

One Earth Solar Farm

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

EN010159/APP/8.3.1

July-August 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	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	7
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council	7

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;

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

- “Not Agreed” indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them; and
- “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

9th October 2024 Meeting (Virtual)

- Masterplan and programme update
- Adequacy of Consultation Milestone
- Statement of Common Ground

1st May 2025

Meeting (Virtual)

Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps

[15th August 2025](#)

[Meeting \(Virtual\)](#)

[Discussion to update the Statement of Common Ground](#)

Cultural Heritage

29th- 30th 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)

Discussion of the Proposed Development post PEIR consultation responses. Review of the potential effects and mitigation in relation to assets in Ragnall and Fledborough Ragnall

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.

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.

Outcome: Historic research shared with Statutory Consultee and informed 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

29/02/2024

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.
01/03/2024	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>
24/04/2024	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>
11/07/2024	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>

Discussion and agreement to move some of the proposed trenches to target specific anomalies detected by the geophysical survey.

02/08/24	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.
23/08/2024	Email correspondence	Updated version of the One Earth Archaeological Evaluation Strategy issued for comments.
23/09/2024	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>
23/09/2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for excavations in Nottinghamshire approved.
01/10/2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for Ragnall approved
25/10/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the sampling strategy for Ragnall.

The following points were agreed:
- *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.*

30/10/2024	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.
07/11/2024	Site Visit	Discussion about the ongoing trial trenching at Ragnall and the sampling strategy.
08/11/2024	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.
12/06/2025	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
--------------------------------	-----------------	--

Outstanding issues to be provided as
an interim note

19th November 2024 Interim Note

Key Topics:

- 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

²Tables 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.

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.	<p>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.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]</p>	Agreed
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. 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, 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>	Agreed
-------	--	--	---	---------------

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> <p>The trial trenching evaluation carried out to date has provided the required information</p>	Under Discussion

			<p>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. 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 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.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			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 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.	
03-02	Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report	The Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report (APP-124), is not a full report and offers a very brief summary of the results. It is essential that the full report for this work is submitted so that a proper assessment of the data can be scrutinised at Examination.	The Applicant will take this away and discuss whether the full report is required to be submitted.	Under discussion

03-03	<u>Scope of Assessment</u>	<p><u>We recommend that areas that return ‘blank’ readings in the geophysics results be tested for reliability with evaluation trenching, particular in areas of high development impact. Section 9.3.36 confirms the need for this, however much of the site has not yet been tested and we strongly reject the assertion in Section 9.3.37 that the work to date delivers the required evidence. In this matter the document is contradictory in terms of recognising the issue but then accepting a limited level of intrusive work to address it.</u></p> <p><u>Given the essential nature of adequate evaluation as the basis to deal appropriately with the developmental impacts and effectively manage development risk, NCC and LCC are deeply concerned regarding the outstanding work, and we would expect the applicant to provide further details for completion of an acceptable programme of evaluation trenching.</u></p>	<p><u>The non-intrusive work carried out to inform the Archaeology ES Chapter provides a holistic approach to the data collection, relying on different survey techniques to off-set the specific limitation.</u></p> <p><u>The results collected during the desk-based have been ground-truthed and expanded upon by a geophysical survey evaluation carried out on the entire Order Limits.</u></p> <p><u>Therefore, the Applicant does not believe that further assessment should be done to test the reliability.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
-------	----------------------------	---	---	-------------------------

<u>03-04</u>	<u>Construction impacts</u>	<u>Impacts from construction activity have not been properly considered beyond a brief assertion in Section 9.5.4 or have been dismissed in Section 9.5.12. These would normally include groundworks for temporary compounds and haul roads, compaction/vibration from vehicle/plant tracking and other related construction activity. Where these occur and archaeology is present, we maintain that the impact is likely to be significant, adverse and negative, especially in areas of poor or shallow ground conditions.</u>	<u>The Applicant's decision to present the potential effects as work packages has been done to keep a degree of flexibility in assessing the effects, and their extent, and to guarantee proportionality and responsiveness to any future potential environmental constraints, technological advancements, and updates in professional guidance.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>03-05</u>	<u>Impacts during operational phase</u>	<u>Operational impacts are also likely to have significant, adverse and negative effects on any surviving archaeology present that has not been adequately assessed or been subject to mitigation works at this stage.</u>	<u>The OWSI will include allowances for an Archaeological Clerk of Work (ACoW) to oversee construction, operation, and decommissioning activities.</u> <u>Specifically, the ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Operation and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>03-06</u>	<u>Assessment results</u>	<u>We do not agree with the weighting of impacts offered by the applicant which are unrealistic. Section 9.6.4 offers an assessment of the importance of archaeological sites and the extent of impacts from developmental works, however these are both dismissively low. In order to have 'Negligible to Minor' Significance of Effect on archaeological sites which have 'High' Magnitudes of Impact, evaluation and mitigation would need to be very extensive otherwise the impact will be significant, adverse and negative.</u>	<u>While the Applicant has acknowledged that some sites may experience a high magnitude of impact, the overall significance of effects is determined by balancing the value of the site, the nature of the impact, and any proposed mitigation measures, consistent with the principles outlined in Historic England's Environmental Impact Assessment and Archaeology (Historic England, 2017). It is not accurate to assume that a high magnitude of impact will invariably result in a significant or adverse effect.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
--------------	---------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

