the PEIR that this would be once, but given the pace of technology, it should be considered if it is likely that the panels could be replaced on numerous	Consideration of the operational scenario now includes reference to the replacement of panels and other equipment, in line with the indicative design life of each feature provided in **Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	occasions. At this stage we would need additional information regarding the phases of replacements in order to consider whether there is one single construction stage, or a series of staged re-construction stages		
Lincolnshire County Council	11. Decommissioning is considered from paragraph 4.71. This will include all aspects of the project with the exception of the two substations, which we understand would be retained at the decommissioning phase. Permissive paths are proposed to be removed, but underground cables may remain. Figure 4.5 clarifies the access points to the Site, which will be used during all phases of the project. These will be accessed from existing and upgraded strategic points on the public road network. At this stage the impact of the access points appears vague and would need to be clarified further as the design evolves, we welcome further dialogue on this matter.	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	12. Access is an important consideration, given the potential for vegetation removal, road reconfiguration and the large vehicles on a local road network. Figure 4.5 identifies a number of access points and we note that some of these directly correlate with selected viewpoints. Continuing on-Site assessment and dialogue will be useful as the design evolves. The masterplan in the current iteration highlights numerous access points and compounds, however the chapter is light on the extent of vegetation loss expectant of the movement of large and numerous vehicles over a significant period of time. Similarly, as mentioned previously, the anticipated panel replacement is lightly explained; the potential to change a significant proportion of 17 the development throughout the 60-year lifespan of the development would recreate an unexplained proportion of the construction period at least once and possibly more given the pace of technological development. We would anticipate that, as the design evolves towards the DCO submission, that the impact of the reconstruction, the mitigation measures to be implemented and the number of reconstructions anticipated	Details regarding proposed site access are provided in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9].** The extent of proposed vegetation removal is shown on **Vegetation Removal Plan [EN010159/APP/2.8**]. Details regarding proposed mitigation planting is provided in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** The location of access points and internal access tracks, as shown on the vegetation removal plan, have been selected to minimise vegetation loss, making use of existing field access points where practical.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	throughout the lifespan of the development is clarified fully.		
Lincolnshire County Council	13. Section 5 considers the planning context of the project; this is further considered in Appendix 12.1 and will be discussed in section B below. In accordance to best practice, both national and local policy are appraised.	Noted. Relevant policies are provided in **ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]: Appendix 11.1: Summary of Relevant Legislation, Policy and Technical Guidance.**	N
Lincolnshire County Council	14. Appendix 4.1 describes the project and introduces the concept of 'good design', and that this is a consideration that has influenced the design from onset; influencing the siting, sustainability and appearance of the project. The iterative process of the masterplan has resulted from on-going consultation. AAH have contributed to the consultation and will continue this as the project evolves. Four project principles are	Landscape mitigation has been designed to be sensitive to the site and its existing character. The mitigation proposed is shown on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** and detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** Mitigation planting has typically been set back from receptors in order to retain the openness of views	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	directing the design, these are climate, people, place and value. These principles have led to design decisions including offsets from features including trees, woodlands, hedgerows, PRoWs and rivers/ waterbodies. Such principles are welcomed and will be tested through onsite investigations, desk-based reviews and viewpoint/ photomontage appraisals. Through ongoing dialogue, we expect these principles to be utilised within the masterplan to further minimise, or reduce, adverse visual effects. We welcome the mitigation measures; however, we expect the mitigation to reflect the character of the study area and not blanket the site with planting simply to screen. We look for a masterplan that enhances the existing grain of planting whilst respecting long to medium range views. For example, mitigation along the river needs to be carefully sited to respect long range views.	that is currently characteristic of the locality. Substantial offsets from the River Trent have been embedded, in part in response to visual amenity but also due to flood risk and ecological considerations. These offsets negate the need for extensive screening along the river.	
Lincolnshire County Council	15. The description of the project components, including a breakdown of construction tasks is useful within appendix 4.1. Table 2 breaks the tasks and quantifies likely timescales for the completion of those tasks. This is useful in determining the extent and period of landscape	Establishment practices and maintenance is detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. Further detail, as identified, would be provided in the detailed LEMP prepared following consent and approved via requirement.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and visual impacts. Management plans will be submitted as part of the DCO application, and we welcome ongoing dialogue as these develop prior to the application submission. Table 4 repeats the process of assessment by considering the decommissioning of the project. As stated above, the mitigation measures need to be carefully designed to respect the existing grain of the site. However, we also need to have a robust management plan that ensures maximum success rate in the establishment of the mitigation planting. Climate change has resulted in an environment that can be harsh for plant establishment with long dry springs and summers. We would wish to see a management plan that carefully itemises the number of visits, the actions during those visits, the process of replacing lost plants and ongoing longterm management to ensure the vegetation thrives and enhances the character of the study area. We would also expect any management plans cover an establishment period up to 15 years as a minimum, to cover landscape and visual effects up to the residual phase, but also that the	The oLEMP does detail the function, implementation, establishment maintenance, and long term maintenance for each form of vegetation proposed. The establishment maintenance descriptions include the key principles and outline prescriptions required to be undertaken.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	management plans be reviewed and updated regularly to cover the 60 year project period.		
Lincolnshire County Council	3. The study area has evolved from an initial 5km range, it is stated in para 12.11 that it is unlikely that the project would result in significant landscape and visual effects beyond the 2km range from the Site. This assumption alongside the fieldwork undertaken has resulted in the adoption of a 2km study area for assessment. While we agree with this in principle, and the ZTV does appear to broadly support this, we do have some reservations. We agree that the development of a large-scale solar farm on rural landscape would likely result in significant landscape and visual effects at all stages within the study area of 2km. We do believe that some areas beyond the 2km extent there is the potential for significant impacts especially during construction, the early years of operation and decommissioning, and areas beyond 2km should not be discounted in any assessment. For example, the traffic movement to and from the site will have construction, reconstruction and decommissioning impacts beyond 2kms. Given	The 2km Study Area was subject to further discussion and consultation with the host authorities. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21]** details a study undertaken providing views from beyond the 2km study area. Following review of this study it was agreed with the host authorities that the 2km study area was appropriate via meetings held in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the evolving design, with many unconfirmed design parameters, it is conceivable that visual impacts will be noticeable beyond 2kms in certain areas. Similarly, as a consequence of the programme for the replacement of panels, this may result in impacts comparable with construction during the operational phase of the project. Within the landscape, construction traffic will have a broad range impact. To determine this fully we welcome the range of selected viewpoints, and we provide comment on the viewpoints in section C, below. The ZTV does illustrate, on a bare earth basis, that some visibility is possible beyond the 2km extent. The selection of viewpoints beyond the 2km extent is important, for determining the accuracy of the generated models and fully scrutinising the assumption that significant effects will not be experienced beyond the 2km extent. This is important as the design evolves and the true extent of the development is confirmed. At present there are no viewpoints beyond 2km assessed, and we consider this to be an omission, as well as a leap of faith given the full parameters of the design are not yet fixed.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	4. The baseline landscape analysis conforms with best practice, analysing the landform and topography, the land use and infrastructure, vegetation coverage, PRoW's, and designations. The PEIR then considers the national and regional character areas of the Site as well as village character areas. The assessment proceeds to assess the strategic national designations before moving towards the fine-grain local character, which is a best-practice approach we welcome and it is important that the subsequent LVIA consider the elements and features that make up the landscape 19 character of the Site and Study Area so the effects of development upon these can be fully understood.	The **ES Volume 3: Appendix 11.3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]** builds on the assessment provided in the PEIR, providing further detail regarding elements that contribute to landscape character	N
Lincolnshire County Council	5. The visual baseline is analysed with receptor groups identified in Table 1. The table is useful in that the receptors are identified in relation to representative viewpoints. It is also useful that it is split between villages, isolated properties, PRoW users and road network users, which will likely have differing levels of susceptibility to change. The receptors identified are comprehensive within the 2km study area, however, given all of the points raised above, we	Evidence of consideration of other views beyond 2km is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary [EN010159/APP/6.21].** The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	should not discount receptors beyond the 2km boundary, especially as the design evolves. We would need to see the assessment of some receptors beyond the 2km range, even if to simply scope out		
Lincolnshire County Council	6. Figure 12.8 shows the selected viewpoints in the context of the Site. However, no viewpoints are located beyond the 2km boundary. It would be useful to have a list of representative viewpoints that have been scoped out of the project assessment. As mentioned previously, while it is a fair assumption that beyond 2kms visibility is significantly reduced, it should be proven within the documentation. We would welcome a section in the LVIA that justifies the scoping out of viewpoints that were initially selected.	Evidence of consideration of other views beyond 2km is provided in **ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]: Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary.** The 2km Study Area was agreed with Bassetlaw District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and West Lindsey District Council in November 2024.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	7. The chapter emphasises that the design has evolved through compliance with stated design principles, these were discussed in the above section. The environmental opportunities as set out in the NCA 48 document [REF-44], alongside guidance from the Landscape Institutes Infrastructure Technical Guidance Note [REF-43] are both referenced as drivers for the design principles. Paragraph 12.54 provides a description of the embedded environmental measures that have been included in the masterplan. While the NCAs provide good overarching information and guidance, the key design parameters should evolve from the dissemination of the information provided in published local character assessments, field work and coordination with relevant disciplines such as ecology, heritage, or civil engineers (flooding and land form). This is particularly relevant in carefully and sensitively positioned mitigation planting. The design evolution has been an iterative process and has responded to feedback both from AAH and other parties in the stages preceding the PEIR.	The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by guidance set out in relevant landscape character assessment and field work observations plus coordination with relevant disciplines. With regard to the design of mitigation in response to field work and coordination with relevant disciplines, an explanation is provided in the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	**Methodology** 8. Methodology is considered from paragraph 12.55 and also Appendix 12.2. At this stage the detail of many elements is not fixed and as a result the worst-case scenario is considered. The methodology follows best-practice assessment methodologies by identifying construction, operational and decommissioning effects. Operational is assessed based on year 1 and year 15, but it does not identify in sufficient detail the magnitude of effect due to replacement of panels, which it is stated will occur once in the lifecycle of the project.	Further commentary regarding the impact of replacement of elements across the Proposed Development has been provided in the assessment of landscape and visual effects, beyond that which was provided in the PEIR.	N
Lincolnshire County Council	9. Appendix 5 covers the OLEMP; this details the mitigation proposals and begins to address the important aspect of ensuring that the planting thrives and matures in order to achieve the maximum output in regards minimising the landscape and visual effects of the project in the landscape. The list of species proposed to be planted, 20 alongside planting protocols is useful, however the appendix is light on the methodology for ensuring maximum success rate of planting. It is also light on the impact of the construction, reconstruction and decommissioning processes	Establishment practices and maintenance is detailed in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**, including detail regarding the function, implementation, establishment maintenance, and long term maintenance for each form of vegetation proposed. The establishment maintenance descriptions include the key principles and outline prescriptions required to be undertaken for successful establishment.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	on existing vegetation – both retention and removal. We would welcome the development of this appendix as the project progresses to DCO and will be happy to provide further advice on our expectations of this document.	The landscape design would be implemented in line with the illustrative landscape masterplan included in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** Further detail, as identified, would be provided in the detailed LMEP, prepared following consent and approved via requirement.	
Lincolnshire County Council	10. We welcome the approach to continued design evolution to refine areas where significant effects have been identified. The changes to the design to date have been part of the consultation process and this is an approach we would continue towards DCO submission. To aid this we would welcome speedy resolution to the currently unconfirmed aspects of the project.	Noted.	N
Lincolnshire County Council	**Detailed Comments on PEIR Supporting Figures (Chapter 12 LVIA**) 1. Appendix 12.6 provides imagery of each of the selected viewpoints, the images conform to best practice and generally are clear and well selected. We consider the viewpoints most directly relevant to the Lincolnshire County are 1 to 8 inclusive. Given the scale of the project and	Evidence of consideration of detailed suggestion on proposed viewpoint including other views beyond 2km is provided in **ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]: Appendix 11.5: LVIA Consultation Summary.** Regarding:	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the open character of the landscape other views beyond the 2km study area are possible. At present no viewpoints have been selected beyond the 2km study area, but as stated above, we believe this needs to be tested to scope out. This is particularly relevant in areas where the ZTV does show potential for visibility. 2. The viewpoints have covered a wide range of receptors, including PRoW, Sustrans route, roads, residential receptors. Some views are split in to two for example viewpoint 5 with a view to the northeast and east extending beyond the scope of a single view sheet. 3. The images are clear, photographed during dry clear spring conditions and the Site is clearly identified alongside key locations such as farms and key landscape features. 4. We expect applicants to carefully choose viewpoints to fully represent views effectively with no close obstructions. Fine grain selection of views is expected to maximise the value in assessing the view. 5. Viewpoints 1 & 2 are good wide views and show the site in a wide context. Likewise 3 & 4 seek to achieve the same output, however the	- VP1, 2, 3 and 4 have been retained. - VP5 has also been retained. Further field work was undertaken to determine if a more open view was afforded from an alternative location within Newton on Trent but none found, therefore confirming VP5 to be representative. - VP6: the road corridor was found to be the most open and therefore the view retained as being representative.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	tree belt in 3 and the railway bridge in 4 detract from the view. This reinforces the comments above where fine grain view selection is needed. The value of 3 & 4 is significantly less than 1 & 2. 6. Viewpoint 5 is of little benefit, again we request that this view is moved to provide a more useful impression of the impact on the residential properties. 7. Viewpoint 6 is in a useful locality, but given the tree belt, the view itself has limited merit. It would be beneficial to find a view in the locality that corresponds to a break in the trees and provides a more useful context to the site and the residential properties.		
Lincolnshire County Council	**Conclusion** 1. The landscape section within the PEIR is robust and thorough, and the first six chapters succinctly present the proposed development. Chapter 12 introduces the Landscape and Visual matters and the appendices cover aspects of the matters arising. 2. The design is evolving, and consequently there are significant gaps in the information provided. We understand and expect this at this stage of the process, and we have provided commentary	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	on these and trust that the applicant will engage with relevant stakeholders and interested parties to enhance the DCO package. 3. There are omissions which need addressing and are independent of the design evolution, for example the omission of viewpoints beyond 2kms from the development, even to if only to confirm the assumption that there will be no significant impacts beyond 2kms. The management and establishment of the mitigation planting is only considered on a broad level and not in detail within the oLEMP. Mitigation should not be used without careful consideration of the character of the open landscape. Simply filling views with planting will diminish receptor experiences. 4. Generally, the viewpoints are well considered, there are some exceptions where more selective locations could have been found while still conveying the message. It is not useful to see hedgerow or woodlands as the key focus of the view when the point was to capture the receptor experience in the wide context of the landscape. As mentioned previously, the lack of viewpoints beyond 2km is an omission as the design is not fixed.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	5. The document confirms with best practice methodology and this is welcomed. The process of assessment is clear and the tables provide the information in an easy-to read format.		
Masterplanning			
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Illustrative Masterplan** NSDC note that the latest iteration of the masterplan includes the removal of Solar PV Panels, in the land in between North and South Clifton. As these locations are sensitive residential receptors, this change is welcome. Notwithstanding this, NSDC note that significant areas of PV panels will remain to the east of both these villages and to the west of Thorney. This will require very careful consideration as the design for the scheme is finalised and the EIA is	The masterplan has been updated to remove the panels near Thorney in response to consultation feedback, please see the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. The Illustrative Masterplan indicates the locations of panels, BESS and substations, as well as the mitigation areas [**EN010159/APP/2.7]**, as secured on the **Works Plans[EN010159/APP/2.3].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	finalised and reported within the ES. Finally, in the development of the final scheme design, we would ask that all components of the scheme, including the PV panels, BESS, substation, pipeline, and mitigation areas are clearly presented in both the masterplan and all associated plans that need to be prepared for the DCO submission. It would also be helpful to NSDC and all authorities if the administrative boundaries of the authorities are presented on the plans.		
Noise			
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Chapter 16 – Pg 2 onwards. Noise and Vibration Chapter 16 of the PEIR identifies that the construction activities that are likely to cause disturbance and identified sensitive receptors that may be impacted. As noted in the Chapter, details of the exact locations of noise sources have yet to be finalised and therefore a conclusive and detailed assessment has yet to be concluded in this regard. NSDC would therefore welcome the opportunity to consider an updated assessment on Noise and Vibration once the site layout has been fixed.	**Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.15]** includes an updated assessment based on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7],** which has been further refined since the PEIR was produced. An operational noise condition is proposed to provide control of operational noise levels where flexibility still exists in the design.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	Noise and Vibration LCC supports the comments made by WLDC in respect of noise and vibration as pollution control authority.	This has been noted by the Applicant.	N
West Lindsey District Council	We broadly agree with the approach to noise and vibration. The closest settlement within the West Lindsey District is Newton on Trent where existing residential properties are located adjacent to the north of the A57, there is also a linear row of properties (Park Farm Lane) to the north east of the site boundary.	Noted – the properties on Park Farm Lane are included in the appropriate noise assessment where they fall within the respective study areas.	N
