
Re: The Conduct of One Earth

From Stephen Fox [REDACTED]
Date Tue 29/07/2025 09:02
To One Earth Solar <oneearth solar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Please note my **Interested Party Reference number: FA3AE8AE5**

On Mon, 28 Jul 2025 at 13:35, Stephen Fox [REDACTED] wrote:

FAO Edwin Maund and Alex Jack

Dear Sirs

Consultation Report EN01059/APP/[5.16.2.38](#)

The applicant states they have included the questions and responses from the meeting on 1st August 2024 between themselves and North Clifton Parish and South Clifton Parish Council in appendix J-2. They are not in any of the appendices. Correspondence with One Earth and a sequence of events would appear to suggest that this is a deliberate omission. One Earth is either incompetent or not fit to have their proposal approved.

Since the Statutory Consultees and the Inspectorate were presented with a report with a material omission before they confirmed that the consultation had been conducted correctly I would submit that the process of examination should be put on hold until this is investigated.

The omission would suggest that those who approved the report at the statutory consultees and the Inspectorate have not paid attention to the substance of the report before passing it and allowing it to proceed to examination. It further suggests that the interests and concerns of the local community are of no account to them. What recourse is there for this?

To ensure that this is not overlooked I have requested an open meeting to discuss this on the Have Your Say section of the Project Web Site and by this email I am requesting to address this.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Fox

--

Regards

Stephen

Interested Party Reference number: FA3AE8AE5

Stephen Fox Resident of North Clifton.

1 The way this examination is to be conducted and assessed.

It is imperative that this project is examined with regard to the substance of the applicant's proposal and responses and not on the basis of slavish reference to guidance and regulations however out of date those are with modern science and techniques, - or how incredulous the examiner is with the proposal and representations on a human level, all be it that One Earth might technically have complied with guidance and regulations. That would be like a surgeon deciding to bleed a patient to cure a heart condition in the 21st century. It certainly appears that the proposal has been prepared to that standard and it remains to be seen how the examination works.

Much of the response that the local community received during consultation fall into the above category. A complete reading of the whole proposal leaves one with a similar belief on most pages.

One Earth do not appear to know what it is to use up to date research or what a cost benefit analysis is. Similarly, they have blindly used Environment Agency models and maps when the agency and EN1 have clearly stated that it is One Earth's responsibility to produce their own. Worse is their clear intent to say anything which will comply whilst knowing that it is unlikely that they will be pulled up once the project proceeds.

I am also very concerned with the role of the local authorities as discussions with them and watching their performance or lack of contribution to the meetings held so far, made clear that they dare only speak on a technical level and their major concern is not to raise their head above the parapet when privately they agree with the sentiment above. The blind policy of concern for form, guidance and regulations has resulted in the local councils, and the inspectorate missing that One earth is clearly in breach of the requirements of how to produce and what to include in a Consultation Report, approving that report and then letting it go forward to examination.

It appears that the councils and the regulator are happy with a few brochures, unaudited records of meetings and presentations, exclusively reported by One Earth, as being sufficient of a nod to the planning acts with regard to the interests of, and consultation with, the local community.

On a procedural issue, I believe the local opposition to this proposal is not being given a fair hearing. In an earlier submission I made reference to the negative effect of allowing One Earth the last word on almost every subject in each meeting held so far. Another concern was the effective guillotine the inspector used without notice when he decided that each participant from the public could only speak once at the open meetings when some of us had prepared presentations on a number of subjects - yet he was happy to give the professional lawyers of One Earth as much time as they liked to respond. Further, when I tried to raise a very serious procedural issue regarding the Consultation Report I was promptly closed down.

2) One Earth's systematic attempt to not consult.

I have referred in my earlier submission to the meeting held on 1st August 2024 between One Earth and the North Clifton Parish meeting and South Clifton Parish council and the failure to accurately record this meeting and the presentation put to the meeting and the answers provided by One Earth. What One Earth achieved was the perception that they had consulted but then excluded evidence of the real substance of the meeting and the depth of the local community's dissatisfaction.

North and South Clifton produced a high-quality presentation on the communities' concerns. The response in the meeting by One Earth was inadequate in the extreme but what followed was worse. They took numerous queries and questions away with them and promised to come back. They failed to do so until 19th of November and their response was armature in the extreme. It was a clear attempt to bury us with detail that in large part we already had. Or in short, an insult. There were specific requests and undertakings made and they failed to come back properly on any of them. They clearly used the technique of paltering to get us to move on.

a) They failed to explain why they had claimed to have listened between their initial consultation and the statutory consultation when they had in fact increased the size of the project and reduced the amount of environmental protection between the two, when the major concerns were the overall size of the project and the environment. They promised to come back with clarification but didn't.

b) They didn't appear to know what a cost benefit analysis was and simply kept repeating qualitative arguments for using the High Marnham Connection which are clearly inadequate and didn't seem to think there were any costs to the local community. They gave the impression that they had been told that if they put up a proposal based on that connection it would be nodded through.

c) They stated in the meeting that they couldn't use the environment agency models yet they have done just that in the final proposal. They stated clearly that they have done no modelling or mapping themselves. They would work exclusively on guidance.

d) They tried to blame everything on Orsted, professed to have sympathy with much of what we were saying but claimed to be paid agents who had to do as they were told.

e) They went to great lengths to say that mental health was a high priority and then came back quoting regulations and with no material help. They promised to include and use the local mental health survey presented to them but have failed to do so.

f) they promised to come back with evidence that the local population's mental health would improve once the construction was over but didn't.

g) they stated that they had got the presentation of the impact of the project wrong and promised to consider and come back about provision of a scale model after it was put to them that their pictures were misleading and their 24-inch screen walk through was not fit for purpose -and again they didn't

h) when one of the North Clifton team took them to task on the issue of soil management by simply reading what was in the documents they tried repeatedly to deny what was being read.

The recording of the meeting clearly contradicts the responses that the lawyers for One Earth made regarding to the issue of the scale model and mental health at the preliminary, open and issue specific meetings. This showed that the evidence had either been withheld from the lawyers or they were complicit in the deception and disingenuity.

There is a recording of the meeting of 1st August 2024 approximately 90 minutes long, which together with the written response by One Earth of 19th November 2024 would give Inspectors a real understanding of how One Earth Consult should the Inspectors request that they be submitted.

The team from One Earth were largely immature in their conduct and acted as if they knew that the project would be passed irrespective of any opposition as David White advised the first open meeting held by the inspector.