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 connections to jobs; • 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 	These references are set out under “Other Environmental Matters” in section 16.6 of this chapter	Agreed

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. 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.	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
05-02	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 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	Agreed

		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.	photographs previously provided, confirming that they are representative.	
05-03	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 scope of landscape receptors have been raised to date.	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
05-04	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
05-05	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
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	Agreed

			resulting in agreement that the number and distribution of locations is sufficient.	
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 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 character areas directly affected by the Development would have residual Significant effects – primarily through a change of land-use. This needs to be clarified.	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
05-09	Level of effect on visual 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.	A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25 th June 2025 whereby some level of effects on some visual receptors were discussed.	Under discussion

		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.	It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.	
05-10	Approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impacts	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. 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. 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.	A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25 th June 2025 whereby the potential for significant cumulative effects were discussed. It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.	Under discussion
05-11	Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP)	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. The OLEMP must be explicit (currently it is not) in regards to the landscape mitigation scheme	Outline details of the mitigation proposals, including species selection and monitoring of management prescriptions, is provided in the OLEMP. Replacement of plants that fail to establish within the first five years is also secured within the OLEMP. It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.	Under discussion

		<p>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 		
05-12	Scope of assessment	<p>The LVIA assessment is structured around static views rather than the experience of the visual receptor which should include for sequential and varying views. This should be reviewed further as part of the DCO examination, as the extent of visual effects do not appear to have been fully considered.</p>	<p>LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01).</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

			<p><u>The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19.</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Table 06 – Ecology and Biodiversity

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>05-01</u>	<u>Scope of Assessment</u>	<p><u>NCC has reviewed the Biodiversity Chapter and relevant appendices of the ES and is concerned about some the assessment methodology that has been used and inadequacy of some of the proposed mitigation.</u></p> <p><u>It is considered that there are gaps in the impact assessment and these mean that the impact upon biodiversity has not been robustly assessed, and that the full extent of required mitigation has not been properly established. This also makes it difficult to conclude whether the impacts of the proposal will be positive, neutral or negative.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant provided at Deadline 1 additional information on field survey. This information was provided in response, in part, to NCC comments in their relevant representation [RR-154]. The updated information is currently being considered by NCC and the Applicant will seek to discuss the issues raised as part of discussions regarding Statements of Common Ground.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>05-02</u>	<u>Survey Locations</u>	<u>There is a very large area which has not been subject to detailed surveys, further clarification to whether these areas are subject to protected species surveys should be sought. Specifically, why the area around the High Marnham Substation has not been surveyed, when access issues were the constraint.</u>	<u>In terms of the High Marnham Substation, National Grid is planning to construct a new substation close to the existing High Marnham substation as part of the North Humber to High Marnham project (case reference EN020034), which is itself part of the Great Grid Upgrade. The latest proposals see the proposed substation lying within the large arable field immediately to the west of the substation.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
--------------	-------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

			<p><u>This means that the habitat that may be affected is a single arable field and potentially its boundary features. As described in paragraph 6.9.2 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [APP-035] the local wildlife site and any other habitats of interest (e.g. hedgerows) would be crossed by trenchless techniques. Therefore, the only potential effects associated with a connection at this point is associated with the loss of arable land. This is not considered a particular constraint from the biodiversity perspective. It is suggested that the use of trenchless techniques may still require loss of hedgerow, scrub etc. However, this would not be the case as access either side of the LWS would (i.e. launch and retrieval pits) would be taken to the south of the LWS using National Grid's existing access road and to the north of the LWS using the existing field entrance (which has been subject to survey).</u></p>	
<u>05-03</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	<p><u>There are 34 LWS within the 2 km study area, one of which occurs within the Site itself, with a further eight immediately adjacent to the Site. Details of those sites that occur either within or adjacent to the Site are summarised in Table 6.3.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant can confirm that currently all areas within fields proposed for solar PV deployment adjacent to LWS are arable fields. They are separated from the adjacent LWS by hedgerows or scrub.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

