## The Planning Inspectorate

Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1): dDCO and other environmental matters

Application by One Earth Solar Farm Limited.

Actions arising from the ISH1 held on the 9 July 2025.

1 Review the Oaklands made DCO for decommissioning definition and approach to "phase/part" 2 Consider section on materially new or materially different being added to Principal Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO 3 Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP 4 Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review. 5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach. 6 Confirm approach to veteran trees and TPO trees and	Action	Description	Action By	Deadline (D)
definition and approach to "phase/part"  Consider section on materially new or materially different being added to Principal Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO  Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Applicant  Applicant  D1  Applicant  D1  Applicant  D1  Confirm por oach Applicant  D1	1	Review the Oaklands made	Applicant	· · · ·
"phase/part"  Consider section on materially new or materially different being added to Principal Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO  Confirm Applicant D1  relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		DCO for decommissioning		
2 Consider section on materially new or materially different being added to Principal Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO  3 Confirm Applicant D1  relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  4 Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		definition and approach to		
new or materially different being added to Principal Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO  3 Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  4 Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		"phase/part"		
being added to Principal Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO  Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Applicant  Applicant  D1  Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.	2	Consider section on materially	Applicant	D1
Powers section as per Oaklands made DCO  Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  Confirm approach to veteran  Applicant  D1		new or materially different		
Oaklands made DCO  Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  Confirm approach to veteran  Applicant  D1		being added to Principal		
Confirm relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  Confirm approach to veteran  Applicant  D1		Powers section as per		
relationship/consistency between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  4 Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		Oaklands made DCO		
between provisions in dDCO and oLEMP  4 Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1	3	Confirm	Applicant	D1
and oLEMP  4 Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land.  Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO.  Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		relationship/consistency		
Set out how PD rights for a stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  Article 39 and 40 review Applicant D1 wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		between provisions in dDCO		
stat undertaker are assessed in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review Applicant D1 wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		and oLEMP		
in ES. Consider if the whole of the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review Applicant D1 wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1	4	Set out how PD rights for a	Applicant/Councils	D1
the Order Limits should remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		stat undertaker are assessed		
remain as operational land. Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		in ES. Consider if the whole of		
Note for councils to review.  5 Article 39 and 40 review Applicant D1  wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		the Order Limits should		
5 Article 39 and 40 review wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		remain as operational land.		
wording vs Oaklands consider if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		Note for councils to review.		
if reference to BS should be in oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1	5	Article 39 and 40 review	Applicant	D1
oLEMP, or in the DCO. Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		wording vs Oaklands consider		
Applicant to confirm approach.  6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		if reference to BS should be in		
6 Confirm approach to veteran Applicant D1		oLEMP, or in the DCO.		
		Applicant to confirm approach.		
trees and TPO trees and	6	Confirm approach to veteran	Applicant	D1
		trees and TPO trees and		
whether there are veteran		whether there are veteran		

	trees within Order Limits.		
	Appendix 11.6 Chart 3 and		
	Table 2 of Stage 1		
	Arboricultural Report suggest		
	15 veteran trees were		
	recorded.		
7	Applicant and councils to	Applicant	D1
	discuss and agree way	Councils	
	forward on Article 45.		
	Consider including as part of		
	SoCG		
8	Clarify if County Councils	Applicant	D1
	should be included in		
	Schedule 2 1 (b) (ii).		
9	Requirement 3 and 15 to	Applicant	D1
	include all Councils		
10	Requirements 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,	Applicant	D1
	12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20		
	contain wording "substantially		
	in accordance with".		
11	Consider wording for	Applicant	D1
	maintenance in Requirement 8		
12	Consider amending	Applicant	D1
	Requirement 9 BNG to ensure		
	the BNG referenced as		
	deliverable is achieved		
13	Change the word permanent	Applicant	D1
	to operational in Requirement		
	10		
14	Review mitigation plans that	Applicant	D1
	use terms such as 'may' or		
	'would consider' to ensure		
	terminology is actually a		

		1	
	commitment to do so		
	something.		
15	oCTMP page 19 typo 'digital	Applicant	D1
	recorder'?. Review.		
16	oCEMP section 2.5 working	Applicant	D1
	hours. How will it work in		
	practice? Consider if it would		
	be more appropriate for		
	working hours to be specified		
	in DCO?		
17	Provide	Applicant	D1
	evidence/justification/		
	environmental reasons for		
	using 10km search area and		
	sequential test/site selection.		
	Include rationale for		
	discounting land from		
	selection process, with		
	particular reference to the		
	sequential test.		
18	Provide evidence on whether	Applicant	D1
	a Grampian-style requirement		
	is necessary for this dDCO.		
19	Provide graph showing	Applicant	D1
	degradation over time of		
	power generation, plus		
	explanation on overplanting		
	threshold. Also, provide likely		
	generation range and		
	overplanting ratio. Including		
	from year 1 through		
	operational life of the project.		
	Include how often 740MW		
		1	

