One Earth Solar Farm

Volume 9.0: Other Post-Submission Documents [EN010159]

Applicant Response to Local Impact Reports

August 2025

Document Reference: EN010159/APP/9.18

Revision 01

Contents

1. Introduction **3**

1.1 Purpose of the document 3

2. Applicant Reponse Table **4**

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the document

1.1.1 This purpose of this document is to provide One Earth Solar Farm Limited's (the 'Applicant') response to the Local Impact Reports (LIRs) received at Deadline 1 of the Examination, submitted by Local Planning Authorities in relation to the Proposed One Earth Solar Farm.

1.1.2 A total of 5 LIRs were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate from the following Local Planning Authorities:

- Lincolnshire County Council (LCC);
- Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC);
- West Lindsey District Council (WLDC);
- Bassetlaw District Council (BDC); and
- Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC).

1.1.3 Table 1 below sets out comments made by the above Local Planning Authorities in their LIRs and the Applicant's responses to them. Where the Applicant acknowledges a section of the LIR and has no further comment, the Applicant has not copied the text from the LIR into the table below. Those sections of the Local Planning Authorities LIR's that require a response have been set out in the tables below verbatim, with the Applicants response alongside it.

1.1.4 Where applicable, a paragraph number and LPA acronym has been provided to assist with cross referencing to the relevant LIR.

2. Applicant Reponse Table

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
General Matters			
LIR1	**LCC 13.21**	In reference to the Sequential Test, the LCC states: *Currently the methodology appears to discount land which is not capable of being leased by the applicant and a wider search area above the 10km radius from the High Marnham substation does not appear to have been considered. As such there is considered to be insufficient information / evidence provided in the One Earth DCO application to properly interrogate the assertion that the sequential test has been passed with regard to site selection. Further evidence is therefore required to ensure the sequential and exception tests have been appropriately applied.*	The Applicant has prepared further evidence to demonstrate how the Sequential Test has been applied and satisfied as part of site selection, arising from discussions during the ISH1 and within the Local Impact Reports. The Sequential Test Assessment [EN010159/APP/9.15] which has also been submitted at Deadline 2 demonstrates how it has considered reasonably available, lower risk sites that are appropriate for the proposed development and provided further evidence to justify the 10km search area. A sensitivity test has also been undertaken to extend this search area to 15km to address comments raised during the examination and in the Lincolnshire LIR. The additional evidence demonstrates that there are no reasonably available, lower risk sites that are appropriate for the Proposed Development in the extended search area.
Principle of Development / Site Selection			
LIR2	**WLDC 7.17 – 17.19**	*WLDC notes that the applicant considers the Scheme to constitute a 'temporary' development and have treated it as such in their EIA. This has resulted in the assessed impact being derived on the basis that the impacts will be 'temporary'.*	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's 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 (or any limit) is required.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		WLDC consider a 60-year timescale to have the effect of permanent impacts. Whilst the infrastructure can be removed at the end of the consent lifespan, this period is significant and will be experienced over several generations. *To reduce or downgrade impacts on the basis that 60 years is 'temporary' is considered to be an unrealistic approach. All assessments should have been carried out on the basis that the impacts would be permanent to reflect the time period over which they would be experienced. This would potentially be beyond the year 2090 based on the lifespan of development consents being granted.*	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. The EIA Regulations (Schedule 4, Regulation 14(2), paragraph 5) require assessment of effects by duration and reversibility. As detailed in Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development [APP-034], the physical characteristics of the development are described alongside the key activities that will be undertaken during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning. After 60 years the land will be returned to its original state with the decommissioning phase removing of all above ground infrastructure, as well as permissive paths. Trees and hedgerows planted as part of the Proposed Development are assumed to remain in situ as well as any clear span bridges. Whilst 60 years is long-term the time-limited consent is finite, and does not involve irreversible land take, and will be subject to a Decommissioning Management Plan as secured in the DCO. Accordingly, the project is assessed as a temporary use. .
LIR3	**WLDC 8.43**	*The applicant has undertaken a search within a 10km radius of High Marnham, which according to paragraph 10.1.15 of the Planning Statement [APP-168]. However, this is not justified beyond "the desire to be as close to the point of connection as possible". It is not clear why other radii, such as 12km or 15km did not also fulfil that requirement, nor*	The Applicant has prepared further evidence to demonstrate how the Sequential Test has been applied and satisfied as part of site selection, arising from discussions during the ISH1 and within the Local Impact Reports. The Sequential Test Assessment [EN010159/APP/9.15] which has also been submitted at Deadline 2 demonstrates how it has considered reasonably available, lower risk sites that are appropriate for the proposed development and provided further evidence to justify the 10km search area. A sensitivity test has also been undertaken to extend this search area to 15km to address

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		whether such a search would have identified sites outwith Flood Zone 3. It is also the case that, given the compulsory purchase powers available with a DCO, WLDC do not consider that the sequential test needs to be restricted by sites which are "reasonable available".	comments raised during the examination and in the West Lindsey LIR. The additional evidence demonstrates that there are no reasonably available, lower risk sites that are appropriate for the Proposed Development in the extended search area.
Mineral Resource Safeguarding			
LIR4	**LCC 18.12**	*In relation to mineral resource safeguarding and the requirements of policy M11, it is noted that the majority of the development site within the LCC administrative boundary is located in the MSA. In the absence of the applicant undertaking any detailed assessment of the mineral resources to demonstrate otherwise, it has to be assumed that there are viable mineral resources in the underlying land. The potential for mineral sterilisation is therefore significant, albeit temporary in nature. The Council would stress that although the development is considered to be temporary, 60 years is a significant duration, and further applications could come forward to extend this timeframe.*	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel, as identified in Appendix 2 of the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175]. This MSA forms part of a much larger designation in the adopted Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (June 2016). The Applicant has not undertaken any detailed assessments of the mineral resources in the specific area located within the Order Limits because, as set out in the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175], the Proposed Development would not result in the permanent sterilisation of sand and gravel resources within the Order Limits. The development comprises ground-mounted solar PV infrastructure, which is non-intrusive and reversible. Upon decommissioning after the 60-year operational period, the land will be restored, and the underlying mineral resource will remain accessible for future extraction if required. Other solar projects are 60 years and impacts are treated as temporary (see for example the Secretary of State's decision in Cottam, another 60 year consent "4.74 The Secretary of State agrees that the Proposed Development would revert back to agricultural use once the operational time-period has expired and

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			agrees with the ExA that any effects would be temporary and reversible.") With regards to the comment regarding an extension to the 60-year timeframe, that does not form part of the current application and cannot therefore be taken into consideration when assessing the impacts of the Proposed Development on mineral resources. At this stage there is no intention to seek an extension of the operational period of the Proposed Development beyond the 60-year timeframe, however even if this were to be sought, the impacts of any future extensions would need to be assessed through a separate process.
LIR5	**LCC 18.14 – 18.16**	*The Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan is being updated and additional reserves will be required to cover the proposed new plan period up to 2041. Work on the plan is progressing, with consultation carried out in Summer 2024 on the preferred approach to updating the plan. The preferred approach consultation document identifies several 'preferred' sites to meet identified requirements. The outcome of the preferred approach consultation will inform the next stage of the plan-making process which will be a further 6-week consultation on a final 'proposed submission' draft of the new plan, in*	The Applicant has reviewed the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Preferred Approach for updating the plan Document (July 2024), which includes existing and proposed allocations of sites to ensure a steady and adequate supply of sand and gravel over the entire plan period (up to 2041). The Applicant acknowledges that the 60-year operational period of the Proposed Development extends beyond the new plan period which ends in 2041. However, the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Preferred Approach Document confirms that the allocations would amount to the provision of 44.27 million tonnes of sand and gravel, which is in excess of the identified shortfall for the plan period. It is not possible to confirm what additional allocations or provisions might need to be made beyond 2041 for sand and gravel supplies. However, the MSA as shown in Appendix 2 of the Mineral

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		advance of the formal public examination process. *The proposed 60 year operational life of the proposed development would however extend significantly beyond the proposed plan period for the updated LMWLP and further sand and gravel resources are therefore likely to be required in Lincolnshire during the life of the proposals, beyond any that may be identified in the new plan.* *The Council therefore does not agree with the statement at paragraph 4.8.2. of the Minerals Assessment that "There is no need for any additional permitted provision to be made for the foreseeable future."*	Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175] covers a significant area across Lincolnshire, and the part that is included within the Order Limits is very small in comparison. While it is acknowledged that the land within the Order Limits will not be available for mineral extraction during the 60-year operational life of the Proposed Development, the solar PV infrastructure does not constitute a permanent obstruction. The development has been designed to ensure that underlying mineral resources remain undisturbed and can be accessed for future extraction following decommissioning. It is not considered that the temporary use of this land for 60-years for the Proposed Development would materially constrain the potential future extraction of sand and gravel within the County. It is anticipated that sufficient reserves will remain available to meet projected supply requirements over the long term. It is acknowledged that further assessments will need to be undertaken by Lincolnshire County Council as the Minerals Planning Authority to allocate additional sites, and extensions if required in 2041 and beyond. Additionally, a review of the planning history within the Order Limits confirms that no planning applications have been submitted or approved for sand and gravel extraction on the Site that would be prejudiced by the Proposed Development.
LIR6	**LCC 18.17**	*It is acknowledged that the applicant has also put forward an argument regarding the overriding need for the project, in line with the criteria set out under Policy M11. However part of this test requires that the development could not reasonably be sited elsewhere. Whilst the Council notes the reasons given for the selection of the*	With regard to site selection, the Applicant undertook a comprehensive and methodical site selection process, guided by the specific technical and operational requirements of large-scale solar development. This process included a site search and a multi-stage assessment to identify and evaluate potential locations against a wide range of constraints, including proximity to grid connection infrastructure, land availability, solar irradiance, topography, flood

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		proposed site, minerals safeguarding does not appear to have been given any consideration as part of the site selection process.	risk, designated environmental and heritage assets, and land use conflicts. The Site Selection Report (Appendix 1 of the Planning Statement [APP-168]) provides a detailed account of this process and explains why the Proposed Development site was ultimately selected as the most appropriate and viable option. The search demonstrated that suitable alternative sites of comparable scale, capable of meeting the project's energy generation objectives and grid connection requirements, are extremely limited. Further detail is also provided in the Sequential Assessment [EN010159/APP/9.15] also submitted at Deadline 2, which demonstrates that there were no other suitable sites within a 15km search area, and in the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-077], where the approach to site selection is clearly articulated. This detail confirms that reasonable alternatives and modifications have been considered, but no preferred or less constrained locations were identified. While minerals safeguarding is considered at site-selection stage, it is not listed in EN-3 as a formal site selection criterion. Given that the Proposed Development is temporary in nature, with a 60-year operational period followed by full restoration of the land, the underlying mineral resource will remain accessible for future extraction if required. Therefore, in the overall balance of considerations, the presence of safeguarded minerals does not preclude the Site from being selected.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR7	**LCC 18.18**	*Given the nature and scale of the proposals the Council acknowledges that it would not be possible to completely avoid sterilisation of some mineral resources. However, minerals are a finite resource and the fact that MSAs extend beyond the order limits does not preclude the need to meaningfully assess the impact of the proposals on potential sterilisation of resources.*	As set out in the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175], the mineral resources within the Order Limits will not be permanently sterilised. The Proposed Development has a 60-year operational period, and the Proposed Development would be decommissioned at the end of its operational life. Therefore, any minerals within the Order Limits would be available to exploit, if required, at a future date. The Proposed Development does not restrict the existing operations and is reserved by nature; therefore, it does not permanently sterilise the resource, and no further assessment is required. The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development is not in conflict with mineral safeguarding policies.
LIR8	**LCC 18.20 – 18.21**	*With regard to Policy M12 and the safeguarded Newton on Trent Oil site, this site is surrounded on all sides by the proposed Order limits, and whilst the site is currently inactive, it has extant planning permission and could recommence operations at any time until the end-date of June 2036. The Council are of the view that insufficient information has been provided in the assessment undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed development would not prejudice or detrimentally impact upon the operation of the safeguarded site. Relevant issues to consider may include (but are not limited to):* *• access and highways;* *• health and safety (including fire safety);* *• screening/boundary treatments; 57* *• dust*	*One existing mineral site - Newton on Trent Oil Well Ref: 32 adjoins the proposed Order Limits and is safeguarded under Policy M12: Safeguarding of Existing Mineral Sites and Associated Minerals Infrastructure*. This includes a 250-metre safeguarding buffer around each site, as shown in Appendix 1 of the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175]. The minerals site is not included within the Order Limits, and access has been retained should this be required for any future operations or maintenance. The surrounding land within the 250-metre safeguarded buffer has been put forward by the current landowner. Discussions with the landowner and status of the oil well are ongoing. However, the discussions to date confirm that the oil well is not currently active and has not been for 10 years. Site visits from the team confirm this and a review of the current lease has been undertaken. The leasehold document refers to an exploration licence for petroleum which has a term of 20 years from 14/01/1998 so this has now expired and does not appear to have been renewed on the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		• *site buffers; and* • *the need to protect any associated utilities and infrastructure etc.* *The Council suggest contacting the site operators and relevant experts such as the Health and Safety Executive, the Environment Agency and local Environmental Health Officers to accurately determine the detailed matters that should be considered and any necessary mitigation. At this stage, the Council has not seen any evidence that such engagement has been undertaken and would wish to see further evidence to confirm that such engagement has taken place, and a satisfactory outcome achieved.*	title. There remains an open dialogue between the Applicant and the landowner should there be any further comments raised. A safeguarded buffer zone of 250m around the existing site is located within the Order Limits and is proposed for Solar Arrays. This form of development would not sterilise the oil resources or impact its operations, if still functioning. The Proposed Development is of a temporary nature, and after 60 years, the land will be returned to its existing use. In response to Policy M12, the Proposed Development has been assessed to ensure it does not prejudice the potential future operation and safeguarded mineral site at Newton on Trent Oil Well Ref: 32. Each of the considerations raised by LCC is addressed below. Access and Highways: As shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-015], there are no proposed access or highway works near Newton on Trent Oil Well, and the existing access to the site off the Southmoor Lane is being retained for maintenance, or operational purpose should it be required. Health and Safety: The oil well has been dormant for 10 years, and through discussions with the landowner it is not expected to re-commence within the operational period of the Proposed Development. As such, there is no direct interface with extraction operations. Standard health and safety protocols, including fire safety measures, will be in place during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			Proposed Development ensuring no risk to mineral site safety. This will be set out in detail in the relevant Management Plans (Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) and the Decommissioning Environmental Management plan (DEMP) as part of the DCO Requirements. Screening and Boundary Treatments: Existing boundaries will be maintained. The Proposed Development will have a minimum 5m offset from Solar PV development to all existing hedgerows as set out in the Outline Design Parameters [REP1-021]. Therefore, the existing boundary will be maintained, protecting the operational areas of the Proposed Development and the existing minerals site. Dust: The Proposed Solar PV Development will be subject to regular cleaning and maintenance throughout its operational lifetime, ensuring that the efficiency of the Solar Panels is not compromised. Further, the presence of the solar installation will not impact the potential future operation of the oil well should it become active within the 6-year operational period of the Proposed Development. Site Buffers: Appropriate separation is maintained from safeguarded sites, with no encroachment into potential operational areas or vegetation along the boundary. Utilities and Infrastructure:

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			No utility works are proposed that would affect the extraction equipment, also noting that the minerals site is not operational and has not been for approximately 10 years. The Proposed Development does not conflict with the operation or safeguarding of Newton on Trent Oil Well Ref: 32 and is considered compliant with Policy M12. Relevant engagement and consultation with regulatory bodies and technical consultees has already been undertaken with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Environment Agency, and Local Environmental Health Officers. No objections or issues have been raised regarding the Proposed Development adjoining the existing mineral site. In light of the above, the Applicant considers that the Proposed Development would not prejudice or detrimentally affect the access or maintenance, or potential future operations of the safeguarded mineral sites. As set out above and in the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175], discussions with the landowner and status of the oil well are ongoing, however the discussions to date confirm that the oil well is not currently active and has not been for 10 years. Site visits from the team confirm this and a review of the current lease has been undertaken. The leasehold document refers to an exploration licence for petroleum which has a term of 20 years from 14/01/1998 so this has now expired and does not appear to have been renewed on the title. There remains an open dialogue between the Applicant and the landowner should there be any further comments raised.
LIR9	**LCC 18.22**	*The council also wish to raise concerns with the statement in paragraph 3.4.14 of*	The paragraph was included to demonstrate the local planning policy context, however it is noted that this reflects the Central Lincolnshire

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		the submitted minerals assessment which states "It is therefore clear that the direction of travel for LCC as the relevant Minerals Authority is to resist fossil fuel extraction where possible" This statement is misleading and pre-judges the Council's emerging policy position in the updated Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This statement reflects the position of the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee which acknowledges it is not a mineral planning authority, not Lincolnshire County Council in its role as Mineral Planning Authority.	Joint Strategic Planning Committee (CLJSPC) position which has prepared the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2018-2040) as the development plan for the City of Lincoln, West Lindsey, and North Kesteven District Councils, rather than Lincolnshire County Council as the minerals authority.
Cables			
LIR10	**LCC 18.19**	*It is also noted that underground cables may remain in situ following decommissioning, which could potentially therefore lead to the permanent sterilisation of mineral resources through introduction of a constraint on potential future extraction in surrounding land. This should be given due consideration when determining the final route/method of the grid connection. Wherever possible the cable route should follow existing constraints and infrastructure corridors such as roads, railways, drainage routes or existing pipelines or cable routes or alternatively follow the edge of significant landscape features rather than directly*	The Applicant acknowledges the importance of minimising potential sterilisation of mineral resources and agrees that, where feasible, aligning the cable route with existing infrastructure corridors is considered good practice. This approach will continue to be considered during the detailed design phase. However, in several instances, routing through agricultural land has been pursued as it offers a shorter alignment. Based on current understanding, the proposed underground cables are not expected to result in permanent sterilisation of mineral resources. This matter will be further considered at detailed design phase.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		crossing open fields. This would ensure minimal sterilisation of resources.	
LIR11	**BDC Decommissioning Impacts**	*An outline construction management Plan and outline Operational environmental management Plan have been included and an outline decommissioning management plan has been submitted. It is considered that detailed consideration be given to the impacts of all these plans. The impacts of the end of life span of the proposal would be on a similar scale to the construction stage in regards to traffic and removal of cables, equipment and hard surfacing. Mitigation measures should be put in place if cables are left in place to safeguard the residents and the environment.*	For cables, the Applicant understands that Natural England are comfortable for these to be left in place where left deep enough (from an agricultural land and soils perspective), as they would be avoiding the soil disturbance altogether at decommissioning. The main requirement is that cables are installed deep enough to avoid any potential impact from standard agricultural practices during operation (i.e. the installation depth). The position of a minimum depth of 900mm coverage is recognised as the industry standard, and has been adopted by The Applicant for these cables The Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [REP1-051] presents a safe decommissioning strategy for the proposed Development, and considers the cables being left in-ground as part of this assessment.
Design			
LIR12	**LCC 17.16**	*The Council welcomes the design changes made to mitigate Significant Negative effects on Landscape and Visual, and the comprehensive chapter on this. Landscaping and new planting (trees and hedgerows) should be maximised, including contributing to new accessible woodland. It is accepted that new hedgerows and woodland in general can be beneficial. However new woodland should be accessible to the*	The proposed landscape mitigation has sought to respond appropriately to the prevailing landscape character. As noted in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at paragraph 11.4.13, woodland cover within the Order Limits is very low. The landscape mitigation therefore proposes very limited additional woodland meaning there are no feasible opportunities where accessible woodland could be delivered as part of the Proposed Development. The Applicant has committed, within the OLEMP [REP1-053], to enhancing existing habitats 12 months prior to the installation of the solar PV panels, as well as further habitat delivery during

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		public, where feasible and it would not affect construction or operation. New planting should take place as early in the project phases as possible, so that trees and hedgerows are established sooner into the construction and/or operation phase(s) than 15 years reference in the ES	construction on a field-by-field basis, which is noted at paragraph 5.1.5.
LIR13	**LCC 17.17**	*Land around and under the panels could potentially still be used for some arable food growing. Where it is not, grazing land or wildflower meadows could be considered rather than grass to continue food production and/or contribute to biodiversity improvements.*	In terms of animal grazing on the land, paragraph 11.1.43 of the Planning Statement [APP-168] notes that "*while the conditions which would allow for grazing would be delivered, the Applicant is unable to make a commitment that grazing will occur as the usual process would be for a farmer with animals to graze to approach a landowner to seek agreement to graze animals on their land, not the other way around*." The Applicant will continue to discuss with the relevant landowners and provide an update during examination.
LIR14	**WLDC 8.9 – 8.10**	*Whilst recognising the general locations and site characteristics favoured by solar farm development, WLDCs view is that policy requires applicants to minimise impacts a far as possible. The design approach adopted by the OESF project has, however, resulted in solar panels being sited up to field boundaries in highly visible locations. Additionally, associated development such as the BESS and substation, up to 13.5m high, according to the height parameter plans [APP-016], has also been located in a location is highly visible with open views into the site from area within West Lindsey and adjacent to the south from*	The BESS and substations have been sited in line with the Outline Design Parameters [REP1-021] which considers offsets to landscape features, and noise rating levels on residential receptors. The Proposed Development has also been refined with regard to Agricultural Land Classification and areas at risk of flooding, and constructability. The eastern BESS and substation are located at the foot of a slight hill which rises towards the A1133, which is the furthest east of the A1133 without being in areas at risk of flooding. Whilst it is correct that the height parameter plan identifies that the substation will be up to 13.5m above existing ground level, the Outline Design Parameters states that the footprint of the substation (located east of the River Trent) will occupy a maximum area of up to 23,800m^2. This equates to 12.6% of the combined 188,305m^2 of the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		within Newark and Sherwood District Council administrative area. *The location of panels, BESS and substation in the large open field to the east of the A1133 represents a highly visible and conspicuous part of the OESF project and WLDC does not understand from the application how, integrating policy requirements on 'good design' has resulted in a methodology that has resulted in this area being selected as the optimal location for this type of development*	eastern BESS and substation Work Areas 2 and 3. Ancillary buildings located within the substation compound will measure a maximum height of 8m tall, however these will cover only cover a maximum footprint of 1200m^2, equating to less than 1% of Work Areas 2 and 3. The remaining area would be up to the height of 3.5m above existing ground level identified for the BESS, as is also stated in the Outline Design Parameters. Within the OLEMP [REP1-053] at paragraph 5.3.9., the Applicant has committed to managing existing hedgerows to increase screening including filling in gaps and thickening hedgerows with a broad range of native species as well as planting additional hedgerow trees. This will apply to the western site boundary adjacent to the A1133 which will reduce the visual impact of solar panels, BESS and substation on motorists overtime. The Applicant's firm view is that it has minimised visual impacts as far as practicable while still meeting the needs of the Proposed Development, consistent with National and Local Policy. That policy direction does not require the complete avoidance of all adverse effects, and NPS EN-1 at 3.2.1 expressly contemplates that it is not possible to develop the necessary amounts of renewable energy infrastructure without some residual adverse effects. Paragraph 5.10.5 also recognises that virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape.
LIR15	**WLDC 8.21**	*As explained above, the design approach applied to the OESF project has resulted in the siting of large-scale infrastructure in the form of the substation and BESS being located in conspicuous and highly visible location within the West Lindsey District. The eastern BESS area is identified on the height parameter plans*	The Applicant has continually sought to embed good design into the Proposed Development, and evidence of this is provided in the Design Approach Document [AS-013]. The Applicant disagrees that the substation and BESS are located in a conspicuous and highly visible location. The Applicant judges that the extent over which visual impacts will be experienced as a result of the Proposed Development will be localised. This is supported by

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		[APP-016] as having a maximum height of 13.5m. It should be noted that, according to plans submitted by Anglian Water for the works currently being undertaken at the Hall Water Treatment Works, immediately northwest of and adjacent to the eastern BESS area, the current main (and highest) building on the water treatment works site is approximately 10m in height to its ridge. This is currently the highest structure for some considerable distance. Assuming the 13.5m maximum height indicated on the plans will extend across the majority of the BESS area, the BESS area would be a major new element in the countryside, akin to distribution warehousing.	the conclusions of Chapter 11 [REP1-025] which finds that significant visual effects would be mostly experienced by people within or immediately adjacent to the Order Limits and no significant effects are predicted beyond approximately 200m of the Order Limits. The Outline Design Parameters [REP1-021] provides further details on how the visual impacts of Work No. 2 and 3 will be mitigated. This includes co-locating the substation and BESS together, providing a minimum 300m from residential properties and 100m from public rights of way, and providing soil storage in the form of bunds around the substation perimeter. Buildings and containers will also be finished in a muted colour that is sympathetic to the surrounding environment.
LIR16	**WLDC 8.28**	*WLDC deems the impact of the OESF upon landscape character and visual effects within the district to be significant and adverse. It is not understood why the Scheme has been designed in a manner that does not seek to minimising effects by siting large scale infrastructure in such a prominent location, clearly visible from public rights of way upon the only raised ground in the nearby landscape.*	The iterative assessment and design process undertaken throughout the pre-application phase has sought to minimise adverse impacts as far as has been practical however some impact is considered inevitable. This is reflected in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that "*Virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation.*" With regard to public rights of way specifically, the Design Approach Document [AS-013] explains how the Applicant has sought to maintain one side of public right of way open and free from above ground infrastructure. Where this has not been possible, the Applicant has embedded a minimum 15m offset to Works Area 1

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			which in many instances extends far beyond 15m and with hedgerows, trees and grassland provided within the offset. Significant residual visual effects are reported in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] on users of public rights of way that pass adjacent to or through the Order Limits, which is considered inevitable for this type of nationally significant energy infrastructure project, but otherwise no significant residual visual effects are predicted beyond approximately 200m of the Order Limits, which demonstrates the relatively localised visual impact of the Proposed Development.
LIR17		*WLDC considers that the impacts on the landscape could be minimised further, as required by Policy S53 through the consideration of:* ▪ *Increasing the set-back of solar PV panels from the site boundary with the A1133.* ▪ *Siting the substation and BESS further to the east (away from the A1133 and the public right of way) to sit on lower topography and be viewed against the backdrop of existing woodland.* ▪ *Reinforce and increase the height of the western site boundary adjacent to the A1133 with further tree and hedgerow planting with appropriate species such as maple, hawthorn, ash and oak. Deliver such planting through the Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) (APP-179), ensuring that there are no*	The BESS and substations have been sited in line with the Outline Design Parameters [REP1-021] which consider offsets to landscape features, and noise rating levels on residential receptors. The Proposed Development has also been refined with regard to Agricultural Land Classification, areas at risk of flooding, and constructability. The eastern BESS and substation are located at the foot of a slight hill which rises towards the A1133, which is the furthest east of the A1133 without being in areas at risk of flooding. Whilst it is correct that the height parameter plan identifies that the substation will be up to 13.5m above existing ground level, the Outline Design Parameters [AS-013] states that the footprint of the substation (located east of the River Trent) will occupy a maximum area of up to 23,800m^2. This equates to 12.6% of the combined 188,305m^2 of the eastern BESS and substation Work Areas 2 and 3. Ancillary buildings located within the substation compound will measure a maximum height of 8m tall, however these will cover only cover a maximum footprint of 1200m^2, equating to less than 1% of Work Areas 2 and 3. The remaining area would be up to the height of 3.5m above existing ground level identified for the BESS, as is also stated in the Outline Design Parameters.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		breaks along the highway (e.g. reinforce the gaps near to the layby to the south of the site entrance which offers clear views of the site).	Within the OLEMP [REP1-053] at paragraph 5.3.9., the Applicant has committed to managing existing hedgerows to increase screening including filling in gaps and thickening hedgerows with a broad range of native species as well as planting additional hedgerow trees. This will apply to the western site boundary adjacent to the A1133 which will reduce the visual impact of solar panels, BESS and substation on motorists overtime.
Buried Heritage			
LIR18	**NCC 5.2.2**	*It is the Council's position that to properly assess the impact of a development upon archaeology, the applicant should provide sufficient desk-based research, non-intrusive survey and intrusive field evaluation to adequately understand the archaeological resource within the scheme and detail the proposed development impacts upon it. This is necessary to design an agreeable Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) to limit as far as possible the proposed development impacts. The Environmental Statement (ES) must present the full range of findings from this archaeological work and provide an evidential basis for at least an Outline AMS (OAMS) for consideration at Examination*	The approach to archaeological data collection for the One Earth Solar Farm has been designed in compliance with national policy (NPPF, NPS EN-1, EN-3), and professional standards and guidance, including, but not limited to, the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) *Code of Conduct*. It has been developed in collaborative consultation with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. As per EN-1 Paragraph 5.9.11 and Paragraph 207 of the NPPF, this has been achieved by carrying out an appropriate desk-based assessment followed by proportionate evaluation work, which as per CIfA's Standard for Evaluation (2023), encompasses both non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork. The non-intrusive assessment is presented in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (APP-110 to APP-115) and includes a review of the HER data, LiDAR and aerial photographic assessment, geoarchaeological deposit modelling, and a geophysical survey covering the entire DCO boundary. The methodology for this non-intrusive assessment is outlined in Section 11.3 of the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038]. This methodology has been agreed with relevant stakeholders,

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			acknowledged in the Relevant Representations, and follows applicable legislative and policy requirements as well as best practice guidance. In line with CIfA's Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation, the non-intrusive assessment informed a phase of trial trenching evaluation undertaken to support the Buried Heritage ES Chapter and the DCO application. A further phase of trial trenching is currently being designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England and is included in the draft outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) (an advanced draft of which, reflecting discussions undertaken to date with the parties, is intended to be submitted at Deadline 3). This will inform the detailed design of the Proposed Development and guide the implementation of mitigation strategies to offset potential impacts on buried heritage assets. Additionally, in accordance with paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, to minimise the risk of encountering unknown archaeological remains beyond the 29 identified locations, archaeological trial trenching will be carried out in advance of construction. This will target areas where significant ground disturbance is expected as part of the final design of the Proposed Development. This second phase of intrusive evaluation will be delivered as a pre-commencement requirement, focusing on locations identified as having the potential to contain buried heritage remains. The phased strategy aims to provide sufficient data to inform the DCO application while minimising unnecessary disturbance to the archaeological resource. It meets the robustness requirements set out in NPS EN-1 and EN-3 and aligns with professional standards

