



One Earth Solar Farm

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

**Draft Statement of Common Ground with Newark and
Sherwood District Council**

EN010159/APP/8.6

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 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District Council.
- 1.2.2 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District 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 01 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
General Catch Ups		
7th July 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial Introductions to the Project
7 th July 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council
22nd August 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Follow-up introduction meeting to the Project
1st November 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project briefing for new officer • PPA Discussion
8th 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
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

19th December 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on selected scope of assessment and inclusion of recommended NDHAs of North Clifton Station and North Clifton Primary School. Agreement to assess group value of the Church of St Gregory's and the relationship held with North and South Clifton.
--------------------	-------------------	--

12th March 2024	Correspondence (email)	Confirmation on scope of assessment.
-----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------------

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

21st 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 North and South Clifton, and Thorney.</p> <p>Outcome: NSDC confirmed approach taken to North and South Clifton was suitable. Confirmation that assessment of views north would be cross referenced against the LVIA</p> <p>Outcome: NSDC confirmed no impact to assets within Thorney due</p>
------------------	-------------------	---

to distance from the Order Limits and lack of visibility.

19th November 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusions of heritage impacts and scope of additional information required.
--------------------	-------------------	---

Air Quality

		The parties have not been engaged directly in consultation on the topic of Air Quality, however responses have been provided via the Scoping Opinion and Relevant Representations. The methodology and approach has been agreed via this method.
--	--	--

Ground Conditions

27 November 2024	Email	<p>Information was provided to Newark and Sherwood District Council relating to land and groundwater contamination issues.</p> <p>The Scoping Opinion had indicated that potential impacts to existing geological units from contamination should be assessed within the ES for the construction phase and the decommissioning phase. The Applicant confirmed that the ES chapter provides an assessment of potential effects on</p>
------------------	-------	--

existing geological units and provided a copy of the methodology for review.

The Applicant also confirmed that the ES chapter provides an assessment of the potential contamination of groundwater for the construction and decommissioning phases of the project (including consideration of existing groundwater abstraction points). A copy of the methodology was attached for review. It was noted that the methodology had been amended for One Earth Solar Farm since it was presented in the PEIR.

2 December 2024

Email

Response from Newark and Sherwood District Council with two follow up queries relating to the information that was provided on 27 November 2025.

10 December 2024

Email

Response from the Applicant (to all local planning authorities) further explaining the reasons for the amendments to the methodology and providing a response relating to the query on the outline BSMP.

16 June 2025

Email

The Applicant requested information held by the local authority relating to private water abstraction locations (licensed or unlicensed) in response to consultation comments that the original dataset may not have been complete. Response awaited as to whether any information is available from Newark and Sherwood District Council.

Landscape and Visual

22nd March 2024

Technical Memorandum
(AAH TM01)

Key Topics:

- Initial scoping and methodology for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)
- Compliance with GLVIA3 and Landscape Institute guidance
- Use of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and fieldwork
- Identification of receptors (residents, PRow users, road users)
- Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)
- Selection of viewpoints and photomontages
- Consideration of ancillary infrastructure (e.g., substations, battery storage)
- Recommendations for additional viewpoints and receptor categories

Key Outcomes:

- Agreement on methodology and RVAA approach
- Recommendation to include viewpoints beyond 2km due to potential visibility
- Request for further details on design elements (e.g., PV arrays, substations)
- Emphasis on iterative consultation as design evolves

Highlighted need to assess impacts
on heritage assets and railway views

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>
9th July 2024	Technical Memorandum (AAH TM02)	<p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) • Project overview: 740MW solar farm across 1500Ha • Design evolution and consultation feedback • Landscape and visual baseline conditions • Use of Rochdale Envelope principle • Assessment of construction, operation, and decommissioning impacts

- Mitigation planting and management plans
- Viewpoint selection and ZTV analysis

Key Outcomes:

- Recognition of evolving design and need for ongoing consultation
- Concern over lack of viewpoints beyond 2km and potential underestimation of impacts
- Request for detailed management plans for mitigation planting
- Emphasis on character-sensitive mitigation rather than blanket screening
- Recommendation for robust long-term vegetation management (15+ years)

Identification of gaps in assessment, especially regarding panel replacement and access impacts

14th November 2024

Virtual meeting

Key Topics:

- LVIA Study Area
- Emerging design parameters
- Approach to solar replacement
- Scope of representative viewpoints
- Ancient woodland, and veteran or ancient trees

Key Outcomes:

- Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR

Written comments to be provided as
technical memorandum

18th November 2024 Technical Memorandum
(AAH TM05)

Key Topics:

- Updated LVIA methodology and ZTV figures
- Assessment of viewpoints beyond 2km
- Review of study area scoping photos
- Continued concerns about solar panel replacements and mitigation management