		<u>However, NCC considered this to be incorrect as Marnham Railway Yard LWS, Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS and Road Wood LWS all fall into the Order Limits Boundary.</u>		
<u>05-04</u>	<u>Survey of Skylarks</u>	<u>Impacts on ground nesting birds, particularly Skylarks, seem to be of greatest concern, but it does not appear that an attempt has been made to estimate how many Skylark territories there will be post-development, with mitigation. Furthermore, with regards to para 6.10.92 of the Biodiversity Chapter, further detail is needed of the extrapolation of Skylark territories has been carried out, given only a quarter of the site was surveyed and the extrapolation from 66 pairs to 115 pairs suggests that half the Limit Order is unsuitable for Skylarks, which seems unlikely. In summary, the approach to breeding birds represents a significant area of concern.</u>	<u>With regards skylark, the mitigation proposed is considered appropriate to provide breeding opportunities to all pairs that may be displaced from the solar array areas. Clarification around this was provided in the update to Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] at Deadline 1 in light of the latest breeding bird data (also see [REP1-034]).</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

05-05	<u>Reptile surveys</u>	<p><u>A sampling approach was used to assess the highest quality habitats within five locations across the Order limits. Grass snake (peak count of 2 adults) and common lizard (peak count of 3 adults) were confirmed to occur within these habitats. However, no reptiles were identified along the Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS. Considering that reptiles were identified to be present within these areas, and therefore present within the order limits, it is unclear why no further surveys undertaken in wider areas.</u></p>	<p><u>Reptile survey was not proposed within the Scoping Report [APP-080]). Following NSDC response to the scoping report, reptile surveys were undertaken. The targeted nature of these surveys was discussed in a meeting held on the 11 March 2024 with the relevant planning authorities. During the meeting it was acknowledged that reptile populations are unlikely to be at particular risk of solar development (allowing for usual mitigation during construction) and that there were long term opportunities to benefit this species group.</u></p> <p><u>Although there were limitations to the survey (mainly due to survey equipment being removed and/or moved by members of the public), neither the outcome of the assessment nor the approach to mitigation or enhancement would change.</u></p> <p><u>As the type or level of mitigation proposed would not likely change regardless of the extent of survey (i.e. sampling all ditches or hedgerow bottoms) the Applicant considers it would be disproportionate to have undertaken a wider survey effort.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
-------	------------------------	--	---	-------------------------

05-06	Baseline Bat Survey Approach	NCC is unclear as to why static 10 for the bat baseline survey was positioned outside of the Order Limits and seek clarification to why only of the locations 2 (locations 11 and 12) incorporated arable fields, when this forms the majority of the on-site habitats.	The Applicant is content that the bat data provided is adequate to understand the types of bats present within the Order Limits and their general level of activity both in habitats where you would typically expect to record higher levels of activity (e.g. woodland edge) and low levels of activity (within arable fields). Further data collection would not alter the approach to design, mitigation or enhancement as the retention and buffering of habitats of most interest to bats have largely been retained. The enhancements proposed will be beneficial for bats by providing more connection and structure in the landscape and by providing better feeding opportunities.	Under discussion
05-07	Impacts on badgers	The preference is for suitability sized holes rather than gates to be used to facilitate movement of badgers around the order limits.	Noted – environmental measure C9 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] allows for either. C9 was updated to remove references to gates at Deadline 1.	Agreed
05-08	Environmental Measures	C13 - This type of fencing would not stop animals from entering active works. Other methods of mitigation need to be considered.	Environmental measures C13, C15, C16, C19, C20, C24 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] were updated at Deadline 1.	Under discussion

