

One Earth Solar Farm

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

EN010159/APP/8.6.1

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 | 16 |
| 4.1 Position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council | 16 |
| 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 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District Council.
- 1.2.2 Newark and Sherwood District Council is one of the host authorities for the application, and the remainder of the host authorities have separate Statements of Common Ground.
- 1.2.3 Collectively, the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3 Purpose of this document

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

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

1.3.3 Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4 Terminology

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

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

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

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

2. Description of the Proposed Development

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

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

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

3. Record of Engagement

3.1 Summary of Consultation

- 3.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation throughout the early stages of the Proposed Development. Table 01 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council in relation to the Application.

| Date | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| General Catch Ups | | |
| 7th July 2023 | Meeting (Virtual) | Initial Introductions to the Project |
| 7 th July 2023 – Ongoing | Correspondence (Email) | Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council |
| 22nd August 2023 | Meeting (Virtual) | Follow-up introduction meeting to the Project |
| 1st November 2023 | Meeting (Virtual) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project briefing for new officer • PPA Discussion |
| 8th February 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | Statement of Community Consultation Briefing |

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 11 th March 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project overview • Ecology Survey programme overview • Summary of habitat information • Summary of bat surveys • Summary of bird surveys (breeding and wintering) • Summary of badger, otter and water vole surveys • Summary of great crested newt surveys • Identifying local conservation priorities (to include within landscape design) • Approach to BNG, incorporating local priority species |
| 19 th April 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development |
| 8 th May 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | Discussion around socio-economic impacts |
| 14 th May 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | Consultation briefing including an update on EIA, the masterplan and consultation programme |
| 12 th July 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team; • Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing |
| 9 th October 2024 | Meeting (Virtual) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan and programme update • Adequacy of Consultation Milestone |

- Statement of Common Ground

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

Cultural Heritage

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

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

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

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------|---|
| 21st August 2024 | Meeting (On Site) | <p>Discussion of the Proposed Development post PEIR consultation responses. Review of the potential effects and mitigation in relation to assets in North and South Clifton, and Thorney.</p> <p>Outcome: NSDC confirmed approach taken to North and South Clifton was suitable. Confirmation that assessment of views north would be cross referenced against the LVIA</p> <p>Outcome: NSDC confirmed no impact to assets within Thorney due</p> |
|------------------|-------------------|---|

to distance from the Order Limits and lack of visibility.

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

Air Quality

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

Ground Conditions

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

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

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

2 December 2024

Email

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

10 December 2024

Email

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

16 June 2025

Email

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

Landscape and Visual

22nd March 2024

Technical Memorandum
(AAH TM01)

Key Topics:

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

Key Outcomes:

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

Highlighted need to assess impacts
on heritage assets and railway views

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 22 nd April 2024 | Virtual meeting | <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LVIA methodology • LVIA Study Area • Landscape receptors • Visual receptors • Representative viewpoints • Photomontages <p>Key Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for LVIA study area refinement to be detailed in the LVIA • Suggestion of ZTV approach and agreement to share drafts for comment • Comments on consultation note to be provided in writing <p>Follow-up meeting to be scheduled following publication of the PEIR</p> |
| 9th July 2024 | Technical Memorandum (AAH TM02) | <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) • Project overview: 740MW solar farm across 1500Ha • Design evolution and consultation feedback • Landscape and visual baseline conditions • Use of Rochdale Envelope principle • Assessment of construction, operation, and decommissioning impacts |

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

Key Outcomes:

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

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

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 14 th November 2024 | Virtual meeting | <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LVIA Study Area• Emerging design parameters• Approach to solar replacement• Scope of representative viewpoints• Ancient woodland, and veteran or ancient trees <p>Key Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|

Written comments to be provided as technical memorandum

18th November 2024 Technical Memorandum
(AAH TM05)

Key Topics:

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

Key Outcomes:

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

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

19th August 2025

Virtual meeting

Key Topics

- Approach to visual assessment
- Impacts on landscape character areas
- Approach to cumulative assessment

- Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
- Residential Visual Amenity Assessment

Key Outcomes

- Applicant to provide written clarifications on approach to visual assessment for NSDC to review.
- NSDC to review assessment on landscape character areas to determine if varying levels of effect is justified.
- NSDC to review Joint Interrelationships Report [REP1-074] submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1 to understand the approach to cumulative assessment across the wider ES.
- Applicant to review how a detailed planting plan will be secured in the DCO
- NSDC to review updated OLEMP [REP1-053] submitted at Deadline 1 to check if suggested items have been appropriately addressed.
- NSDC to review approach to Residential Assessment and Design [REP1-077] to understand how Residential Visual Amenity has been considered.

Table 01 – Record of Engagement

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council

- 4.1.1 The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council, following a series of meetings and discussions with respect to the key areas of the Proposed Development. This includes matters where discussions are ongoing.
- 4.1.2 As noted above, this is a 'live' document, and some aspects have yet to be agreed upon between both parties. The intention is to provide a final position in subsequent versions of the SoCG, addressing and identifying where changes have been made, and ultimately, documenting agreement by both parties on relevant points.

Table 02 – Cultural Heritage

| Ref. | Description of Matter | Stakeholder Comment | Applicant's Response | Status |
|-------|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| 02-01 | Scope of Assessment of NDHAs | Written comments received on 12 th March 2024 confirmed NSDC are in agreement with scope shown in Table 10.6 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039] | Noted. | Agreed |
| 02-02 | Scope of Assessment | Request of a full assessment of impact and detailed mitigation of Proposed Development within the ES Chapter. | Full assessment was provided in ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] and Technical Appendix 10.2 [APP-127 and APP-128]. | Agreed |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| 02-03 | Query on Phrasing of introduction text | The phrasing which has been applied to all heritage assets within the district states: 'Significance heavily linked and similarity of potential effects.' This statement reveals the strong impact and significance of the assets the proposed development will have on these heritage assets. The impact of the project is heavily linked to their significance. | <p>For clarity, the quoted phrasing is located within the tabulated introduction pages [14-19] of the Technical Appendix (ref. App-128). The purpose and context of this text is the grouping of assets for assessment later in the report and in the ES Chapter (APP-039). The phrasing is not assessing the value (significance) or effects, nor does it imply that the Proposed Development would affect these assets.</p> <p>The assessment of effects occurs within the Technical Appendix (ref. App-128) and ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | Under Discussion |
| 02-04 | Perceived impact to Church of St George the Martyr and Church of St Helen | Further consideration required on setting of both assets and further mitigation required – specifically for the impact on Church of St Georgie the Martyr, and Church of St Helen. | <p><u>Church of St George the Martyr</u> Effects of the Proposed Development on St George the Martyr are located within paragraphs 4.136 – 4.139, page 66 of Technical Appendix 10.3 [APP-128] and paragraphs 10.9.9 and 10.6.98.100 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039].</p> <p><u>St Helen Church</u> This asset has been assessed in ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) at paragraphs 10.6.7 and</p> | Under Discussion |

| | | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | <p>10.6.126, in paragraph 4.191 of the Technical Appendix [APP-128].</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping [Figure 10.3 (APP-055)], the Proposed Development would hold no visibility.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | |
| 02-05 | Ruins of Old Church in Churchyard | Recommendation of further mitigation to protect any views. | <p>This asset has been assessed in ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) at paragraphs 10.6.7 and 10.6.126 and on page 85 of Appendix 10.2 (grouped with other assets in Thorney, as agreed with stakeholders – see Table 10.5 [APP-128]).</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility, there would be no impact to the value (significance) of this asset, further mitigation is not required as no harm can feasibly exist which requires screening.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | Under Discussion |

