

I have included a summary of what I said and intended to say at the preliminary meeting and the open meeting plus some comments of what transpired at the meeting.

Stephen Fox

Resident of North Clifton

Comments at the Preliminary and Open Meetings on Wednesday 9th July 2025 and on the conduct of One earth at the said meetings and at the issue specific meetings on 10th and 11th July 2025.

#### Summary

1 As there are reasons to believe One Earth are acting fraudulently the first procedural issue is whether the examination should proceed.

2 Failure of One earth to put the local community in a position to fully understand the impact of the project.

3 The consultation and the Consultation report had not been properly conducted and had excluded information relating to local community's representations and representatives of the local authorities agreed with this conclusion.

4) Evidence is provided regarding the disingenuous conduct of One Earth's in their representations at the Preliminary and Issue Specific Meetings which were designed to mislead the inspectors. If they act that way with the inspector, how can they be trusted to carry out commitments made in their proposal?

5) 101 Economics requires that in assessing a project proposal, one can only include benefits that are unique to the proposal. Providing energy to transition to green energy is not unique to One Earth's proposal. It can be provided at multiple sites in the UK that do not involve building on a flood plain.

6) The High Marnham connection has not been granted and probably will not be available in the time scale indicated or any earlier than one would be available elsewhere in Great Britain.

7) The process of giving the applicant the last word at the Preliminary, Open and Issue Specific meetings simply served for One Earth to continue with their obfuscation perpetrated throughout the consultation, in the Consultation Report and in the Proposal.

8) I have shown in the addendum to the submission below my exchange of emails with One Earth regarding the omission of North and South Clifton's presentation to and minutes of the meeting on 1st August 2024 from Appendix J-2 of The Consultation Report.

One Earth have now confirmed that they have omitted a significant part of the local communities' objections to their proposal from the Consultation Report. It has taken them 10 days for them to reply to my request for clarification, and they have replied saying, "I know it was included in an earlier draft but appears to have been lost in the finalisation process". This is simply not credible as they have had a team of lawyers crawling all over their process. The time taken to respond when they are under the inspector's spotlight would seem to indicate that they have been considering how to respond to such a deliberate omission. Such an exclusion must have been deliberate. It would also account for Mr Griffiths' discomfort in his response to the question of the scale plan at the Preliminary Meeting and his bluster on the question of mental health at the Issue Specific meeting. A review of the recordings would be enlightening. This conduct further adds to the evidence showing that One Earth have conducted their consultation dishonestly, and that the Consultant Report is dishonest and that they are not fit to be granted approval to develop a major project.

#### Submission

Whilst recognising that the Inspectorate had made the decision to proceed with the examination of the proposal, I wished to record that the consultation with the immediate community was totally inadequate, that the Consultation Report was inaccurate and dishonest in many respects, and it had been written not on a basis of how the consultation had been performed but in a way designed to pass the test irrespective of how it was actually performed. Many other documents in the application have been written in the same way and with a similar intent.

One Earth had totally failed to put the local community in a position to appreciate the impact of the project, and their consultations were designed to disguise and minimise appreciation of the project Impact. The impressive list of "mitigations" in the Consultation Report is designed to mislead. The locality will be destroyed. The mitigations claimed in this application are at best palliative. Their responses to local representations throughout the process left the local population incredulous.

I raised this at the Preliminary Meeting because it becomes a procedural issue if one believes that the consultation had been carried out, and the application prepared, as I contend, as the first procedural issue for the inspector to consider must be whether the examination should proceed as the inspectorate would have accepted a fraudulent Consultation Report.

None of the local councils who confirmed that the application had been conducted correctly were present at local consultations or took soundings from the local communities relating to the local consultations' adequacy or honesty. The inspectorate appeared to have failed to examine the substance of both the conduct of the consultation and claims in The Consultation Report and passed it simply on the basis of process. The multiple complaints by members of the community regarding the conduct of One Earth contained in our submissions to the inspectorate appeared to have been discounted entirely. The attempt by Newark and Sherwood District Council to bring these to the inspectorate's attention (in the appendix to their letter of 11th March 2025) were similarly ignored. I would contend that representations of the local community have been deliberately and fraudulently omitted from Appendix J-2 of the Consultation Report. See the addendum to this submission.