Bassetlaw District Council	The main sources of noise likely to arise from this proposed site are from the electrical transformers, inverters, other substation equipment and battery storage equipment. Noise is anticipated as being noticeable within 300m; the updated design has therefore incorporated this with noise generating plant and equipment located at this distance as a minimum from the nearest residential receptors. Otherwise, once operational noise is unlikely to	Noted. The operational noise assessment has taken account of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.15]** includes the assessment of operational noise from noise generating plant and equipment, which has been carried out in accordance with BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. This assessment	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	be of issue as there are expected to only be a small team of workers and engineers to provide maintenance for the site. However, before any decision to approve or refuse the application is made, it is recommended that the applicant be required to provide a report from a specialist noise consultant or suitably qualified person, to assess the impact of this additional noise source on nearby residential properties. The report shall be conducted in accordance with BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 and shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for assessment. There is likely to be some impact from noise during the construction phase, including both noise and potential vibration effects, though this will be temporary; the construction phase is anticipated to last 2 years. The potential effects should be detailed within the Environmental Statement. In order to limit the likely impact from noise, I would suggest that a condition is applied that construction work and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, including deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site shall be carried out only between the following hours: 08	includes refinements to the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** and associate works plans that have been made since the PEIR. The potential noise and vibration effects of construction, including construction traffic, will also be included within the Noise and Vibration chapter of the EIA. This assessment will be carried out in line with the guidance set out in BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 and an **outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.4]** has been produced, which includes consideration of the control of noise and vibration during construction. The limits to construction hours are noted and included in the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]**.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	00 Hours and 18 00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08 00 and 13 00 Hours on Saturdays and; at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays. A Construction Traffic Management Plan should also be submitted and adhered with to limit the effects from construction and decommissioning traffic noise and vibration. Additionally, effective steps should be taken by the operator to prevent the deposition of mud, dust and other materials on the adjoining public highway caused by vehicles visiting and leaving the site. Any accidental deposition of dust, slurry, mud or any other material from the site, on the public highway shall be removed immediately by the developer		
West Lindsey District Council	Figure 4-3 Shows an Operational Parameter Plan- It would be useful, not only for the LPA's, but for the public to have a site layout plan which details where the relevant host District authority boundaries lie. Operational Phase of Project- 4.61. The project will be operational for 60 years, which is broadly in line with other on-going NSIP projects within the WLDC district. The ES will be expected to detail deconstruction and removal of the	The Applicant has produced a variety of maps to display the Proposed Development, some of which show the district boundaries to indicate the location – for example, the map included on page 4 of the Statement of Community Consultation (see **Consultation Report [EN010159/5.1]** for more information). Not all of the maps show these lines in order to reduce the complexity of the information being displayed.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	development beyond its lifetime. The ES should however detail the environmental effects that are likely to arise for maintenance and repair throughout the lifetime of development. i.e. what are the failure / replacement rates for the solar PV panels, batteries, and other equipment.	The Environmental Statement assesses the potential impacts throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development, including the operational and decommissioning stages. The indicative design lives of scheme components are included in the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.5].** This also includes details about the approach to replacement of components.	
Bassetlaw District Council	Construction working hours will be 7.00 - 19.00 hours Monday to Saturday with allowance for occasional, overnight working where operations cannot be paused, for example completion of the Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). This may have an adverse impact on the residential amenity and access to neighbouring properties and will need to be considered.	Construction working hours will be 7.00 - 19.00 hours Monday to Saturday. The need to undertake some limited works outside normal working hours or overnight cannot be discounted, and 24-hour working may be necessary in some locations. Such works may include, for example, some trenchless crossings if the technique in use and/or ground conditions dictate that continuous working is required, highways works (to minimise traffic disruption) or commissioning activities. If night-time working is required at specific locations, additional temporary lighting may be used at those locations for limited periods of time. Where onsite works are to be conducted outside core working hours, they will comply with the restrictions pursuant to the	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		consenting process. Where on-site works are to be conducted outside the core working hours, they will comply with the limits and controls detailed in the CEMPs, and any other restrictions agreed with the relevant planning authorities. Further information is included in the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]**	
Bassetlaw District Council	Once completed, there are likely to be relatively few light sources associated with this proposed scheme. There may be the need for permanent lighting to the battery storage, inverter and transformer compounds. However, there may be a need for significant lighting during the construction phase both at locations where installation is taking place (in the winter) and at fixed construction compounds. I order to ensure that such lighting does not cause nuisance, I would suggest a condition that all artificial lighting for the site both temporary and permanent shall be of such a design and installed and sited/ angled in such a manner as to prevent glare or light shining directly into neighbouring dwellings and that details of necessary lighting are submitted to the planning authority.	The lighting design for the Proposed Development will seek to limit impacts upon sensitive receptors and will be directional, orientated internally, away from the surrounding environment (including ecological habitats), and will be fitted with features to minimise light spillage. No external lighting will be permanently operated as part of the Proposed Development. The details of lighting and the commitments to ensure there are no likely significant effects are included in the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** and the **oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Safety and Security			
Bassetlaw District Council - Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	No specific comments but request for info and guidance provided: The Fire Authority ask that the above Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System Guidance (produced by the National Fire Chiefs Council [NFCC]) [REF-46] is provided to the developer. It is the content of which and any other relevant standards (e.g. NFPA) that the Fire Authority will seek assurances against. If that guidance is not to be met then detailed expert evidence and or technical data will be requested to justify such deviations. The Fire Authority notes that within the documentation accessed on line there are several generic statements / observations of 'good intent' made by the developers with regards to the safety considerations for the BESS containers. However without the detail to substantiate these statements the Fire Authority cannot offer any further meaningful comments. As such the Fire Authority reserve the right to	The **Works Plan [EN010159/APP/2.3]** primarily follows NFCC guidance, supplemented by NFPA 855 [REF-46], FM Global, and other industry best practices. The **oBSMP [EN010159/APP/7.11]** outlines how this guidance has been implemented in the design and, where deviations occur, details the alternative mitigation measures supported by evidence and relevant standards. The Applicant acknowledges the relevant authority's right to consult further. The Applicant will ensure appropriate consultation to inform risk management and emergency response planning. We are currently in consultation with the FRS and include any recommendations from the discussion prior to submission.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	consult further once that detail is known. Although active fighting is mentioned in the information accessed on line, The Fire Authority is aware that the 'industry' is considering moving from extinguishment for fire incidents involving BESS containers, to 'burn out' and protect. This is based on advice from industry leading experts. The Fire Authority seeks to clarify that the relevant enforcing authority for the protection of the environment (for example Environment Agency / Environmental Health / UK Health Security Agency) should be consulted. The relevance being that if this approach is not approved by that enforcing body, this may influence any subsequent risk management and emergency response plans detailing the requisite safety provisions expected for the site. Whilst The Fire Authority does recognise burn out as a potential means to resolve an emergency of this type on site, it is not the role of the Fire Authority to authorise it.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	I have consulted with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue (LFR) who have provided the following comments: 24 Due to the nature of this application, the Fire Authority requires that the below items are included within the development. Provided that these requirements are met, the Fire Authority would make no objection to the application. Access Access for fire appliances and fire fighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations 2010 (As Amended), Approved Document B, Part B5 [REF-47]. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for firefighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence. Carrying Capacity LFR requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping appliances of 18 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2010 (As Amended) [REF-47], Approved Document B, Part B5. This weight limit would also apply to any private/shared access	Access roads suitable for fire appliances and fire fighters shall be provided subject to confirmation during detailed design. We are aware and will comply with these access requirements, including ongoing discussions with the FRS for appropriate access to the site. Automatic suppression systems – Units shall be selected with suitable automatic fire suppression systems and adhere to relevant standards. Details of all fire safety mechanisms, including but not limited to fire suppression systems, shall be passed onto the fire service/Fire Safety Advisers during detailed design stage. Water supply – Noted, there shall be adequate provision of water for firefighting purposes for both BESS Sites. This shall be suitable for providing the amount of water required in the NFCC guidance. Fire water run-off – Appropriate measures shall be in place to ensure any possible fire water run-off is effectively captured, stored and treated if required. The **oBSMP [EN010159/APP/7.11]** outlines the drainage strategy for the BESS sites. Firewater will	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	roads in order to achieve the above item. If it is not possible to provide access to the proposed development in accordance with the guidance details within Part B5 of Approved Document B, as compensation, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue may accept the provision, at the developer's expense, of an automatic suppression system, designed, fitted and maintained in accordance with the relevant sections of BS5306/BSEN12845:2004. Should this option be considered, our Fire Safety advisers must be provided with detailed plans of the proposed installation. Any scheme proposed should not be of a lesser standard than any provision as may be required by the Building Regulations. Water Supply LFR requires an adequate provision of water supply for firefighting purposes in respect of this DCO application in accordance with the guidance set out in Approved Document B, Part B5, Section 16 "Fire mains and hydrants". In accordance with this guidance, LFR recommends the suitable provision of fire hydrants to be provided at the developer's expense or an	be contained within the BESS site through a drainage system, preventing environmental contamination. Any water used for cooling adjacent units will be collected. All firewater will be stored in a designated containment area until tested. Any fire hydrants shall comply with the relevant standards. The site-specific FRA will guide the final design and protection measures. Environmental Bulk storage – highly flammable/explosive/water reactive/toxic substances shall not be stored in close proximity to the BESS and shall adhere to NFPA 855 [REF-48].	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	alternative supply of water where appropriate. If fire hydrants are preferred, all hydrants should conform to BS750-2012. Further guidance on the provision and siting of private fire hydrants is given in BS 9990. Reference should also be given to BS9999:2017 Section 22, 'Water supplies for fire and rescue service use'. Hydrants should be clearly indicated by a plate, fixed nearby in a conspicuous position, in accordance with BS 3251. Fire hydrant acceptance testing will be carried out by a Hydrant Inspector on completion and a standard hydrant marker "H" plate will be fitted nearby. Following adoption the Fire Service will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance and repairs for the lifetime of the fire hydrant. If an alternative supply of water for firefighting purposes is preferred, then this would be accepted subject only to meeting the criteria set out in Approved Document B, Part B5, 25 Section 16. To be accepted, Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue will require suitable evidence detailing the proposal for an alternative supply of water and demonstrating its compliance with relevant guidance. Environmental Bulk storage of highly flammable/explosive/water reactive/toxic		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	substances and any site whereas large scale recycling activities are proposed will need to be specifically consulted with Fire Authority to ensure that the full operational impact, should a fire occur, is assessed and that an adequate provision is recommended. There are a number of methods available, through which the fire water runoff problem can be addressed, the most obvious being to use a fire suppression system to contain a fire, thus not requiring large volumes of water and containment measures, such as bund walls or drainage systems with lagoons, interceptors, reed beds or treatment plants. It is not for the fire service to stipulate which approach to take, simply to ensure that suitable measures are made a condition of planning approval through a firefighting water run-off strategy.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Requirements LFR recognises the use of batteries (including lithium-ion) as Energy Storage Systems (ESS) is a new and emerging practice in the global renewable energy sector. As with all new and emerging practices within UK industry the Service would like to work with the developers to better understand any risks that may be posed	We will continue to engage with the FRS to ensure any risks are appropriately mitigated and suitable safety measures are in place. The BSMP shall reflect these discussions along with any other documents that are to be shared with the FRS. As stated above, the illustrative masterplan and **oBSMP [EN010159/APP/7.11**] will adhere to	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and develop strategies and procedures to mitigate these risks. We will work and engage with the developer as the project evolves, to ensure it complies with the statutory responsibilities that we enforce. The developer should produce a risk reduction strategy (Regulation 38 of the Building Regulations) as the responsible person for the scheme as stated in the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 [REF-49]. We would also expect that safety measures and risk mitigation is developed in collaboration with LFR. The strategy should cover the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the project. During the construction phase the number of daily vehicle movements in the local area will significantly increase. The Service will want to view the transport strategy to minimise this impact and prevent an increase in the number of potential road traffic incidents. Any development should not negatively impact on the Service's ability to respond to an incident in the local area. LFR works within the guidance of the National Fire Chief's Council (NFCC) who have been working with several government departments to	NFCC guidance [REF-46], NFPA 855 [REF-48] and other relevant standards. The oBSMP explains how the requirements of NFCC are adhered to within the design and planning. The Applicant recognises the importance of collaboration throughout all project phases to ensure compliance with regulations and will consider emergency response times and road safety in the transport strategy. The transport strategy has not been considered at this stage however this can be addressed in the emergency response plans or risk management plans during detailed design.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	ensure that fire and rescue services are made aware of any new proposals. NFCC have created a guidance document (link below) that constitutes LFR's requirements for new BESS development proposals. [REF-44] Following the work of NFCC, the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) has revised its Planning Policy Guidance to include reference to BESS [REF-50]. LFR are aware that large scale BESS is a fairly new technology, and as such risks may or may not be captured in current guidance in pursuance of the Building Regulations (as amended) and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 [REF-49]. This will highlight challenges the FRS have when responding to Building Regulations consultations. For this reason, we strongly recommend applying the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems. Failure to comply with the above requirements at planning stage can seriously compromise firefighting operations resulting in unnecessary risk to life, loss of property and unnecessary damage to the environment.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Socio-Economics			
Bassetlaw District Council	The PIER acknowledges that there are several PRoWs which pass through or are close to our Site, along with Route 647 of the National Cycle network (the Sustrans route). A usage survey of some of the existing PRoWs was carried out as part of the baseline. Therefore usage surveys should be conducted to assess the impact of the development. For the consideration of Employment and investment, there will be temporary Employment for Construction and small numbers of Employment at operational stage. Projects such as this may result in employment through specialised subcontractors however the employment of local people who do not increase journeys to the site and rely on temporary accommodation should be secured wherever possible. The Council would also like the following observations to be considered: • Job numbers during and post construction – based on broad assumptions • Further information required on direct and	The assessment presented in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]** confirms the estimated construction jobs created by the Proposed Development to be a peak of 750, with an average of 554 full time jobs over the two-year construction period. Additional site-specific information is also presented regarding the existing jobs, based on landowner surveys, which was confirmed to be 7.75 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs. During operation, the net change in direct employment was estimated to be 7.25 FTE and 9.75 indirect FTE. Overall, the net operational employment increase was found to be negligible at all spatial levels (including local and district levels). It is difficult to establish the likelihood of the specific jobs, at construction, operational or decommissioning stages, being taken up by residents of one or other of the three Local Authority Districts, but the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8**] aims to maximise local involvement and benefits.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	indirect jobs • The long-term jobs figure was a low figure when the presentation was delivered – more detail on this • Identifies construction employment and demand for accommodation – how many construction workers do they anticipate will work on the site during development and what proportion do they anticipate will be from the travel to work area. • Further consideration for supply chain opportunities • Claimant count data in Bassetlaw did spike temporarily in the autumn of 2023 due to the Wilko HQ and Distribution Centre closing – reflected in the graphs – reflected in season trend graph too • Pg 31. Employment opportunities available to local people during construction and operational period due to skills needs – it would be good to identify skills requirements • Pg. 35 estimate 4,000 FTE jobs across the whole value chain from the project – it would be useful to have more of a breakdown of their expect numbers for construction	Additionally, the assessment considers the demand for accommodation and the potential for impacts on visitors and tourism, as a result of all phases of the Proposed Development.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	and long-term operation • It would be useful to provide some examples of trades and the types of jobs this will entail – parag. 18.60 • 18.64 about employment when the project becomes operational is very vague • 18.65 do we need to test out how many agricultural jobs may be displaced as a result of the development • 18.67 the net additionality of jobs is not significant for the operational stage – there is a disconnect here with the estimated 4,000 FTE jobs across the whole value chain – there is a over reliance on supply chain that are not directly involved in the development/operation • Impact of perception of visitors and businesses this is very subjective and hard to measure but they have acknowledged • Is there a plan to support economic benefits during the term of the construction and when the site becomes operational? • At what stage will the economic business case specific to the project and outline what outputs and outcomes will be delivered in relation		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	to job, apprenticeships, internships, supply chain opportunities etc. It is welcomed that a detailed assessment of the significance of effects will be presented in the ES.		
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 18 – Socio Economics** In respect of Socio Economics, Chapter 18 sets out the potential for direct and indirect job creation during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases. Whilst job creation is noted as a potential positive benefit, any permanent direct employment is limited to a net change of between 0-5 jobs (once displacement is taken into account). Although construction jobs are likely to be more significant (peaking at 750 over the course of the construction period) it is noted that the average could be lower. NSDC acknowledge that reference is made to the 'Local Area' which is based around four Lower-Layer Super Output Areas (LSOA), but without a further breakdown provided distinct to the Newark and Sherwood district in respect of jobs, it is difficult to	The assessment presented in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]** confirms the estimated construction jobs created by the Project to be a peak of 750, with an average of 554 full time jobs over the two-year construction period. Additional site-specific information is also presented regarding the existing jobs, based on landowner surveys, which was confirmed to be 7.75 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs. During operation, the net change in direct employment was estimated to be 7.25 FTE and 9.75 indirect FTE. Overall, the net operational employment increase was found to be negligible at all spatial levels (including local and district levels). It is difficult to establish the likelihood of the specific jobs, at construction, operational or decommissioning stages, being taken up by	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	quantify the specific benefits to the authority. Notwithstanding this, construction jobs are in any event of a temporary nature. NSDC would welcome further clarification on both potential job creation at the district level and how such potential jobs can be secured as direct and tangible employment on either a temporary or permanent basis	residents of one or other of the three Local Authority Districts, but the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8]** aims to maximise local involvement and benefits.	
Transport and Access			