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 02-06 | Lychgate at Church of St George | “Impact of proposal This listing would not be as impacted as the Church of St George due to its location, but it still forms part of the wider setting.... Recommended Mitigation None would be required for this heritage asset.” | <p>The Zone of Theoretical visibility (Figure 10.3 [APP-055]) confirms no intervisibility of the Proposed Development. There would be no effect on the appreciation of the church, churchyard and lychgate</p> <p>Therefore, this asset would not change the assessed effects (or lack thereof) on the Church of St George the Martyr (Grade II*).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | Under Discussion |
| 02-07 | Fledborough Viaduct | The impact of solar panels either side would be detrimental to the wider setting of the viaduct. | <p>No solar arrays are to be located on either side of the viaduct as the land is not included within the Order Limits. It is unclear which northern small parcel is recommended for removal; to clarify the nearest Order Limit north of the Site is at c.660m.</p> <p>As noted within paragraphs 10.6.68 – 10.6.71 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039], the industrial historic interest of the asset is not reliant on views of a particular character of the landscape to understand its value.</p> <p>The Proposed Development would hold a negligible neutral effect and result in no change to the contribution of the wider setting to asset’s value.</p> | Agreed |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3] | |
| 02-08 | Firs Farmhouse (Grade II) | Small strip of the solar farm seems encroach towards the heritage asset | Figure 10.1 [APP-055] of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] confirms that the Order Limits stand at c.930m to the west of this asset. There is no stretch of the Order Limits which stand within the vicinity of the asset and no harm will arise. Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3] | Agreed |
| 02-09 | Hall Farmhouse (North Clifton. Grade II, NHLE: 1302529) | There may be possible views from this heritage asset. | As illustrated within Viewpoint 25a (Figure 11.13.7 ^a [APP-068]) and assessed at paragraph 10.6.96 of ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039), the Order Limits would stand distant from the asset and hold no intervisibility | Under Discussion |
| 02-10 | Trent Lane Farmhouse (North Clifton. Grade II, NHLE: 1369937) | There will be views in nearby field. Recommended mitigation suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset. | The Order Limits would stand at distance from the asset (over 280m to the north), would not backdrop views of this asset from the Viaduct, and would hold no adverse effect on the appreciation of the asset as an agriculture farmhouse. | Under Discussion |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | <p>No harm is identified and therefore no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | |
| 02-11 | The Old Manor House (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1046018) | Mitigation Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset. | <p>The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | Under Discussion |
| 02-12 | Thorney War Memorial. (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1462827) | Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation. | <p>Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | Under Discussion |
| 02-13 | Cottage at Thorney Hall (Thorney. | Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation. | <p>Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of</p> | Under Discussion |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|--|--|-------------------------|
| | Grade II, NHLE: 1369961) | | <p>the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | |
| 02-14 | House at Thorney Hall. (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1046017) | Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation. | <p>Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3]</p> | Under Discussion |
| 02-15 | Summary of response | Request for further information on the impacts to the Church of St George the Martyr, and Fledborough Viaduct. | <p>Further information provided to support the assessment that the Proposed Development would not be seen in views of St George the Martyr from the Viaduct.</p> <p>Confirmation of where the assets mentioned have been assessed within ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] and accompanying appendices has been provided to demonstrate that there would be no harmful effects to any of these assets and, as such, no further mitigation is required.</p> | Under Discussion |

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

Table 02 – Air Quality

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

Table 03 – Ground Conditions

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

Table 04 – Landscape and Visual

| Ref. | Description of Matter | Stakeholder Comment | Applicant's Response | Status |
|-------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 04-01 | LVIA methodology <u>with regard to landscape assessment</u> – | <p>On review of a revised LVIA methodology submitted by the applicant in November 2024, AAH Consultants noted that <u>it with regard to landscape assessment it</u> appears to be in conformity with the approach adopted at the PEIR, which was accepted as best-practice.</p> <p>While the methodology overall is considered acceptable, AAH Consultants judge that the visual assessment does not fully align with guidance provided within LI Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01. This clarification by the LI clearly states that the focus of a visual assessment should be on visual receptors, with viewpoints being utilised to illustrate potential views. The visual assessment only focusses on a static viewpoint for the assessment and does not fully consider the experience of a receptor, such as a walker along a PROW, or driver along a road.</p> | <p>LVIA methodology <u>with regard to landscape assessment</u> is largely agreed and is considered to be in accordance with industry guidance. but discussion is on-going with regard to approach to visual assessment.</p> | <u>Under discussion Agreed</u> |

| | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|--|--|---------------|
| 04-02 | LVIA Study Area | <p>AAH Consultants commented that effects beyond 2km had not been considered fully at the PEIR as all the proposed viewpoints were located within the 2km LVIA Study Area, despite the ZTV showing the potential for visibility beyond 2km.</p> <p>In response, photographs from 8 locations were provided by the applicant to test the judgement of no significant visibility beyond 2km.</p> <p>AAH Consultants welcomed these photographs but questioned the location of some of them in terms of representativeness of the receptor.</p> | The LVIA 2km Study Area is agreed following a site visit between the applicant and AAH Consultants on 25 th June 2025 which included visiting several of the locations of the supplementary photographs previously provided, confirming that they are representative. | Agreed |
| 04-03 | Scope of landscape receptors | <p>The inclusion of Thorney as a Local Village Character Area following feedback on the PEIR was welcomed.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of landscape receptors have been raised to date.</p> | <p>The scope of landscape receptors is agreed.</p> <p>The scope of landscape receptors was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.</p> | Agreed |
| 04-04 | Scope of visual receptors | <p>Additional visual receptors were suggested following review of the PEIR.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of visual receptors have been raised to date.</p> | <p>The scope of visual receptors is agreed.</p> <p>The scope of visual receptors was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.</p> | Agreed |
| 04-05 | Scope of representative viewpoints | The location of some of the representative viewpoints were questioned and additional viewpoints | The scope of representative viewpoints is agreed. | Agreed |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | <p>were suggested following review of the PEIR.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of representative viewpoints have been raised.</p> | <p>The scope of representative viewpoints was updated in the LVIA ES Chapter to include for the suggested additions and refinements.</p> | |
| 04-06 | Scope of photomontages | <p>An additional Type 4 photomontage was suggested from Viewpoint 58 following review of the PEIR.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of representative viewpoints have been raised.</p> | <p>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.</p> | Agreed |
| 04-07 | Assessment assumptions and limitations | <p>The approach to solar panel replacement during the operation phase was questioned following review of the PEIR.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the assumptions and limitations have been raised.</p> | <p>The assumptions and limitations of the LVIA are agreed.</p> <p>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.</p> | Agreed |
| 04-08 | Level of effect on landscape receptors | <p>The number of significant adverse effects identified in the applicant's assessment was noted as being of initial concern, but more detailed evaluation will be included in the Local Impact Report.</p> <p>The LIR clarifies that several landscape character areas that will have direct effects of development at all phases have not been judged to have Significant</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>Following the publication of the Council's Local Impact Report, further discussion was had on the level of effects on landscape receptors. It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before</p> | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | 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. | discussing further. <u>Council will review in more detail the judgements on the landscape character areas t–hat will be directly affected as a result of the Proposed Development to determine if the varying levels of effects are fully justified.</u> | |
| 04-09 | Level of effect on visual receptors | <p>The number of significant adverse effects identified in the applicant's assessment was noted as being of initial concern, but more detailed evaluation will be included in the Local Impact Report.</p> <p>The visual assessment does not fully account for sequential views from receptors and is overall focussed on a static viewpoint, describing the existing view and change to that view, therefore has the potential to underplay visual effects.</p> | <p>A productive meeting was held between the applicant and AAH consultants on 25th June 2025 whereby some level of effects on some visual receptors were discussed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from<u>Following the publication of the Council's Local Impact Report, before discussing further. – further discussion was had on the level of effect of visual receptors. It was agreed that the Council would review the visual assessment in light of the written clarifications provided by the applicant with regard to the approach.</u></p> | Under discussion |
