

One Earth Solar Farm

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District Council

EN010159/APP/8.5.1

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	13
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council	13
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	4
3. Record of Engagement	5
3.1 Summary of Consultation	5
4. Current Position	6
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council	6

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 Bassetlaw District Council.

1.2.2 Bassetlaw 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 Bassetlaw 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 Bassetlaw 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 Bassetlaw 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 Bassetlaw District Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
General Catch Ups		
25 th August 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial introductions to the Project
25 th August 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council
11 th March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	• 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)	• Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team; • Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing
9 th October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	• Masterplan and programme update • Adequacy of Consultation Milestone • Statement of Common Ground
1 st May 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps
Cultural Heritage		
29 th - 30 th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation on scope of cultural heritage assessment and discussion

of proposed scope of heritage
photomontages.

30 th April 2024	Correspondence (email)	Confirmation from Bassetlaw that the range of heritage assets are correctly identified.
21 st 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 <u>Ragnall</u> 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. <u>Fledborough</u> 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.

21st August 2024

Correspondence (email)

Bassetlaw Conservation Officer sharing Site Visit findings focused on mitigation and topography variance around Whimpton Moor Scheduled Ancient Monument. Response also included advice on Ragnall regarding the now included setback to the east of Main Street and topography review to the north of the Churchyard. Confirmation from the Officer that the impact to Flebrorough would not be directly visual.

19th November 2024

Meeting (Virtual)

Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusions of heritage impact and 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

27th November 2024 Email

Information was provided to Bassetlaw District Council relating to land and groundwater contamination issues.

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 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.

10th December 2024 Email

Response from Applicant (to all local planning authorities) further explaining the reasons for the amendments to the methodology.

16th 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. The response from Bassetlaw District Council was to pass this query onto Nottinghamshire County Council, therefore indicating

that a dataset of this type is not held by Bassetlaw District Council.

Landscape and Visual

22nd April 2024

Virtual meeting

Key Topics:

- LVIA methodology
- LVIA Study Area
- Landscape receptors
- Visual receptors
- Representative viewpoints
- Photomontages

Key Outcomes:

- 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
- Follow-up meeting to be scheduled following publication of the PEIR

14th November 2024

Virtual meeting

Key topics:

- ZTV parameters
- LVIA study area
- LVIA criteria
- Scope of receptors
- Scope of cumulative assessment

Key outcomes:

- Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR

		Outstanding issues to be provided as an interim note
19 th November 2024	Virtual meeting and 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 01 – Record of Engagement

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council

4.1.1 The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw 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 – Human Health

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	Cross referencing human health with other chapters	Human Health Chapter to also include cross-references to the following assessments: • 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;	Set out under “Other Environmental Matters” in section 16.6 of this chapter	Under Discussion

		• Land and Soils Chapter – Impacts on land quality; • Air Quality Chapter – Impacts on human health from traffic, plant and dust during the Construction Phase and the Decommissioning Phase; • Noise and Vibration Chapter – Impacts on noise and vibration levels from traffic and operations		
--	--	---	--	--

Table 03 – Cultural Heritage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Setting of Whimpton Moor Scheduled Ancient Monument	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]. Further analysis conducted on the informative setting of the asset and enhanced mitigation.	Under Discussion
03-02	Impact to assets located in Ragnall	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]. Further discussion held with Officers on Site and additional research undertaken. Proposed Development includes additional mitigation and full assessment of potential effects undertaken in ES Chapter 10 [APP-039, paragraphs 10.6.104 - 10.6.114	Under Discussion
03-03	Impact to setting of	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Under Discussion

	assets in Fledborough		Site visit has been undertaken with Officers to review setting of assets and further mitigation incorporated.	
03- 04	Local Impact Report	Impact of Proposed Development will be detailed in Local Impact Report	Awaiting Local Impact Report to further understanding and further discussions.	Under Discussion