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			and guidance. Crucially, it upholds the principle of avoiding disproportionate and unjustifiable harm to the historic environment, as set out in paragraphs 5.9.28, 5.9.32, and 5.9.33 of EN-1 and paragraphs 215 and 216 of the NPPF. In line with the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038], the selected mitigation strategy will consider the nature, sensitivity, and extent of the buried heritage assets; the nature and magnitude of the impacts arising from the Proposed Development; and the practicality and suitability of implementing the proposed mitigation. A proportionate Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) will be defined for all locations where buried heritage assets will be fully or partially affected by the Proposed Development, within the footprint of that impact. An Outline AMS (OAMS) will be included in the OWSI and will be designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. The applied mitigation measures are expected to avoid residual significant effects on archaeological assets, instead reducing impacts to negligible or minor.
LIR19	**NCC 5.2.5**	*The Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report (APP-124), is not a full report and offers a very brief summary of the results. It is essential that the full report for this work is submitted so that a proper assessment of the data can be scrutinised at Examination.*	The full report has been circulated as a draft for the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England on the 24/07/2025.
LIR20	**NCC 5.2.7 – 5.2.8**	*Section 9.3.33 recognises the limitations of non-intrusive survey (geophysics in this case). Some features are not easily prospected due to low variations in features from background readings or*	The non-intrusive work carried out to inform the Archaeology ES Chapter provides a holistic approach to the data collection, relying on different survey techniques to off-set the specific limitation. As per Annex 1 of CIfA's Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, this included a review of the Historic

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		from masking deposits. Reliance upon a single non-intrusive survey technique will also likely lead to significant confirmation bias in the resulting data. We recommend that areas that return 'blank' readings in the geophysics results be tested for reliability with evaluation trenching, particular in areas of high development impact. Section 9.3.36 confirms the need for this, however much of the site has not yet been tested and we strongly reject the assertion in Section 9.3.37 that the work to date delivers the required evidence. In this matter the document is contradictory in terms of recognising the issue but then accepting a limited level of intrusive work to address it. *Given the essential nature of adequate evaluation as the basis to deal appropriately with the developmental impacts and effectively manage development risk, NCC and LCC are deeply concerned regarding the outstanding work, and we would expect the applicant to provide further details for completion of an acceptable programme of evaluation trenching.*	Environment Records (HER) data, visits to the local archives, relevant on-line resources, cartographic resources, LIDAR and aerial photographs, geotechnical and geoarchaeological information. A full list of the of sources consulted is presented in Section 3.4 page 16-18 of the Archaeology Desk-Based Assessment [APP-110]. The results collected during the desk-based surveys have been ground-truthed and expanded upon by a geophysical survey evaluation carried out on the entire Order Limits. In line with CIfA's *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation* (2023), which advocates the complementary use of both non-intrusive and intrusive techniques, the geophysical survey informed a robust and proportionate programme of trial trenching. The results of the archaeological assessment program programme informed a robust and proportionate trial trenching evaluation carried out to inform the DCO Application and the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038], which included, as appropriate, trenches targeting features identified by the geophysical survey as well as trenches targeting apparently 'blank' areas in the selected areas.
LIR21	**NCC 5.2.9**	*Section 9.5.2 does make provision for additional trenching as part of the post-consent AMS, however this may leave the discovery of significant archaeology very late in the programme when it is*	The Applicant's position is that the Proposed Development retains enough flexibility to accommodate any significant archaeology discovered during the additional evaluation work to be carried out post-consent.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		difficult to accommodate, and leading to potential programme delays, additional cost increases and an unfavourable outcome for the archaeology discovered. Care will need to be taken to ensure the results are available in good time to inform a reasonable AMS which must be agreed prior to the commencement of any development or enabling works.	The potential areas selected for the parameters of the Proposed Development that had less flexibility (BESS and Substations) have been evaluated via trial trenching as part of the evaluation work to inform the Archaeological ES Chapter and the DCO submission. This reflects that there was less flexibility in these locations to respond to trial trenching undertaken post consent in order to avoid likely significant effects. Areas where trial trenching is proposed post-consent, ahead of implementation, represent areas of lower risk for archaeological potential as well as where there is more flexibility at detailed design to avoid or minimise impacts on archaeology (in line with the effects assessed in the ES) if required as a result of the further trial trenching. The Applicant is undertaking engagement with the Archaeological Advisors to the LPAs and Historic England to define the additional archaeological work, and the DCO requirement, to ensure the securement of appropriate procedures for the approval of the AMS following the additional trial trenching evaluation. Consultations with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England will be held during the undertaking of the additional trial trenching, to report on any significant discovery in timely manner. This will allow the design of any additional archaeological work, if required, to inform the AMS. The results of any additional trial trenching evaluation will be shared with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England enough in advance in order to inform any mitigation required prior to the commencement of any development or enabling works
LIR22	**NCC 5.2.10**	*Section 9.3.40 provides a list of potential direct ground impacts from construction. Where these occur and archaeology is present, the effect is likely to be*	Section 9.6 of the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038] presents a list of the work packages proposed as part of the Description of the Proposed Development [APP-034], and the Impact Assessment refers to the work packages rather than to the individual activities..

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		significant, adverse and negative. However, the list is incomplete and lacking detail. For instance, the Ecology Management Plan (APP-179) specifies groundworks including 'landscape and biodiversity enhancement measures; habitat creation and management, including earthworks, landscaping, means of enclosure, and laying and construction of drainage infrastructure', none of which has been accounted for in any detail in Chapter 9.	Maximum (and, where relevant, minimum) parameters for the Order Limits are applied based on a reasonable worst-case scenario to determine the Significance of Effects, assuming that construction activities could take place anywhere on the Order Limits. The Parameters have been assessed for below ground archaeological remains, based on the maximum areas that will be disturbed, within the single work packages. The description of the proposed activities included in work packages have been considered in the assessment of potential ground impacts where archaeology may be present. This approach ensures that all direct ground disturbances likely to affect buried heritage assets are captured within the assessment, considering activities for which the extent and locations are not defined yet, and which details will be available at Detail Desing stage. The Applicant's decision to present the potential effects as work packages has been done to keep a degree of flexibility in assessing the effects, and their extent, and to guarantee proportionality and responsiveness to any future potential environmental constraints, technological advancements, and updates in professional guidance. The approach ensures a reasonable worst case assessment has been undertaken and does not result in under reporting or under assessment of likely significant effects from the Proposed Development. The need for flexibility in design, layout and technology, and therefore in the approach to mitigation, is recognised in National Policy Statement EN-1 is details of a development, such as the final design, may not be finalised until after consent is granted. As further design details become available, specific activities can be further considered through ongoing design refinement and
LIR23	**NCC 5.2.11**	*Impacts from construction activity have not been properly considered beyond a brief assertion in Section 9.5.4 or have been dismissed in Section 9.5.12. These would normally include groundworks for temporary compounds and haul roads, compaction/vibration from vehicle/plant tracking and other related construction activity. Where these occur and archaeology is present, we maintain that the impact is likely to be significant, adverse and negative, especially in areas of poor or shallow ground conditions.*	

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			consultation to ensure appropriate mitigation is identified and implemented. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) will include allowances for the assessment included in ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] to be reviewed, and relevant control systems to define the conditions for said reviews to be undertaken.
LIR24	**NCC 5.2.12**	*Impacts relating to the operational life of the scheme have also received little consideration or have been dismissed in Section 9.5.19. The oOEMP (APP-177) makes provision for preservation areas, but does not address the need for more significant works. Maintenance and refits will be necessary and may be not subject to future planning requirements. The limited operational lifespan of the panels will require their replacement, including likely infrastructure upgrades and further assessment for archaeology will not be possible once the initial construction has been completed. Therefore, operational impacts are also likely to have significant, adverse and negative effects on any surviving archaeology present that has not been adequately assessed or been subject to mitigation works at this stage.*	The OWSI will include allowances for an Archaeological Clerk of Work (ACoW) to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities. Specifically, the ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks. If such works are expected to affect known archaeological remains identified during evaluation or are expected to have a high magnitude of impact in areas where no remains were identified, they will be assessed and any required additional evaluation or mitigation will be discussed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP.
LIR25	**NCC 5.2.13**	*Decommissioning has also received little consideration in terms of archaeology beyond an assumption that there will be no impact in Section 9.5.24 or in the oDEMP (APP-178). At the very least, the*	

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		oDEMP would benefit from the inclusion of an Archaeological Clerk of Works to help manage any resulting strategy required.	
LIR26	**NCC 5.2.14**	*Section 9.6.4 rates the impact of enabling and construction works upon buried heritage assets to a degree that is reductive and unfounded. For example, full removal of archaeology is total destruction and therefore cannot be a 'medium' impact as described, and compression or 'partial removal' of archaeology is not 'negligible': it is the damage and destruction of surviving archaeology without recording.*	To clarify the contents of Section 9.6.4: Paragraph 9.6.4 of the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] should read: Full removal from excavations (truncation), considered to High for Works 2, 3, 5, 6; Partial removal from excavations (truncation), is considered to be "Medium" for Work 4 as it would result in substantial but not complete loss of deposits. Compression or partial removal from traffic of plant and machinery (truncation) is considered to be Negligible for all Works, including Work 7, as such impacts are expected where adequate mitigation measures (i.e plant routes) are in place.
LIR27	**NCC 5.2.15**	*The mitigation proposals in Sections 9.5.27 to 9.5.31 provide for avoidance of sensitive archaeology where possible, or a programme of excavation, monitoring and recording where not. While this high-level approach would be broadly agreeable (as with any scheme), it is essential that a more detailed OAMS be presented at Examination.*	The OWSI will include an Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (OAMS). The OWSI is currently under consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPA and Historic England. An advanced draft OWSI, reflecting discussions between the parties, will be submitted for Deadline 3.
LIR28	**NCC 5.2.16**	*The assessment of individual archaeological sites follows from section*	The Applicant's assessment of development impacts on archaeological assets follows established best practice guidance,

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		9.6.6 to 9.6.224. We do not agree with the weighting of impacts offered by the applicant which are unrealistic. Section 9.6.4 offers an assessment of the importance of archaeological sites and the extent of impacts from developmental works, however these are both dismissively low. In order to have 'Negligible to Minor' Significance of Effect on archaeological sites which have 'High' Magnitudes of Impact, evaluation and mitigation would need to be very extensive otherwise the impact will be significant, adverse and negative.	including the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment* (CIfA, 2020) and Historic England's *Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 - The Setting of Heritage Assets* (Historic England, 2015). The assessment carefully considers both the importance of archaeological sites and the extent of potential impacts from the development, applying recognised professional standards While the Applicant has acknowledged that some sites may experience a high magnitude of impact, the overall significance of effects is determined by balancing the value of the site, the nature of the impact, and any proposed mitigation measures, consistent with the principles outlined in Historic England's *Environmental Impact Assessment and Archaeology* (Historic England, 2017). It is not accurate to assume that a high magnitude of impact will invariably result in a significant or adverse effect. For sites of potential high Sensitivity, the assessment concludes a 'negligible to minor's significance only where there is clear evidence that impacts will be limited, temporary, or effectively mitigated, as supported by the detailed evaluation and mitigation measures proposed (including consideration in terms of design). This approach aligns with the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, 2012), which emphasises a proportionate approach to heritage impacts within the planning system. The Applicant's conclusions regarding the significance of effects are balanced and proportionate, reflecting the best available evidence and consistent with professional guidance. This ensures that archaeological impacts are properly assessed and managed through the development consent process.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR29	**NCC 5.2.17**	*The document repeatedly uses the phrase 'When appropriate and practicable', or 'where necessary and practicable,' in relation to mitigation work. We object to the use of this phrase where mitigation requirements are identified and deemed necessary. It would lead to development impacts being significant, adverse and negative where archaeology is present and an unenforceable programme of work.*	The Applicant's intention is not to seek to justify new likely significant effects at detailed design stage where those have not already been identified in the ES. The Applicant's position is that the Proposed Development retains enough flexibility to accommodate any significant archaeology discovered during the additional evaluation work to be carried out post-consent. The potential areas selected for the parameters of the Proposed Development that had less flexibility (BESS and Substations) have been evaluated via trial trenching as part of the evaluation work to inform the Archaeological ES Chapter and the DCO submission. This reflects that there was less flexibility in these locations to respond to trial trenching undertaken post consent in order to avoid likely significant effects. Similarly, areas with the greatest potential for archaeology were also trial trenched, to ensure likely significant effects could be identified. Areas where trial trenching is proposed post-consent, ahead of implementation, is proposed to be focussed on areas of lower risk for archaeological potential as well as where there is more flexibility at detailed design to avoid or minimise impacts on archaeology (in line with the effects assessed in the ES) if required as a result of the further trial trenching. This is the approach the Applicant has taken to ensure effects from the Proposed Development are unlikely to be worse than those identified in the ES. Given there is the potential for unexpected archaeological finds, there is some need for flexibility and pragmatism in the mitigation proposals, which is reflected by the wording referred to, however, this is not a means by which the Proposed Development can introduce significant effects not previously identified.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR30	**NCC 5.2.19**	*The OAMS must provide for completion of an appropriate scheme of evaluation trenching which will identify each archaeologically sensitive area, the impacts from the proposed development and provide a detailed programme of archaeological works for each that will offset those impacts. This will include excavation, monitoring, preservation in-situ (archaeological exclusion zones) and design solutions. The currently submitted proposals are insufficient and limited and the impact from development remains adverse and negative.*	The OWSI will include an Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (OAMS) that will be informed by the evaluation work carried out to date, and additional phase of trial trenching which is currently being designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. This additional phase of trial trenching will be carried out as a pre-commencement requirement, to investigate the other locations with potential for buried heritage deposits detected, and in line with Paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, in the area where high impacts arising from the construction activities of the Proposed Development are expected.
LIR31	**NCC 5.2.20**	*The wording of an appropriate archaeological DCO requirement will depend on the level of assessment work that has been completed by the close of Examination. We recommend that if some evaluation trenching is still outstanding, then wording similar to that for the recently approved Mallard Pass scheme would be appropriate. It is likely that the implementation of further post-consent assessment work and mitigation work will be complicated and we are currently working with Solar Energy UK and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists to formulate appropriate requirement wording in such instances.*	The Applicant understands the position and, whilst the Proposed Development is distinguishable from Mallard Pass, particularly in terms of the extent of archaeology evaluation done for the purposes of the application, the Applicant has proposed post consent evaluation and has proposed a DCO requirement included in the draft DCO worded accordingly (noting however, that it is proposed in the case of One Earth that further trial trenching would be in accordance with the agreed OWSI, which was not the case at Mallard Pass). The Applicant will continue to discuss the requirement for additional trial trenching with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England, and will present a robust phase of additional archaeological evaluation within the OWSI. Any further amendments to the DCO requirement arising from discussions will be included in the draft DCO when agreed.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR32	**NCC 5.2.21 – 5.2.22**	*The evidence presented to date indicates the presence of significant archaeology across the site but does not yet provide sufficient site-specific detail on nature of much of it or the development impacts. Further, it does not yet offer an agreeable programme of mitigation work to offset those impacts. Therefore, the Council's position must be that the development will have a significant, adverse and negative impact on the archaeological resource encountered in the Order Limits.* *This position will alter when the applicant presents an agreeable programme for completion of the evaluation and assessment work and is able to submit their detailed OAMS for Examination, based on results of all the archaeological work and including the full evaluation report.*	Where trial trench evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole. This combined approach aligns with professional archaeological standards, including the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023), which recommends a complementary use of non-intrusive and intrusive techniques. Providing a flexible strategy for the next phases of trial trenching evaluation and mitigation allows the approach to the archaeological evaluation and mitigation to remain flexible and responsive to any future potential environmental constraints, technological advancements, and updates in professional guidance. This flexibility also ensures that mitigation can be tailored to minimise harm to archaeological assets while enabling efficient project delivery. The need for flexibility in design, layout and technology is recognised in National Policy Statement EN-1 is details of a development, such as the final design, may not be finalised until after consent is granted. The OWSI will include an OAMS that will be informed by the evaluation work carried out to date, and additional phase of trial trenching which is currently being designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. This will be carried out as a pre-commencement requirement, to investigate the other locations with potential for buried heritage deposits detected, and in line with Paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, in

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			the area where high impacts arising from the construction activities of the Proposed Development are expected.
LIR33	**LCC 14.21**	*Given the essential nature of adequate evaluation as the basis to deal appropriately with the developmental impact NCC and LCC are deeply concerned regarding the outstanding work and would expect the Applicant to provide details on when the evaluation and assessment process will be completed. Care will need to be taken to ensure the results are available in good time to inform a reasonable mitigation strategy which must be agreed prior to the commencement of any development or enabling works*	Additional trial trenching work will be carried out as a pre-commencement requirement, to investigate the other locations with potential for buried heritage deposits detected, and in line with Paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, in the area where high impacts arising from the construction activities of the Proposed Development are expected. The OWSI will also set the program for the results of the trial trenching to be made available to inform the mitigation strategy ahead of commencement of any development or enabling works.
LIR34	**LCC 14.26**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.3.40 provides a list of below ground disturbance however this list is incomplete. It does not for example include the groundworks specified in the Ecology Management Plan [APP-179] where paragraph 1.2.3 lists 'Areas of habitat management comprising landscape and biodiversity enhancement measures; habitat creation and management, including earthworks, landscaping, means of enclosure, and laying and construction of drainage infrastructure.' The provision of detail for*	The Applicant has set out its approach in response to LIR23.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		the proposed impacts is essential for understanding how the proposed development works will impact on surviving archaeologically significant areas.	
LIR35	**LCC 14.27**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.2 makes reference to further trenching as part of a mitigation strategy. Given that the mitigation strategy itself needs to be informed by the trenching results it would be advisable for adequate trenching to be undertaken first thus allowing the results to form the baseline evidence necessary for the creation of an informed mitigation strategy.*	The OWSI will include an OAMS that will be informed by the evaluation work carried out to date, and additional phase of trial trenching which is currently being designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. This will be carried out as a pre-commencement requirement, to investigate the other locations with potential for buried heritage deposits detected, and in line with Paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, in the area where high impacts arising from the construction activities of the Proposed Development are expected. The OWSI will also set the program for the results of the trial trenching to be made available to inform the mitigation strategy ahead of commencement of any development or enabling works.
LIR36	**LCC 14.28**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.8 states that in Areas of Archaeological Constraint (AAC) 'where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact.' The Council objects to*	As the Applicant recognises that the micrositing/concrete footings are not mitigations that can be applied thorough the entire DCO, these will be implemented when effective and practicable, within areas of Archaeological Constraints as per Paragraphs 9.5.8 – 9.5.11 of ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038], and as defined in the AMS. Effectiveness and practicability will be informed by the archaeological evaluation results and Detail Design of the Proposed Development and will be discussed with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. The use of micrositing/concrete footings will be included in the AMS and in the CEMP.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		the use of the phrase 'where necessary and practicable,' it is unenforceable and unacceptable. It will also depend on the nature, depth, state of preservation and sensitivity of the archaeology as to whether concrete footings would be appropriate and would not damage or destroy surviving archaeology without allowing it to be preserved by record.	
LIR37	**LCC 14.29**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.9 discusses preservation in situ. All management plans must include the specific mitigation measures required to ensure the preservation in situ areas are protected from development works such as machine tracking or plant storage which could damage or destroy the surviving archaeology.*	Preservation in situ and preservation by design measures will be included in the relevant management plan, and their application monitored by the ACoW. Areas of Archaeological Constraints (AAC), and the applicable mitigations measures will be included in the OAMS, and allowances for their implementation will be included in the OCEMP, OOEP and ODEMP.
LIR38	**LCC 14.31 – 14.33**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.11 states that 'An Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) will be appointed for the Construction Phase who will be reviewing and monitoring all works in the Order Limits.' The Council do not consider this to be acceptable.*	The OWSI will include allowances for an ACoW to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities. Specifically, the ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks. If such works are expected to affect known archaeological remains identified during evaluation or are expected to have a high magnitude of impact in areas where no remains were identified, they will be assessed and discussed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		There will be development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases as well as the Construction phase as well as any enabling works which could damage and destroy surviving archaeology. An appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works will therefore need to be appointed prior to the commencement of any groundworks or plant movement. They will be responsible for monitoring archaeological mitigation measures for the preservation in situ areas and any unevaluated areas which have yet to be subject to agreed mitigation. This will need to be included in an agreed Archaeological Management Plan to ensure that protective measures stay in place and are adhered to throughout the development. *This will need to be included in all management plans and an Archaeological Clerk of Works will need to be appointed to ensure adequate mitigation measures are taken for archaeology which would otherwise be destroyed without identification or recording by the development works.*	Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP.
LIR39	**LCC 14.35**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.14 states that 'When appropriate and practicable, the locations*	The Applicant has set out its approach in response to LIR29.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		of BESS, substation, ancillary works, construction compounds and the grid connection cable routes will consider buried heritage constraints as part of the detailed design.' The use of the phrase 'when appropriate and practicable' is unenforceable and unacceptable.	
LIR40	**LCC 14.36**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.15 includes archaeological mitigation through record or detailed excavation and that 'A programme of archaeological monitoring and recording may be undertaken during the construction works.' We recommend that preservation in situ is also included in the range of archaeological mitigation, it is discussed in paragraph 9.5.9.*	Avoidance/Preservation-in-situ has been considered separately within ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] and included in the draft OWSI as one of the potential mitigation measures applicable.
LIR41	**LCC 14.37**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.15 goes on to say that 'Where non-intrusive trenching methods are proposed for cable routes, the CEMP(s) will include a contingency for archaeological intervention/mitigation in the event that unplanned activities threaten the preservation of known buried heritage remains.' Please clarify what specifically is meant by 'unplanned activities.' The full extent of proposed*	Paragraph 9.5.15 of ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] covers the event of unplanned and/or contingency ground works that might be required during the construction works, not known at the time of the OCEMP submission

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		impact of the cable route like the rest of the redline boundary extent of the site will need adequate assessment and evaluation to inform reasonable mitigation of currently surviving archaeology which would be damaged or destroyed by the development.	
LIR42	**LCC 14.40**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.22 states that 'Decommissioning is anticipated to commence in 2090, and the majority of the Order Limits would be returned to its original use after 39 decommissioning and will be available for its original use.' Details are required on how this will be undertaken in order to understand the ground impacts. If it will revert to agricultural land for example, will the hundreds of thousands of piles be removed, what ground impacts would occur for cabling, would tree planting for ecological mitigation and landscaping be retained or pulled out?*	As detailed within ES Chapter 5 [APP-034], the decommissioning works will involve the removal of all above ground infrastructure including the BESS and substation foundations. There are no plans to remove trees and hedgerows as part of the decommissioning of the project. The Applicant has also outlined the approach to mitigating potential impacts upon built heritage assets in the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Plan [APP/7.6.1]. The OWSI will include allowances for an ACoW to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities. Specifically, the ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks. If such works are expected to affect known archaeological remains identified during evaluation or are expected to have a high magnitude of impact in areas where no remains were identified, they will be assessed and discussed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the CEMP, OEMP and ODEMP.
LIR43	**LCC 14.41**	In reference to Paragraph 9.5.24 within ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *We agree that archaeological remains which have been removed would not experience any further effects. We are*	

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		concerned that as there is no detail on the ground impacts of decommissioning there can be no understanding or effective mitigation measures to protect archaeology that survives across this landscape. Other solar NSIP schemes have provided indications that decommissioning will include works which would impact on surviving archaeology such as removal of all concrete, hardstanding areas, infrastructure foundations and internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m, or at if necessary temporary bunding and/or settlement ponds will be installed to allow for isolation and onsite treatment of any sediment laden or contaminated water prior to discharge to the drainage system.	An OAMP will be submitted within the OWSI for approval and secured through a Requirement of the DCO, when consent is granted. The AMP will be agreed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England to ensure that protective measures presented in this OWSI stay in place and are adhered to throughout the development Impacts at the phase of decommissioning are expected to be no greater than in construction. The oDEMP further details the approach to infrastructure removal in Section 3 [AS-051].
LIR44	**LCC 14.45**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.27 states that 'Where specific embedded environmental measures cannot be employed or are not deemed sufficient to avoid or reduce the impact on buried heritage assets, where reasonably practicable significant adverse effects will be offset through the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation measures.' Again, 'where reasonably practicable' is an unmeasurable unenforceable phrase*	The Applicant has set out its approach in response to LIR29.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		which is unacceptable and inappropriate for the NSIP planning process.	
LIR45	**LCC 14.47**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.28 lists archaeological mitigation and again leaves out preservation in situ although it is discussed in Section 9.5. It too is an 'industry-wide recognised archaeological mitigation measure.'*	Avoidance/preservation-in-situ has been considered separately within ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] and included in the draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) as one of the potential mitigation measures applicable.
LIR46	**LCC 14.48**	*Please be advised that as stated above all of the twenty-nine archaeologically sensitive areas identified from the DBA and geophysical survey along with any other significant archaeological areas identified during further trenching phases and during assessment of the cable route corridor will require sufficient evaluation to allow enough understanding for reasonable mitigation measures.*	As part of the draft OWSI, an additional phase of trial trenching will be carried out as a pre-commencement requirement, to investigate the other locations with potential for buried heritage deposits detected during the assessment work completed to date and not yet evaluated. The results of any additional trial trenching evaluation will be shared with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England enough in advance in order to inform any mitigation required prior to the commencement of any development or enabling works.
LIR47	**LCC 14.49**	*The statement 'when likely significant effects are expected on those areas' is deeply concerning. No works including plant movement, storage, drainage, ecological or landscaping measures, reprofiling, habitat creation or any other works which would cause destruction to surviving archaeology can be undertaken until the area is sufficiently evaluated to determine whether mitigation is required*	The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between providing the required evidence to inform the DCO application and limiting the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The Applicant considers that information submitted meets the requirements of the NPPF, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, the EIA Regulations and PINS scoping opinion and provides an adequate baseline for the assessment of impacts including the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		to record or protect significant archaeology.	The trial trenching evaluation carried out to date has provided the required information to define nature, extent, preservation and significance that will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy for the Proposed Development. This includes assessing the Project Design's capacity to address and accommodate any archaeological constraints that have been, or may in the future be, identified. This process also provided a better understanding of the buried heritage assets and demonstrated the substantial reliability of the non-intrusive assessments and evaluation carried out to inform the targeted trial trenching evaluation. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole. The OWSI will expand on this point, presenting allowances for additional trial trenching on both the areas where the survey carried out to date showed potential for archaeological deposits and has not been evaluated to date, and within locations where the impact from the Proposed Development is expected to be highest. As the detailed design for the Proposed Development has not yet been finalised, the exact location for the additional trial trenching cannot be determined at this stage. The oWSI currently under discussion will be informed by the progress of the detailed design for the Proposed Development, and the results of any further archaeological work will be appropriately considered and provided for in the detailed design.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR48	**LCC 14.50**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.5.30 makes reference to 'an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy which will be submitted for approval and secured through a Requirement of the draft DCO.' Recommend remove the word draft.*	The Applicant agrees that the sentence in question should reference the DCO rather than draft. However, the Applicant does not think this alters the understanding of the sentence and does not consider it is proportionate to amend the chapter for this amendment only
LIR49	**LCC 14.51**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.6.4 rates impacts of enabling and construction works upon buried heritage assets to a degree that is reductive and unfounded. For example full removal of archaeology is total destruction and therefore cannot be a 'medium' impact, and compression or 'partial removal' of archaeology is not negligible: it is the damage and destruction of surviving archaeology without recording.*	To clarify the contents of Section 9.6.4: Paragraph 9.6.4 of the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] should read: Full removal from excavations (truncation), considered to High for Works 2, 3, 5, 6; Partial removal from excavations (truncation), is considered to be "Medium" for Work 4 as it would result in substantial but not complete loss of deposits. Compression or partial removal from traffic of plant and machinery (truncation) is considered to be Negligible for all Works, including Work 7, as such impacts are expected where adequate mitigation measures (i.e plant routes) are in place.
LIR50	**LCC 14.52**	*Regarding the assessment of individual archaeological sites which follows from paragraphs 9.6.6 to 9.6.224, the*	The Applicant has set out its approach in response to LIR23.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		weighting of impacts is as unrealistic as that expressed in paragraph 9.6.4 with the importance of archaeological sites and the extent of impacts from developmental works both dismissively low. In any case the listed impacts are incomplete, please see below for the Councils comments on the FRA and Drainage Strategy.	
LIR51	**LCC 14.53 – 14.55**	*In order to have 'Negligible to Minor' Significance of Effect on archaeological sites which have 'High' Magnitudes of Impact, evaluation and mitigation would need to be very extensive.* *As a single example ROO4, the Roman settlement of Ragnall, is assessed as having high magnitudes of impact and there is no detail provided on how these will transform to 'Negligible to Minor' Significance of Effect. These will have a Significance of Effect of 'Negligible to Minor.' In order for this to happen the full extent of the site will need to be determined by robust ground-truthing by trenching and if the type of archaeological mitigation measure is by record this important the site will need to be totally excavated in advance of any groundworks or any other development impact including plant movement.*	The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) provided in ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage (APP-038) and expanded in the Outline WSI aims to offset any significant effect in EIA terms by a combination of embedded environmental measures and archaeological mitigation. The AMS will be informed by the trial trenching carried out to date and by an additional phase of trial trenching to be carried out as a pre-commencement condition to investigate the other locations with potential for buried heritage deposits detected, and in line with Paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, in the area where high impacts arising from the construction activities of the Proposed Development are expected.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		To give an understanding of just how difficult this would be in archaeological terms, paragraph 9.7.2 in the Summary of this report states that 'Of the 527 trenches carried out for the evaluation, 387 were designed to investigate areas where neither the DBA nor the geophysical survey suggested the presence of archaeology. Of these trenches, 94 recorded archaeological features not previously identified, 86 of which located in the area of the Sunken Roman Village of Ragnall alone.' So out of the trenches undertaken so far to ground-truth so-called 'blank' areas, 86 trenches had positive results, and Ragnall is much more extensive than previously understood.	
LIR52	**LCC 14.56**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraphs 9.6.225 and 9.6.226 state that there will be no likely significant effects during Operation and Maintenance phases or during the Decommissioning phase in excess of the construction phase. The Council does not agree. There is no information on the specific ground impacts of how for example infrastructure and the solar arrays will be removed or information regarding the impacts of refits throughout the 60 year lifetime of the scheme.*	In consideration of the Environmental Measures presented in Section 9.5 of ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage (APP-038, pp. 39-44), and in consideration of the currently unknown technologies or requirements for Operation and Maintenance and Decommissioning phases, it's the Applicant's position that there will be no likely significant effects in excess of the construction phase. Additionally, to offset any potential uncertainty and as control measure, the OWSI currently under consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England, include the presence of an Archaeological Clark of Work. The ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks. If such