		<p><u>C15 – Not considered sufficient – would also disturb ground nesting birds too much. Mitigation to prevent nesting birds should be undertaken - i.e. cutting of any longer grassland habitats or other vegetation outside of the nesting bird season and then management of any grassland swards to a low height to deter nesting (grassland habitats) Areas of habitats such as scrub, hedgerows etc should be cut in the reptile active period, immediately following suitable nesting bird surveys by experienced Ecologists.</u></p> <p><u>C16 – Are these areas going to be protected once these works have been completed – they need to be fenced or have a specific phasing to prevent any encroachment during construction and decommissioning.</u></p> <p><u>C17 – To be created 12 months prior to the installation of the modules. What protection are these going to have? Management works to the grassland during the establishment period will need to be undertaken which could impact any skylark nests</u></p> <p><u>C18 – Consideration of different types to be created currently all will just be sown with a species rich grassland Could some be made with sandy substrate and have an acid grassland mix created?</u></p>	<p><u>Detailed management of grassland being primarily established for skylark will be provided in the LEMP. Appropriate measures (such as timing of management measures) will be detailed and subject to local planning authority approval via Requirement 8 of the draft DCO.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant notes the request for use of imported sand to create some beetle banks. This request would be considered during detailed design, noting that dependent on scale this could have implications with regard over aspects such as number of HGV movements.</u></p> <p><u>Assumptions have been made regarding hedgerow loss as the exact placement of access points is not confirmed. The design focuses on existing gateways and hedgerow gaps, but extent of enlargement needed to accommodate the 6m access tracks have not been measured. Therefore, a precautionary loss (assuming 6m loss at each access point through a hedgerow) has been assumed.</u></p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>C19 & 20 – Clarification sought for the numbers to be used and locations. 50 and 25 doesn't seem to be enough</p> <p>C24 – 50 including 3 barn owl boxes doesn't seem to be enough</p>	<p>Fencing of the solar panels has been specified to minimise habitat loss, whilst also creating coherent areas for management and operation.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

Table 07 – Traffic and Transport

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>07-01</u>	<u>Access strategy used for construction access</u>	<u>NCC queried the access strategy, in particular, the bypass of Ragnall.</u>	<u>The Applicant is preparing further details on A57 access junction and bypassing of Ragnall and will provide this to NCC post a Stage 1 RSA of the A57 junction</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>07-02</u>	<u>Access junction drawings</u>	<u>NCC requested that all access drawing be appended to the TA.</u>	<u>The Applicant has updated the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21.1] with the access junction drawings.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>07-03</u>	<u>Road Safety Audits</u>	<u>NCC have requested a Stage 1 RSA at Gates A and H (A57 and Roadwood Lane)</u>	<u>The Applicant has drafted a Stage 1 RSA Briefing for NCC to approve, prior to the RSA being undertaken.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>07-04</u>	<u>Barred Routes</u>	<u>NCC noted concerns about roads not on the barred routes and that this could allow traffic to bypass the suggested routes and lead to under estimates in the impact review.</u>	<u>The Applicant has updated the barred routes in the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21.1] and oCTMP [EN010159/APP/7.9] to address the NCC comments and understand that matters relating to routing and traffic impacts are addressed by these changes.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>07-05</u>	<u>Passing Places</u>	<u>NCC have requested passing place details for Crabtree Land and Moor Lane.</u>	<u>The Applicant has provided plans illustrating passing place provision on both</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

			roads in the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21.1]	
07-06	Wear & Tear Agreement	NCC request that the oCTMP includes a Wear & Tear Agreement and that this includes drain gullies within 500m of an access point	The oCTMP [EN010159/APP/7.9] has been updated to include this.	Under discussion
07-07	Accident data	NCC requests that the accident data is updated to summer 2025	The Applicant will provide an update to the Transport Assessment at Deadline 2.	Under discussion
07-08	Staff Travel Plan	NCC requested further details on travel plan monitoring and remedial actions.	The oCTMP [EN010159/APP/7.9] has been updated to include this.	Under discussion

Table 08 – DCO Requirements

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
08-01	Timeframe for requirements	NCC considers that notification of a decision within 10 weeks as a standard approach is insufficient. NCC is particularly concerned with the resourcing of such requirements and therefore consider that a more appropriate default period equating to Major Environment Impact Assessment development for a planning application of 16 weeks is more appropriate. Whilst NCC note that Part 2(c) includes for the ability to agree an alternate period, the expectation for 10 weeks would be set by its inclusion in the standard wording. The project is significant in size and scale and the information submitted for many of the requirements is likely to involve a significant amount of information and an appropriate time period must be afforded for NCC to consider this. This issue would be compounded by the combination of other NSIP projects within the county (an outlined briefly in Section 2), should they gain development consent. These projects follow a similar timeline and will place cumulative pressure on the statutory functions of the planning department.	The Applicant is discussing this, and hoping to have a meeting with all LPAs on this matter.	Under discussion