Table 04 – Air Quality

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	ES Chapter Comments	Dust during Construction: The construction phase could generate dust, which could adversely affect air quality and the health of nearby residents. Measures to mitigate dust emissions, such as water spraying, dust screens, and monitoring, should be thoroughly evaluated and implemented.	As presented in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13 – Air Quality [APP-042], a construction dust risk assessment was undertaken to identify the level of mitigation required to ensure there are no significant effects from dust and particulate emissions during construction. The 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].	Under Discussion

Table 05 – Land and Groundwater

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	Methodology for Land and Groundwater assessment	No response received	In the absence of further queries, the methodology put forward by the Applicant was adhered to in the assessment of land and groundwater receptors, without any subsequent queries or concerns on the assessment having been submitted by Bassetlaw District Council	Under Discussion
05-02	Request for private water supply data	Response indicates that this dataset would be held by Nottinghamshire County Council, if available.	No data on private water supplies are held by Bassetlaw District Council, so no further action is required on this matter	Under Discussion

Table 06 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
06-01	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

06-02	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 25th June 2025 which included visiting several of the locations of the supplementary photographs previously provided, confirming that they are representative.	Agreed
06-03	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
06-04	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

06-05	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
06-06	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
06-07	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

06-08	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 25th 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
06-09	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. 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.	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. It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.	Under discussion
06-10	Approach to assessing cumulative	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	A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25th June 2025 whereby the potential for significant cumulative effects were discussed.	Under discussion

	landscape and visual impacts	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.	It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further.	
06-11	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 and maintenance post any approval, and include: - 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	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

		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		
--	--	---	--	--

Table 07 – Noise and Vibration

<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>Operational Noise Assessment</u>	<u>Further details on plant/mitigation will be required to ensure noise nuisance complaints do not arise from the operation of the solar farm. Whilst the report provides baseline noise monitoring for the development site, the location/type of plant to be incorporated within the development has yet to be firmed up.</u>	<u>Noted.</u>	<u>Under discussion.</u>

07-02	<u>Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment</u>	<u>Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment. Currently it seems that the development phase has the potential to give rise to nuisance complaints from existing residents from trenching, construction of the access track, piling etc. Further details will be required on the specific techniques to be applied and likely mitigation to ensure that impact is reduced appropriately.</u>	<u>Specific measures for the control of construction noise will be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). An Outline CEMP has been provided with the application documents [APP-176]. The Outline CEMP includes consideration of measures to limit the potential impact of noise during construction, and will be developed further, in discussion with the Local Authorities, as further details of the precise construction plant and equipment required, construction methods to be employed, etc. become available. Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO [APP-007] secures that prior to construction, a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Since the CEMP will be submitted once further details of the methods of construction, equipment types needed, durations of specific activities, etc. are available, it will be possible to provide greater detail on noise mitigation measures at that stage. The submitted CEMP(s) are therefore the most appropriate place for detailed discussion of noise mitigation measures.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
-------	--	--	--	-------------------------

07-03	Baseline noise survey locations	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	The baseline noise survey was carried out at locations that were agreed as being appropriate (as shown in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [APP-044] and Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	Under discussion
07-04	Baseline noise survey results	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	Sufficient data was gathered at each of the baseline noise monitoring locations to form an appropriate basis for the noise assessment (see Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	Under discussion
07-05	Study areas	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	The respective study areas and the associated sensitive receptors identified are appropriate for the basis of the following assessments: Construction traffic noise and vibration; On-site construction noise and vibration; Operational noise.	Under discussion
07-06	Standards and guidance	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	The appropriate standards and guidance have been referenced for the following aspects of the assessment: Construction traffic noise and vibration; On-site construction noise and vibration; Operational noise.	Under discussion

07-07	Significance criteria	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	Appropriate significance criteria have been adopted for the assessment of the significance of effects associated with: Construction traffic noise and vibration; On-site construction noise and vibration; Operational noise.	
07-08	Control of noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	Potential noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). An outline CTMP has been included as part of the application documents [APP-181], for further discussion and agreement.	Under discussion
07-09	Control of on-site construction noise and vibration	Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council	Potential impacts of on-site construction noise and vibration can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). An outline CEMP has been included as part of the application documents [APP-176], for further discussion and agreement.	Under discussion