Bassetlaw District Council Nottinghamshire County Council	A proposal of this magnitude will have significant impact on the existing transportation network mainly during the project's construction phase. Therefore, the HA will require a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) and supporting studies to assess the additional traffic demands and any required mitigation to the highway network. These should be prepared in accordance with current Planning Practice Policy, Nottinghamshire County Council's Design Guide and other industry accepted guidance on TA's. The HA will need to consider the detail of the transportation impacts once the planning application (s) is/(are) made and is likely to secure any necessary mitigation measures	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** illustrates the level of development trips that are predicted at the peak of construction activities and what mitigation measures are required to mitigate significant effects. The **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**, is provided and sets out details to a number of the points raised by the Council. Specific responses to each of the points raised are set out below:	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	through planning condition and S106 obligations. The TA should include the following details and information: - 1. The access strategy outlining design philosophy and the approach for the scale of development proposed 2. Note - baseline appraisal data, key analysis parameters and assessment methodology should be agreed with the HA before the full TA work is undertaken. 3. The TA should clearly define the proposed schemes in relation to the different LPA administrative boundaries i.e., Bassetlaw, Lincolnshire, and Newark & Sherwood. 4. The number, size and frequency of the vehicles that will be associated with the construction and completed – operational phases of the proposal. 5. The proposed routing of the construction vehicles from the principal highway network to the proposed sites, including vehicle tracking where necessary to show that the highway network can adequately accommodate construction vehicles access, egress and turning. This will	Note 1: Details relating to access strategy are set out in **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** and The **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**. Note 2: The methodology was detailed in the scoping stage and in the following technical meeting. Note 3: **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** does not distinguish between local authority boundaries as this is outside the scope of the document, which is to provide a technical assessment of transport. Details of the wider area study are provided. Note 4: **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** provides details of vehicle classes during the construction and operational phases.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	require a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to be agreed with the HA. 6. Details of the proposed temporary/permanent access(s)/hardstanding in the site, including achievable visibility splays, access widths, finished gradients, surfacing materials and drainage measures. The layout plan(s) should show the proposed access and its interface with the existing public highway network. This must be a topographical plan, accurately showing all street furniture/posts/trees/assets at a minimum scale of 1:500. Access arrangements and proposed highway improvements will require independent Stage I Road Safety Audit (RSA) to be undertaken in accordance with HD 19/15. 7. Details of the proposed welfare compounds/parking/unloading/manoeuvring areas within the site during both the construction and operational phases by use of a comprehensive Construction Management Plan (CMP). 8. All temporary construction sites (expected to be mostly agricultural field) should include proactive measures to prevent deleterious	Note 5: The **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]** describes the proposed access routes. Consultation with regards to Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) routing has been undertaken using the contacts for AIL movement from the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Load database, in line with AIL permitting processes. Note 6: Junction details are provided in **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** notes that the highway authorities will be consulted to achieve technical approval, prior to access junction works commencing. This will include detailed design drawings and associated Road Safety Audits (RSA), where required. Future RSA would be undertaken in line with GG119, this being the new standard that replaced HD19/15 [REF-51]. Note 8: The design of the site access junctions as noted in the **oCTMP[EN010159/APP/7.9]** includes a commitment that the junction bellmouths and	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	construction material and mud being transferred to the public highway i.e., Wheel wash facilities. 9. The reports should include detailed long-term management strategies to mitigate any negative transport impacts of the development and where possible promote sustainable active movement. 10. The TA should include a chapter that deals with cable routing corridors and utility diversion/installation over/under the public highway for the National Grid connection. Especially, how the main connection of the solar power system will be established at High Marnham substation. The opportunity to share cabling infrastructure with the other solar panel schemes/utilities in the area should be explored. 11. All new cables in public highway need to be installed by a statutory undertaker and use of a Section 50 licence under the NRSW Act [REF-52] for installation by other companies is not acceptable. 12. Some sensitive rural roads will require dilapidation surveys and road condition prior to and after heavy construction work has been undertaken. 13. The proposal must identify any minor public	initial sections of track will be constructed in metalled surface to prevent the transmission of mud and debris onto the public road. The access tracks are to be a of a crushed stone construction to further prevent mud being deposited on the highway. **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]** also notes that wheel wash and road sweepers will also be deployed where required by the local highway authorities. Note 9: The long term traffic generation of the Project is covered by the operational phase review. During the operational phase, up to 10 LGV trips per day, on average, are predicted to cater for cleaning of panels and general Site maintenance. When longer term maintenance of battery units or panels is required, HGV access will be necessary with up to 12 HGV trips potentially per day. The number of vehicle trips occurring during this phase will be well below the number of movements assessed for the construction phase.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	highways affected and their future treatment. This should include definitive/non-definitive rights of way such as public footpaths, public road, bridleway, BOAT or restricted bye way. 14. The area appears to contain a limited number of environmental weight limits, but the HA encourages early consultation to limited environmental annoyance to affected villages/residents and to ensure works programmes are not hindered. Contacts 15. Enquiries about adopted public highway record.uk Please note this list is not exhaustive and the applicant will be expected to provide appropriate assessment information that reflects site conditions and its locality.	All of the proposed access junctions will be constructed to adoptable standards and will be maintained by the Applicant throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Note 10: **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** does not include details of the cable crossing. **Figure 1.1 of the Outline Export Cable Route Concept Method Statement** [**EN010159/APP/7.13]** details the locations of cable crossing points, noting that the majority over roads will be undertaken using Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and as such, no impact on traffic operation is predicted. The sharing of cable trenches by different projects is outside the scope of the Transport Assessment for the Proposed Development. Note 11: Noted and agreed by the Applicant. Note 12: Noted and agreed by the Applicant. A Wear & Tear agreement is outlined in **Outline**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]. Note 14: The access strategy presented in **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]** illustrate that construction traffic will be routed onto A and B class roads wherever possible and that access through residential areas of Ragnall, North Clifton, South Clifton, Spalford and Newton on Trent will not occur. Note 15: Noted and agreed by the Applicant.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Newark and Sherwood District Council	**Chapter 13 – Pg 2 onwards. Transport and Access** As Nottinghamshire County Council are also a 'host' authority for the purposes of this DCO application and are also the responsible Highway Authority, at this stage, we will leave NCC to respond on this topic area directly to the applicant, as part of their consultation response.	Noted and agreed by the Applicant, with response to Nottinghamshire County Council outlined below.	N
West Lindsey District Council	**Chapter 13: Transport and Access** It is noted that there are not expected to be any significant impacts associated with the development process. Nonetheless, the potential for construction traffic to coincide with other NSIP projects, is likely and this must be fully assessed, in comparison to the construction statements of the other projects. The Local Planning Authority would defer to any advice received from the Local Highway Authority at Lincolnshire County Council with regards to highways matters. Construction Phase- 4.63. The ES will need to consider the cumulative environmental effects of constructing development, alongside the construction of other NSIP projects that are currently within the PA2008 process. One of which has now been consented (Gate Burton	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** includes a cumulative development sensitivity review to review the potential impacts of the Project alongside other developments. **Chapter 18- Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]** considers the cumulative effects with other projects in the local area.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Energy Park- 12/07/2024).		
Nottinghamshire County Council	**Highways and Transport** Paragraph 3.14 suggests that the accesses to site would be new accesses or upgraded farm accesses. However, three of the seven proposed highway access points (within Nottinghamshire) are also PROWs. **Study Area** The TA suggests that the effects of the construction traffic generated by the proposal would be most pronounced in close proximity to the proposed access junctions and the study area limited accordingly to the A57 and the northern extents of the western and eastern parcel access roads. However, the traffic information indicates that there are significant numbers of vehicles that either would or could approach from the south for both East and West parcels, but the study area	The study area was discussed and agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council at the scoping stage and in the following discussion meeting. A routing diagram, based upon the route requirements that construction traffic will be required to use as part of **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**, is provided in **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** as requested by the Council. The traffic impact within these links in minimal and will only dissipate the further the distance from the site.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	appears to have been arbitrarily curtailed and so there is insufficient information to allow us to properly assess the possible implications. Page 78 of the Outline Construction Management Plan (OCMP) suggests that on selection of the principal contractor, wider area routing information will be made available, but it is the proposed routing within the more immediate area that is missing or unclear. NCC would anticipate this to have been carried out in what is effectively the triangle between the A46, A1 and A57. 2 Accordingly, in order to be able to meaningfully consider the acceptability of the study area, NCC would request that a routing diagram to each gate is provided on all roads linking to the A46/A1/A57.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	**Barred Routes** Gates B-D cannot be accessed from A57 to the North because of the proposed Main St Ragnall access restriction. There is also a school/Academy and 4m height restriction from the low bridge on Marnham Rd, which would mean construction traffic/quarry/material deliveries is likely to come off the A1 through Sutton-on-Trent - Grassthorpe – Normanton-on-Trent OR Tuxford via Polly Taylor's Lane. NCC	The proposed construction routing is detailed in **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**. The Proposed Development requires access tracks to be constructed to serve the site and using these, it possible to avoid the village of Ragnall. This provides a distinct environmental benefit to residents and this bypass will be used by all	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	are in receipt of complaints in regard to existing HGV use in this area. However, none of the routes in this area have been included in the PEA or the study area and so the impact has not been properly considered/assessed. It is unclear why Ragnall is a barred route as it is signed as the HGV route for High Marnham and is therefore established as a suitable route. The A57 is identified as a strategic road but runs through Newton on Trent which appears to be on the barred route list. It is stated that access to the Eastern side will be via the A1133 but gives no indication of where the A1133 is accessed from, although Table 13-8 indicates that out of the 249 HGVs on the A1133, 85% will be from the south. Spalford, South Scarle and Collingham are not on the barred routes list and are not considered either in the PEA or in the study area and therefore vehicles could approach from these routes with no consideration given to the impact. Please see section on the Preliminary Environmental Assessment above	construction traffic and enforced through the CTMP. The other routes suggested by the Council are not proposed to be used and will be managed by the CTMP. This ensures that traffic impacts do not occur on minor roads or in settlements where such HGV traffic would not be appropriate.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Nottinghamshire County Council	**Access** All access points appear to be on roads with speed limits of or over 40mph and therefore DMRB standards apply for their design. Any gates should be set back a suitable distance to accommodate waiting HGVs off highway. There are numerous roads which are too narrow for HGVs to pass, and these should be assessed for provision of localised widening / passing bays. Gates F, G and H appear to be in Lincolnshire but Gate H appears to be on a bend with visibility splays crossing into Nottinghamshire, so we reserve the right to comment on future submissions for this gate. **Delivery of Highway Works** Please confirm if the highway works are being delivered under licence, agreement or Statutory Instrument.	The proposed access junctions have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) [REF-53]. Figures illustrating the junction layouts and associated visibility splays are provided in **the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].** It is proposed that the rights for constructing an access will be subject to a technical approval process with the relevant local authority prior to works commencing. This will be secured through the Construction Traffic Management Plan. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]** is submitted as part of the DCO Application.	N
Nottinghamshire County Council	**General Comments** Cable connection crossing points should be shown where they affect public highway. The scheme affects many minor PRofW highway – so the applicant needs to seek the direct input of Countryside Access All new cables in public highway need to be installed by a statutory undertaker and use of a	**Figure 1.1 of the Outline Export Cable Route Concept Method Statement [EN010159/APP/7.13]** illustrates the location of cable crossings. The majority of road crossings will be undertaken by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) or by lane closure, rather than whole road closures.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Section 50 licence under the NRSW Act for installation by other companies is not acceptable. Some sensitive rural roads will require dilapidation surveys and road condition prior to and after heavy construction work has been undertaken. The area appears to contain several environmental weight limits. The HA encourages early consultation with the LHA to limited environmental annoyance to affected villages/residents and to ensure works programmes are not hindered. After the construction and during the decommissioning works the LHA will expect the applicant to thoroughly clean the public highway and any road gullies for 500m either side the primary site accesses. This obligation needs to be contained in the CTMP or secured by planning condition.	The Applicant notes the comments relating to contractors and licencing. The Applicant will engage with the relevant Highway Authorities regarding the need for any Wear & Tear agreements separately.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Nottinghamshire County Council	**Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA)** Notwithstanding our concerns in regard to the limited study area, paragraph 13.59 of the TA states that where overall traffic flows or HGV flows increase by more than 30%, this is used to inform a screening exercise. Based on the counts undertaken in 2024, Table 13-9 indicates that only Crabtree Lane and the Public Rights of Way proposed to be used for access exceed this figure. To check that presented, we have compared this to available NCC data and DfT data. The total volumes of traffic across all datasets are very similar. However, there are significant differences in the HGV volumes presented in the TA. The traffic counts have been done by using tubes which can't discriminate between two axle rigid HGV's and large wheel based LGV's so anything in the latter category e.g. transit vans have been included in the HGV numbers, inflating those numbers considerably. NCC do not therefore accept the summarised flow data submitted and do not accept the results of the PEA which has been based on it. Clearly, even within the study area presented, there are 4 more links which would appear to trigger the	A review of the traffic data has been held with the independent traffic surveying firm that undertook the surveys. The surveying contractor has recalibrated the data to take into account longer wheel base Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) and this data is now presented within **the Transport Assessment [[EN010159/APP/6.21].** The revised data accords with historic HGV data use and addresses the Council's previous concern.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	requirement for further investigation but have not been considered. Table Included - Comparison of TA HGV data with NCC and DfT HGV data with resultant % increase.		
Lincolnshire County Council	**Transport and Access** LCC as Highway Authority has reviewed the PEIR and have the following comments to make. The methodology and assessment set out in Chapter 13 is appropriate and the scale of traffic impact in terms of vehicle numbers and distribution is suitable. The estimation of trip generation and distribution as contained within Appendix 13.2 is considered to be reasonable. The impact on LCC highway network is envisaged to be within the daily variation of traffic flows. LCC considers the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) as detailed within Appendix 10.3 to be acceptable in principle. LCC notes that the CTMP will need to be conditioned to ensure the proposal is delivered in accordance with the plan and should, for example, keep most construction	**Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21]** provides the details of the traffic generation and potential for impact. A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan outlining measures that would offset the temporary traffic impacts is provided in **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**. The Council's comments relating to the acceptable impact of the project within their road network is noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	traffic scheduled outside of peak network hours. 22 Overall, the proposals mostly fall within Nottinghamshire, however, they do impact upon the highway network within Lincolnshire County Councils administrative boundaries. These impacts are considered to be acceptable subject to the OCTMP being detailed and conditioned.		
Lincolnshire County Council	**Public Rights of Way (PRoW)** LCC are pleased to see that PROWs would be maintained through diversions during construction and decommissioning phases, and would be retained, further connected through permissive paths, especially connecting Newton on Trent to Sustrans' national cycle route, during the operational period. There may be potential for improvements to be made such as hard surfaces to enable inclusivity and new bridges crossing streams. Land not used for solar PV panels could be of benefit for physical activity, including gardening. It is felt that this has the potential to have a significant positive effect. LCC notes the limited pedestrian facilities within the immediate vicinity of the project proposals, however, LCC is pleased to see that PRoWs leading through the	**Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9]**, provides details of the temporary Public Rights of Way (PRoW) measures that may be necessary to ensure the safety of path users and construction staff during the construction period. This includes displaying signs to notify of upcoming closures, asking people to avoid a route where there are more serious hazards but also not asking people to avoid a route if there is no safety reason to do so and remediating the surface of any PRoW that has been disturbed after construction, Further details are also provided in **Streets, rights of way and access plans [EN010159/APP/2.4]** and the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.14]).**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	scheme development area have been considered within the Landscape and Visual Impact of the site. It is noted that the outline CTMP shall include summaries of path management proposals to assist PRoW and path users during the construction period. LCC notes that these measures shall be further refined as the project progresses and will be reported within the final ES. LCC notes that the method and timings for any temporary diversions should be included in any proposals. Diversions should be the preferred approach than absolute closure of a route. Consideration should be given to desire lines, to avoid lengthy diversion routes. The outline CTMP should include information regarding the methodology of temporary route closures, how a temporary closure will take place, including notices and giving notice to LCC, how long any closure will last for, where the diverted routes will run and the specification of any surface will be applied to them, and what arrangements there are for reinstatement of the original path and surfaces. Maintenance of all permissive routes should also be considered.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire County Council	Regarding the proposed options for cable routes across the River Trent (PEIR Chapter 4, River Crossing Options 4.40 to 4.45). LCC supports the installation of cables beneath the River Trent (Option 1) as this minimises visual and physical impact on the landscape and heritage assets. However, Option 2, which involved attaching cables externally to the Fledborough viaduct, now part of the national cycle network, would harm this heritage asset. The viaduct is an important historical structure within the landscape, and attaching cables to it would harm its significance. Additionally, LCC encourages further consideration of assets associated with the historic railway line linking Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, now part of the national cycle network. This route, passing east to west across the proposed site as it approaches Lincoln, is considered a heritage asset, although not currently recorded in the Historic Environment Record (HER). The proposal to install solar panels on either side of the route would impact its setting and disrupt the landscape's historical legibility, thereby diminishing its significance. This issue is not	The crossing of the River Trent to allow electrical connections to occur will be undertaken using a Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) operation, rather than proposals to attach the cabling to existing structures. The potential visual impact of the Project from viewpoints located on the National Cycle Network route is described in **Chapter 11- Landscape and Visual.EN010159/APP/6.11]**. This assessment contains details of landscaping and mitigation measures for receptors across the Development Order.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	addressed in the PEIR's cultural heritage chapter. LCC considered more information is needed, including an assessment of the impact on this asset and options for design and mitigation methods, to explain and justify the proposed scheme.		
Lincolnshire County Council	There are several other NSIP applications currently proposed within Lincolnshire, whilst the principal sites are located outside of the proposed 15km ZOI wider implications, particularly traffic and transport may have some interactivity and cumulative impact. Consideration should be given to the geographical scale of the other NSIP projects within Lincolnshire and in adjacent authority areas. The cumulative assessments of these projects and their impacts should be kept under review.	The transport cumulative assessment is provided in **Appendix 12.2: Transport Assessment** of the **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21].** Applications out with the 15km ZOI have been considered where those schemes have publicly available data that includes traffic flows on the Project study area network roads. As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18]** taking account of other existing and, or approved projects there are no cumulative likely significant effects for transport and access.	N