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			works are expected to affect known archaeological remains identified during evaluation or are expected to have a high magnitude of impact in areas where no remains were identified, they will be assessed and discussed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England.
LIR53	**LCC 15.57**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Paragraph 9.7.4 states that 'The information collected during the trial trenching evaluation also confirmed that any effect arising from the construction of the Proposed Development on buried heritage deposits can be successfully mitigated to a non-significant level by a combination of embedded environmental measures and a proportionate and targeted archaeological mitigation.' The Council does not agree with the use of the phrase 'non-significant level,' it is subjective and unenforceable.*	The concept of "significant effects" and therefore conversely not or non-significant effects is a well understood concept in the context of environmental impact assessment. An ES is required, pursuant to the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) to identify likely significant effects, and the ES for One Earth is clear as to what constitutes "significant" effects (and non / not significant effects) in accordance with standard EIA practice.
LIR54	**LCC 14.58 – 14.59**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *Regarding Table 9.8: Summary of Likely Significant Environmental Effects, the Councils comments are as previously stated in our PEIR response for this scheme. To reduce developmental impacts of this magnitude to 'Negligible' on significant archaeology, field*	The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between providing the required evidence to inform the DCO application and limiting the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The Applicant considers that information submitted meets the requirements of the NPPF, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, and provides an adequate baseline for the assessment of impacts including the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		evaluation would need to be virtually total. *This approach, while laudable, is virtually impossible. The whole of the redline boundary would need intensive intrusive evaluation work to identify every surviving archaeological feature in the impact zone. The more usual and more workable approach is to undertake reasonable proportionate evaluation across the redline boundary to have sufficient understanding of the locations, extent, depth and significance of archaeologically sensitive areas and to move through an appropriate f it for purpose mitigation strategy to ensure that significant archaeology is preserved either in situ or by record. The rest of the site is then subject to development.*	The trial trenching evaluation carried out to date has provided the required information to define nature, extent, preservation and significance that will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy for the Proposed Development. This includes assessing the Project Design's capacity to address and accommodate any archaeological constraints that have been, or may in the future be, identified. This process also provided a better understanding of the buried heritage assets and demonstrated the substantial reliability of the non-intrusive assessments and evaluation carried out to inform the targeted trial trenching evaluation. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole. The forthcoming draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigations (oWSI) will define the strategy to carry out additional trial trenching evaluation to evaluate the remaining 20 areas of archaeological potential identified in the DBA and by the geophysical survey. This will also inform the detailed design and mitigation for archaeological remains and this can be secured through draft DCO Requirements 12 [APP-007]. Mitigation for archaeological remains will either be through design changes to avoid impacts (micro siting / exclusion zones or use of non-intrusive foundations) or through excavation or archaeological monitoring where avoidance is not necessary or desirable.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			Carrying out any further trial trenching evaluation as a pre-commencement requirement, will reduce the risk of any disproportionate harm to buried heritage deposits arising from a partial or total removal of assets as a consequence of the archaeological trial trenching investigation, at a time when it is not certain that consent for the Proposed Development will be granted and therefore there is no guarantee of the associated benefits. . In consideration of the following: • CifA's Code of Conduct Principle 2 stating that "the member has a responsibility for the conservation of the historic environment," and Rules 2.1 stating that "A member shall strive to conserve archaeological sites and material as a resource for study and enjoyment now and in the future, and shall encourage others to do the same. Where such conservation is not possible, they shall seek to ensure the creation and maintenance of an adequate record through appropriate forms of research, recording, archiving of records and other relevant material, and dissemination of results", and Rule 2.3 stating that "A member shall ensure that the objects of a research project are an adequate justification for the destruction of the archaeological evidence which it will entail." • Paragraph 5.9.21 of the EN-1 stating that "Where there is a high probability (based on an adequate assessment) that a development site may include, as yet undiscovered heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Secretary of State will consider requirements to ensure appropriate procedures are in place for the identification and treatment of such assets discovered during construction."

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			• Paragraph 2.3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) stating that "In considering the impact on the historic environment as set out in Section 5.9 of EN-1 and whether the Secretary of State is satisfied that the substantial public benefits would outweigh any loss or harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should take into account the positive role that large-scale renewable projects play in the mitigation of climate change, the delivery of energy security and the urgency of meeting the net zero target." The phased approach to assessment, utilising a suite of techniques to build upon and inform one another, is comparable with other DCO solar farm schemes. Large amounts of predetermination trenching are not supported by guidance or by the ethical principle of minimizing harm to the historic environment. In their reply, Historic England support an approach that minimizes unnecessary physical interventions to archaeological remains
LIR55	**LCC 14.60 – 14.62**	In reference to ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage, LCC states: *To cite a single example of impacts included in the submission documents which are not included in this chapter we refer to the FRA and Drainage Strategy [APP-095]. This document makes reference to 'the drainage system and SuDS features' (p45) and that 'Attenuation will be provided within attenuation basins at natural low points' (p51). There will be swales which are 1m deep and they 'will be incorporated*	The Applicant has set out its approach in response to LIR23.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		wherever appropriate to provide additional SuDS benefits and aid in the management and conveyance of surface water runoff' (p42). There will be Detention Basins of 0.8m with Ecological Enhancement Ponds with an additional depth of 100mm to 300mm (depths from the Surface Water Drainage Strategy Eastern BESS Compound figure). All of these works will go below the archaeological horizon, and for land which has been in agricultural use surviving archaeology can be very near to the current ground surface. No information has been provided in the Buried Heritage Chapter to either illustrate the necessary detail of the proposed groundworks or to show an understanding of its impact or the mitigation measures required for this work occurring in areas of archaeological sensitivity. *This document also refers to ecological measures including 'a new ditch is proposed to be dug in the ecological mitigation area (floodplain grazing marsh) near the River Trent, Works to desilt the watercourses…(and) Ecological enhancement in the form of scrapes to create wetland habitat' (p16).* *These types of works would impact upon any surviving archaeology not only in*	

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		terms of groundworks but in the subsequent spreading of spoil which would irradicate any earthworks and redeposit archaeological artefacts within the ploughzone.	
LIR56	**LCC 14.64 – 14.65**	*From the above it is clear that there is considerable uncertainty over the extent of buried heritage assets due to the inadequate amount of trial trenching undertaken. There is a real possibility that remains of more than local/regional significance could be found. Consequently, given this uncertainty, it is not yet possible to understand or quantify the level of impact upon buried heritage significance within the Order limits.* *There is therefore a negative construction impact upon the archaeological remains in relation to the Order limits with the degree of harm as yet unquantifiable due to the insufficient evaluation undertaken so far.*	The extent and scope of the targeted trial trenching evaluation is considered proportionate and appropriate, striking the right balance between providing the required evidence to inform the DCO application and limiting the impact on Buried Heritage Assets arising from any intrusive archaeological work. The Applicant considers that information submitted meets the requirements of the NPPF, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, the EIA Regulations and PINS scoping opinion and provides an adequate baseline for the assessment of impacts including the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains. The trial trenching evaluation carried out to date has provided the required information to define nature, extent, preservation and significance that will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy for the Proposed Development. This includes assessing the Project Design's capacity to address and accommodate any archaeological constraints that have been, or may in the future be, identified. This process also provided a better understanding of the buried heritage assets and demonstrated the substantial reliability of the non-intrusive assessments and evaluation carried out to inform the targeted trial trenching evaluation. Where trial trenching evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the DBA and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole. The forthcoming Outline Written Scheme of Investigations (oWSI) will define the strategy to carry out additional trial trenching evaluation to evaluate the remaining 20 areas of archaeological potential identified in the DBA and by the geophysical survey. This will also inform the detailed design and mitigation for archaeological remains and this can be secured through draft DCO Requirements 12 [APP-007]. Mitigation for archaeological remains will either be through design changes to avoid impacts (micro siting / exclusion zones or use of non-intrusive foundations) or through excavation or archaeological monitoring where avoidance is not necessary or desirable. Carrying out any further trial trenching evaluation as a pre-commencement requirement, will reduce the risk of any disproportionate harm to buried heritage deposits arising from a partial or total removal of assets as a consequence of the archaeological trial trenching investigation, at a time when it is not certain that consent for the Proposed Development will be granted and therefore there is no guarantee of the associated benefits. . In consideration of the following: • CifA's Code of Conduct Principle 2 stating that "the member has a responsibility for the conservation of the historic environment," and Rules 2.1 stating that "A member shall strive to conserve archaeological sites and material as a resource for study and enjoyment now and in the future, and shall encourage others to do the same. Where such conservation is not possible, they shall seek to ensure the creation and maintenance of an adequate record through appropriate forms of research, recording, archiving of records and other relevant material, and dissemination of results",

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			and Rule 2.3 stating that "A member shall ensure that the objects of a research project are an adequate justification for the destruction of the archaeological evidence which it will entail." • Paragraph 5.9.11 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1, 2024), stating that "Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or the available evidence suggests it has the potential to include, heritage assets with an archaeological interest, the applicant should carry out appropriate desk-based assessment and, where such desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation. Where proposed development will affect the setting of a heritage asset, accurate representative visualisations may be necessary to explain the impact." • Paragraph 5.9.21 of the EN-1 stating that "Where there is a high probability (based on an adequate assessment) that a development site may include, as yet undiscovered heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Secretary of State will consider requirements to ensure appropriate procedures are in place for the identification and treatment of such assets discovered during construction." • Paragraph 2.3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) stating that "In considering the impact on the historic environment as set out in Section 5.9 of EN-1 and whether the Secretary of State is satisfied that the substantial public benefits would outweigh any loss or harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should take into account the positive role that large-scale renewable projects play in the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			mitigation of climate change, the delivery of energy security and the urgency of meeting the net zero target." The phased approach to assessment, utilising a suite of techniques to build upon and inform one another, is comparable with other DCO solar farm schemes. Large amounts of predetermination trenching are not supported by guidance or by the ethical principle of minimizing harm to the historic environment. In their reply, Historic England support an approach that minimizes unnecessary physical interventions to archaeological remains.
Biodiversity			
LIR57	**NCC 5.3.3**	NCC has reviewed the Biodiversity Chapter and relevant appendices of the ES and is concerned about some the assessment methodology that has been used and inadequacy of some of the proposed mitigation. These comments highlight key areas of concern relating to specific species and ecological features. At the present time, it is considered that there are gaps in the impact assessment and these mean that the impact upon biodiversity has not been robustly assessed, and that the full extent of required mitigation has not been properly established. This also makes it difficult to conclude whether the impacts of the proposal will be positive, neutral or negative. The highlighted issues can be addressed through further assessment work and development of more robust mitigation. Some of these suggestions	The Applicant provided at Deadline 1 additional information on field survey. This information was provided in response, in part, to NCC comments in its relevant representation [RR-154]. The updated information is currently being considered by NCC, and the Applicant will seek to discuss the issues raised as part of discussions regarding Statements of Common Ground. At Deadline 1 the Applicant provided the following: REP1-023 – Update to Chapter 6 Biodiversity to incorporate further information regarding fish, breeding birds, great crested newts and veteran trees. Also included was an update to a range of environmental measures aimed at addressing points raised in the relevant representations. REP-1-028 – Update to figure showing location of veteran trees. REP1-030 – Updated Ecology Desk Study to include information on fish as requested by the Environment Agency and to clarify the position on Local Wildlife Sites.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		may be secured through updates to the Outline LEMP and NCC is willing to engage further with the applicant to agree appropriate mitigation.	REP1-032 – Updated Extended Habitat Survey report to provide clarity on results. REP1-034 – Updated Breeding Bird Baseline to incorporate data gathered in 2025 to increase survey coverage. REP1-036 - Updated Great Crested Newt Baseline to incorporate data gathered in 2025 to increase survey coverage. REP1-038 – Updated Wintering Bird Baseline to incorporate data gathered in 2025 to increase survey coverage. REP1-040 – Updated Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment to address comments raised within the relevant representations. REP-042 – Fish habitat Baseline. A new report based on information gathered in 2025. The Applicant notes that the Local Impact Reports of Lincolnshire County Council [REP1-089] considers that sufficient information has been gathered to inform the assessment (see paragraphs 10.15 and 10.21). Similarly, the Local Impact Reports of Bassetlaw District Council [REP1-087] describe the survey effort, without raising concerns on its validity to inform a robust impact assessment.
LIR58	**NCC 5.3.4 – 5.3.6**	NCC is concerned that within the limitation section of Chapter 6: Biodiversity Paragraph 6.3.4 and Section 6.6.15, this is a very large area which has not been subject to detailed surveys, further clarification to whether these areas are subject to protected species	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 52). In summary, the area where access was unavailable is large, but will only be used for a cable connection to the National Grid. Based on current proposals by National Grid as part of the Brinsworth to High

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		surveys should be sought. Specifically, why the area around the High Marnham Substation has not been surveyed, when access issues were the constraint. Surely this area will need accessing for the proposals and therefore access should not be an issue to areas within the Order Limits.	Marnham project this will likely see a small temporary loss of arable field only. Regardless the whole area has been classified from satellite imagery and included within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040]. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR59	**NCC 5.3.7**	Within this area there is Marnham Railway Yard LWS, Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS and Old Trent, Marnham LWS which support protected species. The transmission cabling will impact habitats such as hedgerows and therefore these need to be accounted for. In addition, the National Grid project will not have taken account for the loss or impact of these habitats. Again, this has been referenced in paragraph 6.9.2. Access into the habitats will still be required even using trenchless techniques, which may require the loss of sections of hedgerows etc.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 52). The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR60	**NCC 5.3.8**	Paragraph 6.6.5 states: There are 34 LWS within the 2 km study area, one of which occurs within the Site itself, with a further eight immediately adjacent to the Site. Details of those sites that occur either within or adjacent to the Site are summarised in Table 6.3. This is	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 54). Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] and Appendix 6.2 Ecology Desk Study [REP1-030] have been updated to account for these LWS.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		considered incorrect as Marnham Railway Yard LWS, Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS and Road Wood LWS all fall into the Order Limits Boundary.	The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR61	**NCC 5.3.9**	6.10.22 states Habitats within the LWSs will not be directly impacted by construction activities (C1) and will be protected from indirect impacts through the implementation of buffers (minimum of 5 m). This is not considered to be a sufficient buffer, especially during construction with potential impacts from dust and spillages.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 54). Environmental measure C2 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at Deadline 1 to increase the stand off distance to 10m. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR62	**NCC 5.3.10**	It is indicated that the Breeding Bird Baseline (Vol 6.0: Environmental Statement, Vol 3: Technical Appendices Supporting ES Vol 2, Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline) adopted a sampling approach covering 633 ha of the 1478 ha site. It further appears that some areas surveyed are no longer in Order Limits area, and the Biodiversity Chapter (Vol 6.0: Environmental Statement, Vol 2: Aspect Chapters, Chapter 6: Biodiversity) in para 6.3.8 states that the area surveyed is in fact 27% of the Order Limits area, i.e. around only a quarter of the site. The rationale for taking a sampling approach is not clearly justified, and the effect of the	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 55). At Deadline 1 further breeding bird survey information was provided (Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034]) and the assessment updated in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		sampling approach is that some very large parts of the Order Limits area have not been subject to survey which is very concerning.	
LIR63	**NCC 5.3.11**	It is stated in para 6.3.9 that the field survey programme was discussed with stakeholders, and methods agreed as appropriate. With regards to birds, this is not the case, as concerns about the sampling approach were raised, for example in a meeting with the applicant on 11 March 2024 (as minuted). It is indicated that some further surveys will be undertaken in 2025, but no further information is given about the scope of these surveys or how the results will be taken into account as part of the DCO process. It is not clear why omitted areas were not surveyed in 2024.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 55). At Deadline 1 further breeding bird survey information was provided (Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034]) and the assessment updated in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR64	**NCC 5.3.13**	A number of notable bird species were recorded during surveys, including Barn Owl, Hobby, Quali, Grey Partridge, Linnet, Skylark, Turtle Dove, Yellowhammer and Yellow Wagtail. The sampling approach has risked under-reporting the importance of the Limit Order area for rare/scarce species which may only occur patchily across the area, or which have been completely missed so far (such as Tree Sparrow or Corn Bunting).	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 55). At Deadline 1 further breeding bird survey information was provided (Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034]) and the assessment updated in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR65	**NCC 5.3.14**	Impacts on ground nesting birds, particularly Skylarks, seem to be of greatest concern, but it does not appear that an attempt has been made to estimate how many Skylark territories there will be post-development, with mitigation. Furthermore, with regards to para 6.10.92 of the Biodiversity Chapter, further detail is needed of the extrapolation of Skylark territories has been carried out, given only a quarter of the site was surveyed and the extrapolation form 66 pairs to 115 pairs suggests that half the Limit Order is unsuitable for Skylarks, which seems unlikely. In summary, the approach to breeding birds represents a significant area of concern.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 55). At Deadline 1 further breeding bird survey information was provided (Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034]) and the assessment updated in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR66	**NCC 5.3.17**	Paragraph 6.6.52 (ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity EN01059/APP/6.6) states: 11 A sampling approach was used to assess the highest quality habitats within five locations across the Order limits. Grass snake (peak count of 2 adults) and common lizard (peak count of 3 adults) were confirmed to occur within these habitats. However, no reptiles were identified along the Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS. Considering that reptiles were identified to be present within these areas, and therefore present within the order limits, it is unclear why no	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 58). The reptile survey undertaken was a presence / absence survey that identified two species. The appropriate mitigation for these species has been applied (with updates for clarity to environmental measure C15 within Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] provided at Deadline 1). The overall position remains that the effect of the Proposed Development on reptiles will be Significant Beneficial. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		further surveys undertaken in wider areas.	
LIR67	**NCC 5.3.18**	Paragraph 10.131 states: Potential for reptiles to be killed or injured during vegetation clearance is the largest risk to individuals. To avoid this monitoring of vegetation clearance by an Ecological Clerk of Works (C15) would be undertaken. Any reptiles located would be moved to suitable habitat in the near vicinity where they could continue to exist during the construction phase. This is not sufficient mitigation considering the limitations to the survey effort, sampling approach used to undertake the surveys as the distribution of reptiles across the site is not currently known, only across a very small proportion of the site. More mitigation, such as a precautionary method of working should be used i.e. cuts of vegetation to 30cm in a directional manner etc. Measure C15 is not considered sufficient – would also disturb ground nesting birds too much. Mitigation to prevent nesting birds should be undertaken - i.e. cutting of any longer grassland habitats or other vegetation outside of the nesting bird season and then management of any grassland swards to a low height to deter nesting (grassland habitats) Areas of habitats such as scrub, hedgerows etc	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 58). The appropriate mitigation for these species has been applied (with updates for clarity to environmental measure C15 within Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] provided at Deadline 1). The overall position remains that the effect of the Proposed Development on reptiles will be Significant Beneficial. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		should be cut in the reptile active period, immediately following suitable nesting bird surveys by experienced Ecologists.	
LIR68	**NCC 5.3.19**	Paragraph A.6.1.5 of the Reptile Appendix 6.9 (EN010159/APP/6.21) states: Following the completion of the surveys, evolution of the Order Limits has removed some of the sampled area from the project. Clarification is sought with regards to what this area was and what the results of this area were. This area could further indicate reptiles present or likely absence within the order limits.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 58). The reptile survey undertaken was a presence / absence survey that identified two species. The appropriate mitigation (across the whole Order Limits) for these species has been applied (with updates for clarity to environmental measure C15 within Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] provided at Deadline 1). The overall position remains that the effect of the Proposed Development on reptiles will be Significant Beneficial. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR69	**NCC 5.3.20 – 5.3.24**	Refugia deployed on 30th May 2024 and the first survey was on the 11th of June which is under 2 weeks. 3rd survey on the 25th of June was undertaken in too high temperatures – 17-23 degrees. Surveys 4.1, 4.2, 5 and 6 were all undertaken in July which is outside of the optimal window. The sampling method used only used 5 locations across the whole site – 4 of the locations were over the eastern side of the river Trent with only one location in the western side of the river Trent. A very	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 58). The reptile survey undertaken was a presence / absence survey that identified two species. The appropriate mitigation (across the whole Order Limits) for these species has been applied (with updates for clarity to environmental measure C15 within Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] provided at Deadline 1). The overall position remains that the effect of the Proposed Development on reptiles will be Significant Beneficial. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		large area of the site has not been surveyed. It is accepted that the majority of the Site is arable field, however there are still hedgerows, blocks of woodland and grassland (grazed) in the areas which were not surveyed which offer suitability for reptiles. Regarding A.6.3.1 (Reptile Appendix 6.9, NCC state that no information has been provided about when the felts were replaced other than during the following visits and considering that surveys were all undertaken within less than 2 weeks of each other, then it is considered that the replacement of the felts and the time allowed to let the new replacement felts bed in, is not sufficient or in line with best practice guidelines. Also, as 18 felts of the 20 felts were damaged at location B, there was not sufficient felts to undertake a thorough survey in line with best practice guidelines. This location only identified one common lizard at this location, it's not considered a sufficient estimate of the numbers of reptiles at this location. Location E had a total of 14 records over the surveys with a max count of 3 individuals – considering that only 20 felts were used in this area, then its not considered a sufficient estimate of the population present. Considering that	