| 04-10 | 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, | 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. | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | <p>Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge.</p> <p>The LIR clarifies the Council's position in regards to cumulative effects – the concern covers the change across the region (Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire), across multiple character areas. The development of solar and other energy infrastructure is a marked and extensive change to land-use. This will be a defining and key feature of the future landscape character of these regions.</p> | <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from <u>Following the publication of the Council's Local Impact Report, further discussion was had around the approach to assessing cumulative and visual impacts. It was agreed that the Council would review the Joint Interrelationships Report submitted at Deadline 1 to understand the approach to cumulative assessment across the ES. before discussing further.</u></p> <p>-</p> | |
| 04-11 | Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP) | <p>The reduction in significant landscape and visual effects was noted as relying upon the successful establishment of the mitigation planting. It was also suggested that active ongoing management of mitigation features should be included for the lifetime of the facility and clearly set out in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.</p> <p>The OLEMP must be explicit (currently it is not) in regards to the landscape mitigation scheme and maintenance post any approval, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of detailed planting proposals that must be approved by the relevant authority; | <p><u>The OLEMP was updated at Deadline 1 to provide greater clarity surrounding these items. It was agreed that the Council would Outline details of the mitigation proposals, including species selection and monitoring of management prescriptions, is provided in the OLEMP.</u></p> <p>Replacement of plants that fail to establish within the first five years is also secured within the OLEMP.</p> <p>It was agreed that the applicant will await further clarity from the Council's Local Impact Report before discussing further. <u>review this updated OLEMP to check if the items have been appropriately addressed. It was also</u></p> | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintenance of all planting and ecological features for the life of the project; - Appropriate survey and protection of existing vegetation and trees to BS5837; and - Plant replacements in the initial establishment period, however also include for unforeseen circumstances such as extensive plant dieback, or failure to establish or thrive as expected and allow for plant replacement at any time as required to ensure the mitigation planting is fulfilling its role as mitigation | agreed that the Applicant would consider if the OLEMP could be any more explicit about items to be included in the detailed LEMP. | |
| 04-12 | LVIA methodology with regard to visual assessment | <p>On review of a revised LVIA methodology submitted by the applicant in November 2024, AAH Consultants noted that it appears to be in conformity with the approach adopted at the PEIR, which was accepted as best-practice.</p> <p>While the methodology overall is considered acceptable, AAH Consultants judge that the visual assessment does not fully align with guidance provided within LI Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01. This clarification by the LI clearly states that the focus of a visual assessment should be on visual receptors, with viewpoints being utilised to illustrate potential views. The visual</p> | The methodology has been accepted as aligning with best practice, but discussion remain on-going regarding the approach to static and sequential views. The Applicant has provided clarifications on this matter for the Council to review. | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | <u>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.</u> | | |
| <u>04-13</u> | <u>Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)</u> | <u>RVAA threshold was discussed during the pre-application stage and agreed under AAH TM01. Given the extent of embedded mitigation it is agreed that the RVAA threshold will not be reached, although this should be clearly described within ES Chapter 11.</u> | <p><u>The Applicant drawn NSDC's attention to the clarification provided at Appendix F of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at ISH1 [REP1076]. It was agreed that NSDC will review this to understand how Residential Visual Amenity has been considered.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant also agreed to add a clarification regarding the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold to Chapter 11 for Deadline 2.</u></p> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