Table J-1.3 - Summary of Section 42(1)(d) responses and regard had by topic

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Alternatives and Need			
OE_SC_d2	I strongly urge you to consider an alternative site that does not involve the disruption of agricultural land near our properties. Additionally, I request a reconsideration of the field primarily affecting the three properties at this site, which, in the broader context, would not pose a significant loss.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y
Landscape and Visual Impact			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_d2	The visual and aesthetic impact of a large-scale solar farm will irreversibly change the character of our cherished rural landscape, which is valued by residents and visitors alike. This change will adversely affect all three properties Westwood Farm, Westwood Park and Hawthorn Hill Farm in this area and diminish the overall appeal of our community.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y
Socio-Economics			
OE_SC_d1	We believe that the installation of solar panels will affect the value of all properties.	The EIA assesses a variety of economic impacts in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]**. These assessments are conducted in accordance with regulations and guidance as well as the Scoping Opinion that specify which topics to assess and the methodology to use. The potential impact to house values is not included in this assessment in part because there are numerous factors that affect house values and little evidence to show a direct impact due to living near a solar farm. Furthermore, although we understand that it is an important issue to the community, the potential impact on house values is not considered to be a	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		material consideration in the planning process by the government. Instead it is a matter that is usually considered after development consent has been granted, at such time that an impact which gives rise to compensation has occurred. These are typically physical impacts, such as noise, not visual impacts. However, as noted above, we do not consider that this would be the case as the scheme has been designed carefully to take account of the potential for impacts on people's homes.	

OE_SC_d2	It will decrease all our property value and obstruct the views from our properties.	The EIA assesses a variety of economic impacts in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]**. These assessments are conducted in accordance with regulations and guidance as well as the Scoping Opinion that specify which topics to assess and the methodology to use. The potential impact to house values is not included in this assessment in part because there are numerous factors that affect house values and little evidence to show a direct impact due to living near a solar farm. Furthermore, although we understand that it is an important issue to the community, the potential impact on house values is not considered to be a material consideration in the planning process by the government. Instead, it is a matter that is usually considered after development consent has been granted, at such time that an impact which gives rise to compensation has occurred. These are typically physical impacts, such as noise, not visual impacts. However, as noted above, we do not consider that this would be the case as the scheme has been designed carefully to take account of the potential for impacts on people's homes.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Transport and Access			
OE_SC_d1	Westwood Park driveway is privately owned road from the village of Thorney all the way to the Westwood Park. The only people who have been given permission to use it are the Westwood Park, Westwood Farm and Hawthorn Hill Farm. The access to the other farms has been given on an agriculture basis however have still been hold to use specific farm road stated by Westwood Farm. We strongly DO NOT give permission to the One Earth Solar to use this driveway as Solar Equipment, transport and anything else needed would blocked and potentially damage this small farm road which is already in poor condition which is needed daily for Westwood Park, Westwood Farm, Hawthorn Hill Farm and for agriculture reasons.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y
OE_SC_d1	The increase traffic within the small one road village of Thorney would cause lots of disruption to the community and all its residences as the entrance to this privately owned drive is located in the middle of Thorney.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_d2	I reject permission for this project to access and utilize a private road or my track for any activities associated with the solar farm. Furthermore, I firmly deny permission to excavate under my land for purposes such as laying pipes or such like, as described in your plans.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y
OE_SC_d2	The increase in traffic within the small one road village would cause disruption to the community and all its residents as the entrance to this privately owned road is located in the middle of Thorney village.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y
OE_SC_d2	Furthermore, the installation of a solar farm poses serious health and safety risks for my family, as we own horses. The size of the solar panels and the noise they generate will make it unsafe for us to ride along the private road. This poses a particular danger to my nine-year-old daughter and her horse, making it impossible for her to ride safely.	The Applicant prefers to seek voluntary agreements for land that will be part of the project, therefore, we no longer seek to use this access road. This means that the project has removed the fields around Thorney from the project.	Y

Appendix J-2: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s47

Table J-2.1 below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s47 of PA 2008 concerning the Proposed Development and the regard had to them by the Applicant.