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		reptiles are of county importance, then any significant populations of reptiles needs to be determined and protected. Considering that reptiles have been identified at location B, D and E, there doesn't appear to be any enhancements specifically for reptiles within these locations.	
LIR70	**NCC 5.3.26 – 5.3.27**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline NCC seek clarification for why only 4 transects were selected, other than the suitability of habitats in these locations. Justification is sought for why transects to provide a baseline of the sites use by bats was not used. Focusing on just the higher quality habitats and not the overall site may miss any other important commuting or foraging areas across the Site. The heat map in appendix 6.4 Figure 3.4 clearly shows areas which are missing from the survey effort. This method is not consistent with current guidelines (Collins, 2023), with specific reference to the following paragraph: 8.2.8 all habitats should be sampled during the bat activity surveys. If the impact occurs in an area perceived as having low suitability for bats, then this	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61). The bat surveys carried out are considered by the Applicant to have provided the information on what bats are present, what habitats are used most frequently and where corridors of movement exist. This information has fed into the design of the infrastructure and the landscape design. Further data collection would not have altered the design or mitigation measures and would therefore be disproportionate. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		may still need to be surveyed to evidence this or detect unforeseen importance.	
LIR71	**NCC 5.3.28**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline NCC query whether the guidance as provided in paragraphs 8.2.16 and 8.2.25 of the bat survey guidelines has been followed for the bat activity surveys.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61). The Applicant considers that the bat surveys have been undertaken in line with the guidance. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR72	**NCC 5.3.29**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline NCC is unclear as to why static 10 was positioned outside of the Order Limits and seek clarification to why only of the locations 2 (locations 11 and 12) incorporated arable fields, when this forms the majority of the on-site habitats.	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61). Twelve static detectors were deployed with six different habitats covered. Arable fields represented the greatest area, but also the type of habitat where least bats would be expected. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground
LIR73	**NCC 5.3.30**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline *Justification for how the static monitoring locations were selected needs to be sought. The 12 points used appear to be random and not a full representation of all the habitats at the Site and to be directly impacted. Its unclear how the edge of cereal crop and the cereal crop locations (Figure 3.5) have been factored into the*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61). Twelve static detectors were deployed covering the six different habitats that are mainly representative of the Site. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		assessment when the locations provided in Table 2.2 both detail the static detector located within the centre of an arable field with one field containing non cereal crop and the other containing cereal crop.	
LIR74	**NCC 5.3.31**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline *Information for how the solar farm will be monitored needs to be sought. Set locations of the baseline and then post development should be used as a comparison.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61). Environmental measure C33 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] states that the same monitoring locations used to gather the baseline will be used for monitoring to allow comparison before and after development. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR75	**NCC 5.3.32**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline *Bat survey guidelines – it appears that the older bat survey guidelines from 2016 have been used, as cited within the reference. The newer 2023 guideline were available from 2023 and should have been used for both the bat roost and activity surveys*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61). The 2016 guidelines were those that were current at the start of the 2023 season (noting that the updated guidelines were released in September 2023). The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR76	**NCC 5.3.33**	Appendix 6.4: Bat Baseline *Its not clear how the trees have been categorised in terms of their suitability to*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		support roosting bats. The ES Chapter makes reference to the 2023 good practice guidelines, but this doesn't correspond with the technical appendix (6.4: Bat Baseline).	Noted – the potential for bat roosts in trees was considered using the third edition guidance document from 2016, as opposed to the fourth edition from 2023. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR77	**NCC 5.3.34**	In reference to ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity, Paragraph 6.10.86, NCC suggests that: *All trees should be retained and avoided. It seems unnecessary that trees should need to be removed considering the vast area of the Site and options to avoid these features.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154). Vegetation removal has been minimised. Tree loss may be required in locations such as visibility splays etc. Where other considerations are necessary. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR78	**NCC 5.3.35**	In reference to badgers, NCC states: *The preference is for suitability sized holes rather than gates to be used to facilitate movement of this species around the order limits.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 65). Environmental measure C9 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at Deadline 1 to remove reference to gates. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR79	**NCC 5.3.36 – 5.3.37**	In reference to otters, and ES chapter 6: Biodiversity, Paragraph 6.10.116, NCC states: *No information on the size of buffers, location of artificial holts to be impacted*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 66). The location of artificial holts would be decided post-consent as it would require agreement with the relevant local drainage board.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		during decommissioning has been provided or assessed.	The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR80	**NCC 5.3.38**	In reference to Water Vole mitigation, NCC states: *More details are quired on the control of mink, including length of time and location.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 67). Environmental measure C23 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at Deadline 1 to remove reference the period of time over which mink control would take place. No specialist provider of this service has yet been identified, although it is known from Lincolnshire County Council that a project is set to begin in the general area that could provide options for integration. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR81	**NCC 5.3.39**	*ES chapter Paragraph 6.10.53 states: Habitats within the River Trent will not be directly impacted by construction activities (C1) and will be protected from indirect impacts through the implementation of buffers (min 16 m) This buffer is not considered sufficient considering the species the River Trent supports.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 67). The 16m distance is based on the stand off required by the Environment Agency to avoid the need for an environmental permit when working near a tidal river. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR82	**NCC 5.3.40 – 5.3.41**	In reference to ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity, Paragraph 6.10.8 NCC states:	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 68).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		The requirement for monitoring suggests that the exact impacts to lamprey cannot be determined. Although the ES chapter has reviewed the literature and provided justification and mitigation to be used, the use of the word likely does not provide complete confidence that there will be no impacts to this species.	The approach is agreed with Natural England and follows that agreed for the consented projects of West Burton Solar Project, Cottam Solar Project and Gate Burton Energy Park. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground
LIR83	**NCC 5.3.42**	*Lamprey populations will be monitored for no more than 5 years – we would question whether this is sufficient considering their life cycle. Larvae live downstream for 3-7 years and then go to the ocean, before returning to freshwater to spawn and die. 5 years wouldn't be sufficient to monitor any impacts to the population. Especially with the impacts of the cabling under the Trent. There has been no baseline survey to establish the number of lampreys and therefore cannot determine impacts through any monitoring.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 68). The approach is agreed with Natural England and follows that agreed for the consented projects of West Burton Solar Project, Cottam Solar Project and Gate Burton Energy Park. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR84	**NCC 5.3.43**	*Impacts to lamprey during the decommissioning phases have not been considered.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 68). There will be no impacts during the decommissioning phase as the cable ducts would be left in place. Should cables be removed these would be pulled out from joint bays either side of the river. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR85	**NCC 5.3.44**	C13 - *This type of fencing would not stop animals from entering active works. Other methods of mitigation need to be considered.* C15 – *Not considered sufficient – would also disturb ground nesting birds too much. Mitigation to prevent nesting birds should be undertaken - i.e. cutting of any longer grassland habitats or other vegetation outside of the nesting bird season and then management of any grassland swards to a low height to deter nesting (grassland habitats) Areas of habitats such as scrub, hedgerows etc should be cut in the reptile active period, immediately following suitable nesting bird surveys by experienced Ecologists.* C16 – *Are these areas going to be protected once these works have been completed – they need to be fenced or have a specific phasing to prevent any encroachment during construction and decommissioning.* C17 – *To be created 12 months prior to the installation of the modules. What protection are these going to have? Management works to the grassland during the establishment period will need to be undertaken which could impact any skylark nests*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 70). Environmental measures C13, C15, C16, C17, C19, C20 and C24 were all updated in Table 6.6 Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] at Deadline 1. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		C18 – *Consideration of different types to be created currently all will just be sown with a species rich grassland Could some be made with sandy substrate and have an acid grassland mix created?* C19 & 20 – *Clarification sought for the numbers to be used and locations. 50 and 25 doesn't seem to be enough* C24 – *50 including 3 barn owl boxes doesn't seem to be enough*	
LIR86	**NCC 5.3.45**	In reference to the ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity Table 6.7, the NCC states: *The table on page 55 outlines the habitat types, loss and quantification. Considering that at this stage the design, access points, habitat creation and losses are detailed and known it is unclear why 'assumptions' have been made specifically for hedgerow and arable field margins.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 70). The design is indicative. It has been assumed, for example, that all tracks moving through hedgerows would require a 6m gap to be cut, even though many will use existing field entrances. This is to account for any need to micro-site and represents a realistic worst case scenario. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR87	**NCC 5.3.46**	*Paragraph 6.10.35 also states: Fencing will surround the solar tables but will likely be installed in large sections that cover several fields at one time meaning that it will cross through hedgerows on occasion. The removal of a section of a hedgerow to facilitate a fence seems unnecessary habitat loss and impacts.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 70). This approach is common on solar farms and avoids large lengths of additional fencing.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		The hedgerows themselves would act as fencing.	The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR88	**NCC 5.3.48**	In reference to the modified grassland habitat summary within ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, the NCC states: *Clarification is sought with regards to the number of species per square metre and if this should be other neutral grassland? Missing information to define this (see below) – habitat type in UK Habs is not solely based on agricultural use but through the composition. BNG condition assessment sheets also require the use of Condition sheet 6 and not 5 if there are more than 9 species per m2.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 73). The Applicant has reviewed the habitat data within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040] and has not seen a reason to alter the assessment on this particular point. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR89	**NCC 5.3.49**	In reference to the modified grassland habitat summary within ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, the NCC states: *The modified grassland in good condition underneath the solar panels is not feasible. Under the solar panels will require regular management to keep the sward height low and therefore will not be able to meet condition criteria B and D – therefore the maximum is moderate condition for this habitat.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 73). The Applicant does not agree with the position taken by NCC and provides in the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] several examples of DCO solar projects where grasslands of higher diversity have been agreed. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR90	**NCC 5.3.50**	In reference to ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, the NCC states: *It should be noted that UK Hab Guidance for Solar Arrays page 326 states: Record the strips of panels as u1b6 and the strips of vegetation in between the rows separately. New tree planting cannot achieve good condition in 30 years. This needs to be at least moderate – trees are unlikely to pass condition criteria C and E as they will not reach an age to be classed as mature or develop niches within the 30 years.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 73). The Applicant notes that this is not an approach that has been taken on any other solar DCO project. It is also noted that the good condition of trees is reasonable as the Proposed Development will be managed for the lifetime of the project and not just 30 years. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR91	**NCC 5.3.51**	In reference to ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, the NCC states: *No information on the size of the trees inputted into the metric has been provided. As per BNG User Guidance on post-development tree planting, newly planted individual trees should be classed as 'small', unless 'medium' size or above at the time of site-planting and trees planted with a DBH less than 7.5cm are considered to be 'small.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 73). All trees to be planted have been considered to be small. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR92	**NCC 5.3.52**	In reference to ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, the NCC states:	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 73).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		No species lists / results of the quadrats undertaken for the grassland conditions, provided within the BNG assessment or condition sheets provided as an appendix A1 Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets. Many of the condition assessment sheets are also lacking in justification for the pass or fail of each condition criteria.	The Applicant considers that the approach to Habitat Survey was reasonable and provides adequate information on which to base the assessment. A new environmental measure C36 was added to Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] to provide additional comfort. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR93	**NCC 5.3.53**	*Appendix 6-3 extended habitat survey does not contain a direct translation into UK Habs, with references to older Phase 1 habitat types (JNCC 2016), and not UKHabs, therefore finding species lists for the relevant habitat type for comparison is difficult.*	The Applicant has responded to this comment within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 73). The Applicant considers that the approach to Habitat Survey was reasonable and provides adequate information on which to base the assessment. A new environmental measure C36 was added to Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] to provide additional comfort. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with NCC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR94	**LCC 10.24**	*Based on the current assessment, the Scheme is predicted to result in a net gain of 113.17% for area-based habitat units, 92.49% for hedgerow units and 57.75% for watercourse units. The Council considers that if BNG is to be given positive weight in the planning balance a specific commitment in the DCO to delivering more than 10% BNG will be required. The nearby Cottam Solar Project included a requirement*	The Applicant updated the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040] at Deadline 1 to respond to comments from Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council. The outputs of the assessment altered marginally to gains of 112.88% for habitat units, 92.64% for hedgerow units and 57.75% for watercourse units. The Applicant is content to reword requirement 9 to reflect these ambitions and demonstrate that moderate positive weight can be afforded in the planning balance due to BNG.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		(Requirement 9) which sets out specific details of levels of BNG that will be delivered by the development. This approach resulted in ecology and BNG for that development being afforded moderate positive weight in the planning balance. The Council therefore encourages the applicant to provide greater clarity around the level of BNG that will be delivered by the scheme at the earliest opportunity.	The Applicant will update the draft Development Consent Order [REP1-007] to secure at least a 50% uplift in habitat and hedgerow units and a 10% uplift in watercourse units. The percentages from the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040] have not been used as these will change based on the detailed design. The watercourse unit element has remained at a minimum of 10% as agreement to implement the suggested management measures will need to be reached with the Internal Drainage Board. It is however noted that the approach to ditch management is typically applied and should not be of issue as it would not impede management of water levels or flows. The delivery of net gains at levels similar to those within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040] are still predicted as they are intrinsically linked to the habitat specified in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP1-053] through Requirement 8 of the draft DCO [REP1-007]. It is noted that at Deadline 1 the draft Development Consent Order [REP1-007] Requirement 9 was updated. This update used the term 'maximum', this is being substituted with 'minimum' at Deadline 2.
LIR95	**LCC 10.25**	*The Council also encourages the Applicant to work with other developers and stakeholders in the area to identify opportunities to deliver BNG strategically and welcomes continued engagement with the Applicant in relation to BNG.*	The Applicant will initiate discussions with LCC (and other relevant Local Planning Authorities) to identify developers and stakeholders with aligned interests. The Applicant will explore the potential for a collaborative approach to BNG delivery in the area and, subject to progress in these discussions, will provide an update to the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) [REP1-053] at a later deadline.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR96	**LCC 10.28**	*The Council suggests that consideration is given to the establishment of an Ecological Steering Group or similar for the Proposed Development. This group should consist of key ecological stakeholders (both statutory and non-statutory). The remit of the group would be to receive updates on project progress and to advise on issues encountered during construction as well as to refine delivery of required ecological mitigation and enhancement measures. Meetings should be held at an appropriate frequency to ensure good communication between both the developer and stakeholders.*	The Applicant will initiate discussions with LCC (and other relevant Local Planning Authorities) to explore the formation of an ecological steering group that could engage in the delivery of biodiversity enhancement. Should a suitable group be identified, an update to the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) [REP1-053] would be made at a later deadline.
LIR97	**NSDC 9.12**	*NSDC have also raised concerns regarding the proposed buffer distances to watercourses and lack of assessment of encroachment within the riparian zone associated with proposed infrastructure which includes clear span bridges and/or culverts. Without the implementation of sufficient protective buffer zones, there is a risk that the existing habitat may be damaged or degraded through direct construction damage or indirect impacts such as the release of sediments or dust which could flow into connected watercourses downstream of the OL.*	Table 6.6 (environmental measures C2 and C4) in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at Deadline 1 to ensure that other than at crossing points (where clear span bridges will be used) stand-offs to wet ditches and watercourses is a minimum of 10m. This distance is increased to 16m for the River Trent, reflecting its nature as a tidal river. These distances are considered suitable to control the potential effects (particularly during construction) on water courses and ditches.
LIR98	**NSDC 9.13**	*The Council's Relevant Representation's also raised concerns regarding veteran*	The position on veteran trees was reviewed following ISH1. The data within the Arboricultural report [APP-134] was reviewed and Chapter

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		trees. Chapter six states that no veteran trees were identified within the OL during the desk study, while Appendix 11.6 (Arboricultural Report) states under section 3.2 (General Observations) that 15 trees were classified as veteran features which are listed in Table 2. Confirmation has been requested as to whether any mature trees are considered to be veteran under the UKHabitat classification system and address these specific receptors. Currently insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that all Veteran trees would be protected through the lifetime of the development or whether development would accord with local planning policy requirements in this regard.	6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] then updated. An assessment of veteran trees was added to the Ecological Impact Assessment and environmental measure C37 was added to Table 6.6 to ensure that Government guidance on standoff distances will be met. It was confirmed in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] that no veteran trees will be lost nor will stand off distances required following environmental measure C37 be encroached.
LIR99	**NSDC 9.18**	*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.*	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). Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was also 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].
LIR100	**NSDC 9.32**	*Whilst NSDC support the proposal to include monitoring surveys to improve the confidence of the assessment of residual adverse or beneficial effects, which would provide a greater dataset to inform future*	The Applicant has responded to comments regarding bat surveys within the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-075] (see relevant representation number RR.154, page 61).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		large scale solar schemes, there is uncertainty around the impacts resulting from the proposed Scheme given there are woodlands that border the edge of the Scheme. The Scheme's generally low suitability to bats and low habitat diversity is borne out by the dominance of common and widespread species within the survey and desk study data which include common and soprano pipistrelle. The rarer species of barbastelle bat and Nathusius' pipistrelle appear within the data at extremely low rates (~1% and 0.1% of calls respectively). Whilst this may reflect the wide-ranging, migratory behaviour of these species, it also likely reflects the low survey effort (15 recording nights at 6 deployment locations in 2023, though increased to 35 recording nights at 12 locations in 2024) which decreases detection probability for a given species. This is also evident from the heat map which clearly shows a low transect survey effort which is not consistent with current guidelines (Collins, 2023).	The bat surveys carried out are considered by the Applicant to have provided the information on what bats are present, what habitats are used most frequently and where corridors of movement exist. This information has fed into the design of the infrastructure and the landscape design. Further data collection would not have altered the design or mitigation measures and would therefore be disproportionate. The Applicant will seek to confirm the position outlined in REP1-075 with HSDC during discussions on the Statement of Common Ground.
LIR101	**NSDC 9.41**	*The outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) outlines some initial planting guidelines; however, due to the evolving nature of the design proposals, it provides only limited detail regarding the long-term management of vegetation. The guidance needs to be*	The Applicant updated the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP1-053] at Deadline 1 in response to comments provided in Relevant Representations. These updates include confirmation that positive habitat management and associated monitoring will take place throughout the full 60-year operational lifetime of the Proposed Development.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		firmed up within the official LEMP in order to be assured of the enhancements proposed and to create the screening required to lower the visual impact to surrounding sensitive landscape from the proposed Solar Farm and to ensure mitigation for farmland birds and BNG is delivered. There are also inconsistencies with reference to the proposed length of habitat management and monitoring and should be over the lifetime of the development which would be 60 years.	The detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (secured through Requirement 8 of the draft DCO [REP1-007]) will provide sufficient detail on the design and long term management of habitats to enable the approach to be agreed with the relevant authorities.
LIR102	**BDC Ecology**	*The applicants have generously chosen to include Biodiversity Net Gain in the application although Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project applications are not legally compelled to do so until their proposed inclusion date of May 2026. Utilising Biodiversity accounting on a scheme such as this is useful way to ensure the Proposed Development strives to deliver habitats of an agreed quality and the proposals are welcome however, the ascertain that modified grassland present under the panels will ever reach 'good' condition is questionable.*	The Applicant welcomes this comment from BDC. The indicative design of the infrastructure and the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures described in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] have been driven by a commitment by the Applicant to provide a lasting positive legacy for biodiversity in the area, particularly with regards local conservation priorities.
Landscape and Visual			
LIR103	**NCC 5.5.6**	*The Development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering its character on a large scale across an*	The Applicant disagrees that the Proposed Development would result in significant effects on the landscape character at a regional scale. Appendix 11.3 [AS-044] provides the detailed assessment on

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
	LCC 9.15	*extensive area. This landscape change also has the potential to affect a wider landscape character, at a regional scale, by replacing large areas of agricultural or rural land with solar development, affecting the current openness, tranquillity and agricultural character that are identified as defining characteristics of the area. We also judge that this would likely be classed as a permanent project in regards to landscape and visual matters, spanning several generations. As such, the likely effects may be understated as the author has deemed residual effects would be partly reversable.*	landscape receptors including published character areas identified at a regional level, and the extent to which the Proposed Development would affect their key characteristics. The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by the guidance set out in the relevant landscape character assessments and the detailed assessment at Appendix 11.3 [AS-044] also explains how the Proposed Development responds to these where applicable. The Applicant acknowledges that the residual effects would be long term but disagrees that the project should be classed as a permanent project. GLVIA3 notes at paragraph 5.52 that developments that have a limited life are often argued to be reversible, in other words temporary, as the development will eventually be removed and the land reinstated. 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.
LIR104	**NCC 5.5.7** **LCC 9.16**	*We have highlighted some issues with the visual assessment within the LVIA and compliance with the recent Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01; The assessment is structured around static views rather than the experience of the visual receptor which should include for sequential and varying views. This should be reviewed further as part of the DCO examination, as the extent of visual effects do not appear to have been fully considered.*	LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01). The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19. These representative viewpoints were then agreed with LCC [REP1-066] and NCC [REP1-067] during the pre-application stages as

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			shown in the draft Statements of Common Ground that were submitted at Deadline 1. In recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the Proposed Development when travelling through the landscape, more than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at Table 11.9, people travelling along Route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented by Viewpoints 10, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62. Following this through to the detailed assessment provided in Appendix 11.4 [AS-047], one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views.
LIR105	**NCC 5.5.9** **LCC 9.18**	*Tree and vegetation removal associated with the Development, including wider highways improvements and access for construction, must be clarified through the examination process, and subsequently any works (such as lopping or pruning), or removal of trees and hedgerows must be agreed prior to any works commencing. Prior to any construction activities, all tree and hedgerow protection methods associated with that phase of construction should also be clarified and subsequently agreed with the appropriate authority (in this case the local planning authority). This would be to BS:5837 Trees in Relation to Construction and any subsequent arboriculture method statements, again this should be approved by the appropriate authority. In particular this should ensure existing trees, and*	The anticipated maximum extent of vegetation removal is provided at Appendix C of the OLEMP [REP1-052]. The actual required extent of vegetation removal will be confirmed as part of the approval of the detailed LEMP. The Applicant has committed to protecting all trees and hedgerows in accordance with BS:5837 within the OLEMP [REP1-053] which is noted at paragraph 5.3.6. The Applicant has also committed to undertake any works to trees in accordance with BS 3998 within the OLEMP at paragraph 5.3.8. Paragraph 1.3.5 of the OLEMP [REP1-053] also commits the Applicant to submitting a detailed plan for the establishment and maintenance of new and retained trees and hedgerows as part of the detailed LEMP, which will be provided during the detailed design stage as required under Requirement 8 of the draft DCO [REP1-007].

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		associated root protection areas, are suitably protected throughout the entire construction period. This would also likely include areas within the order limits, but away from construction activity, such as storage areas for materials which may suffer from tracking by plant that would damage tree root protection zones.	
LIR106	**NCC 5.5.10** **LCC 9.19**	*While the submission includes landscape proposals (as shown on Figure 2.7: Illustrative Masterplan and the Mitigation Plan within Appendix A of the OLEMP, secured via Work Order 8 on the Works Plans and DCO), these are of a high level and it would be expected that if the project proceeds much more detailed plans would be submitted and subsequently agreed with the appropriate authority prior to the commencement of any works and secured through Requirements of the DCO. This would include clear detail of the areas of landscape mitigation, location and types of planting (species), as well as number, density and specification. The mitigation illustrated on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) has been utilised to assess the landscape and visual effects of the scheme, therefore we would expect any detailed landscape proposals to consist of the area and extent shown on these plans as a minimum. The provision of detailed*	Paragraph 1.3.5 of the OLEMP [REP1-053] commits the Applicant to submitting a detailed plan for the establishment and maintenance of habitats as part of the detailed LEMP, which will be provided during the detailed design stage as required under Requirement 8 of the draft DCO [REP1-007]. It is anticipated that further discussion will be undertaken with the host authorities during the preparation of the detailed LEMP, but the Applicant can confirm that the detailed LEMP will include details of the areas of landscape mitigation, location and species of planting, as well as number, density and specification. The Applicant will also consult with the Local Planning Authorities regarding the proposed hedgerow species list as stated in the OLEMP [REP1-053] at paragraph 5.4.12.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		planting, and subsequent agreement with the relevant authority must be explicit in the OLEMP, which needs to be suitably secured within the wording of Requirement 8 of the DCO (the wording in the draft DCO is currently very much focused on written management and does not include for a detailed planting scheme).	
LIR107	**NCC 5.5.11**	*The wording within the OLEMP should also be specific in the timescales for maintenance (lifetime of the project) and plant replacement (minimum 5 years), as well as cover 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. This maintenance must cover all new planting and existing retained vegetation associated with the scheme, including trees, hedgerows, grassland, shrub/scrub and marginal/aquatic planting. Existing vegetation should be covered by a tree survey and protected to BS5837: Trees in Relation to Construction.*	The OLEMP [REP1-053] has been updated for Deadline 1 to clarify that all existing and proposed habitats will be managed and maintained for the operational duration of the Proposed Development (see paragraph 5.4.3). Also, as the Applicant explained during the Issue Specific Hearing 1 and reported in the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077), any plant failures in the first 5 years will be replaced in the next planting season with stock of the same size whilst an Ecological Clerk of Works will undertake quarterly checks of plants to record their growth and condition. This is committed to within the OLEMP [REP1-053] for example at paragraph 5.4.37. Furthermore, a broad range of species will be planted to enhance biosecurity and provide a greater level of resilience in unforeseen circumstances such as extensive plant dieback. There is currently no commitment within the OLEMP for replacing any plant failures beyond the five-year establishment aftercare period, although a post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP to ensure habitats are still being managed appropriately and in line with the BNG Strategy. The BNG Strategy is based on the delivery of certain habitats to a specific condition, so if planting was to fail after the five-

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			year period for unforeseen reasons, the applicant would liaise with the host authorities to agree an appropriate solution and if necessary, update management measures so that the habitat can achieve its target condition. The Applicant has committed to protecting all trees and hedgerows in accordance with BS:5837 within the OLEMP [REP1-053] which is noted at paragraph 5.3.6. The Applicant has also committed to undertake any works to trees in accordance with BS 3998 within the OLEMP at paragraph 5.3.8.
LIR108	**NSDC 8.8**	The assumptions made on plant growth rates in Section 11.3.40 are generally acceptable, however we would state these are at the higher end of the scale as to what we would deem acceptable for a fifteen-year period: fifteen years being the period that residual effects have been assessed in the LVIA. We would query as to whether the plant growth rates allow for issues during the establishment period and allow for any plant replacements to be carried out along with planting establishing should there be plant failures or lack of acceptable growth. These plant growth rates are dependent upon the successful implementation of a robust and well considered OLEMP, which is covered in further sections of this review.	The assumed plant growth rate has been derived from available information on individual species from plant nurseries. This varies by species, but the growth rate adopted in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] assumes a blanket growth rate towards the slower end of the spectrum for all tree and hedgerow species as to assess a reasonable worst-case scenario. As the Applicant explained during the Issue Specific Hearing 1 and reported in the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077), any plant failures in the first 5 years will be replaced in the next planting season with stock of the same size whilst an Ecological Clerk of Works will undertake quarterly checks of plants to record their growth and condition. This is committed to within the OLEMP [REP1-053] for example at paragraph 5.4.37. Furthermore, a broad range of species will be planted to enhance biosecurity and provide a greater level of resilience in unforeseen circumstances such as extensive plant dieback.
LIR109	**NSDC 8.9**	Given that 60 years is comparable to at least two generations, there is some considerable strength to the	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,

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		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.	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 (or any limit) is required. 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. 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.
LIR110	**NSDC 8.10**	We would also recommend that the applicant consider fully that in this 60-year timescale, the panels, inverters, batteries, and other associated elements will be replaced. It is stated in the ES within Table 5.5 Indicative Design Life of Chapter 5 that this would likely be once for panels, however Inverters and batteries may be more regularly. Also, given the pace of technology, it should be considered if it is likely that the panels	The Applicant has assessed construction as worst case, and due to the low rate of panel degradation [REP1-077], does not expect numerous 'additional' panel replacements to keep with technology change. As it is not expected that cables, foundations, access tracks and other associated civils (e.g. drainage installations), the replacements are not comparable to the original construction period. The extent to which the Applicant can replace scheme components during operation is authorised and controlled by powers in the draft DCO to "maintain" the authorised development. The Applicant has

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		could be replaced on numerous occasions. At this stage we would need additional information regarding the phases of replacements in order to consider whether there is one single construction stage or a series of staged re-construction stages, and activity and deliveries, potentially of large-scale equipment, be for the life of the scheme.	responded in detail at Deadline 1 in relation to the definition of "maintenance" in the draft DCO (see Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075], ref RR.032 on page 105). Additionally, at Deadline 2, the Applicant has updated the outline OEMP to insert a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES. This provides a further check on the scope of the maintenance power, including on the impacts of any replacement.
LIR111	**NSDC 8.11**	<u>ZTV Methodology</u> The process of modelling Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) and subsequent presentation on Figures 11.3 to 11.6 is summarised in paras. 11.4.81 to 11.4.88. Para 11.4.82 references Appendix 11.1: Legislation, Policy, and Technical Guidance for a methodology for the ZTVs, however we assume this is an error, and the correct reference should be to Appendix 11.2: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology. Within Appendix 11.2, a methodology and parameters of the ZTV generation is provided within section A.11.3. The methodology, execution and presentation on Figures 11.3 to 11.6 is	The Applicant notes the erratum and will provide an updated LVIA Chapter 11 for Deadline 2 with corrected reference to Appendix 11.2 at paragraphs 11.4.82.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		acceptable, with elements modelled to their maximum parameters.	
LIR112	**NSDC 8.28**	However, several landscape character areas that will also have direct effects 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, and we would judge that all landscape character areas directly affected by the Development would have residual Significant effects – primarily through a change of landuse.	The Applicant disagrees that all landscape character areas that are directly affected by the Proposed Development would result in significant residual effects. The Applicant is of the view that the Site contributes to the character of different landscape character areas to varying degrees and a blanket approach, as suggested, would overlook the fundamental characteristics of each area and the landscape mitigation that has been embedded into the Proposed Development. The significance of landscape effects, as reported in Chapter 11 [REP1-025], has been determined by considering the relationship between the sensitivity of the landscape character areas and the magnitude of effect. The justification of each landscape character area is detailed in Appendix 11.3 [AS-044]. Consideration of the sensitivity of the receptor has included their susceptibility to the type and nature of development proposed and the value attached to the landscape, as is suggested in GLVIA3 paragraph 5.39. Consideration of the magnitude of effect has included the scale of change, the geographical extent of the area influenced, and its duration and reversibility, as is suggested in GLVIA3 paragraph 5.48.
LIR113	**NSDC 8.29**	Localised removal of vegetation is identified in the assessment of landscape effects; however, it is unclear whether this includes vegetation works on the wider highways network, and what this would entail. We strongly recommend limiting vegetation loss along Site boundaries for access or sight lines, or along construction access routes, because this has the potential to change	As explained at 11.5.21 of Chapter 11 [REP1-025], access points as secured in Work Area 7 have been located to minimise vegetation removal. The OLEMP [REP1-052] also notes at paragraph 5.3.7 that these have been located at current field access locations or in areas where there are existing gaps in the hedgerows and no trees wherever possible. Paragraph 5.3.15 of the OLEMP [REP1-052] explains that where hedgerows are present in visibility splays at construction access/egress points, these will be managed at a 0.9m height to

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		the character of the local landscape beyond the limits of the Development.	further avoid vegetation removal, and following completion of the works will be allowed to regrow to their original height. In cases where hedgerow removal is required for temporary access during construction, paragraph 5.3.10 of the OLEMP [REP1-052] notes that hedgerows will be replanted on completion of the works to reinstate their former structure. The landscape and visual impact assessment provided in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] has had regard to the anticipated maximum extent of vegetation removal which is provided at Appendix C of the OLEMP [REP1-052].
LIR114	**NSDC 8.36**	we 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. Section 6(7): "Assessing viewpoints or visual receptors?" clarifies: "The focus of the visual assessment should be the visual receptors (i.e. the people as set out within paragraph 6.31. of GLVIA3). The purpose of viewpoints is covered at paragraph 6.19 (i.e. for illustration of the visual effects)."	LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01). The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19. These representative viewpoints were then agreed with NSDC [REP1-070] during the pre-application stages as shown in the draft Statements of Common Ground that were submitted at Deadline 1. In recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the Proposed Development when travelling through the landscape, more than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at Table 11.9, people travelling along Route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented by

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			Viewpoints 10, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62. Following this through to the detailed assessment provided in Appendix 11.4 [AS-047], one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views.
LIR115	**NSDC 8.37**	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. The experience and effects will be different depending on the experience, such as traveling along a linear route. The visual assessment does not fully account for this, and if only relying on a static viewpoint and describing the existing view and change to that view, is likely underplaying visual effects.	LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01). The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19. These representative viewpoints were then agreed with NSDC [REP1-070] during the pre-application stages as shown in the draft Statements of Common Ground that were submitted at Deadline 1. In recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the Proposed Development when travelling through the landscape, more than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at Table 11.9, people travelling along Route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented by Viewpoints 10, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62. Following this through to the detailed assessment provided in Appendix 11.4 [AS-047], one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views.
LIR116	**NSDC 8.39**	Therefore, it needs to be clarified as to how sequential views and the experience	LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		of the receptor, rather than a static viewpoint, have been fully considered within the LVIA, particularly with the visual assessment being structured around viewpoints.	appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01). The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19. These representative viewpoints were then agreed with NSDC [REP1-070] during the pre-application stages as shown in the draft Statements of Common Ground that were submitted at Deadline 1. In recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the Proposed Development when travelling through the landscape, more than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at Table 11.9, people travelling along Route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented by Viewpoints 10, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62. Following this through to the detailed assessment provided in Appendix 11.4 [AS-047], one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views.
LIR117	**NSDC 8.48**	Nine receptors are identified in the LVIA as likely to experience Significant residual visual effects. This is a concern and indicates that the scale and extent of Development makes impossible to mitigate all potential visual effects, and there is a potential that all Significant effects have not been fully identified due to the assessment being focussed on static viewpoints rather than visual	The iterative assessment and design process undertaken throughout the pre-application phase has sought to minimise adverse impacts as far as has been practical however some impact is considered inevitable. This is reflected in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that "*Virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation.*"

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		receptors, which could experience views of the Development along a linear route. We also have concerns that the mitigation planting itself has the potential to cause adverse visual effects through blocking or foreshortening currently open views, appearing out of character, or creating a perception of enclosure in an open landscape. Further detail is provided in the mitigation section below, but the mitigation planting must be well considered at any detail design stage, and not simply put in place to screen views of development.	The Applicant is of the firm view that all significant landscape and visual effects have been considered fully and appropriately within Chapter 11 of the ES. LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01). The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19. These representative viewpoints were then agreed with NSDC [REP1-070] during the pre-application stages as shown in the draft Statements of Common Ground that were submitted at Deadline 1. In recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the Proposed Development when travelling through the landscape, more than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at Table 11.9, people travelling along Route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented by Viewpoints 10, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62. Following this through to the detailed assessment provided in Appendix 11.4 [AS-047], one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views. With regard to mitigation planting having the potential to cause adverse visual effects by changing the composition and/or character of the view, this been a key consideration from the outset of the design process, and the Design Approach Document [AS-013] clearly explains how the design has evolved in response to people's

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			views. For example, a minimum 30m buffer from solar panel to solar panel has been embedded in the masterplan to avoid the creation of narrow corridors around public bridleways. Furthermore, within the OLEMP [REP1-053] and with reference to the planting of new species-rich hedgerows, paragraph 5.4.18 states that: *"the height at which these hedgerows will be maintained will be between 3-4m in order to adequately screen the Solar PV Infrastructure. Where screening is not required, proposed hedgerows may be maintained at a lower height in order to maintain open views of the countryside, balancing this with the biodiversity value provided by larger and more complex hedgerow structure."*
LIR118	**NSDC 8.49**	Access, and the wider highways elements of the scheme, do not appear to be fully considered in the LVIA beyond increased traffic during construction and decommissioning phases. This is despite the potential for adverse effects on the views of the rural landscape including potential vegetation loss, urbanisation, and reduction of visual amenity. Consequently, the visual effects during construction may be underestimated within the LVIA due to the impact of loss of vegetation in the wider landscape. We recommend limiting vegetation loss along site boundaries, for access or for sight lines, or along construction access routes, as this has the potential to change the character of the local landscape beyond the limits of the Development. Clarification on this matter by the applicant should be provided.	As explained at 11.5.21 of Chapter 11 [REP1-025], access points as secured in Work Area 7 have been located to minimise vegetation removal. The OLEMP [REP1-052] also notes at paragraph 5.3.7 that these have been located at current field access locations or in areas where there are existing gaps in the hedgerows and no trees wherever possible. Paragraph 5.3.15 of the OLEMP [REP1-052] explains that where hedgerows are present in visibility splays at construction access/egress points, these will be managed at a 0.9m height to further avoid vegetation removal, and following completion of the works will be allowed to regrow to their original height. In cases where hedgerow removal is required for temporary access during construction, paragraph 5.3.10 of the OLEMP [REP1-052] notes that hedgerows will be replanted on completion of the works to reinstate their former structure. The landscape and visual impact assessment provided in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] has had regard to the anticipated maximum extent of vegetation removal which is provided at Appendix C of the OLEMP [REP1-052].

