



One Earth Solar Farm

**Volume 8.0: Statement of Commonality and Statements of
Common Ground**

**Draft Statement of Common Ground with Nottinghamshire
County Council**

EN010159/APP/8.3

July 2025

One Earth Solar Farm Ltd

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Overview _____	2
1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground _____	2
1.3 Purpose of this document _____	2
1.4 Terminology _____	3
2. Description of the Proposed Development	5
3. Record of Engagement	6
3.1 Summary of Consultation _____	6
4. Current Position	15
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council _____	15

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) has been prepared in respect of the application for the Proposed One Earth Solar Farm Development Consent Order (the “Application”) made by One Earth Solar Farm Ltd (the ‘Applicant’) to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“PA 2008”).
- 1.1.2 The DCO Application is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) for the installation, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and associated grid connection infrastructure which will allow for the generation and export of electricity to the High Marnham substation (hereafter ‘the Proposed Development’).
- 1.1.3 The SoCG is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed draft between both parties involved. It will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council.
- 1.2.2 Nottinghamshire County Council is one of the host authorities for the application, and the remainder of the host authorities have separate Statements of Common Ground.
- 1.2.3 Collectively, the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3 Purpose of this document

- 1.3.1 This SoCG is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed draft between both parties. This SoCG is a ‘live’ document and will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.

1.3.2 The SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' Guidance on the examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects ('DLUHC Guidance')¹.

1.3.3 Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

"A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree, or indeed disagree. A SoCG helps to ensure that the evidence at the examination focuses on the material differences between the main parties and therefore makes best use of the lines of questioning pursued by the Examining Authority".

1.3.4 The aim of this SoCG is, therefore, to provide a clear position of the progress and agreement met or not yet met between Nottinghamshire County Council and the Applicant on matters relating to the Application.

1.3.5 The document will be updated as more information becomes available and as a result of ongoing discussions between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council.

1.3.6 The SoCG is intended to provide information for the examination process, facilitate a smooth and efficient examination, and manage the amount of material that needs to be submitted.

1.3.7 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate website.

1.3.8 Once finalised, the SoCG will be submitted to the Examining Authority concerning the Application under section 37 of the PA 2008 for an order granting development consent for the Proposed Development.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 In the table in the issues chapter of this SoCG:

- "Agreed" indicates where an issue has been resolved;
- "Not Agreed" indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them; and

¹ Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (30 April 2024).

- “Under Discussion” indicates where points continue to be the subject of ongoing discussions between parties.

2. Description of the Proposed Development

2.1.1 The Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) array electricity generating facility with a total capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW), a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with an import and export connection to the National Grid.

2.1.2 The principal components of the Proposed Development will consist of the following:

- Solar PV Modules;
- Mounting Structures;
- Power Conversion Stations (PCS);
- Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS);
- Onsite Substations and Ancillary Buildings;
- Low Voltage Distribution Cables;
- Grid Connection Cables;
- Fencing, security and ancillary infrastructure;
- Access Tracks; and
- Green Infrastructure (GI).

3. Record of Engagement

3.1 Summary of Consultation

- 3.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation throughout the early stages of the Proposed Development. Table 1 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
General Catch Ups		
18th July 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial introductions to the Project
18th July 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council
1st November 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	PPA Discussions
9th February 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Statement of Community Consultation Briefing
11 th March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project overview • Ecology Survey programme overview • Summary of habitat information • Summary of bat surveys

- Summary of bird surveys (breeding and wintering)
- Summary of badger, otter and water vole surveys
- Summary of great crested newt surveys
- Identifying local conservation priorities (to include within landscape design)
- Approach to BNG, incorporating local priority species

19 th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development
2nd May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around drainage with Lincolnshire County Council also in attendance
8 th May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around socio-economic impacts
14 th May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Consultation briefing including an update on EIA, the masterplan and consultation programme
12 th July 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team; • Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing

9 th October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan and programme update • Adequacy of Consultation Milestone • Statement of Common Ground
------------------------------	-------------------	---

1 st May 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps
--------------------------	-------------------	---

Cultural Heritage

29 th - 30 th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation on scope of cultural heritage assessment and discussion of proposed scope of heritage photomontages.
--	-------------------	---

21 August 2024	Meeting (on Site)	<p>Discussion of the Proposed Development post PEIR consultation responses. Review of the potential effects and mitigation in relation to assets in Ragnall and Fledborough <u>Ragnall</u></p> <p>Discussion and agreement to review how the development relates to contouring to the north and northwest of St Leonards Church. It was agreed that topography would be overlayed onto the masterplan to demonstrate the relationship between the two.</p> <p>Outcome: Order Limits are shown with topography overlay on page 8 of Technical Appendix 10.2 (APP-127). Discussion held on creating set backs to the east of Main Street and reviewing historic landscape context to inform screening.</p> <p>Outcome: Historic research shared with Statutory Consultee and informed</p>
----------------	-------------------	---

revision of Order Limits to increase setback from Main Street.