Table J-2.1 - Summary of Section 47 responses and regard had by topic

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Air Quality			
OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_O17 OESF_SC_O25, OESF_SC_P05	Concern for air pollution.	**Chapter 13: Air Quality [EN010159/APP/6.13]** assesses potential impacts on air quality from Construction Dust Soiling and Human Health Effects, Onsite Plant Emission Human Health Effects and Traffic Emission Human Health Effects. Potential effects are assessed during construction and decommissioning. In each case, following the application of mitigation, no significant effects are expected.	N
Alternatives and Need			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_O07, OE_SC_O17, OE_SC_O22, OE_SC_EM01, OE_SC_EM03, OE_SC_EM09, OE_PE_01, OE_PE_04, OE_PE_10, OE_PE_11, OE_PE_29, OE_PE_32, OE_PE_37	Statement of support for other energy sources including wind, hydro, nuclear and tidal.	The current national policy calls for a mix of renewable energy sources in order to meet future energy demands. The starting point for the Proposed Development was the grid connection at High Marnham, and then the Applicant sought nearby land that would be suitable. This area is good for solar production, which is why solar is being pursued. See also **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4]** and the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].**	N
OE_SC_EM01, OE_SC_EM11, OE_PE_08	General opposition to solar (including efficiency).	The National Policy Statements (in particular EN-1, paragraphs 3.2.6 – 3.2.8 [EN-2]) establish that there is a demonstrated urgent need for renewable energy generation including solar. Therefore, opposition to solar generally is a challenge to the Government's policy and is not an issue that can be considered or which can be resolved by way of the determination of this Application. Solar technology has advanced significantly in recent years and is now capable of collecting energy, even on cloudy days. The UK is a good	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		location for solar in general because the cooler, rainy weather helps keep panels clean and cool. Recognising this, the Government has set out a need for 45-47 GW of solar power by 2030 as part of Clean Power 2030 Action Plan: A new era of clean electricity. For further information about the appropriateness of the Proposed Development to meet a part of the UK's critical need for low carbon generation is set out in the **Statement of Need [EN010159/APP/7.1].**	
OE_SC_O04, OE_SC_O07, OE_SC_O14, OE_SC_O15, OE_SC_O21, OE_SC_O21, OE_SC_O24, OE_SC_O25, OE_SC_O29, OE_SC_EM09, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM13, OE_PE_02, OE_PE_19, OE_PE_31	Statement the project is too large.	The Proposed Development will generate a significant amount of energy for homes and businesses, which requires more land than a project of a smaller scale. Where possible, the Applicant has sought to minimise the use of land through design measures, and the total size of the Proposed Development has reduced through consultation. The size of the Site has been driven by the size of the grid connection (740MW export / import) and the need to use land efficiently whilst maximising the capacity of the existing grid infrastructure. See the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** in terms of the approach to the design and layout of the Site, including how the size of the site has evolved, and	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		see the Site Selection Assessment appended to the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]** for further explanation of why a site of this size is required and justified.	
OE_SC_O15, OE_SC_O17, OE_SC_O29, OE_SC_O34, OE_SC_P05, OE_SC_P07, OE_SC_O07, OE_SC_O19, OE_SC_O22, OE_SC_P02, OE_SC_P05, OE_SC_EM09, OE_SC_EM13, OE_PE_09, OE_PE_24, OE_PE_33	Statement of support for solar in other locations, including brownfields, rooftops, and other industrial land.	To meet national targets for energy, current policy calls for a variety of renewable energy sources including rooftop installations. On their own, however, these would not produce enough energy to meet future energy needs. Large scale solar is needed to generate significant capacity. The Applicant has considered the availability of brownfield and similar land in identifying the Site, and this is covered in the Site Selection Assessment attached to the Planning Statement. See **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4]** and the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].**	N
OE_SC_O29, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM13, OE_PE_27	Concern about cumulative impacts, statements that the region has ‘done enough’.	The starting point for the Proposed Development was the grid connection agreement at High Marnham. Because the former power station had been decommissioned, there was capacity at this	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		location and in the existing grid infrastructure for a new renewable energy project to connect. This region of the country was previously known as 'Megawatt Valley' because of the string of coal power stations along the River Trent. As they are being decommissioned, a number of energy projects are being developed to replace their capacity. The Applicant appreciates that there is significant change being proposed in this area and has considered the potential for cumulative effects in preparing its plans for the Proposed Development. A full assessment of the cumulative impacts is included in **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].**	
OE_SC_P06, OE_PE_40	General concern about site selection, support for project in another location.	The starting point for the Proposed Development was the grid connection agreement at High Marnham. Because the former power station had been decommissioned, there was capacity at this location for a new renewable energy project to connect. The Applicant sought land in the area that would be suitable for solar development, considering factors such as environmental designations, flood risk, the potential for landscape and visual effects, agricultural land classification (ALC), and proximity to settlements. See the Site	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Selection Assessment appended to the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5], the Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010159/APP/6.4].**	
OESF_SC_O30	No solution to connect across the River Trent.	**Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5]** provides a description of the Proposed Development. This includes the approach to taking cables under the River Trent. Further detail is also provided in the **Outline Export Cable Route Concept Method Statement [EN010159/APP/7.13**].	N
Biodiversity			
OESF_SC_O11, OESF_SC_O34	The Proposed Development will enhance local wildlife and nature.	This is noted and supported by our assessments, which show beneficial effects for biodiversity from the Proposed Development - see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_W01, OESF_SC_O01, OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_O03, OESF_SC_O10, OESF_SC_O13 OESF_SC_O14, OESF_SC_O16 OESF_SC_O18, OESF_SC_O19 OESF_SC_O20, OESF_SC_O20 OESF_SC_O23, OESF_SC_O24, OESF_SC_O25, OESF_SC_O26, OESF_SC_O27, OESF_SC_O28, OESF_SC_O31, OESF_SC_O32, OESF_SC_O34, OESF_SC_P02, OESF_SC_P04, OESF_SC_P05, OESF_SC_O03,	General statement of concern for wildlife and biodiversity.	The Proposed Development incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan designed to achieve an uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and deliver other landscape benefits as described within the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** This plan prioritises enhanced ecological connectivity and aligns with local conservation priorities, ensuring a positive contribution to the surrounding environment. The design process has been informed by extensive field survey data, enabling a targeted approach to habitat creation, enhancement, and management. Biodiversity Net Gain well in excess of 10% is to be delivered as part of the Proposed Development – see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM02, OE_PE_06, OE_PE_20, OE_PE_34, OE_PE_35, OE_PE_36			
OESF_SC_O10, OESF_SC_O19, OESF_SC_O23, OESF_SC_O24 OESF_SC_O25, OESF_SC_O32, OE_SC_EM04, OE_PE_20	Concern regarding loss of habitats and native species.	A summary of the habitat survey information is provided in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6],** with further details in ES **Volume 3, Appendix 6.3: Extended Habitat Survey [EN010159/APP/6.21]**. Native, local species typical of the region will be selected to provide a variety of conditions for multiple flora (fungi and epiphytes) and fauna; this commitment is made within the **Commitments Register [EN010159/APP/7.15]**. No significant effects on identified habitats are expected following mitigation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_O28, OESF_SC_O34, OE_SC_EM02	Concern for impact on local birds.	**Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** assesses potential impacts on skylark, other breeding birds and overwintering birds. Overall impacts on skylark and wintering birds are assessed as not significant. The overall effect on other breeding birds of the Proposed Development is assessed as Significant Beneficial.	N
OESF_SC_O20	Concern for impact on bugs and insects.	Effects on invertebrates are scoped out of the assessment **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** These species occur within the ZoI for all environmental changes. However, the extent of land take will be far exceeded by habitat creation and enhancement which will benefit these species.	N
OESF_SC_O14, OESF_SC_O20, OESF_SC_O27, OE_SC_EM02, OE_PE_20	Concern for impact on deer and foxes.	Allowance for the movement of larger mammals is embedded within the design of the Proposed Development. Security fencing will be installed throughout the Order Limits, around solar array fields and supporting infrastructure. They will be constructed of wire mesh and wooden posts and designed to be stock proof, with a minimum height of 2 m. To avoid fragmentation of habitats, there will be ground level holes/gates at strategic locations, large enough to allow movement of	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		badgers, hedgehogs and foxes. Strategic locations will be adjacent to habitat parcels of medium or high distinctiveness (woodland, mixed scrub, ponds) and on or close to established mammal runs. Specific locations will be identified during the pre-construction surveys, due to the potential for commuting routes to change frequently, however, a minimum of one hole per 150 m of fencing will be created, with a higher frequency around suitable habitats and identified badger sett locations.	
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) To avoid likely significant effects during the construction stage, the construction contractor should prepare and implement a CEMP detailing measures to ensure environmental protection and legal compliance in relation to ecology and other environmental aspects. An Ecological Clerk of Works would supervise and manage the implementation of measures to mitigate impacts on ecological features prior to and during the Proposed Development construction phase. and to be a point of contact for issues which arise over the duration. Landscape and Ecological	Noted. These matters are included in the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4]** and **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Management Plan (LEMP) Habitat creation/enhancement measures should be managed under prescriptions contained within a LEMP and reviewed every five years to ensure the agreed objectives are being met. The LEMP should be secured through the planning system. Also see Monitoring.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Monitoring is a fundamental component of biodiversity management and requires thorough planning to identify key indicators, establish baseline conditions prior to development and assess biodiversity changes through the life of the project. The monitoring section of a BMP should provide details of key elements of biodiversity to be monitored, the method of monitoring and frequency and time of year the activity should be carried out. Key elements of biodiversity, including protected species and BAP priority habitats, should be measured at regular intervals. If a protected species is found on site and specific enhancements have been made, this species should be surveyed at least	Monitoring of flora and fauna including to assure legal compliance, to ensure establishment of habitats and to ensure the delivery of biodiversity net gain is described within **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**, the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]** and the **Outline Construction and Environmental Monitoring Plan (oCEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.4].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	annually at a suitable time of year to check its status (providing this doesn't result in disturbance to the species). Likewise, a specialist habitat such as a wildflower meadow should be carefully monitored to ensure it develops to its full potential. For habitat monitoring it's usually advisable to identify a small number of indicator species. Monitoring should be undertaken by a qualified ecologist with training in the species or habitat of interest. All habitat enhancements should be checked regularly to ensure they are working properly, and nothing has gone wrong. For example, any plantings should be assessed in spring and autumn to ensure the plants have taken and remain healthy. The entire site should be checked regularly for injurious weeds. Nesting and roosting boxes should be cleaned and checked for structural integrity outside of the breeding season. An adaptive management approach should be adopted whereby the results of monitoring feed back into the management of the site. This means that if problems are identified		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	during monitoring, e.g. a flush of injurious weeds on part of the site, then appropriate management action should be rapidly taken. Likewise, if positive results are returned, e.g. an increase in a particular bird species nesting on site, then consideration should be given as to how to maintain and maximise this success. Such management revisions are likely to require specialist ecological knowledge and discussion with appropriate conservation organisations monitoring programme should be implemented to ensure that habitat creation/enhancement work delivered as part of the Scheme is established successfully. BRE (2014) Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments. Eds G E Parker and L Greene.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	7.63. states: “Measures which will be managed throughout the life of our Project will primarily be associated with habitat creation and enhancement. These measures are designed to result in positive effects on biodiversity and to establish an	The Proposed Development will provide well above the 10% minimum BNG expected. Results of the BNG assessment are provided in ref env measurements in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and **Appendix 6.10,**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	overall Biodiversity Net Gain to deliver in excess of the minimum ten percent required uplift in habitat units, hedgerow units and river units." Reflecting the principles and definitions of the Environment Act 2021, all new development will be expected to secure at least 10% net gain in biodiversity so that the biodiversity value of the development exceeds the predevelopment on site habitat value by at least 10%. The BNG aspiration for Nottinghamshire is 20% where appropriate and viable. That target has been agreed by all the Local Planning Authorities. Habitats should be as close to the proposed development site and secured for at least 30 years via obligations/conservation covenant. The mitigation hierarchy still applies of avoidance, mitigation and compensation for biodiversity loss. Appropriate site-specific recommendations will be required for providing enhancements specific for Nottinghamshire BAP species, Section 41 Species and habitats of Principal Importance (NERC Act 2006) [REF-8].	**Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Given the scale of the proposed development there is opportunity to link the existing LWS with other habitats that will be managed to enhance biodiversity, with existing corridors such as the River Trent and the national cycle route across the Fledborough Viaduct also providing the opportunity to join up with other habitats of value that are further afield. We agree that there are opportunities to deliver biodiversity gains based around the following: ▪ Habitat enhancement and creation outside of areas of development (i.e. land set aside for biodiversity and other green infrastructure); ▪ Habitat enhancement and creation within areas of development; and ▪ Species-specific opportunities aimed at improving local provision.	The indicative landscape masterplan within the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010159/APP/7.7]** shows where different habitat types will be created. This includes areas of Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh close to Fledborough Holme LWS and scrub, trees, hedgerows and species rich grassland around the Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS.	N
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	We look forward to reviewing the BNG information that will be released in the upcoming ES chapter (paragraph 7.11 of Chapter 7: Biodiversity).	Please see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and **Appendix 6.10 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	The River Trent corridor provides an opportunity for meaningful habitat enhancement through the restoration of areas of floodplain grazing marsh (a national and local conservation priority), scrapes and temporary pools for waders and wildfowl (providing habitat for notable breeding and non-breeding birds), creation of new hedgerows (a Habitat of Principal Importance (HPI)) and planting of new stands of woodland. Within the site there is the opportunity to create a range of habitats. We would like to see a mosaic of grassland habitat creation and management across the whole site to avoid a uniform monoculture effect. To do this, different fields can be seeded with different seed mixes and manage through cutting at different times/regularities. Should the fields contain tilting panels, the collection of arisings is possible too, which helps promote a diverse sward. Consideration should be given to graze areas with a low density of sheep. Habitat creation/enhancement should be guided by	The River Trent corridor will remain free of above ground infrastructure and will benefit from the creation of complementary habitats including coastal and floodplain grazing marsh and scrapes. Please see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	the Biodiversity Opportunity Map (BOM) for those areas in Newark & Sherwood district to choose which fields should receive the more ecologically beneficial management regimes.		
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	We are encouraged to see the land parcels close to the River Trent have been assigned to biodiversity enhancement. These areas between the Trent and the A1133 have also been mapped as “opportunities for management” or “opportunities for creation” by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (GLNP) as part of the Local Nature Recovery System (LNRS). In this respect we can see that this portion of the scheme will promote ecological connectivity in line with ongoing projects in place by Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and our partners.	The Proposed Development incorporates a 5m standoff for each hedgerow and a 10m ecological corridor around hedgerows within the Order limits to enhance habitat connectivity. Over 250 hectares of mitigation land have been designated, free from any above-ground infrastructure, ensuring the protection and enhancement of biodiversity (includes species-rich grassland, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, woodland and scrub). The design carefully avoids the loss of habitats supporting a diverse range of species, including bats and farmland birds, resulting in minimal hedgerow and tree losses. These measures align with best practices for biodiversity conservation and are detailed further in Chapter 6.7 – Environmental Measures of the Biodiversity Assessment. See **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust remain unconvinced that a “species-rich meadow mix” can be attained beneath the panelling due to the level of shading these areas will incur. In other solar schemes that we have consulted on (both at the NSIP and TPCA level) we feel that modified grassland is a more appropriate choice of habitat type here due to the management requirements needed to maintain this. We await further clarification on this from the BNG information.	Evidence from other solar farms demonstrates that a species-rich grassland mix is effective in enhancing biodiversity (for example see Copping et al. 2025 [REF-54]). We are proposing using shade-tolerant species to maximise ecological benefits. However, in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), the grassland beneath the solar panels will be classified as modified to ensure an appropriately cautious and conservative assessment. This approach reflects best practices in habitat evaluation while still delivering meaningful biodiversity enhancements. **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**	N
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	There are some extensive areas of woodland to the northeast of the project site which are indicated to be given a 25m offset from panelling, according to the latest revision of the illustrative masterplan. Rather than maintaining the hard boundaries between juxtaposing habitats here, we recommend that ecotones are created whereby woodland habitat may transition into the grassland which will dominate the majority of the scheme. Areas	The indicative landscape plan allows habitats such as scrub to be delivered that will both connect the retained woodland to other habitats as well as providing transitionary habitats. See **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]** and the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	where two habitats merge into one another are able to support much greater biodiversity than a single habitat.		
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	One key area of focus for Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust is the stark decline in ground-nesting birds (GNB) and want to see applicants for solar developments make significant efforts to mitigate for any and all losses in breeding territories. The Breeding bird baseline survey notes 3 grey partridge and 98 skylark territories within the order limits (approximately 1 and 26 territories respectively within the Lincolnshire borders after cross referencing with Figures 3.1a-m). These territories will need to be compensated for either in biodiversity mitigation areas or through offsite measures. We understand that an individual solar farm may not have a negative impact on GNB such as skylark and lapwing, at a population level. But we have taken the decision due to the sheer volume of solar farm developments being applied for across Greater Lincolnshire,	Skylark specific mitigation is provided within the Order Limits through provision of large areas of species-rich grassland which will not hold any above ground infrastructure. Grey partridges are expected to benefit from solar development through the provision of habitats suitable for nesting and feeding including new hedgerows, field margins, and species rich grassland.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	including NSIPs, that we will take a consistent approach, as we believe cumulatively, there is true potential to impact populations in Greater Lincolnshire.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Further Survey We note that due to the refinement and subsequent amendments made to the site boundary, the Phase 1 habitat survey requires updating to cover areas not previously incorporated into the study area and to 'ground truth' areas which were subject to assessment at this stage, from satellite imagery. In addition, prior to submission of the ES, an updated data search will be conducted to ensure that any recent records are considered in the final assessment. We support the following actions: ▪ Any new or recent signs of badgers recorded during other ecology surveys in 2024 will be considered. Badger are highly mobile species, moving around the landscape and sometimes switching between main setts. ▪ Additional information regarding the activity of bats within the site will be recorded over the active bat season (April to October) at strategically selected	Further surveys have been completed and are described, alongside environmental measures within **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	monitoring locations. These locations will aim to compare bat activity within the full range of habitat types present, providing a baseline for monitoring conducted during the operational phase. ▪ Species specific surveys for water vole and otter, will be carried out in 2024. Specifically, this will involve the survey of watercourses identified during habitat assessment, as providing suitable habitat for these species. ▪ A small proportion of habitats within the site provide suitability for common reptile species. A sample of riparian/bankside habitat will be surveyed, with the specific aim to establish a population estimate of grass snake which were identified as occurring within the study area by the desk study.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	We note that habitat enhancement for turtle dove is proposed. The Turtle Dove is the UK's fastest declining bird species and is on the brink of extinction. It breeds in lowland England and winters in Sub-Saharan Africa. Classified in the UK as Red under the Birds of Conservation Concern 5: the Red List for	Measures specifically targeting improvement of habitat for turtle dove are described in the Environmental Measures section 6.7 of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].** Land take will occur during the construction phase, as the construction activity reduces the amount of	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Birds (2021) [REF-55]. The turtle dove has been on the red list in the UK since 1996. Red is the highest conservation priority, with species on this list needing urgent action. There is a small, and thus vulnerable population in Nottinghamshire. Turtle Dove requires seed food, nesting habitat, and water within 300m of each other. They eat seeds, and feed on the ground in weedy areas or in the short stubble after a harvest. Seeds such as chickweed, fumitory, common mouse ear and oilseed rape, as well as cereal grains, are important food sources for turtle doves. One cause of the decline is thought to be lack of seed and grain during the breeding season, resulting in a much shorter breeder season with fewer nesting attempts. They prefer thorny species to nest in, such as hawthorn, over 4m tall and will often build a nest amongst climbers, including honeysuckle and wild clematis. Specifically designed turtle dove plots can provide a seed source. Seeding can be around 25kg/ha (a sparse sward is ok because it	vegetation growing. However, prior to and during construction, creation and enhancement measures undertaken during the construction phase will result in a marked increase in semi-natural habitat. This will include 14.06 km of new hedgerow planting (C27), 58.88 km of hedgerow and tree line enhancement (C27), 243.83 ha of species-rich grassland created outside of the solar arrays and a further 918.20 ha within (C16, C17), species-rich field margins (including those designed for turtle dove) (C30), beetle banks (C18), at least 25 temporary ponds and scrapes (C21) and SuDS features (C21).	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	allows the birds to access the ground). We have established plots 6m wide and 80-350m in length at the Idle Valley NR. We are also working with farmers along the Idle Valley to create plots on their land. If you are interested in hearing more about our aspirations for the project, we would be open to have a discussion.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Part of Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS occurs within the site. We note that embedded measures will prevent negative effects with enhancement measures resulting in positive effects. It is stated that scrub planting will take place within the LWS to contribute to BNG delivery. This strategy should be approached with caution because the LWS is designated for its botanical interest and scrub encroachment on the areas of grassland is an ongoing management issue. A better approach may be to implement a management regime that restores areas of species rich grassland. Section 7.69. states “Our Project will collaborate with the Local Wildlife Trusts to	Funding toward mink control through a third party is to be provided in order to improve conditions for the local water vole population. It is noted from stakeholder discussions that there are at least two projects working within the general area which could be engaged with. Refer to the Environmental Measures section 6.7 of **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	implement an invasive species management plan. This would focus on the removal and prevention of spreading of Himalayan balsam and Japanese knotweed, and the control of American mink." We are interested in discussing how we might work in partnership to expand our Water Vole Recovery Project. This NE-funded project is focussing on a three-strand approach to prevent water voles from becoming extinct in Nottinghamshire – mink eradication, wetland habitat creation and water vole introduction. Through these measures we plan to bring water voles back to our rivers in the County, starting in the Idle and Ryton, followed by three Sherwood rivers and the Erewash in the south. We hope to then work out onto the next rivers in each catchment. We are also liaising with similar mink control projects in Yorks, Derbys and Lincs, to ensure that eventually we all meet up and there are no gaps between boundaries.		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	A total of thirty-nine species were recorded breeding or holding territory during the breeding bird survey (See Figures 3.1a to 3.1m, Annex A), of which: • Three species listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) [REF-56]: barn owl, hobby and quail.• Ten species listed as species of principal importance in England (SPI): dunnock, grey partridge, house sparrow, linnet, reed bunting, skylark, song thrush, turtle dove, yellowhammer, and yellow wagtail. The list of priority habitats and species in England ('Section 41 habitats and species') is for public bodies, landowners and funders to use for biodiversity conservation. Publishing the list is a legal duty under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act [REF-8]. • Nine species recorded as BoCC red-listed species: greenfinch, grey partridge, house martin, house sparrow, linnet, skylark, turtle dove, yellowhammer, and yellow wagtail. Many of the bird species recorded will benefit from the aim to improve habitat	The design of the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7**] provides a wide range of opportunities to a variety of birds including those that are local conservation priorities. Habitat for skylark will be created ahead of construction to mitigate effects on the local population - see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6]**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	connectivity, both within the site and the wider landscape, and by creating a mosaic of habitat types. However, we do have concerns about impacts on Skylark, yellow wagtail and quail, ground nesting birds of arable fields. Section 7.132. states: "Specifically, the potential for disturbance to skylark, depending on the period of construction, may result in significant effects at a Local scale. On a precautionary basis, potential effects on either individuals or local populations of skylark are therefore assessed as being of low magnitude (breeding season only), temporary and not significant on this receptor of importance at a Local scale, in the absence of mitigation (embedded measures and the Construction Environmental Register). Effects would be negligible if undertaken outside the breeding season." We question this assessment. The breeding bird survey revealed 98 skylark territories within the survey area that are likely to be displaced by the solar farm because skylarks avoid nesting under solar arrays. Skylark is a		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	Section 41 species and red-listed bird of conservation concern and so every effort should be made to take conservation action. Skylark is a bird of grassland/crops and when selecting nest sites, open locations are preferred because trees, buildings or tall hedgerows provide perching opportunities for avian predators. Fields with such boundary features will be avoided unless the field area is particularly large. Where tall boundary features are absent, smaller fields may be used. Effective mitigation for skylark requires either the provision of newly available habitat or the enhancement of existing habitat. The Great North Road Solar Park is to retain agricultural land with enhanced ecological management within the scheme boundary where solar panels will not be installed. Enhanced agricultural land may comprise spring sown cereal crops with retention of winter stubbles that provides a longer nesting season with more breeding opportunities and winter foraging and/or skylark plots to aid access to nesting		