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR119	**NSDC 8.53**	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.	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 Appendix E of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077].
LIR120	**NSDC 8.57**	We acknowledge that the LVIA does consider settlements and views from residents within these, but a robust methodology as to how individual properties have been identified (study area) and how their visual amenity would be affected has not been provided.	The Applicant has provided further detail at Deadline 1 explaining the assessment and design approach to individual residential properties at Appendix F of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077].

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
Landscape and Visual			
LIR121	**NSDC 8.60**	*We have highlighted some issues with the visual assessment within the LVIA and compliance with the recent Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01; The assessment is structured around static views rather than the experience of the visual receptor which should include for sequential and varying views. This should be reviewed further as part of the DCO examination, as the extent of visual effects do not appear to have been fully considered.*	LITGN-2024-01 does not specify a precise approach to visual assessment, instead the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported (Section 6.7 of LITGN-2024-01). The LVIA [REP1-025] is focussed on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint as per GLVIA3 paragraph 6.31. As explained in Appendix 11.2 [APP-130] at paragraph A.11.3.9, representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptors, which accords with GLVIA3 paragraph 6.19. These representative viewpoints were then agreed with NSDC [REP1-070] during the pre-application stages as shown in the draft Statements of Common Ground that were submitted at Deadline 1. In recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the Proposed Development when travelling through the landscape, more than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in Chapter 11 [REP1-025] at Table 11.9, people travelling along Route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented by Viewpoints 10, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62. Following this through to the detailed assessment provided in Appendix 11.4 [AS-047], one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views.
LIR122	**NSDC 8.61**	*We have concerns regarding effects on the national, county, and regional landscape character areas from the*	As explained during Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) and detailed within the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		extent of renewable and energy infrastructure proposed across the county. The mass and scale of these projects combined has the potential to lead to adverse effects on landscape character over an extensive area across these published character areas. The landscape character of the local, and potentially regional area, may be completely altered over the operational period through an extensive area of land use change, and introduction of energy infrastructure in an area that is predominantly agricultural. This would also be an issue when experienced sequentially for visual receptors travelling through the landscape and experiencing these schemes across potentially several kilometres, albeit with gaps between the schemes. This is a clear and marked change to landscape character.	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 Appendix E of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077]. The cumulative landscape and visual assessment focusses on a 2km Zone of Influence as this was considered to be a proportionate area in which significant landscape and visual effects could be experienced. This was established based on a number of factors including an understanding of the prevailing landform, vegetation patterns, and the emerging design parameters. With regard to sequential cumulative effects, in line with PINS Guidance – Nationally Significant Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment, and considering the principle of proportionality and relevance, the cumulative effects assessment adopts a receptor-led approach, focusing on projects with spatial and temporal overlap that may result in significant in-combination effects. The Applicant is of the view that a sequential cumulative assessment is more appropriate for regularly used routes like major roads, railway lines, ferry routes, popular paths, rather than a convoluted journey that would intentionally pass by any solar infrastructure in the area. The Applicant considers there to be no regularly used routes where sequential cumulative impacts with other NSIPs would be a relevant consideration, and further, no such routes have been identified by NSDC during the pre-application stage.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR123	**LCC 17.10**	*Offsets from individual properties and community assets are welcomed as it does appear that the solar arrays and associated fencing are further away from people's homes and better screened. However, the fields used for solar arrays are still very close to North Carlton and appear to encircle some small hamlets and individual properties, which may leave residents feeling enclosed. This proximity to built up areas is a concern. The impact on households where their current view is significantly altered, must be adequately addressed or mitigated. Some land not used for solar PV panels has been redesignated for accessible green space and nature, the Council welcomes this, although consider that more could potentially be made available for community growing (contributing to good diet and nutrition) and other community gains.*	The Applicant assumes that reference to North Carlton is an error. Nonetheless, the Applicant has provided further detail at Deadline 1 explaining the assessment and design approach to individual residential properties at Appendix F of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077]. With regard to additional land being made available for community growing and other community gains, the Applicant is committed to providing community benefits as part of the Proposed Development and these suggestions will be explored further through the project's community benefit fund.
LIR124	**LCC 19.9**	*The in-combination landscape and visual effects of the OESF alongside other solar developments around Gainsborough and in Nottinghamshire could significantly impact the landscape character at national, county, and regional levels. The combined mass and scale of these projects may lead to adverse effects over a large area, altering the predominantly agricultural landscape. This change would be noticeable to visual receptors when traveling through the area, experiencing the NSIP/DCO schemes sequentially across several kilometres.*	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 Appendix E of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077]. The cumulative landscape and visual assessment focusses on a 2km Zone of Influence as this was considered to be a proportionate area in which significant landscape and visual effects could be

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			experienced. This was established based on a number of factors including an understanding of the prevailing landform, vegetation patterns, and the emerging design parameters. With regard to sequential cumulative effects, in line with PINS Guidance – Nationally Significant Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment, and considering the principle of proportionality and relevance, the cumulative effects assessment adopts a receptor-led approach, focusing on projects with spatial and temporal overlap that may result in significant in-combination effects. The Applicant is of the view that a sequential cumulative assessment is more appropriate for regularly used routes like major roads, railway lines, ferry routes, popular paths, rather than a convoluted journey that would intentionally pass by any solar infrastructure in the area. The Applicant considers there to be no regularly used routes where sequential cumulative impacts with other NSIPs would be a relevant consideration, and further, no such routes have been identified by LCC during the pre-application stage.
LIR125	**WLDC 7.25 – 7.26**	*WLDC notes that Landscape and Visual assessment in the ES does not carry out a cumulative assessment against the projects including Gate Burton, Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge Solar.* *This is due to a 2km study area buffer being applied, which excludes the other projects. 7.26. Whilst this approach may reflect typical methodology, it results in there being no assessment of the total impact of all of the projects on the landscape character of West Lindsey and the significant magnitude of change that its character will endure as a consequence of solar farm development cumulatively.*	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 Appendix E of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077].

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			The cumulative landscape and visual assessment focusses on a 2km Zone of Influence as this was considered to be a proportionate area in which significant landscape and visual effects could be experienced. This was established based on a number of factors including an understanding of the prevailing landform, vegetation patterns, and the emerging design parameters.
Transport			
LIR126	**NCC 3.4**	*NCC wishes to secure explicit confirmation within the OPROWMP that any damage caused to the site because of the works including to trees, shrubs, vegetation, verges, path surfaces, signage, fences, drainage and all and any other infrastructure will be made good, with a pre- and post-works condition assessment carried out by the applicant. NCC also seeks confirmation that any appropriate measures will be put in place to ensure the safety of users, and that signage will be installed to warn users of any disruption. This should include any crossing points that are required during the construction phase, details of which shall have been agreed prior to their installation, and which shall give priority to any users of the multi-user route. This is necessary in order to minimise the impact on users of the NCR including pedestrians and cyclists.*	The Applicant can confirm that in respect to path surfaces, the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan **[REP1-061]** in section 3.2.3 makes clear that any footpath which has its surface disturbed will be remediated upon completion of the relevant construction activity. The Applicant has set out the proposed control measures for crossing points in Section 3.2.6 of the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan **[REP1-061]**, which contains details of the proposed signage that would be put in place to communicate risks to both public right of way users and construction workforce traffic. The Applicant confirms that any signage to be installed will be agreed prior to installation with the Local Highways Authority.
LIR127	**NCC 5.6.3**	*The County Council has reviewed the Transport and Access Chapter and relevant appendices of the ES and is concerned about the assessment methodology that has been used to assess the impact of construction traffic on the local highway network and the acceptability in principle of the proposed accesses, which have not been justified. There are certain routes that would be expected to carry a significant proportion of construction traffic, which have been omitted from the transport assessment study area, and which could have an impact on some significant settlements. There also access*	Discussions with NCC have been held and additional barred routes included in the updated oCTMP report [REP1-055]. This includes the following: • B1164 (between Carlton-on-Trent and Tuxford); • A1133 through Collingham; • Grassthorpe Road (between Sutton on Trent and the Main Street / Polly Taylors Road junction).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		points which have been proposed which could have consequences for the Major Road Network and result in a highway safety risk.	
LIR128	**NCC 5.6.4**	*Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] in paragraph A.12.4.6 also states in regard to the Environmental Impact Assessment that further consultation has been held with NCC. Other than the response to the statutory pre-application consultation provided in July 2024 the HA have had no further input, and the concerns raised in that consultation do not appear to have been adequately addressed in the current documents*	Further discussions have been held with NCC to address their concerns relating to vehicle routing, access strategy, travel plan management and wear & tear agreements. These have resulted in updates to the Transport Assessment, Transport Chapter and oCTMP report.
LIR129	**NCC 5.6.6**	In reference to ES Chapter 12: Transport, the NCC states: *12.3.3. states that Fig 1 of the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] shows the study area, but this is incorrect as Fig 1 is the development location plan. This should in fact refer to Figure 6.*	This correction has been made in the updated Transport Assessment report [REP1-045].
LIR130	**NCC 5.6.7**	*Routes which have been excluded were specifically highlighted as an issue in our previous consultation comments and the response given in Consultation Response [EN010159/APP/5.1] is not accepted. Furthermore, this response states that the routes identified will not be used and that these routes will be managed by the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9] (OCTMP). However, neither routes are referred to in this document but this statement is also directly contradicted by Figure 5 of Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] which shows that the A1133 to the south is an intended HGV route (albeit the route shown is cut off) and this is also supported by the traffic figures.*	Discussions held after the LIR drafting have been held with NCC. With regards to routing, a revised oCTMP [REP1-055] has been provided that addresses the Council's comments. The revised barred routes now include the following: • B1164 (between Carlton-on-Trent and Tuxford); • A1133 through Collingham; and • Grassthorpe Road (between Sutton on Trent and the Main Street / Polly Taylors Road junction).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR131	**NCC 5.6.8**	*The A1133 to the South of South Clifton is predicted to have 202 daily construction related vehicles on it and therefore should be included in the study area. The A1133 to the north is predicted to have 86 daily construction related vehicles using it and is included in the study area. This is a clear disparity.*	Discussions held after the LIR drafting have been held with NCC. With regards to routing, a revised oCTMP has been provided that addresses the Council's concerns. The revised barred routes now include the following: • B1164 (between Carlton-on-Trent and Tuxford); • A1133 through Collingham; and • Grassthorpe Road (between Sutton on Trent and the Main Street / Polly Taylors Road junction).
LIR132	**NCC 5.6.9**	*We have a significant concern that the A1133 between the A46 and the site and the B1164 linking the A1 south to the site have neither been considered in the assessments nor included in the proposed barred routes. These routes are the shortest and quickest routes to both the east and west parcels from south using either the A1, A46 or the A17. This has potential to create impacts on the settlements of Sutton on Trent, Collingham and Besthorpe (amongst other smaller ones) which have not been considered.*	Discussions with NCC have been held and additional barred routes included in the updated oCTMP report [REP1-055]. This includes the following: • B1164 (between Carlton-on-Trent and Tuxford); • A1133 through Collingham; • Grassthorpe Road (between Sutton on Trent and the Main Street / Polly Taylors Road junction).
LIR133	**NCC 5.6.12**	*There remains disparity with regards to the number of HGVs as a percentage increase which impacts on the extents of the areas which should have been included in the Environmental Impact Statement but have not been.*	Discussions with NCC have been held and additional barred routes included in the updated oCTMP report [REP1-055]. This includes the following: • B1164 (between Carlton-on-Trent and Tuxford); • A1133 through Collingham; • Grassthorpe Road (between Sutton on Trent and the Main Street / Polly Taylors Road junction).
LIR134	**NCC 5.6.13**	*A.12.5.21 of Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] states that in relation to existing traffic conditions that the counts were recalibrated and crosschecked with DfT data. The majority are now broadly in line with what would be expected but there are two (excluding the A57 Dunham count which appears to be a replica of the A57 west data) where the HGV numbers are considerably different to the information based on DfT data that we provided*	Discussions on this matter have been held with NCC after the LIR was drafted. With regards to the HGV composition of flows, the provision of barred routes information in the revised oCTMP addresses concerns relating to traffic impacts on communities to the south of the Proposed Development. The percentage of HGV on the two A roads would not affect the mitigation that is proposed in the form of the oCTMP.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		previously; namely the A57 west of Dunham where it is claimed that there are 865 HGVs compared to the 688 from the DfT (an increase of more than 25%) and the A1133 south of South Clifton where it is claimed that 792 HGVs compared to the 334 from the DfT (an increase of 137%). The response is therefore not accepted.	
LIR135	**NCC 5.6.15**	In reference to ES Chapter 12: Transport, the NCC states: *Table 12.8 indicates a percentage impact summary, based on information given in Table 12.7, presumably against Table 12.5. However, this table only provides overall construction traffic as a percentage of all traffic and subsequent paragraphs describe the range of HGV increases as being between 1.5% and 32.8% and does not highlight the % increase respective to each link. However, when correcting the errors made with regard to the existing numbers of HGVs, NCC have identified that there is a 42% increase in HGV traffic on the A57 West of Dunham and a 60% increase on the A1133 south of South Clifton. As this latter route is not included in the study area, the impacts have not been assessed.*	Discussions with NCC have been held and additional barred routes included in the updated oCTMP report [EN010159/APP/7.9.1]. This includes the following: • B1164 (between Carlton-on-Trent and Tuxford); • A1133 through Collingham; • Grassthorpe Road (between Sutton on Trent and the Main Street / Polly Taylors Road junction).
LIR136	**NCC 5.6.16**	*We would also note that A.12.5.22 and Figure 7 of Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] identifies there were traffic surveys at 9 locations but Tables 1 and 3 identify 10 sites. It appears that A57 Dunham is a duplication of the A57 west of Dunham as these have the same traffic flows, which would not be anticipated with the access to High Marnham between them.*	The A57 data was used as a proxy for Dunham. The level of construction traffic through Dunham is however restricted to 50 movements per day and below the threshold for any further assessment.
LIR137	**NCC 5.6.17 – 5.6.18**	*The proposed Access points have not been justified and no information submitted to determine the principle of their acceptability.* *The Response to PINS Scoping Opinion [EN010159/6.21] states the Highway Authority has been*	Discussions held after the LIR drafting have been held with NCC. The updated barred route list provided and secured through the oCTMP addresses a number of the concerns that NCC raised with regards to access.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		consulted over access points. However, these were only very broadly indicated in the initial consultation which confirmed the design standards to be used. Access points are therefore not currently agreed.	The Applicant understands that the only access junction in contention is located on the A57. Further technical details, including a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit are being prepared for NCC's consideration to help close out this matter.
LIR138	**NCC 5.6.19**	*In our previous consultation response, we queried why Ragnall is included in the barred routes as it is the signed HGV route to High Marnham, but this has not been fully explained within the Consultation Response [EN010159/APP/5.1]. Avoiding routes will automatically provide environmental benefit, but as it has not been considered under IEMA in the same way that all other links and routes have, this choice has not been justified.*	Discussions held after the LIR drafting have been held with NCC. Further technical details, including a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit are being prepared for NCC's consideration to help close out this matter.
LIR139	**NCC 5.6.20**	*Excluding Ragnall requires an additional access onto the A57 within a 50mph speed limit, catering for circa 430 construction vehicles per day (in peak). This is likely to create delay on the Major Road Network, contrary to the assessment in Table 12.10 in Chapter 12: Transport and Access [EN010159/APP/6.12] and is likely to result in conflicts with a resultant highway safety risk. This access has therefore neither been justified nor its impact properly considered.*	The Applicant has held discussions with NCC on this matter after the LIR was drafted. Further technical details, including a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit are being prepared for NCC's consideration to help close out this matter.
LIR140	**NCC 5.6.22 – 5.6.24**	*The response provided in Consultation Response [EN010159/APP/5.1] states that figures illustrating the junction layouts with visibility splays are provided in the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]. However, the drawings in the Transport Assessment show the swept 23 paths at the access intended for the Abnormal Load vehicles and do not show the accesses at each gate.* *It has however been subsequently highlighted that access drawings are within EN010159 000121- 2.4 Streets rights of way and access plans. These drawings should be referenced within or appended to the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]. In order to be able to fully consider the acceptability of these, a*	Following discussions with NCC, copies of the access junction drawings will be provided in the Transport Assessment (Appendix B). Stage 1 Road Safety Audits are proposed. Revised drawings illustrating access at this location have been prepared and will be appended to the updated Transport Assessment.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		Road Safety Audit to GG119 should be carried out and submitted. *However, some clarification is also required as the drawings are numbered and do not correspond to the alphabetic convention referred to in all other documents, neither do they correspond to the sequential numbers (i.e. A=1) so the applicant should review and reconcile this, to ensure consistency.*	
LIR141	**NCC 5.6.25**	*In reference to the Transport Assessment, NCC states:* *Gate H, Junction 3 - Details are shown on a private track. The access to highway should be assessed instead, and this would need to be the subject of the safety audit.* *Junction 5 – Not shown in Fig 4 of the Transport Assessment.* *Junction 8, 9 and 17 – These are crossing points but should be referenced within the Transport Assessment as they are still access points.*	A new access drawing will be prepared to demonstrate the visibility and proposed turning manoeuvresat Gate H. The revised drawing will be included in Appendix B of the updated Transport Assessment [REP1-045]. Junction 5 is an emergency access junction and is referenced in the updated Transport Assessment [REP1-045], noting that it does not accommodate any construction traffic flows. Junctions 8, 9 and 17 are crossing points and not access points from the public road network. As such they do not contribute to the traffic impact assessment.
LIR142	**NCC 5.6.26**	*The response provided in Consultation Response [EN010159/APP/5.1] states that figures illustrating the junction layouts with visibility splays are provided in the Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21]. However, the drawings provided show the swept paths at the access intended for the Abnormal Load vehicles and do not show the accesses at each gate.*	Following discussions with NCC, copies of the access junction drawings will be provided in the Annex B of the Transport Assessment [REP1-045].
LIR143	**NCC 5.6.27**	*The HA will need to see drawings showing all accesses, including details of the highway boundary, swept paths and the required visibility splays alongside any vegetation (hedgerows/trees) requiring removal as a*	Following discussions with NCC, copies of the access junction drawings will be provided in the Annex B of the Transport Assessment [REP1-045]. The drawings provide swept paths, visibility splays and geometric details.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		minimum. These preliminary drawings should be accompanied by a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to GG119.	Road Safety Audit are being prepared.
LIR144	**NCC 5.6.28**	*Proper consideration has still not been given to the requirement for passing bays. Whilst Crabtree Lane is noted to have some passing places, it has not been determined that these are suitable or sufficient. Paragraphs A.12.5.18 and A.12.5.19 of Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] suggest that both Polly Taylors Road and Moor Lane are circa 6m in width which is an overestimation, and their suitability to accommodate HGV traffic should be established with passing points identified if required. Gates E, J and I need to be considered with regards to this.*	A plan illustrating passing places on Crabtree Lane and Moor Lane has been prepared and is presented in Appendix B of the Transport Assessment [REP1-045]. Discussions with NCC have clarified the queries relating to Polly Taylors Lane and no further details are required.
LIR145	**NCC 5.6.29**	*It should also be confirmed if all accesses are to be made permanent for use during the operation phase.*	All access points are designed to be permanent to allow for servicing in the operational phase.
LIR146	**NCC 5.6.30**	*Paragraph A.12.3.39 of Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] states that the access junctions will be metalled for the initial section to prevent debris being brought out onto the public road network with gates set back 15m. This does not accommodate the maximum legal length of an HGV and therefore this should be amended accordingly (a 25m setback would be recommended).*	The distance has been increased to 25m in the updated Transport Assessment.
LIR147	**NCC 5.6.31**	*The collision data should be updated and included in the access considerations.*	The accident data is under review following discussion with NCC. A revised accident data set is to be available at Deadline 3.
LIR148	**NCC 5.6.32**	*A.12.5.27 of Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21] suggests that 'slight' accidents are damage only accidents. This is not the case. Slight accidents are injury accidents.*	The accident data is under review following discussion with NCC. A revised accident data set is to be available at Deadline 3.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR149	**NCC 5.6.33**	*Information submitted in relation to the accesses (above) should specifically consider any collisions in their vicinity and will need to consider the latest available data (as that provided is out of date). The latest accident information available covers 2024 and part of 2025 and can be obtained by emailing roadinjuryaccidentdata@viaem.co.uk*	The accident data is under review following discussion with NCC. A revised accident data set is to be available at Deadline 3.
LIR150	**NCC 5.6.34**	*Consultation Response [EN010159/APP/5.1] states that the Applicant will engage with the relevant Highway Authorities separately regarding the need for any 'Wear and Tear' agreements. However, there is no reason why this should not be included in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010159/APP/7.9] or otherwise secured through this process and include details of a pre and post works highway condition survey with timescales for implementation of any repairs necessary alongside securing means for emergency repair works during the construction phase.*	A Wear & Tear Agreement is already included in Section 4.7 of the oCTMP [REP1-055]. The NCC request for the drainage gullies on either side of the access junctions has been included.
LIR151	**NCC 5.6.35**	*After construction the Highway Authority require the highway and any road gullies within 500m either side of each access to be cleaned. This should also be included in the OCTMP and linked to the dilapidation survey to account for any post construction repair works.*	A Wear & Tear Agreement is already included in Section 4.7 of the oCTMP [REP1-055]. The NCC request for the drainage gullies on either side of the access junctions has been included.
LIR152	**NCC 7.3**	[Councillor Barlow] *had also highlighted potential issues over the construction of this project and the A46 Newark bypass/A1 junction improvement which is another NSIP project awaiting decision but with Government commitment to fund.*	The Proposed Development has a minimal impact on the A1 and as such, no significant cumulative impact with this project is anticipated.
LIR153	**LCC 12.5**	It is noted that no PRoW within Lincolnshire are planned to be temporarily diverted. The Council appreciates the inclusion of the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan [APP-086], however paragraph 3.2.3 states that gates would be BS5709 compliant. This should be BS5709:2018. BS5709:2018 advocates that	An update to the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan has been prepared and issued at Deadline 1 in order to accommodate the concerns raised by Lincolnshire County Council, these amendments are provided in tracked changes in REP1-062.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		the least restrictive option should be chosen. The Council would therefore stress that rather than gating off the PRoW, a gap should be the preference, and instead the haul road should be gated, allowing unobstructed access for path users.	
LIR154	**LCC 17.14**	The Council is pleased to see that PRoWs would be maintained through diversions during construction and decommissioning phases, and would be retained with green space enhancements, further connected through permissive paths (especially connecting Newton on Trent to Sustrans' national cycle route), during the operational period. There may be potential for improvements to be made such as hard surfaces to enable inclusivity and new bridges crossing streams.	The Applicant welcomes the comments from LCC and is happy to engage further with LCC to explore opportunities for any additional potential improvements that can be made as part of the Proposed Development.
LIR155	**WLDC 7.39 – 7.40**	The OESF Transport Assessment states that the Cottam Solar project has not been included in the cumulative assessment as it would not coincide with the OESF construction period. It also omits the Tillbridge Solar Project from the assessment for the same reasons. WLDC contends that this is an incorrect assumption to make as the Cottam project has a 5-year consent lifespan, which has yet to commence development (or submit details to discharge DCO 'requirements'). There is therefore a strong likelihood that construction activity and associated travel movement could occur at the same time using the same roads for five solar NSIP projects concurrently. WLDC considers that, as all the traffic data for each project is in the public domain, the OESF should assess the likely cumulative construction traffic impacts.	Cumulative traffic matters have been considered and the assessment is based upon the published dates of construction, as per standard transport planning guidance. As such, no further assessment is considered reasonable or necessary. The approach adopted in the assessment of cumulative traffic is standard and compliant, noting that LCC, as highways authority does not share this opinion with the District Council.
LIR156	**WLDC 7.42 – 7.43**	The OESF assesses and proposes two construction traffic route options. As both options have been demonstrated to be viable by the applicant, WLDC	The construction access routes are described in the Transport Assessment [REP1-045 O].

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		considers that there is no compelling reason to propose both routes, and that the 'Proposed Access Route 2', using the M18 to access the site from the west, should be the only option used. This would avoid potential significant cumulative construction traffic impacts along the A15, the A46 Lincoln bypass and the A57 from Lincoln to the site. The avoidance of 'Proposed Access Route 1' would minimise the impacts upon communities in terms of disruption, noise and air quality impacts, and additional traffic management that could extend for a period of 5-10 years should all five NSIP projects overlap/stagger their construction phases.	This indicates access primarily from the south and east, with no access proposed from the A15. The AIL access route is illustrated in Appendix A of the Transport Assessment **[REP1-045 O**]. Route 1 for just the transformer loads uses the A15. The traffic using this is for two AIL and as such will not have a significant traffic impact on this route. Cumulative traffic matters have been considered and the assessment is based upon the published dates of construction, as per standard transport planning guidance. As such, no further assessment is considered reasonable or necessary. The approach adopted in the assessment of cumulative traffic is standard and compliant.
LIR157	**WLDC 7.44**	It is also noted by WLDC that the OESF project has not engaged collaboratively with other cumulative projects with regard to traffic management. The other solar NSIP project of Gate Burton, Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge have all worked together to produce a 'Joint Report on Interrelationships', which brings together the key cumulative impacts of the projects and identifies areas where impacts could be minimised/mitigated. This report was produced and submitted as part of the respective applications and was updated as required during examination phases.	A Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] was submitted at Deadline 1 which considers the cumulative effects of the nearest NSIP solar schemes located within 16km of the Proposed Development. In addition, an update to the Transport Assessment [REP1-045] was submitted at Deadline 1 incorporating committed developments. The findings from both these assessments confirm there are no inter-project cumulative significant effects on any environmental aspect. The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP1-055] and the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP1-047] sets out details on how the Applicant will work with other projects to reduce potential cumulative impacts. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP1-053] has also been updated for Deadline 2 following discussions with the host authorities (including WLDC). The oLEMP includes the setup of a Steering Group with other willing solar developers in the area (as well as with the host authorities ecologists and conservation organisations such as the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust) to implement opportunities for delivering biodiversity enhancements strategically, sharing lessons learnt regarding habitat establishment and management and adding

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			to the overall knowledge base associated with the effect of solar farms on biodiversity.
LIR158	**WLDC 8.52**	WLDC also question why the Scheme appears to propose on the Indicative Layout (EN010159/APP/2.9 rev 1) two construction access points in close proximity to each other from the A1133 into the eastern part of the site. There does not appear to be a compelling reason to remove hedgerows forming the field boundary to create this access. The use of a single access would minimise the environmental harm caused and WLDC would welcome such an amendment to the OESF project. The Transport Assessment (Appendix 12.2 EN010159-000179-6.21) identifies the northernmost access as "Gate F", but the access immediately adjacent the Anglian Water Works is not shown. WLDC considers this needs to be clarified.	The southern access junction is for emergency access during the operational phase and would not be used for construction access. Further details of this access are provided in Transport Assessment [REP1-045].
LIR159	**WLDC 8.54**	The Gate G access is directly opposite the existing access for the Anglian Water Hall Water Treatment Works. Given a maximum 6 metre width without removing the field boundary hedgerow there does not appear to be enough width for two large goods vehicles to pass each other on the access road. This has the potential, if a large goods vehicle is leaving the site, for the need to an incoming vehicle to need to wait on the carriageway of the single carriageway A class road with a 60 miles per hour national speed limit for the vehicle to exit.	Gate G is proposed to utilise an existing access track to the north of the Anglian Water Hall Water Treatment Works, with upgrades only to the proposed access point off the A1133 to facilitate access and egress movements. HGV traffic is able to pass in safety within a 6m width.
Waste Management			

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR160	**NCC 5.7.5 – 5.7.6**	*The County Council agree that future capacity for the lifespan of the development is unrealistic to forecast and that for inert waste, it is likely capacity will continue in a cyclic nature. However, the Council considers that future hazardous and non-hazardous capacity in Nottinghamshire is more uncertain, with the Table 11 of emerging Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan, as modified by the main modifications proposed following examination, identifying a deficit in non-hazardous disposal capacity by 2038.* *As raised in paragraph 5.58 and paragraphs 7.38 – 7.41 of the emerging Plan, due to underlying geology of the area and wider environmental constraints, the scope to provide hazardous and non-hazardous capacity in Nottinghamshire is extremely unlikely. It is noted that the assessment considers the capacity in the East Midlands area for non-hazardous and nationally for hazardous, but we believe that the applicant should recognise the potential that non-hazardous capacity could be significantly reduced in the future.*	As outlined in Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082] paragraph 1.6.7, the sensitivity of waste relates to availability of landfill capacity in the absence of the Proposed Development as outlined in the IEMA Guidance, "*landfill capacity is recognised as an unsustainable and increasingly scarce option for managing waste*." As outlined in paragraph 1.6.9 waste receptor sensitivity is determined as "very high" and a worst-case scenario for sensitivity is considered for landfill capacity. The criteria for very high is: *"the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is:* • *expected to reduce very considerably (by >10%);* • *end during construction or operation;* • *is already known to be unavailable; or would require new capacity or infrastructure to be put in place to meet forecast demand"* The recognition of the potential that non-hazardous capacity could be significantly reduced in the future was therefore inherent in the waste assessment.
LIR161	**LCC 18.26**	*The Council has reviewed the application in respect of waste matters and whilst waste has been scoped out of the ES as a separate chapter, Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development of the ES [APP-034] sets out the arrangements that are proposed for managing any waste produced by the development, following the waste hierarchy. More specific measures are set out in the outline CEMP [APP-176], outline OEMP [APP-177], outline DEMP [APP-178] and outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP) [APP–184]. However, further details of expected waste arisings, and of their proposed fate, from all phases of the project will need to be included in the final SWMP.*	Table 4.1 within 7.12 Outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP) [APP-084] summarises the anticipated waste streams from construction. Paragraph 4.1.2 states that this table will be updated by the Principal Contractor during the development of the SWMP. Details of expected waste arisings, and of their proposed fate, from operation and decommissioning will be included in the OEMP and DEMP and outlined below. The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (REP1-049] updated at Deadline 1 state in paragraph 2.9.5: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:*

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			• *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."* The Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (including restoration) [REP1-052] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.8.7: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."*