	would be generated across a		
	year.		
20	Explain differences if any for	Applicant	D1
	landscape assessment if		
	different panels are used.		
	Explain how ES deals with this		
	issue		
21	Explain how panel heights	Applicant	D1
	vary with each raised level		
	proposed		
22	Confirm acceptability of	Nottinghamshire	D1
	Article 16	СС	
23	Confirm acceptability of	Nottinghamshire	D1
	Schedules 4 to 7	СС	
	ISH1 Day 2 10 Ju	ily 2025	1
24	Provide clarity in Requirement	Applicant	D1
	20 or oDEMP to account for		
	the scenario of the scheme		
	stopping generating before 60		
	years and needing to be		
	decommissioned early		
25	Review whether the time	Applicant	D1
	period in Requirement 20 (3)		
	should be longer than 10		
	weeks		
26	Provide evidence on risk to	Applicant	D1
	environment that may be		
	potentially caused by leaving		
	cables in the ground as part of		
	the decommissioning. Include		
	potential impacts on water		
	environment, drinking water		
	protected areas and soil.		

27	Respond to Mr White's written	Applicant	D1
	submission/RR		
28	Respond in detail in respect of	Applicant	D1
	a potential inverter fire		
29	Respond in respect of water	Applicant	D1
	protection areas		
30	Figure referenced within	Applicant	D1
	paragraph 3.5 of AS-051 to be		
	provided		
31	Provide response in respect of	Applicant	D1
	flood storage and any knock		
	on effect		
32	Response on point made by	Applicant	D1
	Mrs Fox with regard to design		
	of structures and their ability		
	to withstand water flow in		
	event of a flood event or		
	breach event		
33	Respond to consider effect of	Applicant	D1
	EA gates during a flood event		
	to be clarified		
34	Respond on effect of heave	Applicant	D1
35	Provide an illustrative plan of	Applicant	D1
	the western BESS to show		
	relative ground levels,		
	proposed ground levels to aid		
	in understanding of water and		
	landscape effects		
36	Clarification on date when	Applicant	D1
	Screening for WFD was		
	submitted		
37	EA to respond to RR from Mr	EA	D1
	White dealing with any		
	concerns in respect of water		

	protection areas,		
	contamination, or effects on		
	drinking water		
38	Updated CTMP to be provided	Applicant	D1
	to address issues in respect of		
	minor road network, include a		
	plan identifying access points		
	and barred routes.		
39	Review of access points and	Applicant	D1
	details on plans to be co-		
	ordinated		
40	Undertake discussion with	Applicant / NCC	D1
	NCC to consider access points		
	and need or otherwise for		
	road safety audit		
41	Submit joint landscape report	Applicant	D1
	referenced at other DCO		
	(Cottam) to the Examination		
42	Provide list of 20 (14+6)	Applicant	D1
	properties visited and full list		
	of properties within Order		
	Limits		
	Provide spatially on a plan.		
	Explain how assessed.		
43	Provide examples of other	Applicant	D1
	solar schemes with similar		
	separation distances from		
	dwellings/PRoW		
44	Provide routes where	LCC,NCC,NSDC,	D1
	landscape "fatigue" may exist	BDC/Oliver Brown	
	due to cumulative solar		
	schemes in the area		
<u> </u>		l	<u> </u>

45	Provide information/evidence	Applicant	D1
	for effect on heritage asset		
	Lincoln Cathedral		
46	Consider whether ASI	Applicant	D1
	itinerary will include views		
	of/from Whimpton Moor and		
	from Roman tower		
47	Share cumulative traffic	Applicant	ASAP
	information with councils to		and
	allow them to comment on it		before
	in LIR		D1
48	Share comments on	LCC	ASAP
	cumulative traffic, content in		
	Chapter 12 is different to		
	Chapter 18		
49	Provide clarification on size/	Applicant	D1
	scale/frequency/locations of		
	extent of soil		
	scraping/storage		
50	Respond to LCC concern with	Applicant	D1
	regard to Cumulative effects		
	loss of BMV and agricultural		
	use and written ministerial		
	statements.		
51	Provide an explanation of	Applicant	D1
	effect on agricultural supply		
	chain businesses and the		
	consequence of job loss vs		
	gained		
52	Provide further explanation of	Applicant	D1
	the Cornwall Study on tourism		
	and effects of solar farms		
53	Further information to be	Applicant	D1
	provided on socio economics		
	<u> </u>	Í.	ı

	and tourism and travel plan		
	target of 80%		
54	Update and correct cumulative	Applicant	D1
	effect chapter, including a		
	review of Bassetlaw DC RR for		
	content on cumulative effects.		
55	Provide map/plan showing	Applicant	D1
	consented and upcoming solar		
	DCO schemes and the order		
	limits in Notts and Lincs		
56	Provide explanation and	Applicant	D1
	justification on Zone of		
	Influence for cumulative		
	assessment.		