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	habitat. Set-aside and fallow habitat also provide excellent habitat. In addition, land outside the red line boundary will provide mitigation/compensation for the displacement of skylark territories which have the aim of increasing the carrying capacity to 'absorb' a significant proportion of territories from the site. Implementing such measures, in conjunction with enhanced foraging habitat within the site could reduce residual effects on these species. The strategy will also support yellow wagtail and quail. We encourage the promotors of the One Earth Solar Farm to implement the strategies outlined above.		
Buried and Cultural Heritage			
OESF_SC_O11, OESF_SC_O20 OESF_SC_O21, OESF_SC_O25	Concern about local impact on heritage and history of the area.	Impacts on cultural heritage are assessed in **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10].** During construction and decommissioning phases, there would be likely significant adverse effects to Whimpton Moor Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument), Ragnall House (Grade II), Barn at	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Ragnall Stables (Grade II), Ragnall Hall and Attached Outbuildings (Grade II), Church of St Leonard, Ragnall (Grade II*), Church of St Gregory, Fledborough (Grade I), Manor House (Grade II), Roman Vexillation Fortress (Scheduled Monument), Skegby Manor and Pigeoncote (both Grade II) and Pigeoncote at Hall Farm (Grade II). Whilst significant, these effects would be temporary and reversible. There would be no significant effects to all other assets found within the remaining settlements. It is noted for the decommissioning phase, that whilst the effects would be similar to construction during the phase, it would likely be returning to an approximate baseline position by removing solar development from the setting of heritage assets. As such, while there would be some temporary adverse effects during the decommissioning that are similar to those occurring during construction, the outcome of this phase would likely remove any adverse effects that have arisen during the operational phase.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		During the operational and maintenance phase, there would be likely significant adverse effects in short and medium-term to designated assets in Ragnall, however these would be mitigated in the long term as the proposed planting becomes established. Long-term significant effects would only arise to Whimpton Moor Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument) and attempts have been made to further mitigate these effects through design changes since statutory and stakeholder consultation, including further setbacks, strengthening of hedgerow planting, and assessment of topography. As identified within the assessment, it is considered that due to the nature of the asset and the effect on this asset, additional mitigation to manage visual impact (i.e. further planting or slight increases to setbacks) would not materially change the nature of effects. The identified likely significant adverse effects are considered to equate to less than substantial harm (middle of the spectrum) to the contribution of setting to value and would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the Proposed Development, as per NPS EN-1 [REF-2] 5.9.32 and 5.9.33.	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		There would be no likely significant adverse effects to the remainder of designated assets within 1km radius of the Order Limits, or to designated assets between 1-2km radius of the Order Limits and NDHAs within 1km of the Order Limits. This is considered to be a result of an engaged consultation process and good design to mitigate effects where possible. It is noted that there would be some minor and negligible adverse effects to designated assets (Church of St Gregory, Manor House and Skegby Manor and Pigeoncote) which, whilst not significant, would equate to a low level of less than substantial harm to the contribution of setting to significance of these heritage assets. This would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the Proposed Development, as per NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.32 [REF-2] and NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.3.8 [REF-1]. There would also be adverse effects (not significant) arising to several NDHAs which would require a balanced judgement to be taken, having regard for their significance and the scale of any harm or loss, as per NPS EN-1 [REF-2] paragraph 5.9.33. The Applicant has done what it can to avoid and minimise impacts on	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		cultural heritage assets and considered the limited adverse effects are outweighed by the substantial need for the Proposed Development along with the other benefits it would provide. Potential effects on buried heritage are considered in **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9].** It is expected that any effect arising from the construction of the Proposed Development on buried heritage deposits can be successfully mitigated to a non-significant level by a combination of embedded environmental measures and a proportionate and targeted archaeological mitigation. No significant effects on buried heritage are expected as a result of the operation or decommissioning of the Proposed Development.	
Climate and Carbon			
OESF_SC_O08 OESF_SC_O21, OESF_SC_O23	Need more information and assurance on environmental impact.	The **Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6]** sets out the Applicant's assessment of potential environmental impacts. The topics considered in the Environmental Statement follow those set out in the Scoping	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Opinion issued by the Planning Inspectorate in December 2023.	
OESF_SC_O01, OESF_SC_O15	The project is not green.	The assessment of GHG effects in **Chapter 14: Carbon and Climate Change [EN010159/APP/6.13]** has demonstrated that the Proposed Development will have a significant beneficial effect in relation to climate change as a result of indirect GHG emissions avoided by the Proposed Development and its role in the transition to net zero. In addition, the Proposed Development incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan designed to achieve an uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and deliver other landscape benefits as described within the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** This plan prioritises enhanced ecological connectivity and aligns with local conservation priorities, ensuring a positive contribution to the surrounding environment. The design process has been informed by extensive field survey data, enabling a targeted approach to habitat creation, enhancement, and management.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Biodiversity Net Gain well in excess of 10% is to be delivered as part of the Proposed Development – see **Chapter 6: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.6].**	
OESF_SC_O10, OE_PE_06	Project will increase carbon footprint (source of panels from China).	The assessment of GHG effects in **Chapter 14: Carbon and Climate Change [EN010159/APP/6.13]** has taken into account the full lifecycle in assessing the carbon impact of the Proposed Development, and concludes that the Proposed Development will have a significant beneficial effect in relation to climate change as a result of indirect GHG emissions avoided by the Proposed Development and its role in the transition to net zero.	N
OESF_SC_O21 OESF_SC_O30, OESF_SC_O31 OESF_SC_P07, OESF_SC_P08	Concern about how the panels will be recycled at the end of the project.	The **ODEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** includes a commitment to recycling components when the Proposed Development is decommissioning, including 100% of the solar panels.	N
OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_P07	Cables remaining in ground is unwanted industrial waste.	The Proposed Development would be decommissioned in accordance with the **ODEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** as secured in the **Draft DCO [EN010159/APP/3.1].** It is proposed to leave	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		cables in the ground at decommissioning as this would be less impactful than removing them from the ground.	
Community Benefit			
OESF_SC_O27, OESF_SC_O28 OESF_SC_O29, OESF_SC_O33, OE_SC_EM03	Compensation should be paid for locals who are impacted.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
OESF_SC_P01, OESF_SC_P03 OESF_SC_O27, OESF_SC_O30, OE_SC_EM12	Locals should get reduced energy bills.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_P08, OESF_SC_P05, OE_SC_EM12	Support local infrastructure (bus services/libraries etc.).	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
OE_SC_EM03	Request for EV charging points for residents.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
OE_SC_EM11	Request for funding at local schools.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM11	Request for car parking to access Sustrans route.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
OE_PE_22, OE_PE_41	No community benefit.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
OE_SC_P04	Request for local farmers to decide what community benefits should be.	The Applicant is still in the process of reviewing feedback on what the community would like to see as part of the Community Benefit package, and no final decisions have been made. The Applicant has already established a Community Sponsorship Fund locally and is committed to creating a Community Benefit package to help ensure that there are local	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		benefits from the Proposed Development. It is envisaged that the fund would be set up and then administered with input from the local authorities and members of the community, who could then allocate the community benefit funds as they see fit, in line with the agreed terms of reference for the group or body that is set up to administer the fund. The Applicant has committed to maintaining a community liaison group to liaise with local residents during the construction, operation and decommissioning. For further information, please see the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4], oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5]** and **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6].** The Applicant has also committed to working with local authorities and educational institutions to help ensure opportunities for new jobs created for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development are offered to seek to ensure benefits for local labour when possible, see the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8].**	
Consultation			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_O34, OESF_SC_P07, OESF_SC_O31, OE_SC_EM03, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM13,	Statement there was not enough consultation.	The Applicant has consulted proactively and widely, beyond the requirements for statutory consultation set out in the Planning Act 2008. This has included a first round of non-statutory consultation which was 6-weeks long (Chapter 3), and an 8-week long statutory consultation (Chapter 6), which included 5 in-person events, 2 webinars, 20 site visits, and 5 meetings with parish councils. Four of the five local planning authorities have confirmed the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone. Full details are set out in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].**	N
OESF_SC_O07, OESF_SC_O08	More information needed.	The Applicant has consulted proactively, widely and iteratively on the Proposed Development. This included an initial stage of non-statutory consultation on its early plans, as well as statutory consultation on its updated masterplan and the preliminary results of its EIA. This has meant that more information has been presented over time to ensure that feedback is built into the process at an early point, when it can have a meaningful impact on the Proposed Development. The Applicant considers the information published at each stage of the consultation to be appropriate to the level of	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		feedback requested. Full details are set out in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].**	
OESF_SC_O05, OESF_SC_O06	Should be government consultation on nationwide energy strategy.	This is outside of the scope of this Proposed Development.	N
OESF_SC_O01	Concerns about green washing.	The Proposed Development has been presented in a factual manner. All consultation materials are available as part of the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].**	
OE_SC_EM13	Concern over lack of site visit.	After seeing this item of feedback, the Applicant contacted the individual to arrange a site visit, which occurred on 10 July 2024, as detailed in Table 6.5 of the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1].**	N
General			
OE_SC_O01, OE_SC_O03, OE_SC_O04, OE_SC_O07,	General statement of opposition.	Noted.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_O09, OE_SC_O10, OE_SC_O13, OE_SC_O17, OE_SC_O32, OE_SC_P02, OE_SC_EM01, OE_PE_26, OE_PE_28			
OE_SC_O11, OE_SC_O33	Statement of support.	Noted.	N
OE_SC_EM09, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM01, OE_SC_EM14, OE_PE_01	Support for renewable energy (in general).	Noted.	N
OE_SC_O19, OE_SC_O22, OE_SC_O26	General concern over impact on quality of life.	The Applicant notes that the Proposed Development would be a change to the current landscape, however, the design for the Proposed Development, shown illustratively on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7],** has changed significantly throughout the development	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		process in response to community feedback in order to reduce impacts and provide benefits such as the provision of new permissive paths. See also **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. Impacts on health and wellbeing are considered in **Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** which finds a net positive impact.	
General: The Developer			
OESF_SC_O01, OESF_SC_O02 OESF_SC_O03, OESF_SC_O03 OESF_SC_O19, OESF_SC_O21 OESF_SC_O32, OESF_SC_P07, OESF_SC_O18, OE_PE_30	General statement of distrust of developers and their intentions.	The Applicant has consulted proactively and widely as set out in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]. Appendices J-1 and J-2 of the Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]** provide an open and transparent record of the feedback that the Applicant has sought and the regard that the Applicant has had to it. The Proposed Development is being brought forward as a joint venture between Padero Solaer Limited trading as PS Renewables (company number: 08021337) and Orsted Onshore UK Limited (company number: 06636519).	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Orsted Onshore UK Limited and its related entities (collectively "Ørsted") is a market leader within the UK in offshore wind generation, already operating 12 offshore wind farms alongside onshore wind projects in Scotland, renewable hydrogen and energy storage. As one of the largest renewable energy companies in the world, Ørsted has a history of delivering similar projects and its proven track record of securing capital funding, including Hornsea One, Two, and Three. Established in 2012, PS Renewables is one of the UK's largest privately held companies that specialises in the development and asset management of renewable energy projects including solar and BESS. PS Renewables existing solar farm portfolio totals over 300MW of electricity producing potential in the UK. Further information about the Applicant can be found in the **Funding Statement [EN010159/APP/4.2]**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_O21, OESF_SC_O32 OESF_SC_P07, OESF_SC_O03, OESF_SC_O24, OE_SC_EM13 OE_SC_EM14, OE_PE_13	Concern that developers and landowners are benefitting.	While the Proposed Development is privately owned, it is proposed in response to the critical national need for low-carbon energy generation identified in National Policy Statement EN-1 [REF-2]. Further detail on the need for the Proposed Development is set out in the **Statement of Need [EN010159/APP/7.1].** Furthermore, the Applicant has committed to a community benefit package to ensure that there are local benefits as well as the national benefits from the Proposed Development.	N
OESF_SC_O03, OESF_SC_O01	General scepticism to project commitments.	The Applicant has consulted proactively and widely as set out in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]. Appendices J-1 and J-2** of the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]** provide an open and transparent record of the feedback that the Applicant has sought and the regard that the Applicant has had to it. Commitments are secured within the **Draft DCO [EN010159/APP/3.1].** If granted consent the Applicant would be under a legal obligation to comply with the requirements of the DCO and failure to do so would constitute a criminal offence, enforceable by the local planning authorities.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_O01, OESF_SC_O06, OE_SC_EM03, OE_SC_EM11	Money is going towards foreign interests.	The Applicant is unclear of the relevance of this statement to the Application. However, it notes that the Applicant is registered in the UK as One Earth Solar Farm Limited (Company number 13078087). The Applicant is a joint venture between Padero Solaer Limited trading as PS Renewables (UK registered company number: 08021337) and Orsted Onshore UK Limited (UK registered company number: 06636519). Orsted Onshore UK Limited and its related entities (collectively "Ørsted") is a market leader within the UK in offshore wind generation, already operating 12 offshore wind farms alongside onshore wind projects in Scotland, renewable hydrogen and energy storage. As one of the largest renewable energy companies in the world, Ørsted has a history of delivering similar projects and its proven track record of securing capital funding, including Hornsea One, Two, and Three. Established in 2012, PS Renewables is one of the UK's largest privately held companies that specialises in the development and asset	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		management of renewable energy projects including solar and BESS. PS Renewables existing solar farm portfolio totals over 300MW of electricity producing potential in the UK. Further information about the Applicant can be found in the **Funding Statement [EN010159/APP/4.2].**	
Human Health			
OESF_SC_O30, OESF_SC_O26, OE_SC_EM10	Concern about fire risk.	The Applicant has set out its approach to managing fire risk in the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [EN010159/APP/7.11].** A layered safety approach will be used to reduce risks and ensure safety. This includes choosing safe chemistries, ensuring BESS compliance with relevant standards like NFPA 855 [REF-48], conducting tests such as UL 9540a, battery	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		management systems, fire detection and suppression systems, enclosure design, maintaining safe separation distances to prevent propagation, and other measures outlined in the **oBSMP [EN010159/APP/7.11**]. This shall be followed up in detailed design stage with the development of an emergency response plan (ERP) in consultation with the local FRSs. This will include information to assist operators and firefighters in an effective fire response. A risk management plan shall also be developed along with the ERP. Although BESS fires have the potential to release harmful gases, these risks can be effectively managed. The 2017 DNV report (OAPUS301WIKO(PP151894)) [REF-57] emphasizes that, in the event of a fire, maintaining sufficient distance between the BESS units and residential areas, along with ensuring proper ventilation, significantly mitigates the impact of toxic fumes. Fire responders will stay a safe distance from the smoke plume until it's confirmed to be safe, using gas detectors and air quality monitoring. We will also include plans to handle	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		post-incident hazards as part of our pre-fire planning and recovery process. Impacts on health and wellbeing are considered in **Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010159/APP/6.16].** Following the application of measures in the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [EN010159/APP/7.11]**, no significant effects on human health are expected as a result of fire.	
OESF_SC_W01, OESF_SC_O03 OESF_SC_O16, OESF_SC_O19 OESF_SC_O20, OESF_SC_O21 OESF_SC_O24, OESF_SC_O25 OESF_SC_O31, OE_SC_EM04, OE_SC_EM16, OE_SC_EM09, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM04.	Concern about general health and well being.	The Applicant notes that the Proposed Development would be a change to the current landscape, however, the design for the Proposed Development, shown illustratively on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7],** has changed significantly throughout the development process in response to community feedback in order to reduce impacts and provide benefits such as the provision of new permissive paths. See also **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. Impacts on health and wellbeing are considered in **Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]** which finds a net positive impact.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_PE_23			
OESF_SC_O20, OESF_SC_O21, OESF_SC_O24, OESF_SC_O31, OE_PE_35	Concern about impact on mental health.	The assessment of the Environmental Statement includes potential impacts during the project's construction, operation and decommissioning stages, therefore, whilst we appreciate the consultation and application process can be stressful or worrying for people, impacts in advance of the project's consent are outside of the scope of the EIA. However, to seek to provide reassurance to people, the approach undertaken by the Applicant has been to maximise community engagement at all stages of the development, enabling local communities to positively influence the design evolution of the Proposed Development. The design has changed significantly in response to feedback received concerning assets and environmental matters which are considered to be important locally. As a consequence, a participatory approach can increase the sense of control within a community	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		and result in various embedded mitigation measures and enhancement areas being secured. Potential mental health effects will be mitigated by several factors including numerous offsets from individual properties and community assets. Taking into account the anticipated physical and mental health effects for this determinant, the magnitude of effect is assessed as low due to the short-term duration, temporary nature and accounting for the embedded design measures. The Applicant has also undertaken efforts to communicate with the local community throughout the development period, to help inform them about updates to the Proposed Development in response to their feedback, and explain the next steps in the development process to help reduce anxiety caused by a lack of information. The assessment methodology and outcomes are set out in the chapter, including recommendations on mitigations where necessary. For more information, see **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16]**	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_W01	Nearby recreational activities pose risk of damage to solar panels and equipment.	The Proposed Development will include measures to protect equipment including security fencing installed throughout the Order Limits, around solar array fields and supporting infrastructure and CCTV. Fencing will be constructed of wire mesh and wooden posts and designed to be stock proof, with a minimum height of 2 m.	N
OESF_SC_O25, OESF_SC_O26	Concern about chemical leaks.	The use, management and storage of any contaminants (including chemicals and silt/sediment runoff) are outlined within the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4].** As set out within the **Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 7.2 of Environmental Statement [EN010159/APP/6.21])**, potentially contaminated runoff from the BESS areas in the event of a fire will be contained within the detentions basins and will be tankered away. Chemicals are not proposed for the cleaning of the panels. This will be through the use of potable water brought to site.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Hydrology and Hydrogeology			
OESF_SC_O19, OESF_SC_O20 OESF_SC_O26, OESF_SC_O31 OESF_SC_O34, OESF_SC_P02 OESF_SC_P08, OE_SC_EM08. OE_PE_05, OE_PE_19	Impact on flooding in the area.	The **FRA** (**Appendix 7.2** in **ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]**) demonstrates that there will be no significant increase in flood risk from any sources as a result of the completed development. A conservative assessment has now been undertaken and it is concluded that the panel frames could in theory displace 617.7m3 of floodwater which equates to an increased flood depth less than 1mm when considered across the design flood extent within the Order Limits. This is within the 5mm standard tolerance that the EA referred to in the meeting and it has been agreed that floodplain compensation is not required. This is as a result of the proposed environmental measures set out previously, and as summarised below:	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		• Sequentially setting out the proposed development, ensuring that sensitive equipment is not located within the floodplain, wherever possible. • The raising of equipment (both solar modules and inverters where necessary) above the design flood level (with the exception of some small localised areas) on frames and voided structures, to ensure no loss in floodplain storage or adverse changes in flood flows. • No land raising being proposed within the design flood extent of the Order Limits, ensuring there is no loss in floodplain storage. • Managing surface water runoff from any areas of significant hardstanding and restricting runoff to match the natural greenfield runoff rates. This ensures there is no increase in flood risk downstream.	
Land and soils			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_O01, OE_SC_O02, OE_SC_O03, OE_SC_O04, OE_SC_O07, OE_SC_O10, OE_SC_O10, OE_SC_O12, OE_SC_O15, OE_SC_O16, OE_SC_O17, OE_SC_O17, OE_SC_O18, OE_SC_O21, OE_SC_O29, OE_SC_O30, OE_SC_O31, OE_SC_O32, OE_SC_P03, OE_SC_P05, OE_SC_P05, OE_SC_P06, OE_SC_P07, OE_PE_07, OE_SC_P08,	Concerns about impact to agriculture and food security.	The Applicant notes the importance of balancing both food security and energy security; however, the Proposed Development includes a minimal amount of land, when considering the total amount of land currently used for agricultural production in the UK. To meet national energy targets would only require 0.3% of the UK's land. The largest threat to agriculture is climate change, which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world. The Applicant has sought to avoid and minimise the use of the best and most versatile (BMV) land, which is explained further in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and see **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]** for the assessment of the impact on soils. The **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5]** also sets out the position with respect to policy related to BMV and agricultural land.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM10, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM13, OE_PE_10, OE_PE_14, OE_PE_18, OE_PE_19, OE_PE_24, OE_PE_32, OE_PE_38			
OESF_SC_O01, OESF_SC_O02	Concern about building on green belt.	The Proposed Development is not on green belt land.	N
OE_SC_EM03	Dispute classification of land.	An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey of the Order Limits has been undertaken, with site work completed from June 2023 to April 2024, in line with industry best practice and Natural England guidance TIN049. The survey work involved using an auger to assess soil types (topsoil and subsoil) to depths up to 1.2m (approximately one sample per hectare), with some additional larger trial holes (also to 1.2m depth). The ALC survey covers the Order Limits,	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		with a total surveyed area of 1240 hectares (ha). The results of the ALC survey are summarised in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**, with reference to **Figure 8.5 (ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.20])**. The full ALC survey report is presented as **Appendix 8.3 (ES Volume 3 [EN010159/APP/6.21]**. The ALC and Best Most Versatile (BMV) land is as follows: • Grade 1 (BMV land): none present • Grade 2 (BMV land): 19.7% (244.8ha) • Grade 3a (BMV land): 33.6% (416.1ha) • Grade 3b (non-BMV land): 46.7% (579.5ha) • Grade 4 (non-BMV land): none present • Grade 5 (non-BMV land): none present • Non-agricultural land: none present • Urban land: none present.	
OESF_SC_O21, OESF_SC_O30, OESF_SC_O31 OESF_SC_P07, OESF_SC_P08, OE_SC_EM11	Concern about permanent damage to the land.	The assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on soil and agricultural land use is completed within **Chapter 8: Land and soils [EN010159/APP/6.8].** This is based on the 60 year design life for the Proposed Development, which is secured in the DCO Requirements (Schedule 2): Decommissioning and Restoration of the **DCO [EN010159/APP/3.1].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		The land can be returned to an agricultural land use after the Proposed Development has been decommissioned (save for some established habitats that would remain). The final Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will ensure that the land is returned with the same Agricultural Land Classification, and that no deterioration in soil quality has occurred. Overall, the Applicant would expect the quality of the soil to increase over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. With respect to decommissioning, all infrastructure will be removed from the Site, including panels, batteries, inverters and other above-ground infrastructure. Below-ground cables at greater depth than 1m will remain in situ, as this causes fewer impacts than removing them, while still allowing agricultural land use to be reverted to. The Applicant would be required to decommission the land in accordance with the approved Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, compliance with which is enforceable by the	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		local authorities and any breach may constitute a criminal offence.	
National Farmers Union	The Midlands NFU welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Consultation of One Earth Solar Farm. The NFU represents over 46,000 farmers and growers nationally. Our farmers and growers have shaped and maintained our iconic countryside for generations. Our natural resources are precious, and farmers are continually working to protect them while producing our food. The following media quote was made by NFU Deputy President Tom Bradshaw to the London City AM business paper on 21 August 2022: "Renewable energy production is a core part of the NFU's net zero plan and solar projects often offer a good diversification option for farmers. However, there is a need to strike a balance between food security and climate ambitions. It is important that large scale solar farm development is located on lower quality	During the site selection process, the Applicant applied specific environmental search criteria, including agricultural land grade to find appropriate land which would be able to deliver its objectives. According to the provisional ALC mapping (Defra and Natural England), this area (i.e. in proximity to the point of connection) of Nottinghamshire and to a lesser extent, Lincolnshire, has a mixture of largely Grade 3 with small pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 4, making complete avoidance of BMV impossible for development of the scale proposed. The Natural England predictive mapping also shows large areas of the Order Limits as having a low-to-moderate likelihood probability of BMV with one swathe of high likelihood between North and South Clifton (which was subsequently removed so only a small parcel remained).	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	agricultural land, avoiding the most productive and versatile soils. Utilising roofs and farm buildings for solar should also be incentivised as it delivers a sustainable method of energy production while avoiding any land use conflict." The NFU strongly encourages developers of large and super-large solar farms to follow existing best practice guidelines for multi-purpose land use (energy production, grazing of small livestock and agrienvironmental measures). Development proposals for solar should be considered in the context of the importance of the nation's food security and resilience. Solar farm development and associated accommodation and conveyance works, should be located on lower-quality agricultural land or brownfield sites, avoiding as far as possible development on agricultural land of classification 1, 2, 3a (Best and Most Versatile land). Further, the NFU has a strong preference for developments which are roof mounted, so avoiding land take altogether. Where there	On this basis, the Order Limits were considered favorable, based on predictive mapping at site selection stage and avoided the swathes of Grade 2 to the east and west. Consideration was given as to whether alternative land could be found with less impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics. Further information is provided in the Site Selection Report at Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5].** An ALC survey has been completed, so that a detailed assessment of potential impacts to land of higher agricultural quality could be undertaken (as presented in **Chapter 8: Land and Soils [EN010159/APP/6.8]**). In addition, the cumulative impacts from the Proposed Development have been considered on	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	is a cumulative effect of such developments in close proximity, the NFU believes that there must be strong collaboration between the developers to minimise the impacts such as coordination of construction programmes, sharing haul roads, etc., to avoid additional land requirements unnecessarily.	a regional and national scale within **Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [EN010159/APP/6.8]**. The Applicant will coordinate with other developers to reduce potential impacts during construction where possible, if the Proposed Development is consented. The long term potential for agricultural use of the land after decommissioning is primarily protected by following measures set out in the **Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.10]**. The measures relate to minimising soil compaction – working only when soils are dry and friable, use low ground pressure machinery, avoid trafficking using designated haul roads. With the use of the soil management plan, the soils will be put back in good agricultural state. Under areas of solar, the soils will include shade tolerant grasses. Long term establishment of grass without agricultural traffic will help the soil ecosystem develop and support better soil structure and plant development by putting back natural nutrients into the soil.	
Landscape and Visual Impact			