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			At Deadline 2, the Applicant has updated the Outline OEMP to insert a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the Environmental Statement. This provides a further check on the scope of the activities undertaken during operation, including with respect to waste and is also designed to support and assist the Councils in anticipating waste likely to be generated.
LIR162	**LCC 18.27**	*As with other solar NSIP's the Council has serious concerns about the lack of current capacity for recycling solar panels, particularly at decommissioning but also with operational failures given the 60 year lifetime, weather related impacts (note the impact of Storm Darragh on the Porth Wen Solar Farm on Anglesey) and the cumulative impacts alongside other proposed NSIP-scale solar farms, particularly in terms of waste management capacity. The impact of adverse weather or other event which would require replacement of panels significantly earlier in the project lifetime would create issues given the lack of current capacity for recycling solar panels. There is no certainty that sufficient capacity for recycling solar panels will be available in 60 years' time. This has the potential to become a significant issue.*	Construction, operation and decommissioning have been assessed in Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]. Operational replacement, either planned or due to adverse weather or other event are covered in the operational assessment and since the decommissioning assessment concludes no significant effects any operational replacement would be of a lesser magnitude of impact. At Deadline 2, the Applicant has updated the outline OEMP to insert a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the Environmental Statement. This provides a further check on the scope of the activities undertaken during operation, including with respect to waste and is also designed to support and assist the Councils in anticipating waste likely to be generated.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			The cumulative assessment is provided in section 1.10 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.3: Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]. As stated in paragraph 1.10.10 "*The cumulative assessment focuses on decommissioning waste since:* • *The peak of waste generation would be during decommissioning and this is therefore the worst case in terms of waste generation – the decommissioning scenario would also cover any large-scale interim replacement of PV modules and other components; and* • *Operational waste generation is not expected to be concurrent for all projects, given that their PV modules and other components would have different operating periods and it is very unlikely that all facilities would replace their equipment at the same time."*
LIR163	**LCC 18.28**	*In respect of Policy W1 of the LMWLP this requires the Council to make provision for sites to meet predicted future capacity gaps for waste arisings. Currently there are no waste facilities locally to process discarded solar infrastructure as it is replaced during the lifetime of the development and at the decommissioning stage. When combined with the other solar projects in the county and region, cumulatively this will potentially present a significant issue and additional facilities to ensure these products are sustainably disposed of will be needed. The developer needs to be mindful that local facilities for recycling solar waste don't exist at present and this needs to be taken in account as part of any decommissioning plan. The ES Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment, Table 1-4 'Indicative Design Life of Proposed Development Components' assumes a 25-40 year lifespan for Solar PV compared to a 60 year operational lifetime for the project which, alongside a potential failure rate (both individually and cumulatively alongside other solar farms) would impact*	The developer is mindful that local facilities for recycling solar waste do not exist at present. Paragraph 1.9.23 of Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082] states that *"recycling routes are generally available for decommissioning materials at present, and it is likely that there will be even greater opportunities for recycling in the future, not least because the market will have expanded to meet demand as solar PV installations increase."* As outlined in the East Yorkshire Solar Farm The Examining Authority's Recommendation Report, 17 February 2025 paragraph 3.13.50. *"While the capacity of facilities to deal with the decommissioned solar PV panels is still evolving, I see no reason to disagree with the Applicant's view that the system will respond to demand over time. There is nothing to suggest that the type or number of panels involved in the application scheme would lead to particular difficulties in this regard."* Therefore the Applicant considers it reasonable to assume that solar panel recycling will have expanded to meet demand as solar PV installation increase.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		on recycling capacity and capability but also on its estimation of emissions.	The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [REP1-049] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.9.5: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."* The Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (including restoration) [REP1-052] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.8.7: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."*

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR164	**LCC 18.29**	*The Council notes the applicant's commitment at paragraph 2.8.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-176] that a SWMP would be prepared and agreed prior to commencement of construction and the requirement (20) in the draft DCO [APP-007] to submit a DEMP. However, it will be necessary for a mechanism to be incorporated that requires a waste management strategy to be submitted which demonstrates the expected quantity of solar infrastructure that would be discarded during the operational and decommissioning phases and the arrangements to be put in to ensure adequate facilities are available to sustainably dispose/recycle these items in the future.*	The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [REP1-049] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.9.5: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."* The Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (including restoration) [REP1-052] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.8.7: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."*

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			At Deadline 2, the Applicant has updated the Outline OEMP to insert a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the Environmental Statement. This provides a further check on the scope of the activities undertaken during operation, including with respect to waste and is also designed to support and assist the Councils in anticipating waste likely to be generated.
LIR165	**LCC 18.30**	*The Council has concerns about some aspects of the Applicant's assessment and consider that further work is needed in order to adequately demonstrate that the impact of the development in terms of waste would not be significant. The Council wish to raise the following points:* *• The applicant should be aware that, whilst PV panel recycling facilities may be available in time to process the quantities of waste panels generated by this project, this is by no means certain. Thus, the applicant needs to indicate what they propose to do if such capacity is not forthcoming and assess the impacts accordingly.* *• Particular consideration needs to be given to the cumulative quantities of waste arising from this and other proposed large-scale solar infrastructure nearby. This includes the significant overall failure rate of PV panels during the operational phase.* *• The need for a commitment that the applicant will set out, and regularly review, their forecasts for, and*	Paragraph 1.9.23 of Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082] states: *"recycling routes are generally available for decommissioning materials at present, and it is likely that there will be even greater opportunities for recycling in the future, not least because the market will have expanded to meet demand as solar PV installations increase."* As outlined in the East Yorkshire Solar Farm The Examining Authority's Recommendation Report, 17 February 2025 paragraph 3.13.50. *"While the capacity of facilities to deal with the decommissioned solar PV panels is still evolving, I see no reason to disagree with the Applicant's view that the system will respond to demand over time. There is nothing to suggest that the type or number of panels involved in the application scheme would lead to particular difficulties in this regard."* Therefore the Applicant considers it reasonable to assume that solar panel recycling will have expanded to meet demand as solar PV installation increase.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		proposed fate of, all wastes arising in each phase of the project – commissioning, operational and decommissioning.	The cumulative assessment is provided in section 1.10 of Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]. As stated in paragraph 1.10.10 "*The cumulative assessment focuses on decommissioning waste since:* • *The peak of waste generation would be during decommissioning and this is therefore the worst case in terms of waste generation – the decommissioning scenario would also cover any large-scale interim replacement of PV modules and other components; and* • *Operational waste generation is not expected to be concurrent for all projects, given that their PV modules and other components would have different operating periods and it is very unlikely that all facilities would replace their equipment at the same time."* The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [REP1-049] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.9.5: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."*

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			The Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (including restoration) [REP1-052] updated at Deadline 1 states in paragraph 2.8.7: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and* • *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."* At Deadline 2, the Applicant has updated the outline OEMP to insert a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES. This provides a further check on the scope of the activities undertaken during operation, including with respect to waste and is also designed to support and assist the Councils in anticipating waste likely to be generated.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR166	**LCC 18.31 – 18.32**	*The Council would also draw attention to safeguarded waste sites in proximity to the Order Limits. This includes Land Opposite Park Farm Cottage, Kettlethorpe, which houses ST01 a safeguarded sewage treatment works (STW). The STW is approximately 70m from the northern boundary of the Order Limits.* *Also notable is Hall Water Treatment Works, this site, whilst omitted from the Order Limit red line boundary is surrounded by it. This site is not defined as safeguarded under policy W8 within the MWLP, as it is relatively new. However, the Council is of the opinion that in the spirit of the policy Hall Water Treatment works, should be approached as if safeguarded and mitigations should be in place to ensure the proposed development would not prejudice or detrimentally impact upon the operation of this site or ST01.*	The Applicant is aware of both the safeguarded waste site, Land Opposite Park Farm Cottage, Kettlethorpe, which houses ST01 a safeguarded sewage treatment works (STW) and the Hall Water Treatment Works which is in proximity to the Order Limits. The Applicant has provided responses relating to the Hall Water Reservoir/Water Treatment Works as part of the deadline 1 submission. For clarity, please refer to the post hearing notes included within Agenda Item 8.1 of the Written Summary of Applicants Oral Submission at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-077] and response to Relevant Representation RR-050 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]. In addition, the Applicant is aware of an access point (Gate D) proposed adjacent to the Hall Water Reservoir and this would involve crossing over AWS's pipeline assets. The access proposal prepared at the location designated as Gate G is proposed to be widened to accommodate construction vehicle movements and ensure that access and egress movements can be undertaken safely. The Applicant is cognisant of the risk of buried services in this region and will continue to work collaboratively to ensure that any assets (both above and below ground) that are essential for the operation of the Hall Water Reservoir are suitably protected. In relation to the STW ST01, due to the separation distance of approximately 70m which includes the A57 and existing planting and vegetation, it is not considered that there will be any detrimental impacts upon the operation of the STW. The Proposed Development is wholly located to the south of the A57 and the access points into the Proposed Development site would come off the A57 and head south into the various parcels of the Order Limits without any interface with STW ST01.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			In relation to both waste sites, it is therefore considered, in compliance with Policy W8: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites of the Lincolnshire Waste and Minerals Local Plan (2016) that the Proposed Development would not seek to redevelop the sites to a non-waste use, and would not amount to the encroachment of incompatible development on the understanding that the Proposed Development would not have any interaction or impacts on STW ST01 north of the A57 opposite Park Farm Road, and there are mitigations in place to protect Hall Water Treatment Works from potential pollutants during construction, operation and decommissioning (as set out in response to Relevant Representation RR-050 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]) and no impacts on the operations as set out above.
LIR167	**LCC 19.11**	*As the waste planning authority, the Council is also concerned about the impact from waste arising from solar developments and the lack of existing waste capacity as described above. The waste arisings from these proposals combined both during the operational and decommissioning phases is potentially significant. It must be highlighted that as there is no Waste chapter in the ES having been scoped out. Waste management is included in the outline CEMP [APP-176], outline OEMP [APP 177], outline DEMP [APP-178] and oSWMP [APP–184]. These documents however only consider how to address waste arising from this development rather than the cumulative impact of solar panels, particularly at decommissioning but also with operational failures and repowering, particularly in terms of waste management capacity.*	There is no Materials and Waste chapter in the ES however a materials and waste assessment was not scoped out; a full assessment equivalent to an ES chapter waste included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.3: Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]. The purpose of the SWMP, CEMP, OEMP and DEMP is to address waste arising from the Proposed Development rather than the cumulative impact of solar panels from other developments. However, text has been added to the oOEMP [REP1-050] and oDEMP [REP1-052] at Deadline 1 which states: *"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:* • *Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;* • *Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and*

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			• *Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent."* The cumulative assessment is provided in section 1.10 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]. Regarding operational and maintenance waste, every 12 months from the date of final commissioning and before undertaking the maintenance for the year ahead, the Applicant will submit a planned maintenance schedule for the year ahead to the relevant planning authorities, excluding unforeseen emergencies that require maintenance throughout the year. Unforeseen emergencies that require maintenance throughout the year are considered to include maintenance activities that are needed to be undertaken urgently for health, safety or environmental reasons in response to an event or circumstance which happens unexpectedly. As part of the maintenance schedule, the Applicant will also inform the relevant planning authority when a Scheme component is no longer operational and requires final decommissioning. The annual planned maintenance schedule must include the following details as a minimum: a) The extent and nature of the scheduled maintenance; b) Details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced; c) Details of transport requirements; d) Estimated waste arisings; e) The proposed timing of such maintenance; and f) Confirmation that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of such maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES. The Applicant will further notify the relevant planning authorities of any maintenance that has been undertaken as a result of unforeseen emergencies. Such notification shall be given as soon as practically possible but no later than 14 days from the emergency maintenance

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			being carried out. Such notification shall include details of the extent and nature of the maintenance.
Development Consent Order			
LIR168	**NCC 6.2**	*The DCO should explicitly contain a mechanism that allows coordination of any programmed works with any existing utility works, so that NCC in its capacity as the Highway Authority can help to minimise overall environmental and operational disruption on the highway network. The Highway Authority needs to ensure its statutory duty to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on the highway network is not compromised.*	The street works the Applicant needs to undertake pursuant to Article 8 of the dDCO are subject to the Counties' permit schemes, as confirmed by Article 9, and that provides a mechanism by which they Counties can have oversight of the programming of those works. With respect to highway works, the outline CTMP [REP1-055] confirms at paragraph 3.2.6 that access junction works and associated mitigation works on the public road network will be subject to a technical approval process. Paragraph 3.2.7 then sets out that for any works to the highway the detailed design of these works must be submitted to the highway authority for approval, and that paragraph then sets out what that submission should include. The submission includes a programme for the works amongst other details. There is therefore a mechanism for the local highway authority to have oversight over the programming of these works.
LIR169	**NCC 6.3**	*It is noted that a full list of streets which are subject to streets works, alterations and proposed access points are provided at Schedules 4-7. However, the content of these schedules is not agreed because the transport assessment methodology is not currently accepted by NCC (as discussed in Chapter 5.6 of this LIR). Also, whilst it is noted that any works referred to in these schedules would be subject to approval from the street authority (in accordance with the procedure detailed in the DCO), NCC would expect this to comprise full technical approval and for its costs to be covered.*	The Applicant has had further discussions with NCC following the drafting of the Local Impact Report. The changes to barred routes that are outlined in the outline CTMP [REP1-055] have addressed the Council's concerns relating to additional study area roads. The outline CTMP [REP1-055] confirms at paragraph 3.2.6 that access junction works and associated mitigation works on the public road network will be subject to a technical approval process. Paragraph 3.2.7 then sets out that for any works to the highway the detailed design of these works must be submitted to the highway authority for approval, and that paragraph then sets out what that submission should include. Paragraph 3.2.8 of the oCTMP [REP1-055] then confirms that the Applicant will reimburse the highway authorities for the technical approval process.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			Paragraph 3.2.9 confirms that the CTMP will detail the exact process for technical approvals. The Applicant understands that NCC are comfortable with the proposed technical delivery process.
LIR170	**NCC 6.4**	*Any powers to undertake works on the highway network should not fully circumvent the Highway Authority's system to coordinate road works and powers to impose a TTRO should remain with the County Council who will carry out the necessary promotions and consultations.*	The point about the ability to coordinate road works has been responded to in LIR168. With respect to traffic regulation measures, Article 16 of the draft DCO sets out the powers the undertaker would have, and at Art 16(4) confirms that before exercising such powers the undertaker must (1) consult with the chief officer of policy and (2) obtain the written consent of the traffic authority. Art 16(5) then sets out notification that must be undertaken before exercising the power. The inclusion of such powers in a DCO for the delivery of a nationally significant infrastructure project is not unusual, and there are appropriate safeguards built into the Article as outlined.
LIR171	**NCC 6.5**	In reference to Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, NCC states: *The requirements assigned to NCC align with its areas of expertise and statutory responsibility and the topics covered in this LIR. They are therefore satisfactory in principle with the exception of the Soil Management Plan (Requirement 19) which NCC believes should be discharged by the District Council for continuity with the topics covered in their LIR. It is assumed that NCC would be consulted on matters where it is not the determining authority but has interest.*	The Applicant has amended paragraph 1 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO so that the District Councils are the relevant planning authority in relation to requirement 19.
LIR172	**NCC 6.7**	*NCC notes that where an application to discharge a requirement is made a fee is to apply and must be paid to the relevant planning authority for each application. However, the fees vary significantly between each requirement. In relation to those requirements where NCC is the relevant planning authority, the highest fee of*	The fees set out in Schedule 15, paragraph 5(2) are £2578 for the first application of the discharge of requirements 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19. Any other requirements are £298 – this relates to R3 (phasing plan), 6 (community liaison group), 9 (BNG), 11 (drainage), 15 (CTMP), 16 (operational noise), 17 (skills, supply chain and employment), and 21 (ground conditions). These listed requirements

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		£2535 applies to Requirements 7 (Battery Safety Management), 12 (Archaeology), 18 (PROW Management Plan) and 19 (Soil Management Plan). Whereas Requirements 11 (Surface and Foul Water Drainage) and 15 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) would be subject to a fee of £145. This fee is considered to be too low and the rationale for adopting a differential approach between requirements is not clear. NCC would recommend applying the same fee structure to all of its requirements, unless evidence can be provided to the contrary. The costs to the council should be adequately covered through a suitable fee structure in the DCO and the fees should also be index linked from the date of the DCO.	are expected to typically be less onerous to discharge, having regard to the amount of material likely to be submitted, and the complexity of the subject matter, however, the Applicant considers that the higher fee should be applicable in relation to the CTMP and that change has been made at Deadline 2. The approach taken is fairly well established for Orders made in Lincolnshire. Paragraph 5(3) is included to ensure fees captured within the Schedule are updated to increase in line with inflation, as per the regulatory approach.
LIR173	**NCC 6.8**	*NCC considers that notification of a decision within 10 weeks as a standard approach is insufficient. NCC is particularly concerned with the resourcing of such requirements and therefore consider that a more appropriate default period equating to Major Environment Impact Assessment development for a planning application of 16 weeks is more appropriate. Whilst NCC note that Part 2(c) includes for the ability to agree an alternate period, the expectation for 10 weeks would be set by its inclusion in the standard wording. The project is significant in size and scale and the information submitted for many of the requirements is likely to involve a significant amount of information and an appropriate time period must be afforded for NCC to consider this. This issue would be compounded by the combination of other NSIP projects within the county (an outlined briefly in Section 2), should they gain development consent. These projects follow a similar timeline and will place cumulative pressure on the statutory functions of the planning department.*	The Applicant has set out its position on this point at ISH1 as recorded in the **Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-077]** in relation to Article 45 starting on page 12 of that document. The Applicant does, however, appreciate the points raised by the Council and at Deadline 2 has extended the time from ten to twelve weeks. The Applicant does not agree that the time allowed should be any longer than this, for the reasons previously set out in support of the ten week period. The Applicant has also made consequential amendments to the time periods in Article 45 and Requirement 20 (Decommissioning and restoration).
LIR174	**LCC 22.1**	*Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General), Article 39*	The Applicant has responded to a similar point raised by NSDC in its relevant representation, and that response is provided at the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		A schedule of trees known to be required to be removed to be included in the DCO and referenced in Article 39. Subsequent approval of the Relevant Planning Authority should be required for any further tree removal beyond those trees identified in the schedule and as shown on the removal plans in the oLEMP. The Council are of the view that paragraph 5.3.6 the oLEMP could be amended to incorporate requirements to update the removal plans in the final LEMP which would be the subject of approval under Requirement 8 of the DCO.	Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075], ref RR.135, page 116 – 121. The Applicant does not agree that a schedule of all trees or shrubs which may be removed is necessary or proportionate, and that there are adequate controls in place with respect to the operation of the power in Article 39, as set out in REP1-075.
LIR175	**LCC 22.1**	*Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General), Article 40* *The Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report [APP-134] does not identify any TPOs within the development boundary. The report does identify quite a few Grade A trees / groups either within or near the boundary that may over the course lifetime of the site come to be worthy of TPO consideration (Section 3.1).* *The Council therefore consider it would be appropriate for the article to be amended to require consultation with the relevant planning authority prior to the removal of any trees that may become subject to a TPO in the future. There should also be an expectation of replacement of any TPO tree removed, and an obligation that the relevant planning authority Tree Officer should be informed where any tree subject to a post February 2025 TPO is pruned/ felled, to allow records to be updated.* *The ExA is referred to the wording of article 40 for The A38 Derby Junctions DCO 2023 which provides for consultation with the relevant planning authority and seeks to ensure replacement of felled TPO trees.* *Suggested wording for article 40(2):*	At Deadline 2 the Applicant has updated the outline OEMP to include a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES. This provides a further check on the scope of the maintenance power, including oversight in relation to trees that require removal. The Applicant noted at Deadline 1 in the **Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]**, ref RR.135, page 116 – 121 that it would update the oLEMP to include a commitment in relation to replacement of trees subject to a TPO, that amendment has been made at Deadline 2, to provide that where an individual tree subject to a TPO must be removed (for example, due to it being dead or in a dangerous condition) and the local authority requires a replacement, a new tree will be planted in the same place or as near as practicable.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		(2) In carrying out any activity authorised by paragraph (1)— *(a) the undertaker must do no unnecessary damage to any tree or shrub and must pay compensation to any person for any loss or damage arising from such activity;* *(b) the duty contained in section 206(1)(a) (replacement of trees) of the 1990 Act is not to apply although where possible the undertaker is to seek to replace any trees which are removed; and* *(c) the undertaker must consult the relevant planning authority prior to that activity taking place*	
LIR176	**LCC 22.1**	*Schedule 2 (Requirements), Requirements 3, 4, 5 and 20* *The Council would wish to be a consultee on these requirements.*	The Applicant has added the County as a consultee at Deadline 1 for requirements 3 and 4. The Applicant has added the Counties to requirement 5 at Deadline 2, reflecting their scope as local highway authority, and to requirement 20 reflecting the Counties' role as local highway authority and local waste authority.
LIR177	**LCC 22.1**	*Schedule 2 (Requirements), Requirement 9* *Proposed BNG Requirement* *1. The authorised development may not commence until a biodiversity net gain strategy has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body.* *2. The biodiversity net gain strategy must include details of how the strategy will secure a minimum of xx% biodiversity net gain in area habitat units and a minimum of yy% in hedgerow units and zz% in watercourse units for all of the authorised development during the operation of the authorised development, and the metric*	The draft DCO submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2 adopts this approach.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		that has been used to calculate that those percentages will be reached. *3. The biodiversity net gain strategy must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological management plan and must be implemented as approved and maintained throughout the operation of the authorised development to which the plan relates.*	
LIR178	**LCC 22.1**	*Schedule 16 (Procedure for Discharge of Requirements Article 3* *Due to the capacity and availability of consultees, it is requested that (6)(a) to 15 working days.*	The Applicant has made this change at Deadline 2.
LIR179	**LCC 22.1**	*Schedule 16 (Procedure for Discharge of Requirements Article 5 (Fees)* *The Council consider that the fee schedule should be update to reflect the fees due to be introduced in April 2025 and requests that a proportionate increase is reflected in the fees set out in Schedule 16.* Suggested Wording: 5. (1) Where an application is made to the relevant planning authority for a discharge, a fee is to apply and must be paid to the relevant planning authority for each application. (2) The fee payable for each application under sub-paragraph (1) is as follows— (a) a fee of £2,578 for the first application for the discharge of each of the requirements 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19; (b) a fee of £588 for each subsequent application for the discharge of each of the requirements listed in	The Applicant agrees and has made these changes in the **draft DCO** submitted at Deadline 1 **[REP1-007]**.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		paragraph (a) and any application under requirement 5 in respect of the requirements listed in paragraph (a); and (c) a fee of £298 for any application for the discharge of— (i) any other requirements not listed in paragraph (a); (ii) any application under requirement 4 in respect of requirements not listed in paragraph (a); and (iii) any approval required by a document referred to by any requirement or a document approved pursuant to any requirement.	
LIR180	**LCC 22.1**	*Schedule 14* *There is currently no Protective Provision for The Protection of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue included within the DCO.* *Heckington Fen approved DCO Schedule 13 Part 9, para 104 to 107 includes appropriate wording.* *FOR THE PROTECTION OF LINCOLNSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE Interpretation* *104.— (1) For the protection of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue as referred to in this Part of this Schedule the following provisions have effect, unless otherwise agreed in writing between the undertaker and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue.* *(2) In this Part of this Schedule— "Index Linked" means an increase in the sums payable on an annual basis or pro rata per diem in accordance with the most recent published figure for the Consumer Price Index, or during any period when no such index exists the index which replaces it or is the nearest equivalent to it; and "Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue" means Lincolnshire County Council in its capacity as a fire and rescue*	The Applicant is agreeable in principle to the protective provisions sought by the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service, however, it would first like to understand how the arrangements would work alongside Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service and it is seeking to discuss this point with both services.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		authority pursuant to section 1(2)(a) of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004. *Site visits* *105.— (1) The undertaker must, prior to the date of final commissioning of Work No. 2, use reasonable endeavours to facilitate a site familiarisation exercise in connection with Work No. 2 of the authorised development for Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue for the purposes of providing the necessary assurance to Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue that all the required systems and measures are in place in accordance with the battery safety management plan.* *(2) Following the first anniversary of the date of final commissioning of Work No. 2 of the authorised development, the undertaker must use reasonable endeavours to facilitate an annual review of Work No. 2 by Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue at the reasonable request of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, up until the year in which the undertaker commences decommissioning of Work No. 2.* *Costs* *106.— (1) Pursuant to the provisions set out at paragraph 105, the undertaker must pay to Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue—* *(a) £16,665 in the first year of operation of the authorised development for, or in connection with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue's attendance at the site familiarisation exercise facilitated by the undertaker pursuant to paragraph 105(1), such sum to be paid within 30 days following the date of the site familiarisation exercise; and* *(b) £1,530 in each subsequent year of operation of the authorised development until the date of decommissioning of Work No. 2, such sums to be paid within 30 days of the date of the annual review for that*	

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		year, if in that year an annual review has taken place pursuant to paragraph 105(2). *(2) The costs payable under this sub-paragraph (1)(b) are to be Index Linked.* *Arbitration* *107. Any difference or dispute arising between the undertaker and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue under this Part of this Schedule must be determined by arbitration in accordance with article 38 (arbitration).*	
LIR181	**BDC Draft Consent Order**	*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.*	The Applicant has set out its position on this point at ISH1 as recorded in the **Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-077]** in relation to Article 45 starting on page 12 of that document. The Applicant does, however, appreciate the points raised by the Council and at Deadline 2 has extended the time from ten to twelve weeks. The Applicant does not agree that the time allowed should be any longer than this, for the reasons previously set out in support of the ten week period. The Applicant has also made consequential amendments to the time periods in Article 45 and Requirement 20 (Decommissioning and restoration).
Battery Storage			
LIR182	**LCC 20.8**	*To enable the Fire and Rescue Service to undertake the necessary monitoring to ensure the BESS is in accordance with the relevant requirement (currently requirement 7 of the draft DCO [APP-007]) a financial contribution is required via a Protective Provision within the DCO for the Fire Service so that it has sufficient resources in place to undertake monitoring of the BESS connected to this project. This approach has been agreed as part of the recently approved Gate Burton, West Burton and Cottam DCO, therefore there is a*	The Applicant is agreeable in principle to the protective provisions sought by the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service, however, it would first like to understand how the arrangements would work alongside Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service and it is seeking to discuss this point with both services.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		precedent for this approach to be followed for this application.	
LIR183	**LCC 20.10**	*In reference to the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan, the LCC states:* *Section 4 (General Fire Safety) of the Plan acknowledges that the developer will need to continue to engage with LFR as the development progresses and further information is made available. LFR wish to retain the right to provide further comments as further specific details are submitted and are satisfied that all other remaining appear compliant at this stage of the development.*	The Applicant is continuing to work with LFR, and has provided updated outline Battery Safety Management Plan [REP1-059] and Statements of Common Ground [REP1-066] for Review since submission at Deadline 1
Noise and Vibration			
LIR184	**BDC Impact on Human Health**	*Volume 6 Appendix 15.4 Operational Noise Assessment 15.2.19 - 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. However comfort is taken from section 15.5.6 of the report where it is confirmed that noise levels from inverters/power conversation systems will not exceed the limits in the ES chapter and additional noise mitigation will be provided to ensure that this is the case.*	As noted, the Applicant has included a proposed noise condition within Regulation 16 of the draft DCO [REP1-007], which would be expected to control noise to acceptable levels. Whilst the precise plant and equipment to be used during operation of the Proposed Development is not yet available, and therefore the precise design of mitigation measures that will be required is not yet known, the proposed noise condition will ensure that any required mitigation is specified such that the proposed noise limit is achieved.
LIR185	**BDC Impact on Human Health**	*Volume 6 Environmental Statement. Volume 3 Technical Appendices supporting ES Volume 2. Appendix 15.3: 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*	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 [REP1-047]. 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. Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO [REP1-007] secures that prior to construction, a CEMP must be submitted to and