Fledborough

Discussion held on the enclosed setting of St Gregory's Churchyard and the key view from this location being towards Fledborough Viaduct. Request for further review of views looking north from the PRow located to the north of the Church.

Outcome: Agreement that Manor House and St Gregory's Church could be jointly assessed. Further review on screening of eastern Order Limit boundaries.

02nd September 2024 Correspondence (email)

Confirmation from Conservation Officer that no comments to the minutes from the Site Visit on the 21st August 2024.

19th November 2024 Meeting (Virtual)

Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusion of heritage impact and additional information required.

Buried Archaeology

29th February 2024 Meeting (Virtual)

Introduction to the Site, Proposed Development and the proposed scope of assessment. Discussion over the approach to the geophysical survey work at the Scheduled Monuments at Newton-on-Trent & at Whimpton and to specific non-designated archaeological assets.

1st March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Discussion on further evaluation scope and strategies for trial trenching have been discussed at a high level. Agreed to include an assessment of geology and topography to inform the DBA.</p> <p>Agreed to consider the current guidelines about flint scatters early within the evaluation design.</p>
24th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Fieldwork update on the geophysical survey.</p> <p>Draft trial trenching strategy presented by Iceni, LCC asked for a more detailed information regarding trenching sampling percentages.</p>
11th July 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Meeting to discuss approach for trial trench evaluation and the One Earth Project Design, which presents the approach to the archaeological evaluation.</p> <p>Discussion and agreement about the procedure for Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) submissions and sign-off; and on the approach for monitoring site visits agreed and weekly reporting.</p> <p>Discussion and agreement to add black and white imagery from the draft geophysical survey report as background to the trenches to the Archaeological Evaluation Strategy</p> <p>Discussion and agreement to move some of the proposed trenches to target specific anomalies detected by the geophysical survey.</p>

2nd August 2024	Email correspondence	Agreement on the Archaeological Evaluation Strategy, asking for the approach to the trial trenching evaluation not be limited to than the high-impact areas.
23rd August 2024	Email correspondence	Updated version of the One Earth Archaeological Evaluation Strategy issued for comments.
23rd September 2024	Email correspondence	<p>Request and agreement on all archaeological features to be investigated unless otherwise agreed.</p> <p>Request for the whole Order Limits to be subject to trial trench evaluation.</p> <p>Agreed a remote sign-off system for blank trenches on site visits for trench with buried heritage features or deposits.</p>
23rd September 2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for excavations in Nottinghamshire approved.
1st October 2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for Ragnall approved
25th October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Meeting to discuss the sampling strategy for Ragnall.</p> <p>The following points were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ragnall is one of the areas that will require appropriate archaeological mitigation. - Where features form a definite arrangement a sample of features within the arrangement will be sample excavated. Features not suited to

		excavation in evaluation trenches will be investigated in plan only. This would typically apply to areas of complex, intercutting features such as structures with in-situ floor surfaces, kilns and other 'special' features, all of which benefit from open area investigation and suffer when excavated during trial trench evaluations. No features will be wholly excavated; similarly, structures and features worthy of preservation will not be unduly excavated.
30th October 2024	Email correspondence	Further conversation of sampling strategy for Ragnall, agreeing to a limited number of slots through features that appear in multiple trenches on the geophysical survey, although if these appear to have a different form in other trenches, that will still need to be investigated.
7th November 2024	Site Visit	Discussion about the ongoing trial trenching at Ragnall and the sampling strategy.
8th November 2024	Email correspondence	Further review of sampling strategy for Ragnall by limiting to a sample excavation of approximately 70% of the total linear features to be investigated in trenches with dense archaeology.
12th July 2025	Email correspondence	Results of the trial trenching evaluation carried out south of the reservoir circulated.