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_W01, OE_SC_O04, OE_SC_O05, OE_SC_O06, OE_SC_O08, OE_SC_O09, OE_SC_O14, OE_SC_O15, OE_SC_O18, OE_SC_O18, OE_SC_O18, OE_SC_O18, OE_SC_O19, OE_SC_O20, OE_SC_O20, OE_SC_O23, OE_SC_O27, OE_SC_O28, OE_SC_O30, OE_SC_O30, OE_SC_O31, OE_SC_O32, OE_SC_O33, OE_SC_O34, OE_SC_P01,	General concern about visual impact and change of the countryside landscape,	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would be a change to the current landscape, however, the Applicant has taken steps, from site selection stage, through to the design of the scheme and then consideration of additional mitigation as part of the environmental assessment process, to avoid, minimise and mitigate adverse visual effects as far as possible. The Proposed Development's design, shown illustratively on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7]** has changed significantly throughout the development process in response to community feedback in order to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts. See the Site Selection Assessment appended to the **Planning Statement [EN010159/APP/5.5],** the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. A full assessment of visual impacts is included in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_P02, OE_SC_P07, OE_SC_P08, OE_SC_O06, OE_SC_EM01, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM13, OE_PE_19, OE_PE_38, OE_PE_39			
OE_SC_W01, OE_SC_O05, OE_SC_O20, OE_SC_O26, OE_SC_P03	Concern about visual impact to properties close to the project boundary.	The Applicant specifically sought out feedback from properties near the Order Limits through a series of site visits to local properties. The feedback from these visits as well as other written feedback led to significant changes around these properties, to develop bespoke setbacks that minimise visual impacts. See also **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. A full assessment of visual impacts is included in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_W01, OE_SC_P03, OE_SC_P04, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM11	Concern about visual impact to historic monuments, listed buildings and medieval village.	The potential impacts to heritage sites in the area has been considered, including the Roman fortress, medieval village, and listed buildings in the local area. The Applicant consulted with the local planning authorities as well as Historic England to ensure the setbacks from these sites were substantial enough to minimise impacts. See also **Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.9],** and **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10].**	Y
OE_SC_EM04, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM15, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM11	Concern over height of the panels.	The heights of the panels have been selected in order to balance the need to generate significant energy against the need to use more land, while also ensuring the panels are high enough off of the ground to allow flood water to flow beneath them. The height of the panels has been reduced in areas with lower flood risk, and the Applicant has sought to reduce visual impacts by creating setbacks around key locations, such as homes, villages, and public rights of way, and introducing landscaping to provide visual screening in places as set out in the **oLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**. See also **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. A full assessment of	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		visual impacts is included **in Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].**	
OE_SC_O04, OE_SC_O23	Visual impact of protected areas (SSSI and conservation areas).	There are no SSSI areas within the Order Limits, however, there is one conservation area within 1km radius of the Order Limits which is South Clifton village. There is a SSSI within 2km to the south of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development's design, shown illustratively on the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN010159/APP/2.7**], has changed significantly around villages, including South Clifton, to reduce impacts. See also **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [EN010159/APP/6.10]** and **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11],** as well as the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**	Y
OE_SC_P07	Visual impact of the BESS.	The locations of the BESS have been selected in part to reduce visual impacts by being located away from local properties. They will be further mitigated through using natural colours and landscaping. See **Design Approach Document**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		[EN010159/APP/5.8] and the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7]**.	
OE_SC_O20, OE_SC_EM08	Local church and Viaduct views will be spoilt.	The panels on the fields between Fledborough and the viaduct have been removed to preserve views around the church and of the viaduct. See the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**	Y
OE_SC_O20	West of the river has more allowance for visual amenity.	After the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant made significant changes to the eastern half of the Proposed Development in response to consultation feedback. During the statutory consultation, we received feedback that these changes felt unbalanced, and that more change was needed on the western portion. These changes were made, including significant changes around Fledborough and Ragnall, such that the design is consistently designed around individual properties and villages. See the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_O31	Visual impact on local tourism.	Potential impacts on local tourism have been assessed in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17].** There are a number of recreation facilities and tourist attractions, including caravan/camp sites and pubs in the Study Area, but not within the Order Limits. This chapter also considers the impacts on public rights of way and the Sustrans route which crosses over the viaduct. The potentially sensitive receptors have been identified, and most are more than several hundred metres from the Order Limits, and thus the impacts are considered to be relatively low.	N
OE_SC_O04, OE_PE_15	Physical, mental and psychological health and wellbeing effected by loss of natural landscape.	The assessment of the Environmental Statement includes potential impacts during the project's construction, operation and decommissioning stages, therefore, whilst we appreciate the consultation and application process can be stressful or worrying for people, impacts in advance of the project's consent are outside of the scope of the EIA. However, to seek to provide reassurance to people, the approach undertaken by the Applicant has been to maximise community engagement at all stages of the development, enabling local communities to	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		positively influence the design evolution of the Proposed Development. The design has changed significantly in response to feedback received concerning assets and environmental matters which are considered to be important locally. As a consequence, a participatory approach can increase the sense of control within a community and result in various embedded mitigation measures and enhancement areas being secured. Potential mental health effects will be mitigated by several factors including numerous offsets from individual properties and community assets. Taking into account the anticipated physical and mental health effects for this determinant, the magnitude of effect is assessed as low due to the short-term duration, temporary nature and accounting for the embedded design measures. The Applicant has also undertaken efforts to communicate with the local community throughout the development period, to help inform them about updates to the Proposed Development in response to their feedback, and explain the next steps in the development process to help reduce anxiety caused by a lack of information. The assessment	