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		techniques to be applied and likely mitigation to ensure that impact is reduced appropriately.	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.
Cumulative Effects			
LIR186	**LCC 19.6**	*APP-146 Volume 3: Technical Appendices Supporting ES Volume 2 Appendix 18.2: Other Development Long List Stages 1 and 2 contains the long list as developed in line with the criteria based approach described in Chapter 18 [APP-047] paragraph 18.3.21 and includes nine NSIP solar schemes within Lincolnshire. It is noted that the cut off date for the assessment is 14 January 2025 however 2 solar farms for which DCO applications had not yet been submitted to PINs have been included on the long list, namely Fosse Green and Beacon Fen, which is welcomed. Please note Meridian Solar Farm (scoping submitted to PINs 31/05/2024) has been omitted from the long list despite a scoping request being submitted to PINS on 31/05/2024. Leoda Solar Farm (scoping submitted to PINS 31/01/2025) should also be included in any updates. The Council will therefore expect to see the applicant's cumulative assessment updated accordingly to include these proposals.*	ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047], ES Volume 3, Appendix 18.2: Other Development Long List Stages 1 and 2 [APP-146] and Appendix 18.3: Summary of Other Developments included within the Cumulative BMV Assessment [APP-147] have been updated to reflect the inclusion of Meridian Solar Farm and Leoda Solar Farm, as well as to address comments received at Deadline 1.
LIR187	**LCC 19.8**	*The nature and scale of current and emerging proposals relating to large scale solar developments in Lincolnshire is unprecedented. At the time of writing this report 5 NSIP scale solar schemes have been granted a DCO in Lincolnshire and a further 8 schemes (including One Earth) that are either progressing through examination or are at pre application stage. There is a cluster of NSIP scale solar developments around Gainsborough*	A Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] was submitted at Deadline 1 which considers the cumulative effects of the nearest NSIP solar schemes located within 16km of the Proposed Development. This includes Cottam Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park, Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park, West Burton Solar Project, Fosse Green Energy, Tillbridge Solar, Steeples Renewables Project.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		which includes Tillbridge, Cottam, Gate Burton and West Burton. Three of which have already been granted consent, also within close proximity is Steeple Renewables located within Nottinghamshire. The cumulative impacts of the One Earth solar farm, combined with the other developments identified could be significant. These impacts include landscape and visual effects, construction-related traffic and transport movements, waste and the long-term loss of BMV agricultural land. Such changes are likely to negatively affect the local community's amenity. Although noted that these developments are not contained within the short list of 'other developments' assessed, the Council is of the view that at a minimum these NSIPs/DCOs should be included on the short list. As conveyed in their PEIR response the Council 'is pleased to see the consideration of projects that have not yet been approved and are still in the application process' and that 'whilst the principal sites are located outside of the proposed 15km ZOI wider implications, particularly traffic and transport may have some interactivity and cumulative impact'. The 'scoping out' of NSIPs/DCOs from the short list is of significant concern to the Council. The assessment of inter-project cumulative effects should be kept under review as the OESF project progresses through examination and the lists and assessments updated as information becomes available.	The Joint Interrelationship report also considers the North Humber to High Marnham Overhead Lines and the proposed High Marnham Substation, which lies within the Proposed Development Order Limits. In addition, an update to the Transport Assessment [REP1-045] was submitted at Deadline 1 incorporating committed developments. The findings from both these assessments confirm there are no inter-project cumulative significant effects with the NSIP solar schemes on any environmental aspect. As outlined in the Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] and Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047] with the North Humber to High Marnham Overhead Lines there will be a moderate to major adverse cumulative effect (significant), affecting on the visual amenity of PRoW users south of East Drayton during both construction and operation.
LIR188	**LCC 19.13**	*The Council in its Relevant Representation put forward a request that the ExA adopt a mechanism as supported by the ExAs for the solar projects in western Lincolnshire (Cottam, Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge) and also for the Outer Dowsing offshore wind proposal in the east of the County, where each applicant was required to produce an inter- relationship report at the start of their examination and then subsequently updated at each deadline during the examination. For the reasons*	A Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] was submitted at Deadline 1.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		set out above the Council would wish to see a similar approach adopted for the One Earth proposal.	
LIR189	**WLDC 7.22**	*WLDC notes that the applicant has provided a drawing that identified the approximate location of other projects through numbered circles (Figure 18.9 / Drawing Number EN10159/APP/6.20/18.9). Whilst serving as a useful reference, WLDC wishes to see a drawing that shows the true extent of solar farm area coverage in the District and surrounds, including solar NSIPs and any large scale (49.9MW) schemes consented or proposed to be consented under the Town and Country Planning Act. Were such a drawing produced with, for example, the Order Limits/red-line boundaries of other projects shown, the extend of land lost to solar farm development and the proximity to each other would be revealed. WLDC considers that this exercise is required in order for the cumulative impacts of the OESF project to be properly considered. WLDC request that proposed large vehicle and AIL routes are included in this drawing or set of drawings, along with context background mapping showing flood risk zones and agricultural land classification.*	A Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] was submitted at Deadline 1, which includes the drawing of the other solar NSIPs as requested by WLDC.
Built Heritage			
LIR190	**NSDC 13.8.1**	*<u>Church of St George (1046053) – Grade II* (Near North Clifton)</u>* *<u>Impact of proposal</u>* *The Church has architectural and historical significance and dates to the 13th century. The topography of the area means the belfry is very exposed and visible from many vantage points. One vantage point that has not been identified within the assessment of significance is that of the viewpoint from the viaduct. This viaduct is higher than the surrounding ground level and is a cycle route. No photographs have been provided from the*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.136) and additional information, including a view of the Church of St George from the Fledborough Viaduct (p.635) [REP1-075]. This confirms that consideration has been had on whether the significance of this asset, including the contribution of setting to significance, would be affected and why it is considered that no adverse impact would arise as a result of the Application.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		viaduct, with railings either side leaving an exposed and open view to the site with trees and shrubs scattered around the area. *Recommended Mitigation* *The wider site has been identified within the assessment provided as not having a relationship with the Church. This has no discernible bearing on the impact and level of harm that would be incurred from the proposal. Consideration should be afforded to how the proposed development impacts on the setting of this important heritage asset*	
LIR191	**NSDC 13.8.2**	*Church of St Helen (1302452(- Grade II* (Thorney)* *Note: This was not identified on map as Grade II** *Impact of proposal* *The Victorian church from 1850 has special architectural interest with its mixed of period styles. The proposal is far more distant from the site, with a road, hedging and a field between the eastern edge. This lessens the impact on the setting of the asset considerably compared to The Church of St George.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Consider planting more trees and hedging to further screen views onto the site would further protect the setting of the heritage asset.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the 'Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations' at RR.135 **REP1-075**]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR192	**NSDC 13.8.3**	*Ruins of Old Church in Churchyard (1178446) – Grade II* *Impact of proposal* *The ruins are unusual and distinct feature that further increase the significance of the setting near the Church of St. Helens. The impact would be limited due to their*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.140) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		positioning as the Church of ST Helens shields any views. *Recommended Mitigation* *Increase hedging and tree coverage to further protect any views.*	
LIR193	**NSDC 13.8.4**	*Fledborough Viaduct (Fledborough and North Clifton) Victorian to late 20th Century (Monument)* *Impact of proposal* *The monument is a significant Victorian architectural monument and is closely sited to the Grade II* St George Church. The impact of solar panels either side would be detrimental to the wider setting of the viaduct.* *Recommended Mitigation* *The small parcel of land north should be removed with no panels near the viaduct to preserve the setting.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.141) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no development within the small parcel of land to the north of the viaduct and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR	**NSDC 13.8.5**	*Firs Farmhouse (1302430) – Grade II* *Impact of proposal* *A small strip of the solar farm seems to encroach towards the heritage asset.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Unless an access road, it is recommended that this area is removed. If this the case, then no harm shall be incurred.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.142) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no solar arrays in close proximity to this asset and no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR194	**NSDC 13.8.6**	*Hall Farmhouse (1302529) – Grade II (North Clifton)* *Impact of proposal* *There may be possible views from this heritage asset, no pictures present this within the report.* *Recommended Mitigation*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.142), including additional information, including images of this asset (p.635) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		Increase hedging and planting to further reduce any views of the new site.	
LIR195	**NSDC 13.8.7**	*Trent Lane Farmhouse (1369937) – Grade II (North Clifton)* *Impact of proposal* *Limited, possible views from the site but is surrounded by other structures. There will be views in nearby field.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.142) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR196	**NSDC 13.8.8**	*The Old Manor House (1046018) – Grade II (Thorney)* *Impact of proposal* *Within a residential area, the property has a buffer zone formed by a street and another row of properties across it.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.143) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR197	**NSDC 13.8.9**	*Thorney War Memorial (Gates) (1462827) – Grade II (Thorney)* *Impact of proposal* *While slightly closer than the church, the gates are less significant. There is still ample space between this asset and the proposal, so impact would be limited.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.143) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR198	**NSDC 13.8.10**	*Cottage at Thorney Hall (1369961) – Grade II (Thorney)*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		Impact of proposal *The asset is near the eastern site, but behind the Grade II* St Helens Church meaning the impact is limited.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.*	Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.143) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
LIR199	**NSDC 13.8.11**	*House at Thorney Hall (10460170) – Grade II (Thorney)* *Impact of proposal* *The asset is near the eastern site, but behind the Grade II* St Helens Church meaning the impact is limited.* *Recommended Mitigation* *Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.*	The Applicant has provided further information and responded to comments in Deadline 1 within the Applicants Responses to Relevant Representations at RR-135 (p.144) [REP1-075]. This confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of this asset and therefore no further mitigation would be required.
Whole Life Cycle			
LIR200	**NCC 7.3**	Councillor Bingham, the Cabinet lead for Transport and Environment has stressed the need to consider the whole life environmental impact of this technology from manufacturing through to the landfill disposal.	As part of the DCO submission, an Environmental Statement has been produced in accordance with the EIA Regulations. As outlined in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [APP-031], the purpose of EIA is to ensure that the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development are fully understood and considered during the decision-making process. This includes assessing the whole-life environmental impact of the Proposed Development, covering all likely significant environmental effects (both adverse and beneficial) arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phases.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
Grid Connection			
LIR201	**LCC 8.1**	*The applicant has received a grid connection offer from National Grid to connect to the proposed High Marnham Substation. The new High Marnham Substation does not form part of the DCO application and will be subject to planning permission through the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, for which a planning application is yet to be submitted. This presents potential concerns regarding the information available to inform the Environmental Statement (ES), the timing of the two related projects and the deliverability of the One Earth Solar project.*	ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047] and the Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] assess the potential cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development alongside the proposed High Marnham Substation. This assessment is based on the most up-to-date publicly available information. The Applicant recognises that the High Marnham Substation falls within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development and acknowledges the potential for construction activities associated with both projects to overlap. In response, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP1-047] includes a commitment to coordinate, where practicable, with National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) to minimise any adverse effects resulting from project interactions during construction. The Applicant considers that the Secretary of State can be satisfied there is no obvious reason why the High Marnham substation works would not come forward, and there is no justification for any requirement being imposed on the Proposed Development in this respect. Paragraph 4.11.8 of NPS EN-1 anticipates and allows for the circumstance in which "*it may not be possible to coordinate applications*" and paragraphs 4.11.8 and 4.11.9 go on to set out what the Applicant needs to satisfy the decision maker of in that situation. The Applicant has addressed the requirements of these paragraphs, including that there is no obvious reason why the application for the High Marnham substation should be refused. National Grid has indicated it is pursuing an application for planning permission for the High Marnham substation, and the Applicant understands this will be submitted in Q4 of 2025, and the Applicant anticipates planning permission being granted, having regard to relevant planning policy.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			As above, a cumulative assessment has been undertaken which considers the Proposed Development and the High Marnham Substation.
LIR202	**LCC 8.5 – 8.6**	*It is noted that One Earth Solar has a grid connection agreement which relies on connection to a new substation being promoted by National Grid at High Marnham. The Grid Connection Statement [APP-174], states that engagement with the National Energy System Operator (NESO) has resulted in a grid connection offer which provides a connection date of 2029. The proposed new High Marnham substation will require planning consent under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The National Grid project website indicates that a planning application would be submitted in early 2025, with construction anticipated to commence during summer 2026 and a fully operational substation being achieved by winter 2029. However at the time of writing of this LIR a planning application for the proposed new High Marnham substation has not yet been made.* *Construction of the One Earth Solar Farm according to paragraph 5.5.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1: Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development of Construction [APP-034] is proposed to commence in 2027. This introduces a potential issue, should there be further delays to the substation application or in the event that it is not granted planning consent, as the Solar Farm's mobilisation and construction may in these scenarios start before the planning consent for the proposed High Marnham substation is secured. It is therefore important to clarify how the two projects would align if there are delays in the substation's timeline or if it does not proceed as planned.*	See response to LIR201 (above).

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR203	**LCC 8.8**	*Certainty of a grid connection and therefore the deliverability of this project is a concern to the Council. There is a potential risk for negative environmental impacts to occur from the One Earth development commencing without the benefits of generation which would be relied upon for the grant of any consent being secured. Should the SoS be minded to grant the DCO, the Council are of the view that the DCO should make provision through a requirement to restrict the commencement of the One Earth development until a particular point has been reached with the High Marnham Substation, which we consider should be more than a material start, so that it can be said with certainty that this necessary infrastructure will be delivered in line with the assumptions made in the ES. The Council would draw the SoS attention to requirement 33 of the Keadby 3 (Carbon Capture Equipped Gas Fired Generating Station) Order 2022 which imposes a restriction on commencement until an environmental permit is in place. Whilst this requirement relates to an environmental permit need it has similarities in that it was the case that negative environmental effects could occur if the control was not in place.*	This issue was raised and discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and the Applicant was asked to comment on the inclusion of a Grampian style requirement in the DCO. The Applicant strongly disagrees that there is any justification for imposing such a requirement, and its reasoning in this respect is set out in the Applicant's Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-077] at Agenda Item 6(i), in particular at pages 25 – 27.
LIR204	**LCC 8.9**	*A further consideration is the effect on the validity of the ES should there be a slippage in timescales for the One Earth development due to not being able to connect to the grid by the connection dates indicated, for example, ecology surveys becoming out of date or overlaps with the construction phases of future projects which were not envisaged to be constructed at the same time as One Earth, due to optimistic assumptions within the ES not coming to fruition.*	In terms of slippage in predicted timescales, the ES can only be based on worst-case assumptions, which is a reasonable worst case. There is a lock in place via paragraph 2(4), Schedule 15 of the Draft DCO [REP1-007]. Pursuant to Schedule 15, when the Applicant is discharging requirements, it will need to confirm that the subject matter being approved would not be likely to give rise to any materially new or different environmental effects compared to those in the ES. In this way, the Applicant is bound by the effects contained in the ES.
Land and Soils			
LIR205	**LCC 15.11**	*The potential impacts on BMV agricultural land in respect of the One Earth proposal and cumulatively with*	A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in Chapter 8: Land and

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		other projects (both NSIP and Town and Country Planning Applications (TCPA)) that are emerging/known about in Lincolnshire are of significant concern to the Council. The Council will seek to protect high quality agricultural land in Lincolnshire (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) from development in accordance with its Energy Infrastructure Position Statement adopted 5 December 2023. This statement acknowledges that Lincolnshire has a high proportion of BMV agricultural land, which is the basis for its prosperous agricultural industry. The Council will object to proposals on Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.	Soils [APP-037], with consideration of cumulative effects provided in Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047]. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. Only approximately 120 ha will be permanently removed from agricultural land use (for ecological enhancement areas) and 534.67 ha will be used temporarily (for solar PV infrastructure, BESS and substations) and will returned to agricultural land use on decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The area of BMV agricultural land within Lincolnshire is estimated to be in the region of 402,900 ha, as such there is only a very small percentage of this BMV that will be affected (based on the areas of BMV land within the Order Limits, the temporary change in land use as a result of the Proposed development will affect 0.03% of BMV land within Lincolnshire and 0.5% of BMV land within Nottinghamshire). If all the 'reasonably foreseeable' schemes (including the Proposed Development) within Lincolnshire proceed, the change in land use would be 0.70% (including temporary and permanent schemes). The change in land use in Nottinghamshire, including the Proposed Development (for temporary and permanent schemes) would be 0.64%
LIR206	**LCC 15.18**	*The Council would also highlight the potential need for a supervisory agriculture soils specialist, particularly in regard to drainage management. The applicant addresses land drainage within ES Chapter 8, paragraphs 9.3.7 – 9.3.8 and consider necessary actions regarding impact upon agricultural drainage. Land drainage is a key factor in assessing both land classification and the impact on land restoration particularly along any cable or grid connection route, where trenches are dug, or where soils are stripped even temporarily. The Council is of the opinion it would be beneficial to provide post construction monitoring of soil quality where drainage has been re provided to*	If any land drains are encountered the applicant will seek the advice of a drainage specialist as mentioned within the Soil Management Plan [APP-182] on how to restore the drainage. Additionally, the Applicant will repair and restore any damage caused to drains throughout the Scheme as mentioned within the Soil Management Plan [APP-182].

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		ensure that any drainage issues do not impact on soil quality.	
LIR207	**LCC 15.20**	*ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects [APP-047] states that over the full development site 170.81ha of BMV land would be permanently removed from use due to construction of the BESS and substation facilities and ecological enhancement measures. Of the land which is defined as ecological enhancement areas and mitigation, such as habitat suitable for skylark nesting 42% of this is identified as BMV, with 58% non BMV. For areas allocated for substations and BESS sites, 81% of this land is identified as BMV, with 19% non-BMV. According to the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) Guide 'A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment' (February 2022) 'the permanent loss, or reduction in quality, of more than 20ha of agricultural land due to development is of very high magnitude' which is acknowledged as 'major' in Table 11.7. 15.21* *The difference between Grade 3a and 3b agricultural land is however quite small in this instance and there is a degree of subjectivity about the difference, although the ALC findings are not disputed.*	The construction of BESS, substation facilities and ecological enhancement will be removed following decommissioning therefore the entire site is deemed as temporary land take oppose to permanent. Therefore, in accordance with the IEMA guidance the magnitude is not very high as the table refers to permanent land take. A minor magnitude within construction and negligible magnitude within decommissioning has been reported as the Applicant will have no permanent land take as it is only temporary. Further details of this assessment can be found within Chapter 8: Land and Soils [APP-037].
LIR208	**LCC 15.22**	*Soil structure can be significantly damaged during the construction phase due to heavy vehicle traffic. If this work is done when soils are wet, there can be significant damage. While much of this damage can be remedied post-construction, but not all and it is possible that long-term drainage problems may occur.*	Mitigation practices have been incorporated into the Soil Management Plan [APP-182] to prevent damage to soil structure. Mitigation practices include stopping work when soils are above the plastic limit and when heavy rainfall has occurred as well as seeding soil bunds throughout the winter. Suitably trained personnel will advise on winter workings and soil moisture content to ensure correct procedure is in place during construction to prevent structural damage.
LIR209	**LCC 15.23 – 15.24**	*The scale of the project and the amount of BMV land, makes the impact significant at both District and County level. The cumulative effect is significant for Lincolnshire*	A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in Chapter 8: Land and Soils [APP-037], with consideration of cumulative effects provided in

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		and the District. There are several other large solar schemes proposed or approved across the wider area that contribute to this impact. *The 2024 UK Food Security Report identifies that 'Water and land, important agricultural inputs, are under increasing human and geopolitical competition and are being used at an unsustainable rate. The food system's essential natural resources continue to be depleted without being recovered for future use.' By reducing the amount of BMV land available by incrementally removing land for large infrastructure projects puts additional pressure on the remaining land to keep agricultural production supply stable, or alternatively more food will have to be imported with the sustainability implications of food miles and associated carbon emissions.*	Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047]. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. The inter-project cumulative effects are considered minimal due to their temporary nature. In terms of impacts on food production, with the removal of the text on the availability of agricultural land used for food production from former Footnote 62 (now superseded by Footnote 65) of the NPPF, there is no longer a need to consider food production in land use planning terms. The applicable policy tests are therefore those set out in section 5.11 of NPS EN-1, namely whether the use of agricultural land is justified and necessary, and whether the loss of BMV land has been minimised through site selection. Notwithstanding the removal of consideration of food production from the NPPF, even if this were a relevant policy consideration, the Applicant maintains that the impacts of the Proposed Development on food production will not be significant as set out below. A detailed assessment of possible cumulative impacts relating to soil and agricultural land has been completed in Chapter 8: Land and Soils [APP-037], with consideration of cumulative effects provided in Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047]. This assesses the quantities of BMV land that will be taken out of use due to other developments (both permanently and temporarily) in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. Only approximately 120 ha will be permanently removed from agricultural land use (for ecological enhancement areas) and 534.67 ha will be used temporarily (for solar PV infrastructure, BESS and substations) and will return to agricultural land use after the operational stage of the Proposed Development. The area of BMV agricultural land within Lincolnshire is estimated to be in the region of 402,900 ha, as such there is only a very small percentage of this BMV that will be affected (based on the areas of BMV land within the Order Limits, the temporary change in land use as a result of the Proposed development will affect 0.03% of BMV land within Lincolnshire and 0.5% of BMV land within

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			Nottinghamshire.). If all the 'reasonably foreseeable' schemes (including the Proposed Development) within Lincolnshire proceed, the change in land use would be 0.70% (including temporary and permanent schemes). The change in land use in Nottinghamshire, including the Proposed Development (for temporary and permanent schemes) would be 0.64%. The Applicant has also addressed concerns raised by the Councils in relation to BMV and cumulative impacts at Issue Specific Hearing 1 – see the response in Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-077], at Agenda Item 8.4 particularly pages 67 – 68, including the post hearing note which cites the decision of the Secretary of State on West Burton.
LIR210	**LCC 15.26**	*Table 1 of Appendix 18.3 [APP-147], the Council is pleased to see the majority of NSIP solar developments within Lincolnshire are listed within this table however notably absent are Meridian and Leoda Solar Projects, the Council is of the opinion that these schemes should also be assessed within any BMV cumulative assessment.*	Chapter 18 - Cumulative Effects [APP-047], Appendix 18.2: Other Development Long List Stages 1 and 2 [APP-146] and Appendix 18.3: Summary of Other Developments included within the Cumulative BMV Assessment [APP-147] have been updated to reflect the inclusion of Meridian Solar Farm and Leoda Solar Farm, as well as to address comments received at Deadline 1. This has not changes the result of the assessment.
LIR211	**LCC 15.27**	*The Council has recently undertaken a review of BMV land impacted by Solar development within Lincolnshire, whilst it is noted that the applicant has assessed cumulative effects on BMV under differing criteria the Council considers highlighting the extent of solar developments within the county to be relevant.*	Noted. Chapter 18 - Cumulative Effects [APP-047], Appendix 18.2: Other Development Long List Stages 1 and 2 [APP-146] and Appendix 18.3: Summary of Other Developments included within the Cumulative BMV Assessment [APP-147] includes the impacts on BMV from solar development as well as BESS, based on the criteria as detailed in Chapter 18. While there is no one specific way to assess cumulative effects, we have followed PINS guidance and taken an approach consistent with other Solar DCOs
LIR212	**LCC 15.29**	*Whilst loss of BMV land under the solar PV panels is considered as temporary, 60 years is a considerable amount of time. In addition to this temporary loss, there would be permanent loss of BMV land as a result of this proposal due to ecological enhancement measures and the land area required for the High Marnham substation.*	The Applicant has taken steps to avoid and minimise use of BMV land, however, there does still remain BMV land within the Site. The Applicant has set out its justification for this in the application documents. It is explained within Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-033] that other potential Order Limit locations were not of significantly better BMV profile in comparison to the Order Limits, resulting from detailed ALC

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			survey. As the Order Limits have evolved, some land parcels of ALC Grade 2 have been removed in seeking to avoid and minimise impacts to BMV land. With complete avoidance of BMV land not possible in a way that still achieves the objectives of the Proposed Development, a key focus in the design of the Proposed Development was on minimising impacts on BMV land as much as possible. In terms of the potential permanent loss of BMV land as a result of infrastructure that will not be removed at the decommissioning phase, the only land that will be permanently removed from agricultural use would be the ecological enhancement areas which comprise approximately 120 ha of land, which is only a very small percentage of the BMV land across Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. As detailed in the oDEMP [APP-178], cables left in situ after decommissioning would not impact the future agricultural use of the land, provided they were buried at a minimum 0.9m depth. Cables buried at least 1m below ground are expected to be left in place. This approach is considered to be best practice and typical of solar DCOs, however the DEMP provides a mechanism that requires the Applicant to implement what will be the most appropriate approach at the time of decommissioning. This would allow cable removal to be considered in more detail at a later stage.
LIR213	**LCC 15.30**	*Nevertheless, the whole area is productive farmland, which would be removed from mainly arable farming for 60+ years and at best, a lower intensity grass-based system would replace it. The loss of arable production is considered locally significant and in view of other projects in the wider District and County potentially cumulatively significant. For context, the total arable crops and uncropped arable land in Lincolnshire is 385,930ha according to figures published by DEFRA, the total land proposed to be covered by solar farms, NSIP (order limits) and TCPA applications, is*	The Applicant considers the cumulative loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land in the Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047]. This includes consideration of the Steeple Renewable Project [EN010163] as well as major projects within 10km of the Site and for any other Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) or Solar Farm Scheme (which meets the cumulative criteria) beyond 10km of the Site (see Environmental Statement Appendix 18.3: Summary of Other Developments included within the Cumulative BMV Assessment [APP-147]). The cumulative effects assessment concludes that if all the ‘reasonably foreseeable’ schemes within

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		approximately 13,620 ha. On the assumption that the majority of land proposed for solar farms is arable land (solar land take being around 3.5% of the arable total) and based on the total crop output figure of £1,564 million for 2023, the potential loss of crop output could be in the region of £50 million.	Lincolnshire proceed, the change in land use would be 0.26% (including both temporary and permanent schemes). The change in land use in Nottinghamshire (for both temporary and permanent schemes) would be 0.14%. The Applicant can confirm that the 60-year consent being sought is temporary. This position has been supported by the Secretary of State in recent decisions confirming 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. Therefore, the impact upon productive farmland would be for a temporary period.
LIR214	**LCC 15.31**	*Should development go ahead, there would be a significant loss of the best classifications of agricultural land, with a significant loss of economic and other benefits. This loss of BMV land is contrary to national policy in the NPS EN1 and EN3 and Policy S67 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.*	The Applicant has sought to avoid, reduce or mitigate the use of BMV land wherever practicable. While complete avoidance of BMV land was not achievable without compromising the objectives of the Proposed Development, minimising impacts on BMV land has remained a key priority throughout. As a result of this approach, the Order Limits have evolved over time, with certain land parcels classified as ALC Grade 2 removed to reduce the extent of BMV land affected. The Applicant has provided justification for this within the application documents, including Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-033]. This chapter explains that alternative locations considered during the site selection process were not of significantly better BMV profile in comparison to the Order Limits, based on detailed ALC surveys.
LIR215	**LCC 19.10**	*The Council is also concerned about the cumulative impact of development, particularly large scale solar*	Details relating to the Leoda Solar Farm and Meridian Solar Farm have been added to Figure 18.9, and incorporated into the

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		development, on agricultural land. Please note both the Meridian and Leoda solar farms (as previously referenced above) have been omitted from Figure 18.9 Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land and Other Developments [APP-147]. Paragraph 18.5.14 states that 'If all the 'reasonably foreseeable' schemes within Lincolnshire proceed, the change in land use would be 0.26% (including temporary and permanent schemes)'. The Council would request the calculations which sit behind this percentage, as from our own tracking of solar development NSIPs and TCPA permissions, these developments appear to cover circa 3.5% of the arable cropped and uncropped land in Lincolnshire.	calculations relating to the change in land use of BMV land for reasonably foreseeable schemes within [EN010159/APP/6.21.1] .Both these schemes are located within Lincolnshire, and therefore the change in land use for BMV land within Lincolnshire if the Proposed Development proceeds along with the other schemes that are deemed to be 'reasonably foreseeable' has been adjusted to 0.7%. The Applicant considers that the 3.5% figure quoted in this comment may relate to all arable land, not just BMV land, which may result in the difference in these values. The numbers used in the calculations are presented in Table 18.1 and Table 18.2 of Appendix 18.2 [EN010159/APP/6.21.1]. Calculations also use the values given within the ES Chapter for the total areas of BMV land within Lincolnshire and within Nottinghamshire.
LIR216	**BDC Historic Land Contamination**	*The site may have a history of contaminative land use, raising concerns about existing land contamination. A thorough investigation into the extent of contamination, including soil and groundwater testing, may be necessary. Appropriate remediation plans must be developed to ensure the site is safe for its intended use.*	The Preliminary Risk Assessment (provided in Appendix 8.2 [APP-099 to APP-104]), is the initial step in assessing potential land contamination within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. This desk-based assessment evaluates historical and current land uses to identify areas where contamination may be present and to inform the scope of subsequent intrusive site investigations.. The results will be subject to a detailed risk assessment to establish whether further investigation or remediation is required. If areas of potential contamination are identified, and require further investigation or delineation, the scope of any additional work will be agreed with the local planning authority to ensure transparency and regulatory oversight. Any contamination confirmed within the Order Limits will be assessed in terms of its potential risks. This will inform decisions on the need for remediation and the appropriate measures to ensure the site is safe and suitable for its intended use.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR217	**BDC Risk of Future Land Contamination**	*The proposed development activities may introduce new contaminants into the environment. An evaluation of potential contamination sources and robust strategies to prevent future contamination should be an integral part of the proposal.*	The possibility for the Proposed Development to introduce new contaminants is considered within Chapter 8: Land and Soils [APP-037], and numerous methods to mitigate these possibilities are detailed within the management plans for all phases of the Proposed Development (Outline Construction Management Plan, Outline Operational Management Plan and Outline Decommissioning Management Plan [APP-176, APP-177 and APP-178]). If fuel, oils and chemicals that are required for the Proposed Development are properly stored and used, then any potential risks from these materials will be minimised, resulting in the assessment concluding that there are no likely significant effects on land or soils from contamination introduced by the Proposed Development.
LIR218	**BDC Loss of Best and Most Versatile Land**	*Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would be operational for a period of 60 years and that the applicant is reliant on the loss being temporary, the District Council are concerned that the proposal would see a total loss at 660.9ha of land classified as BMV agricultural land. Given that some infrastructure, for example cabling, would be permanent and remain in place after the decommissioning period, some loss of BMV agricultural land would be permanent. There are a significant number of solar farms, BESS Facilities and screening opinions currently being considered and consented in this Local Planning Authority area and the wider area together with DOC consent awarded to other NSIP's within the administrative area. Other NSIP schemes are also under consideration such as Steeples renewable project acceptance stage and the National Grid upgrade (pre-app stage). As such, the cumulative impact of the potential loss of BMV agricultural land should be carefully considered.*	The Applicant has taken steps to avoid and minimise use of BMV land, however, there does still remain BMV land within the Site. The Applicant has set out its justification for this in the application documents. It is explained within Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-033] that other potential Order Limit locations were not of significantly better BMV profile in comparison to the Order Limits, resulting from detailed ALC survey. As the Order Limits have evolved, some land parcels of ALC Grade 2 have been removed in seeking to avoid and minimise impacts to BMV land. With complete avoidance of BMV land not possible in a way that still achieves the objectives of the Proposed Development, a key focus in the design of the Proposed Development was on minimising impacts on BMV as much as possible. In terms of the potential permanent loss of BMV as a result of infrastructure that will not be removed at the decommissioning phase, the only land that will be permanently removed from agricultural use would be the ecological enhancement areas which comprises approximately 120 ha of land, which is only a very small percentage of the BMV across Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			As detailed in the oDEMP [APP-178], cables left in situ after decommissioning would not impact the future agricultural use of the land, provided they were buried at a minimum 0.9m depth. Cables buried at least 1m below ground are expected to be left in place, and that approach is based on the Applicant's understanding (informed by use of cabling elsewhere and the approach taken on other similar schemes) that these cables would be unlikely to be considered as waste if left in the ground.
LIR219	**WLDC 8.35**	*WLDC disagrees with the justifications provided by the applicant. A significant amount of BMV land is purposed to be lost without sufficient justification as to way the design approach has not avoided its use as part of the scheme. To locate infrastructure such as the BESS on BMV land has not been adequately justified, especially where there are lower grades of land nearby that could accommodate these Scheme components.*	The Applicant has taken steps to avoid and minimise use of BMV land, however, there does still remain BMV land within the Site. The Applicant has set out its justification for this in the application documents. It is explained within Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-033] that other potential Order Limit locations were not of significantly better BMV profile in comparison to the Order Limits, resulting from detailed ALC survey. As the Order Limits have evolved, some land parcels of ALC Grade 2 have been removed in seeking to avoid and minimise impacts to BMV land. With complete avoidance of BMV land not possible in a way that still achieves the objectives of the Proposed Development, a key focus in the design of the Proposed Development was on minimising impacts on BMV as much as possible.
LIR220	**WLDC 8.36**	*The applicant's reliance on the loss of BMV land being 'temporary' is, in WLDCs view, flawed given the 60-year lifespan that the OESF seeks development consent for. This is a significant period of time, akin to permanent development, where land would not be available across the whole Scheme for the production of food. The total land and over 660ha of BMV land will be lost to the agricultural sector for the production of food for several generations. This is an impact that is significant and adverse.*	The utilised agricultural area (UAA) is 16.8 million hectares in 2024 (Defra 2024), therefore the total agricultural land take from the Proposed Development accounts for less than 0.01% of the UAA. Therefore, the Proposed Development will not have a significant effect on National Food Production. Additionally, throughout operation significant proportions of the Site will be able to be grazed which will help increase soil organic matter and overall soil quality. Following the decommissioning the scheme the land will be returned to agricultural use which is why the development has been deemed as temporary. The Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects including consents granted for