Representatives of the local councils, during discussion immediately after the Preliminary Meeting, agreed with my point regarding the inadequacy of the approval of both the consultation process and Consultation report but stated that the inspectorate wanted simple answers on process and did not address issues of substance! They did not feel able to let the inspectorate know what they believed when answering the formal request as to whether the Consultation Report had been properly performed.

At the Preliminary Meeting we had an example of the conduct, and obfuscation, of One Earth which was immediately obvious to those in possession of the facts and across the documents as I have no doubt Mr Griffiths, for One Earth was. That is:

When responding to the point I made to the meeting that whilst One Earth had promised to come back to us on the provision of a scale model of the project and that it was impossible for us to understand its impact without it, he said that

they had provided both mocked up photos and a 3D walk through of the project designed to show its impact. He should have been aware that the request for the scale model had been made to the Project Manager in open meeting with North Clifton Parish Meeting and South Clifton Parish council on 1st August 2024 during which the total inadequacy of the mocked-up photos and 3D walk through were made clear to One Earth and the request for the scale model was because what had been provided failed to properly inform and that the Project manager had promised to consider it and failed to come back to us. (This meeting is mentioned in the Consultation Report, but the record seems to have been omitted from Appendix J-2.) Such a response was simply disingenuous and designed to mislead the inspector. Please see the addendum to this submission.

That the meeting on 1st August 2024, together with the Consultation Report, are total shams is reflected in the facts that the meeting is inaccurately reported in the Consultation Report, and that the responses were totally inadequate and designed to avoid the issues. It was not simply a question-and-answer session. A full recording of the meeting was made with the agreement of One Earth. A full script of the presentation that was made at the meeting by North Clifton Parish Meeting together with minutes of the meeting are provided in my first representation to the inspectorate. One Earth failed to respond to the 1st of August meeting until 19th November 2024, and again on 16th January 2025, after multiple requests for them to respond. Their responses were totally inadequate. None of the major questions asked and issues raised are listed in Appendix J-2 – as they claim in En010159/App/5.1 para 6.2.38. I suspect this omission was deliberate and designed to mislead the inspectorate. (I have searched Appendix J-2 and despite the Consultation Report saying the questions and answers are included there, I have been unable to find them and One Earth have failed to respond to my request for clarification, since the meeting. (This gives the lie to claims made by Mr Griffiths for One Earth that they are permanently engaged with the local community. They simply do not answer emails so where is the engagement? See below.). Please see the addendum to this submission which probably accounts for Mr Griffith's bluster and appears to confirm my suspicions.

Further evidence of the inadequacy of the consultation and the Consultation Report and that One Earth have operated dishonestly is demonstrated in Part 6 of the Issue Specific Meeting. Not only did they not consider local mental health, but they claimed (Mr Richard Griffiths) that it was inappropriate for them to attempt to survey the local population about mental health. This was either disingenuous and dishonest, or Mr Boyd, the Project Manager, had deliberately withheld important information from him. At the meeting with North Clifton Parish Meeting on 1st August 2024 Mr Boyd confirmed that he had received the results of a mental health survey of the 119 members of local population prepared by Dr Sarah Fletcher, a local GP and that he was considering how to respond to it. By email to me on 16 January 2025, One Earth stated that all feedback including the mental health report would be included in the application - it doesn't appear to be there. They said at the Issue specific meeting that they hadn't considered local mental health. Mr Griffith's response on the issue of mental health, ( which you can find in the recording) was nothing but bluster, was inaccurate and shows contempt for the issue and should serve as an indication to the inspector as to how the issues have been dealt with and the seriousness with which One Earth have treated the concerns of the local community. His claims regarding ongoing engagement were simply not true. The above demonstrates contempt for the issue of mental health, more obfuscation from the whole One Earth team - done in an orchestrated way. It is designed to mislead the inspector. Please see the addendum to this submission which probably accounts for Mr Griffith's bluster and appears to confirm my suspicions.