Table 05 – 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>Extensive woodland creation cannot be delivered within the Order Limits without compromising other ecological features (e.g. skylark).</u> | <u>NSDC would like to see substantial areas of woodland created within the Order Limits as part of the Proposed Development, as described within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094]</u> | <u>The Applicant addressed this issue within the 'Applicant's response to relevant representations' [REP1-075]. In response to relevant Representation number RR-135 the Applicant states '<i>There is an inherent tension between creation of more woodland for the project which is associated with (a) ensuring that there is enough open habitats to mitigate skylark and (b) avoiding overshadowing areas of PV. It is also noted that the landscape design is currently indicative as the detailed design has not come forward. Opportunities for more tree planting will be considered at the detailed design phase.</i>'</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |
| <u>05-02</u> | <u>The habitat survey information provided is sufficient to</u> | <u>NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1.</u> | <u>The Phase 1 survey / UK Habitats Classification, Habitats Condition Assessment and Hedgerow Survey provide sufficient information for a robust Ecological</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | <u>inform a robust assessment and BNG calculation</u> | | <p><u>Impact Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.</u></p> <p><u>The provision of additional habitat survey via environmental measure C36 (Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) gives confidence that the detailed design and finalised BNG calculations will be accurate and baseline information available for ongoing monitoring up to date.</u></p> <p><u>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</u></p> <p><u>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.3 Extended Habitat Survey [REP1-032] and Appendix 6.10 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040]</u></p> | |
| <u>05-03</u> | <u>The bat survey information provided is sufficient to inform a robust assessment</u> | <u>NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline</u> | <u>The bat survey as described in Appendix 6.4 Bat Baseline [APP-087] provides sufficient information on bat types, activity levels (across a range of habitats) and distribution of bats to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on this species group. This is in light of the</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C1, C2, C3, C3, C5, C8, C11, C14, C16, C18, C21, C22, C24, C25, C27, C28, C29, C30, C31, C32, C33, C37) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.4 Bat Baseline [APP-087] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</p> | |
| 05-04 | The breeding bird survey information provided is sufficient to inform a robust assessment | NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline | <p>The breeding bird survey described in Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034] ws updated at deadline 1 with further survey data collected in 2025.</p> <p>Appendix 6.5 provides sufficient information on breeding bird density and distribution to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on this species group. This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C1, C2, C3, C3, C4, C5, C6, C8, C14, C15, C16, C17, C18, C21, C22, C24, C25, C27, C28, C29,</p> | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>C30, C31, C32, C34, C37) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</p> | |
| 05-05 | The great crested newt survey information provided is sufficient to inform a robust assessment | NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline | <p>The great crested newt survey described in Appendix 6.6 Great Crested Newt Baseline [REP1-036] ws updated at deadline 1 with further survey data collected in 2025.</p> <p>Appendix 6.6 provides sufficient information on great crested newt distribution to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on this species. This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measure C15) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.6 Great Crested Newt Baseline [REP1-036] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</p> | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| <u>05-06</u> | <u>The information provided on badger, otter and water vole is sufficient to inform a robust assessment</u> | <u>NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline</u> | <p><u>The badger, otter and water vole survey described in Appendix 6.7 Badger, Otter and Water Vole Baseline [APP-090] provides sufficient information on badgers, otters and water vole distribution to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on these species. This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C10, C13, C14, C16, C18, C21, C22, C23, C25, C26, C27, C28, C29, C30, C31, C32, C38) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</u></p> <p><u>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</u></p> <p><u>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.7 Badger, Otter and Water Vole Baseline [APP-090] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</u></p> | <p><u>Under discussion</u></p> <p><u>Under discussion</u></p> |
| <u>05-07</u> | <u>The information provided on wintering birds is sufficient to</u> | <u>NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline</u> | <u>The wintering bird survey described in Appendix 6.8 Wintering Bird Baseline [REP1-038] was updated at deadline 1 with additional data from 2025. It provides sufficient information to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | <u>inform a robust assessment</u> | | <p><u>development on these species (as described within Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]). This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C8, C21, C22 and C29) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</u></p> <p><u>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</u></p> <p><u>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.7 Badger, Otter and Water Vole Baseline [APP-090] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</u></p> | |