Human Health

May 2024	Online meeting	Introduction to the project with public health officer; focusing on human health elements.
----------	----------------	--

Landscape and Visual

22 nd April 2024	Virtual meeting	<p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LVIA methodology • LVIA Study Area • Landscape receptors • Visual receptors • Representative viewpoints • Photomontages <p>Key Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for LVIA study area refinement to be detailed in the LVIA • Suggestion of ZTV approach and agreement to share drafts for comment • Comments on consultation note to be provided in writing <p>Follow-up meeting to be scheduled following publication of the PEIR</p>
14 th November 2024	Virtual meeting	<p>Key topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZTV parameters • LVIA study area • LVIA criteria • Scope of receptors • Scope of cumulative assessment <p>Key outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR <p>Outstanding issues to be provided as an interim note</p>
19 th November 2024	Interim Note	<p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of LVIA figures including ZTVs

- Updated LVIA methodology including specific criteria
- Approach to RVAA
- Review of study area scoping photos

Key Outcomes:

- Acknowledgement of additional viewpoints added and some previous PEIR comments addressed (e.g., VP16, VP26).
- Acknowledgement of updated methodology reviewed and partially improved.

Outstanding issues remain regarding ZTV figures, viewpoint locations, methodological clarifications, visualisation quality

Table 1 – Record of Engagement

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council

4.1.1 The following tables ²set out the position of the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council, following a series of meetings and discussions with respect to the key areas of the Proposed Development. This includes matters where discussions are ongoing.

4.1.2 As noted above, this is a 'live' document, and some aspects have yet to be agreed upon between both parties. The intention is to provide a final position in subsequent versions of the SoCG, addressing and identifying where changes have been made, and ultimately, documenting agreement by both parties on relevant points.

Table 02 – Cultural Heritage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	Scope of Assessment	Nottinghamshire County Council have raised concerns around the scope of assessment.	Concerns have been addressed and no further comments raised on scope of assessment during further statutory consultation. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]	Agreed
02-02	Church and Parish Intervisibility with the Proposed Development	Nottinghamshire County Council believes that intervisibility between churches and rural fields should also be examined.	Detailed assessment on the historic and present setting of churches, including consideration of associated parishes and intervisibility between churches, has been undertaken and included within the supporting Technical Appendix and within this Chapter.	Agreed

² Tables setting out the stance on Traffic and Transport and Biodiversity will be added to the next draft of this Statement of Common Ground following some ongoing discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council.

			Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]	
02-03	Impacts on designated assets	NCC are particularly concerned about the identified impacts to the designated assets of Fledborough and Ragnall and the extent of proposed mitigation	<p>Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]. Further mitigation of effects to designated assets in Fledborough and Ragnall were reviewed on Site with Officers (21 August 2024).</p> <p>The Proposed Development incorporates further setbacks from assets in Ragnall and Fledborough, as well as planted boundaries to mitigate impact. Mitigation is fully explained at Section 10.5 and asset assessment was conducted at Section 10.6 of ES Chapter 10 (APP-039).</p>	Agreed
02-04	Overall Impact of the Proposed Development	NCC raise concerns that there will be an overall harmful impact on the setting and hinterlands of some heritage assets and that the cumulative impacts alongside other nationally significant projects in the Trent Valley and immediate area are likely to be considerable.	<p>Recognition of the accuracy of the submitted information and the mitigation measures is appreciated.</p> <p>To clarify, ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) only found a single long term significant adverse effect would arise: to the Whimpton Moor (Scheduled Monument) which is difficult to mitigate against as harm arising from perceptual changes in the setting, rather than visual changes.</p> <p>Identified harm would be at the mid – lower end of less than substantial harm and need to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme (NPS EN-1,</p>	Agreed

			<p>paragraph 5.9.32; NPS EN-3, paragraph 2.3.8)</p> <p>The cumulative assessment found no additive or synergistic harm</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3].</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Table 03 – Buried Archaeology

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Assessment	<p>Nottinghamshire County Council raises concerns regarding the level of archaeological assessment undertaken to inform the applicants DCO application.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the applicant's assessment work to date, including a desk-based assessment (DBA), geophysical survey (magnetometry) and some targeted evaluation trenching.</p>	<p>Further detail regarding the approach to the trial trenching, and the flexibility provided by the Proposed Development design can be found in Section 3 and Section 9 of the Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038].</p> <p>The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between providing the required evidence to inform the DCO application and limiting the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The Applicant considers that information submitted meets the requirements of the NPPF, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, and provides an adequate baseline for the assessment of impacts including the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains.</p>	Under Discussion