08-02	<u>Fee Structure</u>	<p><u>NCC notes that where an application to discharge a requirement is made a fee is to apply and must be paid to the relevant planning authority for each application. However, the fees vary significantly between each requirement. In relation to those requirements where NCC is the relevant planning authority, the highest fee of £2535 applies to Requirements 7 (Battery Safety Management), 12 (Archaeology), 18 (PROW Management Plan) and 19 (Soil Management Plan). Whereas Requirements 11 (Surface and Foul Water Drainage) and 15 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) would be subject to a fee of £145. This fee is considered to be too low and the rationale for adopting a differential approach between requirements is not clear. NCC would recommend applying the same fee structure to all of its requirements, unless evidence can be provided to the contrary. The costs to the council should be adequately covered through a suitable fee structure in the DCO and the fees should also be index linked from the date of the DCO.</u></p>	<p><u>The fees set out in Schedule 15, paragraph 5(2) are £2578 for the first application of the discharge of requirements 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19. Any other requirements are £298 – this relates to R3 (phasing plan), 6 (community liaison group), 9 (BNG), 11 (drainage), 15 (CTMP), 16 (operational noise), 17 (skills, supply chain and employment), and 21 (ground conditions). These listed requirements are expected to typically be less onerous to discharge, having regard to the amount of material likely to be submitted, and the complexity of the subject matter. The approach taken is fairly well established for Orders made in Lincolnshire.</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 5(3) is included to ensure fees captured within the Schedule are updated to increase in line with inflation, as per the regulatory approach.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>
-------	----------------------	--	---	--------------------------------

Table 09 – Flood and Drainage

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>09-01</u>	<u>Surface Water Runoff from Solar Farm Areas</u>	<u>Applicant to consider how surface water runoff from the solar farm areas will be managed through the use of vegetated areas and also strategic SuDS features to encourage natural infiltration.</u>	<u>The approach to management of surface water runoff from the solar farm areas is under discussion and pending update from NCC's consultant within their anticipated Addendum on flood risk submitted at Deadline 2.</u>	<u>Under Discussion</u>
<u>09-02</u>	<u>Surface Water Runoff from BESS and Substation Areas</u>	<u>Inspection and maintenance of vegetated cover and any SuDS to be considered.</u>	<u>The approach to management of surface water runoff from the BESS and Substation areas under discussion and pending update from NCC's consultant within their anticipated Addendum on flood risk submitted at Deadline 2.</u>	<u>Under Discussion</u>
<u>09-03</u>	<u>Firewater Containment</u>	<u>Applicant to consider how surface water runoff from the BESS and Substation areas will be managed in line with local policy requirements.</u>	<u>The approach to management of firewater runoff has been agreed and is in line with that set out within the FRA as well as within Section 5 of the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan.</u>	<u>Under Discussion</u>

Table 10 – Waste Management

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>10-01</u>	<u>Assessment Methodology</u>	<u>NCC agree with the assessment methodology proposed by the Applicant.</u>	<u>Noted.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>10-02</u>	<u>Future hazardous and non-hazardous capacity</u>	<p><u>The Council considers that future hazardous and non-hazardous capacity in Nottinghamshire is more uncertain, with the Table 11 of emerging Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan, as modified by the main modifications proposed following examination, identifying a deficit in non-hazardous disposal capacity by 2038.</u></p> <p><u>As raised in paragraph 5.58 and paragraphs 7.38 – 7.41 of the emerging Plan, due to underlying geology of the area and wider environmental constraints, the scope to provide hazardous and non-hazardous capacity in Nottinghamshire is extremely unlikely. It is noted that the assessment considers the capacity in the East Midlands area for non-hazardous and nationally for hazardous, but we believe that the applicant should recognise the potential that non-hazardous capacity could be significantly reduced in the future.</u></p>	<p><u>As outlined in Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082] paragraph 1.6.7, the sensitivity of waste relates to availability of landfill capacity in the absence of the Proposed Development as outlined in the IEMA Guidance, “landfill capacity is recognised as an unsustainable and increasingly scarce option for managing waste.”</u></p> <p><u>As outlined in paragraph 1.6.9 waste receptor sensitivity is determined as “very high” and a worst-case scenario for sensitivity is considered for landfill capacity. The criteria for very high is: “the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>expected to reduce very considerably (by >10%);</u> 	<u>Under Discussion</u>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>end during construction or operation;</u><u>is already known to be unavailable; or would require new capacity or infrastructure to be put in place to meet forecast demand”</u> <p><u>The recognition of the potential that non-hazardous capacity could be significantly reduced in the future was therefore inherent in the waste assessment.</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

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