| <u>05-08</u> | <u>The information provided on reptiles is sufficient to inform a robust assessment</u> | <u>NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline</u> | <p><u>Information on reptiles was provided in the application and remained unchanged at Deadline 1. Responses with regards survey approach, mitigation and outcome of assessment (in light of any survey limitations) was provided in the Applicant's responses to relevant representations [REP1-075].</u></p> <p><u>Regardless of survey limitations the mitigation for reptiles would not alter and the proposed habitat creation and enhancement</u></p> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | | | measures will be beneficial for this species group. | |
| 05-09 | The information provided on fish is sufficient to inform a robust assessment | NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline | <p>Information on fish was added to Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] as requested by the Environment Agency and a fish habitat survey completed in 2025 at crossing points of permanently wet ditches and the River Trent (Appendix 6.11 Fish Habitat Baseline[REP1-042]).</p> <p>The mitigation integrated within the design including use of trenchless crossings, clear span bridges and stand-offs to ditches / watercourse other than at crossings (see environmental measure C7 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>No significant effects on fish due to the construction, operation or decommissioning of the project were predicted.</p> | Under discussion |
| 05-10 | Adequacy of assessment of sea and river lamprey associated with the Humber | NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline | Information on lamprey was provided at application and further added to at Deadline 1 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. A fish habitat survey completed in 2025 at crossing points of permanently wet ditches and the | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <u>Estuary SAC and Ramsar site</u> | | <p><u>River Trent was also provided (Appendix 6.11 Fish Habitat Baseline [REP1-042]).</u></p> <p><u>The mitigation integrated within the design including use of trenchless crossings (including minimum depth requirements), clear span bridges and stand-offs to ditches / watercourse other than at crossings are appropriate for negating potential effects of the Proposed Development (see environmental measure C7 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</u></p> <p><u>Due to general low level of available information on the effects of EMF on lamprey a 5 year monitoring programme has been committed to in line with those agreed with the Environment Agency and Natural England for other Development Consent Order projects with transmission cables crossing the River Trent (see environmental measure C12 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]). With this commitment in place it is appropriate to conclude that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar site.</u></p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | | | The approach taken is supported by Natural England and the Environment Agency. | |
| 05-11 | Outcomes of the assessment | NSDC states its overall position on biodiversity as ‘Neutral/Biodiversity Net Gain – Positive’ within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094]. | <p>Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] in Table 6.11 summarises the outcome of the assessments.</p> <p>All potential effects are either Not Significant or Significant Beneficial.</p> <p>The measures described within Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023], the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan [REP1-047] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP1-053] provide the protections for habitats, flora and fauna to ensure legal compliance and the positive measures to deliver biodiversity enhancements, particularly of a range of local conservation priorities.</p> | Under discussion |
| 05-12 | Biodiversity net gain | NSDC raise various technical points with regard the calculation of Biodiversity Net Gain within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] | The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040] was updated at Deadline 1 to address comments made within Relevant Representations. | Under discussion |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | <p><u>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</u></p> <p><u>It is clear that the Proposed Development would result in the delivery of BNG considerably in excess of 10%.</u></p> | |
| <u>05-13</u> | <u>LWS selection criteria</u> | <p><u>There is no consideration within Chapter 6 to LWS selection criteria and the nonstandardised sampling approach has not considered large parts of the OL. This has potential to underestimate the number of territories for species such as skylark and other rare/scarce farmland bird species that have not been recorded to date such as corn bunting.</u></p> | <p><u>Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at deadline 1 with consideration of LWS selection criteria of both Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire (see Table 6.8).</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at deadline 1 to include new information on breeding birds gathered in 2025. The outcome did not change the conclusions drawn. The additional data gathered was provided in an updated version of Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034].</u></p> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