If they can behave as described in the last two paragraphs whilst under the spotlight of the examination of their proposal, what hope is there that they will carry out their commitments contained in the proposal?

Because I believe One Earth are conducting themselves in a fraudulent way I suggested that 9.1.4 of the Consultation Report should be investigated forensically because the referred panels were probably never intended to be installed and examination of all One Earth's internal documents would reveal this.

That the local community are of the opinion that the consultation was deficient and totally inadequate is not reported in The Consultation Report - as it should have been. Worse their discontent has been deliberately excluded.

The application fails to provide a cost benefit analysis of this proposal against alternatives. Nor is there a cost benefit analysis of the project for the local community. In such analyses, the benefits to the wider community of transitioning to green energy should be discounted as there are ample alternative sites in the UK which would provide the same benefits (this is 101 economics!). Consequently, with this project it is the costs to the local community, properly quantified, which should take priority. There has been no attempt to quantify the costs to the local community. How can the local community be put at risk by building on the flood plain when there are no benefits that cannot be obtained by locating the project elsewhere and off flood plains?

The issue of the High Marnham connection is a red herring as One Earth don't have the connection yet and probably won't any earlier than connections can be obtained at alternative sites. Any approval of the project would, at the least, need to be made contingent on achieving such a connection.

The process of giving the applicant the last word at the Preliminary, Open and Issue Specific meetings simply served for One Earth to continue with the obfuscation perpetrated throughout.

Addendum

I have shown below my exchange of emails with One Earth regarding the omission of North and South Clifton's presentation to and minutes of the meeting on 1st August 2024 from Appendix J-2 of The Consultation Report.

One Earth have now confirmed that they have omitted a significant part of the local communities' objections to their proposal from the Consultation Report. It has taken them 10 days to reply to my request for clarification, and they replied, "I know it was included in an earlier draft but appears to have been lost in the finalisation process". This is simply not credible as they have had a team of lawyers crawling all over their process. The time taken to respond when they are under the inspector's spotlight would seem to indicate that they have been considering how to respond to such a deliberate omission. Such an exclusion must have been deliberate. It would also account for Mr Griffiths' discomfort in his response to the question of the scale plan at the Preliminary Meeting and his bluster on the question of mental health at the Issue Specific meeting. A review of the recordings would be enlightening. This conduct further adds to the evidence showing that One Earth have conducted their consultation dishonestly, and that the Consultant Report is dishonest and that they are not fit to be granted approval to develop a major project.

Stephen Fox

16 Jul 2025, 11:37 (9 days ago)

to info

Good Morning Emily

This is a quote from The Consultation Report -

6.2.38 The meeting with North Clifton Parish Meeting and South Clifton Parish Council on 1 August was formatted as a question-and-answer session. After the meeting, North Clifton Parish Meeting and South Clifton Parish submitted a list of detailed questions regarding the PEIR. These questions and the responses to them are included in Appendix J-2. Would you let me have the page number or numbers in Appendix J -2 where the referred questions and answers appear please.

--

Regards

Stephen

Stephen Fox

Fri 18 Jul, 08:18 (7 days ago)

to info

Hi Emily

My request of 16th July is important as I have undertaken to provide further information to the Inspector so a timely response would be helpful.

--

Regards

Stephen

info@oneearthssolarfarm.co.uk

12:00 (38 minutes ago)

to me

Hello,

I apologise for the slow response. I cannot find the attachment as referenced. I know it was included in an earlier draft, but appears to have been lost in the finalisation process. I'm updating that file now to submit at Deadline 1 with the attachment.

Thanks for bringing it to my attention.

Kind regards,

Emily

Emily's email was received at 12:00 on 25.07.25.