			<p>The trial trenching evaluation carried out to date has provided the required information to define nature, extent, preservation and significance that will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy for the Proposed Development. This includes assessing the Project Design's capacity to address and accommodate any archaeological constraints that have been, or may in the future be, identified. This process also provided a better understanding of the buried heritage assets and demonstrated the substantial reliability of the non-intrusive assessments and evaluation carried out to inform the targeted trial trenching evaluation.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The forthcoming Outline Written Scheme of Investigations (oWSI) will</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>define the strategy to carry out additional trial trenching evaluation. This will also inform the detailed design and mitigation for archaeological remains and this can be secured through draft DCO Requirements 12. Mitigation for archaeological remains will either be through design changes to avoid impacts (micro siting / exclusion zones or use of non-intrusive foundations) or through excavation or archaeological monitoring where avoidance is not necessary or desirable. Carrying out any further trial trenching evaluation as a pre-commencement requirement, will reduce the risk of any disproportionate harm to buried heritage deposits arising from a partial or total removal of assets as a consequence of the archaeological trial trenching investigation, to not be offset by the positive environmental effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>In consideration of the following CifA's Code of Conduct Principle 2, paragraph 5.9.11 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy, paragraph 5.9.21 of the EN-1, paragraph 2.3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), the Applicant considers that the phased approach to assessment, utilising a suite of techniques to build upon and inform one another, is comparable with other DCO</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			solar farm schemes. Large amounts of predetermination trenching are not supported by guidance or by the ethical principle of minimizing harm to the historic environment. In their reply, Historic England support an approach that minimizes unnecessary physical interventions to archaeological remains.	
--	--	--	---	--

Table 04 – Human Health

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	Cross referencing human health with other chapters	<p>Human Health Chapter to also include cross-references to the following assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual Chapter – Impacts on alterations to the landform and the quality of the built and natural environment; • Socio-Economics Chapter – Impacts on education and training opportunities and local business activity; • Transport and Access Chapter - Impacts on accessibility and 	These references are set out under “Other Environmental Matters” in section 16.6 of this chapter	Agreed

		<p>connections to jobs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydrology and Hydrogeology Chapter – Impacts on water resources; • Land and Soils Chapter – Impacts on land quality; • Air Quality Chapter – Impacts on human health from traffic, plant and dust during the Construction Phase and the Decommissioning Phase; • Noise and Vibration Chapter – Impacts on noise and vibration levels from traffic and operations 		
--	--	---	--	--

Table 05 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	LVIA methodology	On review of a revised LVIA methodology submitted by the applicant in November 2024, AAH Consultants noted that it appears to be in conformity with the approach adopted at the PEIR, which was accepted as best-practice.	LVIA methodology is largely agreed and is considered to be in accordance with industry guidance but discussion is on going with regard to approach to visual assessment.	Under discussion

		<p>While the methodology overall is considered acceptable, AAH Consultants judge that the visual assessment does not fully align with guidance provided within LI Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01. This clarification by the LI clearly states that the focus of a visual assessment should be on visual receptors, with viewpoints being utilised to illustrate potential views. The visual assessment only focusses on a static viewpoint for the assessment and does not fully consider the experience of a receptor, such as a walker along a PROW, or driver along a road. Further information will be provided within the LIR.</p>		
05-02	LVIA Study Area	<p>AAH Consultants commented that effects beyond 2km had not been considered fully at the PEIR as all the proposed viewpoints were located within the 2km LVIA Study Area, despite the ZTV showing the</p>	<p>The LVIA 2km Study Area is agreed following a site visit between the applicant and AAH Consultants on 25th June 2025 which included visiting several of the locations of the supplementary photographs previously provided, confirming</p>	Agreed