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass solar farms, which have all been granted 60-year consents. It's 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. 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. The Applicant has assessed the decommissioning of the Proposed Development demonstrating that the Project is temporary with an end date of 60 years from first operation.
Socio-economics			
LIR221	**LCC 16.5**	*The ES assessment expects a net additional employment average of approx. 17 FTEs in Lincolnshire during the operation phase to arise from the development, with the bulk of FTE coming in a 2 year span during construction. When placed against other strategic opportunities such as STEP fusion and industrial decarbonisation, this is small. Some scope on the nature of the long term operational requirements in terms of skills would therefore be welcomed.*	During operation, the Project is expected to generate 15 direct FTE jobs. A survey of all landowners within the Order Limits Boundary (OLB) determined there are currently around 20 jobs (equating to 7.75 FTE) within the OLB; thus, the net change would be an increase of 7.25 direct FTE jobs. As above, these are estimated to generate an additional 9.75 FTE indirectly, along supply chains. At this stage of the Proposed Development, further detail on the types of jobs including skill levels, trades and timings of employment demand, are not currently available. The outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (SSCEP) [APP-180] proposes a number of actions to promote opportunities for local people and businesses, including: • Ensuring effective communication of opportunities; • Understanding intervention needs, such as specific education/training requirements and support the development of relevant programmes; and

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			• Delivering other supportive activities such as volunteer placements, work shadowing and visiting local schools. A working group will be set up to galvanise interest and maximise contributions as early as possible (as described in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [APP-180], and to ultimately ensure as much specific detail as possible is provided in the final Plan. Long-term operational requirements for skills will form part of the final SSCEP.
LIR222	**LCC 16.6**	*In terms of construction employment the APP-046 paragraph 17.6.5 estimates and average of 554 to 750 FTE peak jobs for 2 years would be supported by the development. While it is appreciated that efforts are to be made to resource a local workforce, this number of jobs would result in a significant temporary workforce either commuting to or staying in Lincolnshire particularly when accumulated with other schemes. There could be significant resultant demographic changes, changes to housing demand, changes to other local public and private services, and socio cultural impacts. An example would be a concentration of workers in any one place creating needs on NHS services. Better understanding on the size and social make-up of likely temporary workforce would allow better understanding of these impacts*	Given there was not anticipated to be a permanent increase in the residential population as a result of the Proposed Development, potential effects upon the demand for these facilities was scoped out from detailed assessment, as significant effects were unlikely to occur. Furthermore, the two-year construction period would limit the scale of any potential effects. The ES Chapter 17 – Socio-Economics [APP-046], includes data on existing labour supply, to provide some further context on the likelihood of construction workers being required from further afield and hence increasing demand for accommodation. Whilst the new construction jobs will likely be required at a range of skills levels (including some specialist skills), the data suggests- in quantitative terms – a relatively large pool of potential workers locally: • There were approximately 400 people employed in construction in the local area in 2022 (Table 17.11 in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 17 – Socio-Economics [APP-046]. • There were approximately 10,000 people employed in construction in the three Districts (2022). That number had increased by 17.6% between 2015-2022 (Tables 17.11 and 17.12 [APP-046]). • The number of economically active but unemployed persons (i.e. those out of work but not necessarily claiming unemployment benefit) in the three districts in 2022 amounted to 5,900 people (2021) (Table 17.10 [APP-046]). • The number of persons who are unemployed, seeking work and in receipt of unemployment benefits (i.e. claimant unemployed) in 2024 ranged from approximately 1,600 in West Lindsay; 2,100

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			in Newark and Sherwood and 2,500 in Bassetlaw (see Figure 17.2 in Environmental Statement Volume 3 - Figures 17.1 - 17.10 [APP-078]). Further data from Visit Britian indicates some existing hotel capacity to accommodate additional demand. Data for the West Midlands region indicated average room occupancy of 72% in 2023; 77% in 2024 and 76% in 2025. These data suggest capacity to accommodate additional demand which would have associated positive economic effects. Further accommodation provision could be provided by flexible renting options such as Air B&B. Further potential sources of accommodation may be via private rented accommodation; latest census data from 2021 indicates the percentage of vacant homes range from 5.21% (Bassetlaw); 4.71% (Newark and Sherwood) and 5.02% (West Lindsay). At this stage of the Proposed Development, further detail on the types of jobs including skill levels, trades and timings of employment demand, are not currently available. The outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (SSCEP) proposes a number of actions to promote opportunities for local people and businesses, including: • Ensuring effective communication of opportunities. • Understanding intervention needs, such as specific education/training requirements and support the development of relevant programmes; and • Delivering other supportive activities such as volunteer placements, work shadowing and visiting local schools. A working group will be set up, prior to consent, to galvanise interest and maximise contributions as early as possible, and to ultimately ensure as much specific detail as possible is provided in the final Plan. Long-term operational requirements for skills will form part of the final SSCEP. The Joint Interrelationship Report identifies that there may be a temporary cumulative effect on accommodation locally during the construction phase. Pressures on local accommodation from

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			construction will depend on a number of factors. These factors being i) the precise demand for workers over the course of the construction period, ii) from where these workers are likely to be drawn (i.e. the labour catchment area) iii) the number of those workers drawn from outside of the local area and hence require overnight accommodation. This, in turn, depends on iv) the skill levels required for these jobs. It also depends on the same factors and the same precise construction start/end dates for other cumulative developments. Such effects are therefore uncertain. The OSSCEP [APP-180] acknowledges the importance of collaboration between the Applicant and local communities, to ensure as much of the employment and upskilling opportunities generated by the Proposed Development are realised within the local area and districts.
LIR223	**LCC 16.8**	*The Council disagrees with the conclusions within Paragraph 17.6.13, the Council notes that the landscape and visual effects from the solar panels and ancillary structures would likely deter tourists and create disinterest with the locality. It is right to note that amenity would be affected during construction and that this could also impact tourism – the scale of construction, loss of vegetation, movement of soil and erection of construction compounds would make a significant difference to this environment that is currently characterised by agricultural fields.*	The Applicant assessed effects upon tourism/the visitor economy in the local area (during construction, operation and decommissioning) through reviewing existing facilities, local data on employment in relevant sectors, the proximity and nature of works, as well as effects and mitigation identified in assessments such as Noise, LVIA. It should be recognised that whilst effects on tourism are uncertain – given they reflect individual decision making on when and where to visit, there will be a sizeable increase in construction employment (554-750) on site. Though there is some uncertainty on the level of increase, on balance this would offset any adverse effects given that there would be expenditure from these employees depending on where the employees live. In regard to potential operational effects upon tourism, The Applicant has considered a 2013 Cornwall Study which provides some data on the relationship between tourism and solar farms. This data shows that the majority of visitors were unaware of the presence of solar farms, and their decision to visit would not have been influenced by their presence. In response to the question “How does the presence of wind farms and solar farms in Cornwall affect the likelihood of you visiting the county again in the future (1,003 responses): 2% responded that they make me less likely to visit; 4% that they make me more likely to visit; 94% they make no difference in my decision

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			to visit again in the future. While this study is not directly comparable to the Proposed Development, the data does indicate that the presence of solar infrastructure similar does not significantly affect tourism demand. The various mitigation measures set out in the ES alongside the potential temporary demand for services from construction workers would be expected to mitigate potential impacts to tourism.
LIR224	**BDC** **Loss of Best and Most Versatile Land**	*Given the loss of BMV Agricultural Land there will be a loss of direct and supply chain farming jobs. The proposal will result in temporary construction jobs but permanent employment on completion of the solar farm would be very limited.*	The ES Chapter 17 – Socio-Economics [APP-046] presents data on existing employment levels and estimated job creation during operation. A survey of landowners within the Order Limits Boundary (OLB) identified approximately 20 current jobs, many of which are part-time or seasonal. This equates to 7.75 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) roles. The Proposed Development is expected to generate 15 direct FTE jobs during operation, resulting in a net increase of 7.25 direct FTE roles. In addition, it is estimated that a further 9.75 FTE jobs will be created indirectly through supply chains. With respect to agricultural land, the Proposed Development (including all cumulative schemes) would result in the loss of 0.64% of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land in Nottinghamshire and 0.70% in Lincolnshire. This scale of loss is not considered likely to have a significant effect on supply chain farming employment.
LIR225	**WLDC** **7.48**	*If the cumulative impacts result in much of the accommodation available within West Lindsey being used to accommodate construction workers, WLDC has concerns that this would have an adverse impact upon the tourism sector. Should there be a significant reduction in the availability of accommodation for tourists, it can be assumed that visitors will look elsewhere beyond the District. Due to the potential lengthy cumulative construction period of a number of years, the ability for tourist accommodation businesses to recover once construction is complete is unknown and it is feared it would take significant time to do so. The tourist industry is already seeking to re-establish growth*	The ES Chapter 17 – Socio-Economics [APP-046], includes data on existing labour supply, to provide some further context on the likelihood of construction workers being required from further afield and hence increasing demand for accommodation. Whilst the new construction jobs will likely be required at a range of skills levels (including some specialist skills), the data suggests- in quantitative terms – a relatively large pool of potential workers locally: • There were approximately 400 people employed in construction in the local area in 2022 (Table 17.11 in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 17 – Socio-Economics [APP-046]). • There were approximately 10,000 people employed in construction in the three Districts (2022). That number had

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		post-COVID, and eliminating accommodation for visitors could prolong this recovery.	increased by 17.6% between 2015-2022 (Tables 17.11 and 17.12 [APP-046]). • The number of economically active but unemployed persons (i.e. those out of work but not necessarily claiming unemployment benefit) in the three districts in 2022 amounted to 5,900 people (2021) (Table 17.10 [APP-046]). • The number of persons who are unemployed, seeking work and in receipt of unemployment benefits (i.e. claimant unemployed) in 2024 ranged from approximately 1,600 in West Lindsay; 2,100 in Newark and Sherwood and 2,500 in Bassetlaw (see Figure 17.2 in Environmental Statement Volume 3 - Figures 17.1 - 17.10 [APP-078]). Further data from Visit Britian indicates some existing hotel capacity to accommodate additional demand. Data for the West Midlands region indicated average room occupancy of 72% in 2023; 77% in 2024 and 76% in 2025. These data suggest capacity to accommodate additional demand which would have associated positive economic effects. Further accommodation provision could be provided by flexible renting options such as Air B&B. Further potential sources of accommodation may be via private rented accommodation; latest census data from 2021 indicates the percentage of vacant homes range from 5.21% (Bassetlaw); 4.71% (Newark and Sherwood) and 5.02% (West Lindsay). Due to these factors, the potential effect upon the demand for these facilities was scoped out from detailed assessment as significant effects were unlikely to occur. Furthermore, the two-year construction period would limit the scale of any potential effects. The Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] identifies that there may be a temporary cumulative effect on accommodation locally during the construction phase. Pressures on local accommodation from construction will depend on a number of factors. These factors being i) the precise demand for workers over the course of the construction period, ii) from where these workers are likely to be drawn (i.e. the labour catchment area) iii) the number of those workers drawn from

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			outside of the local area and hence require overnight accommodation. This, in turn, depends on iv) the skill levels required for these jobs. It also depends on the same factors and the same precise construction start/end dates for other cumulative developments. Such effects are therefore uncertain. The OSSCEP [APP-180] acknowledges the importance of collaboration between the Applicant and local communities, to ensure as much of the employment and upskilling opportunities generated by the Proposed Development are realised within the local area and districts.
Community			
LIR226	**LCC 16.9**	*The socio-economic benefits of the scheme are identified in paragraph 17.5.1 of APP 046. The Council's position is that local communities should benefit from NSIP proposals sited in Lincolnshire. Access to local energy supply from electricity generating schemes is both a local and strategic priority. Analysis commissioned by the Council demonstrates that current energy capacity is stretched, impacting on growth, environment, delivery of net zero and fuel poverty. There is a reasonable expectation that NSIP proposals in Lincolnshire should seek to provide investment and opportunities to help resolve these restrictions.*	The Applicant's grid connection would supply electricity to the National Grid, which would then go on to power homes, businesses and schools across the UK. While the project is not proposed to provide a private line directly to any local energy users, the local energy supply would also benefit from this source of energy into the grid. This domestically-produced, renewable energy would help support both regional and national energy goals. By supplying up to 740 MW of clean energy, the Proposed Development would help in the fight against climate change, while also supporting energy security and helping reduce energy costs. The Applicant has also committed to a community benefit fund to ensure that there are also local benefits from the proposed development. This includes a small fund that has already been made available and is currently supporting local initiatives. If the project is consented, the Applicant would provide a larger benefit fund to support local priorities and initiatives. This fund would be outside of the planning process and DCO, but would be a voluntary agreement between the Applicant and the local councils, and designed through further consultation.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR227	**LCC 16.10**	*In relation to the One Earth Solar Farm consultation, further dialogue with the Council on the expected community (including business) benefits from such a development as one of a number creating a cumulative impact on Lincolnshire business and residents, is welcome. The Council would like to explore with the developer the potential for local communities (including the wider Lincolnshire area) to benefit from this development to deliver against the challenges we have in energy infrastructure and the Council will continue to engage with the Applicant in this respect. LCC has provided guidance to the applicant on the type and level of community benefits that we would expect this development to produce, which includes improved direct energy supply to local businesses to help achieve growth, funding for energy projects that would deliver against LCC's strategic priorities and local demand and employment, training and skills opportunities.*	As described above, the grid connection agreement would supply 740 MW to the National Grid, which then goes to power homes and businesses across the UK. The Applicant has secured a grid connect with National Grid. The Applicant will export energy through that grid connect and National Grid will distribute it. The Applicant has committed to a community benefit fund to support local priorities and initiatives, and will continue to consult on the best structure and approach to this fund with the community and other stakeholders if the project is consented. The Applicant will continue to engage with LCC on their strategic priorities, local employment demand, training and skills opportunities to develop the final Supply Chain, Skills and Employment Management Plan.
LIR228	**LCC 16.11**	*The applicant has produced an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) [APP-180]. The Council has engaged with the applicant throughout the pre application stage of development as stated within Paragraph 3.2.2 [APP-180]. The Council's Adult Learning & Skills Team hosts two Regional Adult Skills Groups (one for Lincoln / West Lindsey / South and North Kesteven regions, and one for Boston / South Holland /East Lindsey regions) where providers meet on a bi-annual basis. The aims of these groups are to raise awareness of projects on the horizon, discuss opportunities for collaboration and identify and gaps in provision. It would be beneficial to include information on the Regional Adult Skills Groups in the oSSCEP. The Council's Adult Learning & Skills Team would welcome further engagement*	The Applicant will begin engaging with the Adult Learning & Skills Team during examination and seek to attend the Regional Adult Skills Group to discuss opportunities for collaboration. The Applicant will include further information within the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-X] once we have engaged with the Adult Learning & Skills Team.
LIR229	**LCC 17.11**	*The ES recognises that fuel poverty is higher in West Lindsey than the rest of the study area and England but*	The Applicant's grid connection would supply electricity to the National Grid, which would then go on to power homes, businesses

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		there is then no direct benefits to residents impacted by the development (e.g., offsetting energy costs for residents targeted at households living in fuel poverty); instead the benefit is the longer term expectation that energy costs will fall given largescale renewal electricity production across the United Kingdom.	and schools across the UK. While the project is not proposed to provide a private line directly to any local energy users, the local energy supply would also benefit from this source of energy into the grid. The Applicant has committed to a community benefit package to support local initiatives and priorities. During the pre-application consultation, as described in the Consultation Report [APP-151], the Applicant asked for feedback around using the community benefit fund to reduce energy costs, which has been considered. The Applicant committed to continue to consult with parish councils, the community and other stakeholders on the community benefit package and what it should include.
LIR230	**LCC 17.13**	*The proposed Community Fund could contribute to these community gains and other health improvement agendas. Public Health would like to influence the allocation of the future Community Fund if the DCO is granted, particularly if the Fund for the whole development area is administered by the NCF. Consideration should be given to splitting the Fund between the Lincolnshire Community Foundation (LCF) and the NCF and an appropriate mechanism for securing and delivering these funds and subsequent benefits.*	The Applicant is happy to continue to consult with Lincolnshire County Council on the proposed Community benefit package and how it can support local initiatives, particularly around health. The Applicant notes that the current community fund which has been established and is already providing funding is operated through the Nottinghamshire Community Foundation, but that funds are also available to the Lincolnshire side of the project.
LIR231	**BDC Employment and Skills**	*Bassetlaw District Council remains committed to promoting local employment, skills development, and inclusive economic growth. The One Earth Solar Farm Project presents a significant opportunity to embed these priorities into a major infrastructure development that spans multiple local authority areas including Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood, West Lindsey, Lincolnshire County, and Nottinghamshire County Councils. Given the scale and complexity of this development, the Council strongly encourages the adoption of a comprehensive Employment and Skills Plan (ESP) managed collaboratively across all involved authorities.*	The Applicant will develop and submit a final Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan after consent has been granted. This will be in collaboration with the working group involving Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood, West Lindsay, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County Council. The Applicant is fully supportive of collaborating on the final Supply Chain, Employment and Skills Plan across all host authorities and will continue to engage throughout the planning process to develop the plan.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR232	**BDC Employment and Skills**	*Bassetlaw continues to experience entrenched challenges regarding skills attainment and inclusive employment. Qualification attainment at Level 4 and above remain below the national average, which restricts both economic growth and individual prosperity across the district. Tackling these challenges is a strategic priority for Bassetlaw District Council.* *The Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020–2038, particularly Policy ST29, emphasises the vital role developers can play in promoting local employment and skills development and support the Council's aim to grow a diverse, higher-value employment base supported by a skilled workforce.* *As such, developers of major projects are expected to contribute meaningfully to this ambition through the delivery of robust Employment and Skills Plans (ESPs), creation of training opportunities, and collaboration with local stakeholders.* *To maximise social and economic benefits, it is vital to establish clear commitments to local employment and training, particularly given the short construction phase and long operational life of the project.*	The Applicant notes the challenges regarding skill attainment, and will continue to engage with the Council to further understand how One Earth can support Bassetlaw's ambitions. The Applicant will develop and submit a final Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan after consent has been granted. This will be in collaboration with the working group involving Bassetlaw District Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council, West Lindsey District Council, Lincolnshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. The Applicant will continue engage on supply chain, skills and employment discussions before consent.
LIR233	**BDC Construction Phase**	*The development is projected to create up to 750 temporary Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) construction jobs over the two-year construction period, with up to 4,000 additional FTE roles within the wider value chain. While these opportunities are welcomed, the temporary nature of the construction phase requires careful planning to ensure meaningful skills development. Key considerations include:* *• Prioritising local recruitment to maximise employment for residents of Bassetlaw and neighbouring districts.*	The Applicant notes Bassetlaw's priorities below and will continue to engage with the Council to further understand how One Earth can support Bassetlaw's ambitions. Table 3.2 of the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180] identifies the Applicant's aim to upskill the local area in order to meet skills demand through activities such as placements, work experience, site visits, co-ordination with the local supply chain, and apprenticeships. The Applicant will submit a final Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan which will be in collaboration with

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		• Ensuring the inclusion of apprenticeships and structured training programs, particularly in civil engineering, construction, electrical engineering, and power generation. *• Collaborating with local education and training providers to facilitate short courses, T Level placements, and apprenticeships, mindful of the short duration of the construction phase.* *• Addressing rural accessibility challenges for workers, particularly for those without private transport.* *• Engaging with local DWP offices and employability providers to address economic inactivity and provide opportunities through Skills Bootcamps, SWAPs, and targeted training.*	Bassetlaw District Council and will take BDC's key considerations into account.
LIR234	**BDC Construction Phase**	*The Council expects all major projects to adopt the CITB National Skills Academy for Construction (NSAfC) Client-Based Approach, embedding workforce development into project delivery. Key construction-phase expectations include:* *• Prioritisation of local labour through early supply chain coordination and labour brokerage* *• Short-term placements for NEETs, students, and adult learners (e.g. Skills Bootcamps)* *• Work experience and curriculum-aligned visits with schools and colleges* *• Creating Apprenticeship opportunities in construction and support roles Benchmarks for these expectations are detailed in Appendix 1 (Infrastructure Projects).*	The Applicant will consider adopting the CITB National Skills Academy for Construction Client-Based Approach. The Applicant will register with the Considerate Constructors Scheme, or other similarly aimed schemes to provide positive contributions to the community and environment. Table 3.2 of the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180] identifies the Applicant's aim to upskill the local area in order to meet skills demand through activities such as placements, work experience, site visits, co-ordination with the local supply chain, and apprenticeships.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		To support KPIs and demonstrate commitment to inclusive and responsible operations, contractors are encouraged to register with the Considerate Constructors Scheme.	
LIR235	**BDC Operational Phase**	*The operational phase will offer fewer direct employment opportunities, primarily in maintenance, land management, and technical roles. However, ongoing collaboration with local skills providers is essential to ensure that new roles are accessible and skills gaps are addressed proactively. Establishing robust training partnerships early on will ensure long-term workforce readiness for the project's 60-year operational life. While opportunities will be fewer than the construction phase (and numbers of FTEs are not clearly expressed within the provided documentation) there will be valuable opportunities for:* *• Local inclusive employment, especially among NEETs, people with disabilities, and other priority groups* *• Apprenticeship starts and completions across technical and professional sectors • Industry-recognised qualifications NEBOSH, CMI/ILM, BTEC's etc.* *• Training partnerships with Jobcentre Plus and local education and training providers* *While roles new roles are welcome we would encourage further breakdown of what could be available either for entry roles / career changers, and if roles could be full-time / part-time, permanent or temporary, and how they will be distributed across skill levels.* *The planning documentation currently lacks detail on partnerships with local FE providers, training bodies, or employment support organisations. Stronger*	Table 3.2 of the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180] identifies the Applicant's aim to upskill the local area in order to meet skills demand through activities such as placements, work experience, site visits, co-ordination with the local supply chain, and apprenticeships. The Applicant will continue to engage with the host authorities to provide detail on employee roles during construction and operation, partnerships with local FE providers, training bodies, and employment support organisations.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		engagement in this area will help the developer promote inclusion and maximise impact. *Operational employment and skills expectations are outlined in Appendix 2, with Key Performance Indicators applicable from the point of opening and extending for a period of three years.* *The developer should provide a breakdown of roles and confirm inclusion of structured development pathways (e.g. internal progression, qualifications) in their operator workforce plans.*	
LIR236	**BDC ESP Recommendations – Monitoring and Management of the Employment and Skills Plan**	*To ensure sustained local benefit, the Council recommends the developer adopt an ESP which includes:* *• Clear targets for local recruitment and skills development, both during construction and operation.* *• Specific commitments to apprenticeship starts and completions, including structured pathways for progression to higher-level qualifications.* *• Engagement with local education providers to co-design relevant training and ensure pipeline continuity.* *• Monitoring and reporting mechanisms to ensure transparent delivery against key performance indicators (KPIs).* *• Regular collaboration with the host local authorities to adapt the ESP to changing economic conditions or emerging skills needs.* *To ensure accountability, Bassetlaw District Council expects the developer to commit to regular monitoring and reporting of progress against the ESP. Given the*	The Applicant notes the below recommendation and will submit a final Supply Chain, Skills and Employment Management Plan. Table 3.2 of the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180] identifies the Applicant's aim to upskill the local area in order to meet skills demand through activities such as placements, work experience, site visits, co-ordination with the local supply chain, and apprenticeships. The Applicant will discuss how the plan will be monitored and reported in consultation with the Working Group with Bassetlaw District Council. The monitoring and reporting plan will be submitted to the Local Authorities for approval as explained in Paragraph 6.1.2 of the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180]. The Applicant will develop a reasonable monitoring and reporting system in collaboration with the host authorities. The Applicant is open to discuss reasonable fees to support monitoring and reporting.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
		project's scale and its coverage across several local authority areas (Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood, West Lindsey, Lincolnshire County, and Nottinghamshire County Councils), it is crucial that the monitoring and reporting framework is designed to accommodate multi-authority oversight. Additionally, Bassetlaw District Council reserves the right to levy a monitoring and support fee to cover the costs associated with coordinating multi authority engagement and oversight. Fees would be calculated based on weighted officer time plus oncosts to ensure the provision of effective support and compliance management. *Quarterly updates should be submitted to the Employment and Skills Working Group, which must include representatives from each of the affected authorities to ensure a coordinated and collaborative approach. This collaborative monitoring will facilitate the consistent tracking of employment, training, and skills outcomes, while allowing each authority to address any area specific challenges in a timely manner.*	
LIR237	**BDC Summary**	*In relation to the submitted draft DCO, In the event that the developer should produce one Employment and Skills Plan, how would this be managed/monitored across the districts, how outcomes / Key performance indicators (KPIs) are distributed so the benefits are felt equally/ appropriately by all authorities involved.*	The Applicant will develop and submit a final Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan after consent has been granted. This will be in collaboration with the working group involving Bassetlaw District Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council, West Lindsey District Council, Lincolnshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council (as described in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180]). The monitoring and reporting plan will be submitted to the Local Authorities for approval as explained in Paragraph 6.1.2 of the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [APP-180]. The Applicant will develop a reasonable monitoring and reporting system with the host authorities.

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
LIR238	**BDC Summary**	*It is unclear whether KPI's be considered for the construction phase only or also to the operational phase. It appears that the majority of the outputs (jobs/training parents) were during the short construction phase however and that permanent direct employment may be limited to a total of 7.25 jobs.*	The applicant we develop reasonable targets as part of the working group described in LIR228.
Health			
LIR239	**LCC 17.8**	*The ES has identified older people, unemployed people (the area around the development is more deprived in terms of employment), and people with poor mental or physical health. However, it is not clear how the proposal has developed to reflect the local demography. The ExA must be satisfied that there are no specific groups (e.g., autistic people) residing or accessing day services in the development area.*	The Baseline conditions section of APP-045 outlines the demographic and socio-economic profile of the Local Study Area (comprising of 5,911 people). This Local Study Area includes villages with social infrastructure such as primary schools, sports pitches, churches and community halls. Data on specific health conditions (for example neurological conditions) is not available publicly at this Local Study Area level, largely to avoid disclosing personally-identifiable information. Therefore, the assessment cannot ascertain the number of people with specific health conditions accessing services locally. Where specific health conditions were indicated by respondents themselves in relevant representations, the Applicant has identified a range of mitigation measures. For example, a Relevant Representation was received concerning the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on horse riding, and on a horse rider with autism. The Applicant has ensured that the design of the Proposed Development has taken into account guidance from the British Horse Society in relation to corridor widths for rider safety.
Arboriculture			
LIR240	**NSDC 9.57**	*It is also noted that the order limits area has been altered (albeit this was a decrease in size) since the original arboricultural survey work was undertaken. As such, there is currently no clear understanding of the impact of the proposed development upon trees.*	The Applicant has considered and assessed impacts on the woodland and veteran trees within ES Chapter 6 [REP1-023] and has included environmental measures to ensure that these will be retained and protected within the Proposed Development. With regard to individual trees, these have also considered and assessed in the same way and given the environmental measures secured within the design such as the overall long-term gain in number of

Internal Ref	LIR Ref	Summary	Applicant Response
			trees within the Order Limits, it is anticipated that loss of individual trees would be minimal and therefore would not be significant. The Applicant will prepare and submit an Arboricultural Impact Assessment at the detailed design stage, which will confirm the impact of the Proposed Development on individual trees.
Air Quality			
LIR241	**NSDC 11.10**	*It is noted that a Dust Management Plan (DMP) is proposed as part of the oCEMP. This is not yet available to view.*	The measures set out in ES Volume 2: Appendix 13.5 [APP-137] are set out in full in the oCEMP [APP-176], which in effect constitutes the DMP.
LIR242	**BDC Pollution, Pollution Prevention & Control**	*Given the potential significance of these impacts 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].
Glint and Glare			
LIR243		*A comprehensive glint and glare survey shall be carried out in order to establish that a statutory nuisance will not arise from the proposed development.*	A Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-188] has been submitted. The results show there is no potential likely significant effect for glint and glare occurring to sensitive receptors within the locality.

one earth

solar farm