Table 06 – Principle of Development

| <u>Ref.</u> | <u>Description of Matter</u> | <u>Stakeholder Comment</u> | <u>Applicant's Response</u> | <u>Status</u> |
|--------------|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| <u>06-01</u> | <u>Lifetime of the Proposed Development</u> | <u>Given that 60 years is comparable to at least two generations, there is some considerable strength to the consideration that this would amount to a permanent project, as opposed to a temporary one, especially considering the average lifespan of building design is circa 50 years. If deemed a permanent Development, which it is our position, this is likely to have a bearing on the judgements of effects, as typically a temporary scheme reduces the magnitude of a change. Therefore, the majority of judgements on longer term effects (15 years+) need to be re-visited and adjusted so as to be permanent, and not partly reversible.</u> | <p><u>The Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects including consents granted for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass solar farms, which have all been granted 60-year consents. It is important to be clear that EN-3 para 2.10.65 states that “An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time periods of operation” and does not impose or suggest a 40-year limit is required.</u></p> <p><u>In recent decisions the Secretary of State has confirmed that the 60- year consent lifespan is ‘temporary and reversible for the majority of the land’ (paragraph 4.167 of the Gate Burton decision) and it is the case for this Proposed Development as noted in paragraph 3.6.2 of the Planning Statement [ref. APP-168] that at the time of decommissioning the land will be reverted back to its original condition.</u></p> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><u>The Applicant acknowledges that the residual effects would be long term but disagrees that the project should be classed as a permanent project. The DCO application is for a time-limited consent thus following decommissioning and removal of all above ground infrastructure from within the Site the associated landscape and visual effects would cease. The justification for partly reversible effects is based on the assumption that trees and hedgerows planted as part of the Proposed Development would be retained.</u></p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Table 07 – Cumulative Effects

| <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>Cumulative effects on Landscape Character Areas</u> | <u>We also have concerns regarding cumulative effects on the national, county, and regional landscape character areas from multiple solar projects both approved and also in the system, having the potential to be constructed across the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire regions. While this has been identified in the baseline review, it is important to re-iterate this point.</u> | <u>As explained during Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) and detailed within the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077), the Applicant's approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects is consistent with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance on cumulative effects. With regard to cumulative impacts with other NSIP solar projects, the Applicant also explained that this has been considered within the DCO examinations for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Tillbridge, which all found there to be no potential for significant cumulative effects with One Earth Solar Farm. The Joint Interrelationships Report from the Tillbridge has been submitted to the One Earth Examination Library at Deadline 1 and is found at Appendix D of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077) as well as the Technical Note on Cumulative Effects of Additional Schemes that was submitted to the Cottam Solar Project Examination which is found at</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | Appendix E of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077). | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Table 08 – Air Quality

| <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>Dust Management Plan</u> | <u>It is noted that a Dust Management Plan (DMP) is proposed as part of the oCEMP. This is not yet available to view.</u> | <u>The measures set out in ES Volume 2: Appendix 13.5 [APP-137] will be set out in full in the oCEMP [APP-176], which will in effect constitute the DMP.</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

Table 09 – Noise

| <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>Baseline noise survey locations</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>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]).</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |
| <u>09-02</u> | <u>Baseline noise survey results</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>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]).</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |
| <u>09-03</u> | <u>Study areas</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>The respective study areas and the associated sensitive receptors identified are appropriate for the basis of the following assessments:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• Construction traffic noise and vibration;</u> <u>• On-site construction noise and vibration;</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | <u>Operational noise.</u> | |
| <u>09-04</u> | <u>Standards and guidance</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>The appropriate standards and guidance have been referenced for the following aspects of the assessment:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Construction traffic noise and vibration;</u> <u>On-site construction noise and vibration;</u> <u>Operational noise.</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |
| <u>09-05</u> | <u>Significance criteria</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>Appropriate significance criteria have been adopted for the assessment of the significance of effects associated with:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Construction traffic noise and vibration;</u> <u>On-site construction noise and vibration;</u> <u>Operational noise.</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |
| <u>09-06</u> | <u>Control of noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>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.</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| <u>09-07</u> | <u>Control of on-site construction noise and vibration</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood District Council.</u> | <u>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.</u> | <u>Under discussion</u> |
| <u>09-08</u> | <u>Control of operational noise</u> | <u>Internal discussions ongoing within Newark and Sherwood 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> |

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Newark and Sherwood District Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



one earth
solar farm

Contact

Name

Email

Number