		<p>potential for visibility beyond 2km.</p> <p>In response, photographs from 8 locations were provided by the applicant to test the judgement of no significant visibility beyond 2km.</p> <p>AAH Consultants welcomed these photographs but questioned the location of some of them in terms of representativeness of the receptor.</p>	that they are representative.	
05-03	Scope of landscape receptors	<p>The inclusion of Thorney as a Local Village Character Area following feedback on the PEIR was welcomed.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of landscape receptors have been raised to date.</p>	<p>The scope of landscape receptors is agreed.</p> <p>The scope of landscape receptors was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.</p>	Agreed
05-04	Scope of visual receptors	<p>Additional visual receptors were suggested following review of the PEIR.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of visual receptors have been raised to date.</p>	<p>The scope of visual receptors is agreed.</p> <p>The scope of visual receptors was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.</p>	Agreed
05-05	Scope of representative viewpoints	<p>The location of some of the representative viewpoints were</p>	<p>The scope of representative viewpoints is agreed.</p>	Agreed

		questioned and additional viewpoints were suggested following review of the PEIR. No further comments or concerns on the scope of representative viewpoints have been raised.	The scope of representative viewpoints was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.	
05-06	Scope of photomontages	An additional Type 4 photomontage was suggested from Viewpoint 58 following review of the PEIR. No further comments or concerns on the scope of representative viewpoints have been raised.	The scope of photomontages is agreed. Further discussion was had between the applicant and the District Councils during the preparation of the LVIA ES Chapter regarding the scope of photomontages resulting in agreement that the number and distribution of locations is sufficient.	Agreed
05-07	Assessment assumptions and limitations	The approach to solar panel replacement during the operation phase was questioned following review of the PEIR. No further comments or concerns on the assumptions and limitations have been raised.	The assumptions and limitations of the LVIA are agreed. Additional detail was provided in the LVIA ES Chapter to include a reasonable worst-case scenario with regard to solar panel replacement during the year 15 operational assessment scenario.	Agreed
05-08	Level of effect on landscape receptors	The number of significant adverse effects identified in the applicant's assessment was noted as being of initial concern, but	A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25 th June 2025 whereby some level of effects on some	Under discussion

		<p>more detailed evaluation will be included in the Local Impact Report.</p> <p>The LIR clarifies that several landscape character areas that will have direct effects of development at all phases have not been judged to have Significant residual effects. This appears inconsistent with the findings of effects to the Order Limits and landscape character areas of TW PZ 20 and MNF PZ 09; AAH Consultants would judge that all landscape character areas directly affected by the Development would have residual Significant effects – primarily through a change of land-use. This needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>landscape receptors were discussed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.</p>	
05-09	Level of effect on visual receptors	<p>The number of significant adverse effects identified in the applicant's assessment was noted as being of initial concern, but more detailed evaluation will be included in the</p>	<p>A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25th June 2025 whereby some level of effects on some visual receptors were discussed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the</p>	Under discussion

		<p>Local Impact Report.</p> <p>The visual assessment does not fully account for sequential views from receptors and is overall focussed on a static viewpoint, describing the existing view and change to that view, therefore has the potential to underplay visual effects.</p>	<p>Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.</p>	
05-10	<p>Approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impacts</p>	<p>The 2km Zone of Influence for the assessment of cumulative landscape and visual impacts was questioned, and whether there would be sequential cumulative visual impacts with other solar DCO schemes such as Cottam, Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge.</p> <p>The LIR clarifies the Council's position in regards to cumulative effects – the concern covers the change across the region (Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire), across multiple character areas.</p> <p>The development of solar and other</p>	<p>A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25th June 2025 whereby the potential for significant cumulative effects were discussed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

		energy infrastructure is a marked and extensive change to land-use. This will be a defining and key feature of the future landscape character of these regions.		
05-11	Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP)	<p>The reduction in significant landscape and visual effects was noted as relying upon the successful establishment of the mitigation planting. It was also suggested that active ongoing management of mitigation features should be included for the lifetime of the facility and clearly set out in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.</p> <p>The OLEMP must be explicit (currently it is not) in regards to the landscape mitigation scheme and maintenance post any approval, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of detailed planting proposals that must be approved by the relevant authority; 	<p>Outline details of the mitigation proposals, including species selection and monitoring of management prescriptions, is provided in the OLEMP.</p> <p>Replacement of plants that fail to establish within the first five years is also secured within the OLEMP.</p> <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.</p>	Under discussion

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintenance of all planting and ecological features for the life of the project; - Appropriate survey and protection of existing vegetation and trees to BS5837; and - Plant replacements in the initial establishment period, however also include for unforeseen circumstances such as extensive plant dieback, or failure to establish or thrive as expected and allow for plant replacement at any time as required to ensure the mitigation planting is fulfilling its role as mitigation 		
--	--	--	--	--

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



one earth
solar farm

Contact

Name

Email

Number