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		methodology and outcomes are set out in the chapter, including recommendations on mitigations where necessary. For more information, see **Chapter 16: Health [EN010159/APP/6.16].**	
OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM13	Impact of inverters / fencing / CCTV.	**Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010159/APP/6.5]** provides a description of the Proposed Development. The physical characteristics of the development are described alongside the key activities that will be undertaken during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning. As per the Rochdale Envelope, the maximum parameters have been assessed as part of the environmental aspects (including landscape and visual and cultural heritage) and environmental measures included to mitigation likely significant effects. Such measures include new tree belts which will provide screening as part of the mitigation strategy in relation to visual impacts, as well as respond positively to the prevailing landscape character and enhancing ecological connectivity across the Order Limits. Following the application of mitigation, no significant effects are expected from inverters, fencing or CCTV.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM07	Impact of light pollution.	The lighting design for the Proposed Development will seek to limit impacts upon sensitive receptors and will be directional, orientated internally, away from the surrounding environment (including ecological habitats), and will be fitted with features to minimise light spillage. No external lighting will be permanently operated as part of the Proposed Development. The details of lighting and the commitments to ensure there are no likely significant effects are included in the **oCEMP [EN010159/APP/7.4],** **oDEMP [EN010159/APP/7.6]** and the **oOEMP [EN010159/APP/7.5].** Specific commitments on lighting and the protection for biodiversity is included within **Chapter 8: Biodiversity [EN010159/APP/6.8]** in particular Commitment C8 sets out how the oOEMP and oCEMP will include emergency lighting in line with principles set out in guidance from the Institution of Lighting Professionals and the Bat Conservation Trust to ensure there are no likely significant effects.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM10	Visual impact of panels from bridleways.	The Proposed Development has embedded mitigation specifically to minimise visual effects on equestrians. With reference to 'Advice on Solar farms near routes used by equestrians', published by the British Horse Society, the Proposed Development has: • avoided the creation of narrow corridors around Bridleways extending at least 30m from solar panel to solar panel, beyond the 5m minimum noted in the advice note, as secured on the **Works Plans (Volume 2: Plans/ Drawings/ Sections [EN010159/APP/2.3]);** • utilised post and wire fencing screened by hedgerows, as secured by the Outline Design Parameters and **OLEMP (Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.7];** and provision of additional routes accessible to equestrians via the proposed permissive path network, as secured in the **OLEMP (Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM04	Impact of glint and glare.	A **Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010159/APP/7.16]** has been prepared and considered as part of visual effects where appropriate. No significant effects are identified following the application of mitigation.	N
Landscape and Visual Impact: Mitigation			
OE_SC_EM11 OE_SC_EM04, OE_SC_EM07	Mitigate all boundaries.	The protection of residential views has been a key consideration at each stage of design development and has been informed by field work in and around settlements within the LVIA study area, as well as residential visits where requested. Table 11.10 in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11]** sets out the design response to specific properties that lie beyond villages.	Y
OE_SC_EM04, OE_SC_EM05, OE_SC_EM06, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM08, OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM12,	Request for panels to be set back from specific properties.	The Applicant specifically sought out feedback from properties near the Order Limits through a series of site visits to local properties. The feedback from these visits as well as other written feedback led to significant changes around these properties, to develop bespoke setbacks that minimise visual impacts. See also **Design**	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM13, OE_SC_EM14, OE_SC_EM15		**Approach Document (DAD) [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. A full assessment of visual impacts is included in **Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [EN010159/APP/6.11].**	
OE_SC_EM11 OE_SC_EM12	Request to reduce more panels on the west of the river to equal the reduction provided on the east of the river.	After the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant made significant changes to the eastern half of the Proposed Development in response to consultation feedback. During the statutory consultation, we received feedback that these changes felt unbalanced, and that more change was needed on the western portion. These changes were made, including significant changes around Fledborough and Ragnall, such that the design is consistently designed around individual properties and villages. See the **Design Approach Document [EN010159/APP/5.8]** and the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**	Y
OE_SC_EM11	Requests for panels to be set back from road between Fledborough and Ragnall.	Changes made to the Proposed Development in response to feedback include: • Embedding offsets from Ragnall in the order of 200m east of Main Street and utilisation of existing landform to the west to screen visibility of Work Area 1 (as shown on the	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Works Plans (see Volume 2: Plans/ Drawings/ Sections [EN010159/APP/2.3]); • Integration of offsets from Fledborough, including 130m from the Access Road to Fledborough and retention of a clear view corridor extending for over 700m between residential properties within the village and Fledborough Viaduct, requiring the removal of over 46 acres from Work Area 1 and inclusion in Work Area 8, as secured on the **Works Plans (see Volume 2: Plans/ Drawings/ Sections [EN010159/APP/2.3]).**	
Noise and Construction			
OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_O04 OESF_SC_O06, OESF_SC_O07 OESF_SC_O09, OESF_SC_O10 OESF_SC_O10, OESF_SC_O18 OESF_SC_O20, OESF_SC_O22, OESF_SC_O23,	Concern about noise generally.	The potential for noise impacts is assessed in **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.13].** This includes construction traffic noise, on-site construction noise, operational noise and decommissioning noise. No significant effects from noise are identified following the application of mitigation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM04, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM15, OE_SC_EM10, OE_SC_EM07 OE_SC_EM13, OESF_SC_O24, OESF_SC_O25 OESF_SC_O28, OESF_SC_O29 OESF_SC_O31, OESF_SC_O32 OESF_SC_P08, OE_PE_21			
OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_O06 OESF_SC_O07, OESF_SC_O09 OESF_SC_O10, OESF_SC_O10 OESF_SC_O18, OESF_SC_O22 OESF_SC_O23, OESF_SC_O24	Concern about construction traffic noise.	The potential for noise impacts is assessed in **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.13].** No significant effects are identified from construction traffic noise following the application of mitigation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_O25, OESF_SC_O28 OESF_SC_O29, OESF_SC_O31 OESF_SC_O32, OE_PE_15			
OESF_SC_O04, OESF_SC_O20, OESF_SC_O23, OE_PE_19	Concern about noise during operation (including BESS).	The potential for noise impacts is assessed in **Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [EN010159/APP/6.13].** No significant effects are identified from operational noise following the application of mitigation.	N
Socio-Economics			
OE_SC_EM04, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM11,	Impact on property prices.	The potential impact to house values has not been included in the Applicant's EIA in part because there are numerous factors that affect house	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OE_SC_EM14, OE_SC_EM15 OE_SC_EM07 OE_SC_EM14, OE_PE_12, OE_PE_19, OE_PE_35, OE_PE_41, OESF_SC_W01, OESF_SC_O08, OESF_SC_O22, OESF_SC_O34, OESF_SC_P01		values and little evidence to show a direct impact due to living near a solar farm. Furthermore, although the Applicant understands that it is an important issue to the community, the potential impact on house values is not considered to be a material consideration in the planning process by the government. Instead, it is a matter that is usually considered after development consent has been granted, at such time that an impact which gives rise to compensation has occurred. These are typically physical impacts, such as noise, not visual impacts. However, as noted above, the Applicant does not consider that this would be the case as the Proposed Development has been designed carefully to take account of the potential for impacts on people's homes.	
OE_SC_EM11 OE_SC_EM13	Impact on local job market.	The assessment presented in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17]** confirms the estimated construction jobs created by the Proposed Development to be a peak of 750, with an average of 554 full time jobs over the two-year	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		construction period. Additional site-specific information is also presented regarding the existing jobs, based on landowner surveys, which was confirmed to be 7.75 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs. During operation, the net change in direct employment was estimated to be 7.25 FTE and 9.75 indirect FTE. Overall, the net operational employment increase was found to be negligible at all spatial levels (including local and district levels). It is difficult to establish the likelihood of the specific jobs, at construction, operational or decommissioning stages, being taken up by residents of one or other of the three Local Authority Districts, but the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8**] aims to maximise local involvement and benefits.	
National Farmers Union	The NFU is especially concerned that agricultural tenants' businesses can be adversely affected by solar developments. Landlords and developers should enter early and transparent discussions with tenants to ensure fair treatment.	Discussions regarding tenancy status are principally a matter between landlords and tenants. However, the Applicant has consulted with tenant farmers who live in the consultation zone as part of the non-statutory and statutory consultation phases, to understand how the Proposed Development would potentially impact them and to hear their feedback. Several significant changes to	Y

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		the design were included based on this consultation and are described further in the **Consultation Report [EN010159/APP/5.1]**. The Applicant has also considered the impact of the Proposed Development on employment. Overall, a minor beneficial effect is expected at a district level. Further information is available in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17].**	
Transport and Access			
OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_O04 OESF_SC_O13, OESF_SC_O16 OESF_SC_O18, OESF_SC_O20 OESF_SC_O25, OESF_SC_O26 OESF_SC_O28, OESF_SC_O29 OESF_SC_O32, OESF_SC_P02, OESF_SC_P03	Concern about traffic and road safety in general.	Potential impacts on traffic and road safety are assessed in **Chapter 12: Transport and Access [EN010159/APP/6.12].** A series of mitigation measures and management plans have been proposed to help mitigate and offset the impacts of the construction, operational and decommissioning phase traffic flows. It is proposed that these can be secured by the DCO. No significant effects are expected following the application of mitigation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_P03, OESF_SC_P05, OE_SC_EM13 OE_SC_EM14 OE_SC_EM16, OE_PE_39			
OESF_SC_O14, OESF_SC_O15, OESF_SC_O32, OESF_SC_O19, OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM13 OE_SC_EM14 OE_SC_EM16	Concern about general impact on local roads	Potential impacts on traffic and road safety are assessed in **Chapter 12: Transport and Access [EN010159/APP/6.12].** The construction traffic would result in a temporary increase in traffic flows on the road network surrounding the Proposed Development. The peak of construction in terms of vehicular movements will be 614 daily journeys (120 Car/Lights and 504 HGV journeys). No link capacity issues are expected on any of the roads assessed due to the additional movements associated with the Proposed Development. The effects of construction traffic are temporary in nature and are transitory. No significant effects on local roads are expected following the application of mitigation.	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
OESF_SC_O02, OESF_SC_O18 OESF_SC_P01	Access points are unsuitable.	Access around the Order Limits would be taken from strategic points on the public road network, with access achieved via new access tracks and upgraded farm access tracks. The proposed access junctions have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).	N
OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM14,	A1133 is prone to traffic and speeding.	Capacity of the A1133 is considered in Table 12-9 of **Chapter 12: Transport and Access [EN010159/APP/6.12].** There are no road link capacity issues noted in the study area.	N
OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM13	Request for shorter construction hours.	Construction working hours will be 7.00 - 19.00 hours Monday to Saturday with allowance for occasional, overnight working where operations cannot be paused. Shortening daily construction hours would increase the duration of construction and increase the period of time over which any temporary effects from construction would be in place.	N
OE_SC_EM11, OE_SC_EM13	Concern about cumulative impacts of other projects.	The Transport Assessment included within **Technical Appendices Supporting ES Volumes 1 and 2 [EN010159/APP/6.21]** includes a cumulative development sensitivity review to	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		review the potential impacts of the Proposed Development alongside other developments. Cumulative effects are also considered in **Chapter 18: Cumulative effects [EN010159/APP/6.18].** No significant cumulative effects are expected and no additional mitigation required as a result of cumulative effects.	
Transport and Access: Public Rights of Way			
OESF_SC_W05, OESF_SC_O11 OESF_SC_O19, OESF_SC_O31 OESF_SC_P08, OE_SC_EM10	General concern about impacts on footpaths and bridleways.	Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** These will improve people's access to the natural environment. The Proposed Development has embedded mitigation specifically to minimise potential effects on equestrians. With reference to 'Advice on Solar farms near routes used by equestrians', published by the British Horse Society, the Proposed Development has: • avoided the creation of narrow corridors around Bridleways extending at least 30m from solar panel to solar panel, beyond the 5m minimum noted in the advice note, as	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		secured on the **Works Plans (Volume 2: Plans/ Drawings/ Sections [EN010159/APP/2.3]);** • utilised post and wire fencing screened by hedgerows, as secured by the Outline Design Parameters and **OLEMP (Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.7];** and provision of additional routes accessible to equestrians via the proposed permissive path network, as secured in the **OLEMP (Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	
OE_SC_EM07, OE_SC_EM10, OE_SC_EM14,	Impact on Sustrans route.	Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].** The proposed permissive path network, as shown in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7],** connects to the Sustrans route. Potential impacts on local tourism have been assessed in **Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010159/APP/6.17].** There are a number of recreation facilities and tourist attractions, including caravan/camp sites and pubs in the Study Area, but not within the Order Limits. This chapter also	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		considers the impacts on public rights of way and the Sustrans route which crosses over the viaduct. The potentially sensitive receptors have been identified, and most are more than several hundred metres from the Order Limits, and thus the impacts are considered to be relatively low.	
OESF_SC_O11, OE_SC_EM02, OE_PE_03	Reduced access to footpaths and open fields for recreation.	Existing public rights of way have been supplemented by proposed permissive paths as detailed in the **OLEMP [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	N
OESF_SC_O18, OE_SC_EM08, OE_SC_EM13, OE_SC_EM16, OE_SC_EM10, OE_SC_EM16, OE_SC_EM10, OE_PE_05, OE_PE_17	Impact on horse riding on bridlepaths.	The Proposed Development has embedded mitigation specifically to minimise potential effects on equestrians. With reference to 'Advice on Solar farms near routes used by equestrians', published by the British Horse Society, the Proposed Development has: • avoided the creation of narrow corridors around Bridleways extending at least 30m from solar panel to solar panel, beyond the 5m minimum noted in the advice note, as secured on the **Works Plans (Volume 2:**	N

Consultee	Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
		Plans/ Drawings/ Sections [EN010159/APP/2.3]); • utilised post and wire fencing screened by hedgerows, as secured by the Outline Design Parameters and **OLEMP (Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.7];** and provision of additional routes accessible to equestrians via the proposed permissive path network, as secured in the **OLEMP (Volume 7: Other Documents [EN010159/APP/7.7].**	

Table J-2.2 below sets out a summary of the statements in the petition received during the statutory consultation period and the regard had to them by the Applicant.

Table J-2.2 - Summary of the Statements in the Petition and regard had by topic

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Alternatives and Need		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Better and more sustainable energy production can be achieved from off-shore wind turbines, smaller more community friendly solar developments on homes, factory roofs and brownfield sites.	The National Policy Statements (in particular EN-1, paragraphs 3.2.6 – 3.2.8 [REF-2]) establish that there is a demonstrated urgent need for renewable energy generation including solar. Therefore, whilst we appreciate people may not agree that large scale solar should be part of the solution towards Net Zero, opposition to large scale solar generally is a challenge to the Government's policy and is not an issue that can be considered or which can be resolved by way of the determination of this Application. The Government has set out a need for 45-47 GW of solar power as part of a wider mix by 2030 as part of Clean Power 2030 Action Plan: A new era of clean electricity. The Proposed Development would meet a portion of this need. For further information about the appropriateness of the Proposed Development to meet a part of the UK's critical need for low carbon generation is set out in the **Statement of Need [EN010159/APP/7.1].**	N

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
Climate and Carbon		
Did you know that One Earth Solar Farm will almost certainly be purchasing the majority of solar panels from China?	No procurement decisions have been made in relation to the solar PV panels to be used in the Proposed Development. The Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and that this is a legal obligation on anyone who has the powers under the DCO. That would be achieved by securing the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010159/APP/7.8]** by a requirement of the DCO. This includes a commitment to an Ethical Procurement Policy.	N
Land and Soils		
Did you know that in 2020 almost half of the food we consume in the UK was imported?	Following changes of the NPPF [REF-4] in December 2024, footnote 65 no longer mentions food security and this is no longer a material consideration under that policy. The NPPF [REF-4] and NPS EN-1 [REF-2] and EN-3 [REF-1] are now fully aligned with respect to the use of agricultural land within national planning policy (paragraph 5.11.12 of NPS EN-1 [REF-2]) requiring applicants to demonstrate that development of agricultural land is necessary and that impacts are minimised on best and most versatile agricultural land. The Application has demonstrated through its site selection process as set out in **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010159/APP/6.4]** and the **Planning Statement**	N

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change (Y/N)
	[EN010159/APP/5.5] that it is necessary and justified to use agricultural land and that the use of BMV has been minimised with no significant effects arising in terms of permanent loss. This fully accords with current policy.	

References

REF-1: Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (2023). National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3).

REF-2: Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (2023). Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1).

REF-3: Planning Inspectorate (2024). Advice Note Eleven, Annex C – Advice on working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process, Annex C: Natural England and the Planning Inspectorate.

REF-4: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2018 to 2021) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2012, updated 2025). National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

REF-5: Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act 2006). Sect 40 "Duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity" and Sect 41 – "List of habitats and species of principle importance in England".

REF-6: The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975. Salmon and Freshwater Issue.

REF-7: The Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009.

REF-8 Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act 2006).

REF-9: Historic England (2024). Managing Lithic Scatters: Archaeological guidance for commercial and research projects, planning authorities, land management agencies and developers.

REF-10: Gilmour, N (2012). Lincoln Water Treatment Works, Newton on Trent, Lincolnshire. OAE Report 1259, Oxford: Oxford Archaeology

REF-11: Historic England (2016). Preserving Archaeological Remains: Decision-taking for Sites under Development.

REF-12: Historic England (2019). Piling and Archaeology: Guidance and Good Practice.

REF-13: Historic England (2016). Preserving Archaeological Remains: Decision-taking for Sites under Development.

REF-14: International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) (2020). ICNIRP Guidelines for Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields (100 kHz to 300 GHz).

REF-15: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2018 to 2021) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2014, updated 2022). Flood risk and coastal change.

REF-16: Environment Agency (2016, updated 2022). Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances.

REF-17: Jacobs (2023). Tidal Trent: Modelled Information

REF-18: Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (2011, updated 2018). Code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites.

REF-19: British Society of Soil Science (2021). New Guidance Note: Soil in Construction.

REF-20: The Institute of Quarrying (IQ) (2021). Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings.

REF-21: Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) Guide (2022). A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment.

REF-22: Landscape Institute (2013). Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3).

REF-23: European Union (2012). Directive 2012/19/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council: Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE).

REF-24: The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009.

REF-25: Mansfield District Council (2020). Mansfield District Local Plan 2013-2033.

REF-26: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2024). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide

REF-27: Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (CLJSPC) (2023). Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

REF-28: Bassetlaw District Council (2024). Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038.

REF-29: Newark and Sherwood District Council (2024). Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain Strategic Significance.

REF-30: Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Schedule 9.

REF-31: Planning Inspectorate (2018). Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope.

REF-32: Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. (Regulation 5 (2d)).

REF-33: Newark and Sherwood District Council (2019). Amended Core Strategy and Newark and Sherwood District Council (2024). Amended Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (AADMDPD).

REF-34: The Planning Inspectorate (2017). Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements.

REF-35: Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council (2021). Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Needs Assessment.

REF-36: Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council (2013). Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy.

REF-37: Nottinghamshire County Council (2002). Waste Local Plan, and Nottinghamshire County Council (2021). Adopted Minerals Local Plan.

REF-38: Nottinghamshire County Council (2024). Emerging Waste Local Plan.

REF-39: The Supreme Court (2024): R (on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) (Appellant) v Surrey County Council and others (Respondents), UKSC/2022/0064

REF-40: UK Parliament (2024): Written Ministerial Statement UIN HCWS466: Solar and protecting our Food Security and Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land

REF-41: Lincolnshire County Council (2017). Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (LMWLP).

REF-42: Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) (1988). Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales: Revised criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land (ALC011).

REF-43: Landscape Institute Technical Committee (2019). TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of development proposals.

REF-44: National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) (2023). Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS.

REF-45: Landscape Institute (2013). Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3).

REF-46: National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Guidance.

REF-47: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2018 to 2021) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2010, updated 2025). Fire safety: Approved Document B, Part B5

REF-48: National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) (2023). NFPA 855: Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems.

REF-49: Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005.

[REF-50]: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2018 to 2021) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (updated 2023). Planning Practice Guidance on Renewable and low carbon energy, Planning Policy Guidance on BESS

REF-51: Highways England (2020). GG 119 Road safety audit (formerly HD 19/15).

REF-52: New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.

REF-53: National Highways (2020). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).

REF-54: Copping, J.P., Waite, C.E., Balmford, A., Bradbury, R.B., Field, R.H., Morris I. & Finch, T. (2025). Solar farm management influences breeding bird responses in an arable-dominated landscape, Bird Study, 1 – 6.

REF-55: British Trust for Ornithology (2021). Birds of Conservation Concern 5: the Red List for Birds.

REF-56: Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

one earth
solar farm

oneearthsolarfarm.co.uk