<u>07-10</u>	<u>Control of operational noise</u>	<u>Internal discussions ongoing within Bassetlaw District Council</u>	<u>Potential impacts of operational noise can be controlled by condition. A noise condition, based on appropriate standards and guidance, has been proposed.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
--------------	-------------------------------------	---	--	-------------------------

Table 08 – DCO Requirements

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>08-01</u>	<u>Discharge of Requirements</u>	<u>Further to comments made within this report, it is considered that as this is a cross boundary application site, covering three local authorities and two County Councils, the Local Planning Authority request that in the event of a DCO consent, a period of at least 13 weeks is given to consider all applications to discharge conditions. This is respectfully requested as the submission to approve conditions will require each authority to discuss and agree the scheme in order to get the best outcome for this large cross boundary proposal. It is also requested that the proposed application fees shall reflect officers time spent reaching a decision on those matters.</u>	<u>Meeting to be organised to discuss this further with Bassetlaw District Council and the Applicant.</u>	<u>Under discussion.</u>

Table 09 – Ecology and Biodiversity

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Description of Matter</u>	<u>Stakeholder Comment</u>	<u>Applicant's Response</u>	<u>Status</u>
09-01	<u>The approach and delivery of ecological data is sufficient to inform a robust assessment and BNG calculation</u>	<u>BDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-087] that that full details of survey methods and field survey results have been provided within the application documents.</u>	<u>The Applicant provided a range of desk study and field survey information at application and updated this at Deadline 1 (see Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</u> <u>The information provided has been appropriate to inform the mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements described in table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] and enable the conclusions reached on the significance of potential effects in Table 6.11.</u> <u>All potential effects assessed were either Not Significant or were Significant Beneficial. Overall, the Proposed Development would have a positive effect on biodiversity.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

09-02	<u>Biodiversity Net Gain outcomes</u>	<u>BDC question whether grassland underneath solar panels can be considered to reach modified grassland in good condition within their Local Impact Report [REP1-087].</u>	<u>The Applicant responded to this question in the 'Applicants response to relevant representations' [REP1-075] (relevant representation number RR 135).</u> <u>The Applicant notes that other Development Consent Order projects have recieved consent with more ambitious target conditions (e.g. other neutral grassland in moderate condition), whilst others use grass seed mixes with no wildflower component to achieve target conditions of modified grassland in moderate condition.</u> <u>The Applicant is confident with the correct seed mixes and management that achieving the following criteria is possible:</u> <u>More than 6 species can be established under solar panels using a shade and drought tolerant mix</u> <u>Sward height can be managed to ensure variance in height</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
-------	---------------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------

			• <u>Scrub can be controlled to ensure it accounts for less than 20%</u> • <u>Physical damage of grassland is less than 5%</u> • <u>Bare ground can be controlled to be within 1 and 10%</u> • <u>Bracken can be controlled to be less than 20% cover</u> • <u>Invasive non-native plant species can be controlled if they occur.</u>	
<u>09-03</u>	<u>Delivery of BNG and other biodiversity enhancements</u>	<u>BDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-087] that ‘On balance then it appears the impact of the Proposed Development will from an ecological perspective be positive; local wildlife sites will be buffered, landscape connectivity improved, a variety of habitats enhanced, and new higher quality habitats created. The Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain.’</u>	<u>The Applicant concludes within Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] in Table 6.11 that the potential effects on biodiversity will either be Not Significant or Significant Beneficial.</u> <u>Overall, the Proposed Development would have a positive effect on biodiversity and contribute towards local</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>



			conservation priorities on a landscape scale.	
--	--	--	---	--

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Bassetlaw District Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



one earth
solar farm

Contact

Name

Email

Number