Key Outcomes:

- Acknowledgement of improved ZTV analysis and fieldwork
- Acceptance of revised LVIA methodology as best practice
- Critique of viewpoint selection beyond 2km (suggested better locations)
- Request for more strategic viewpoint placement at submission stage

Outstanding issues remain regarding
long-term management and
equipment replacement impacts

Table 01 – Record of Engagement

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council

- 4.1.1 The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District 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
	Scope of Assessment of NDHAs	Written comments received on 12 th March 2024 confirmed NSDC are in agreement with scope shown in Table 10.6 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039])	Noted.	Agreed
	Scope of Assessment	Request of a full assessment of impact and detailed mitigation of Proposed Development within the ES Chapter.	Full assessment was provided in ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] and Technical Appendix 10.2 [APP-127 and APP-128].	Agreed
	Query on Phrasing of	The phrasing which has been applied to all heritage assets	For clarity, the quoted phrasing is located within the tabulated introduction pages	Under Discussion

	introduction text	within the district states: 'Significance heavily linked and similarity of potential effects.' This statement reveals the strong impact and significance of the assets the proposed development will have on these heritage assets. The impact of the project is heavily linked to their significance.	<p>[14-19] of the Technical Appendix (ref. App-128). The purpose and context of this text is the grouping of assets for assessment later in the report and in the ES Chapter (APP-039).</p> <p>The phrasing is not assessing the value (significance) or effects, nor does it imply that the Proposed Development would affect these assets.</p> <p>The assessment of effects occurs within the Technical Appendix (ref. App-128) and ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p>	
	Perceived impact to Church of St George the Martyr and Church of St Helen	Further consideration required on setting of both assets and further mitigation required – specifically for the impact on Church of St George the Martyr, and Church of St Helen.	<p><u>Church of St George the Martyr</u></p> <p>Effects of the Proposed Development on St George the Martyr are located within paragraphs 4.136 – 4.139, page 66 of Technical Appendix 10.3 [APP-128] and paragraphs 10.9.9 and 10.6.98.100 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039].</p>	Under Discussion

			<p><u>St Helen Church</u> This asset has been assessed in ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) at paragraphs 10.6.7 and 10.6.126, in paragraph 4.191 of the Technical Appendix [APP-128]. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping [Figure 10.3 (APP-055)], the Proposed Development would hold no visibility.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p>	
	Ruins of Old Church in Churchyard	Recommendation of further mitigation to protect any views.	<p>This asset has been assessed in ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) at paragraphs 10.6.7 and 10.6.126 and on page 85 of Appendix 10.2 (grouped with other assets in Thorney, as agreed with stakeholders – see Table 10.5 [APP-128]).</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility, there would be no impact to the value (significance) of this asset, further mitigation is not required as no harm can feasibly exist</p>	Under Discussion

			<p>which requires screening.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p>	
	Lychgate at Church of St George	<p>"Impact of proposal This listing would not be as impacted as the Church of St George due to its location, but it still forms part of the wider setting.... Recommended Mitigation None would be required for this heritage asset."</p>	<p>The Zone of Theoretical visibility (Figure 10.3 [APP-055]) confirms no intervisibility of the Proposed Development. There would be no effect on the appreciation of the church, churchyard and lychgate</p> <p>Therefore, this asset would not change the assessed effects (or lack thereof) on the Church of St George the Martyr (Grade II*).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p>	Under Discussion
	Fledborough Viaduct	<p>The impact of solar panels either side would be detrimental to the wider setting of the viaduct.</p>	<p>No solar arrays are to be located on either side of the viaduct as the land is not included within the Order Limits. It is unclear which northern small parcel is recommended for removal; to clarify the nearest Order Limit</p>	Agreed

			<p>north of the Site is at c.660m.</p> <p>As noted within paragraphs 10.6.68 – 10.6.71 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039], the industrial historic interest of the asset is not reliant on views of a particular character of the landscape to understand its value. The Proposed Development would hold a negligible neutral effect and result in no change to the contribution of the wider setting to asset's value.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p>	
	Firs Farmhouse (Grade II)	Small strip of the solar farm seems encroach towards the heritage asset	<p>Figure 10.1 [APP-055] of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] confirms that the Order Limits stand at c.930m to the west of this asset. There is no stretch of the Order Limits which stand within the vicinity of the asset and no harm will arise.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant</p>	Agreed

			Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]	
	Hall Farmhouse (North Clifton. Grade II, NHLE: 1302529)	There may be possible views from this heritage asset.	As illustrated within Viewpoint 25a (Figure 11.13.7 ^a [APP-068]) and assessed at paragraph 10.6.96 of ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039), the Order Limits would stand distant from the asset and hold no intervisibility	Under Discussion
	Trent Lane Farmhouse (North Clifton. Grade II, NHLE: 1369937)	There will be views in nearby field. Recommended mitigation suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.	The Order Limits would stand at distance from the asset (over 280m to the north), would not backdrop views of this asset from the Viaduct, and would hold no adverse effect on the appreciation of the asset as an agriculture farmhouse. No harm is identified and therefore no further mitigation is required. Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]	Under Discussion
	The Old Manor House (Thorney.	Mitigation Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.	The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further	Under Discussion

	Grade II, NHLE: 1046018)		mitigation is required. Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]	
	Thorney War Memorial. (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1462827)	Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation.	Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required. Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]	Under Discussion
	Cottage at Thorney Hall (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1369961)	Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation.	Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required. Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant	Under Discussion

			Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]	
	House at Thorney Hall. (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1046017)	Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation.	<p>Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p>	Under Discussion
	Summary of response	Request for further information on the impacts to the Church of St George the Martyr, and Fledborough Viaduct.	<p>Further information provided to support the assessment that the Proposed Development would not be seen in views of St George the Martyr from the Viaduct.</p> <p>Confirmation of where the assets mentioned have been assessed within ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] and accompanying appendices has been provided to demonstrate that there would be no harmful effects to any of these assets and, as such, no further mitigation is required.</p>	Under Discussion

			Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 02 – Air Quality

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	ES Chapter Comments	<p>Whilst NSDC are generally content with the majority of measures proposed, we would expect to be provided with 6 monthly (as a minimum) summary updates of complaints, significant incidents, and logs in relation to air quality and dust rather than upon request as is specified in the OCEMP.</p> <p>At an overall level, NSDC accept the findings of the assessment, based on work undertaken thus far. Notwithstanding this, we note that a dust management plan is an area of further work that will be prepared, and we look forward to the</p>	The construction dust mitigation measures, which are set out in ES Volume 2: Appendix 13.5 [APP-137], are included in, and secured by, Table 3.9 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-176]. At this stage, the CEMP is in outline. Prior to construction, the final measures will be agreed with the council before the final CEMP is submitted. The request to be provided with 6 monthly updates can be included.	Agreed

		opportunity to comment on this document in due course.		
--	--	--	--	--

Table 03 – Ground Conditions

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Methodology for Land and Groundwater assessment	Queries on methodology and outline BSMP	The Applicant provided a response to further explain the reasons for the amendments to the methodology and provided a response relating to the query on the outline BSMP	Agreed
03-02	Request for private water supply data	Response awaited to confirm if any data are held by Newark and Sherwood District Council or not	A set of records was supplied by Newark and Sherwood District Council (19 June 2025). These have been assessed and no private water supplies are present within the Order Limits or study area for land and groundwater assessment.	Agreed

Table 04 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	LVIA methodology	<p>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. 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</p>	<p>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.</p>	Under discussion

		experience of a receptor, such as a walker along a PROW, or driver along a road. Further information will be provided within the LIR.		
04-02	LVIA Study Area	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 potential for visibility beyond 2km. In response, photographs from 8 locations were provided by the applicant to test the judgement of no significant visibility beyond 2km. AAH Consultants welcomed these photographs but questioned the location of some of them in terms of representativeness of the receptor.	The LVIA 2km Study Area is agreed following a site visit between the applicant and AAH Consultants on 25 th June 2025 which included visiting several of the locations of the supplementary photographs previously provided, confirming that they are representative.	Agreed
04-03	Scope of landscape receptors	The inclusion of Thorney as a Local Village Character Area following feedback on the PEIR was welcomed. No further comments or concerns on the	The scope of landscape receptors is agreed. The scope of landscape receptors was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.	Agreed

		scope of landscape receptors have been raised to date.		
04-04	Scope of visual receptors	Additional visual receptors were suggested following review of the PEIR. No further comments or concerns on the scope of visual receptors have been raised to date.	The scope of visual receptors is agreed. The scope of visual receptors was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.	Agreed
04-05	Scope of representative viewpoints	The location of some of the representative viewpoints were 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 is agreed. The scope of representative viewpoints was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.	Agreed
04-06	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

04-07	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
04-08	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 more detailed evaluation will be included in the Local Impact Report. 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	A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25 th June 2025 whereby some level of effects on some landscape receptors were discussed. It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.	Under discussion

		character areas directly affected by the Development would have residual Significant effects – primarily through a change of land-use. This needs to be clarified.		
04-09	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 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>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 Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.</p>	Under discussion
04-10	Approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impacts	<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</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</p>	Under discussion

		<p>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 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.</p>	Report before discussing further.	
04-11	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</p>	<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</p>	Under discussion

		<p>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; - 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 	<p>Report before discussing further.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Newark and Sherwood District Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



one earth
solar farm

Contact

Name

Email

Number