

## Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

General & Cross-topic questions			
Question no.	Question to:	Question:	NSDC Response
Q1.0.19	District Councils Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Services UK Health Security Agency Environment Agency	<b>Fire Safety</b> (1) Can the EA, the Councils Environmental Health Teams, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Services, and UK Health Security Agency advise from your different areas of responsibility whether you are satisfied with the proposed approach to fire safety?	NSDC have not previously commented on this issue and have informally agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council that they will lead on matters of Fire Safety, given their links with Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue. Notwithstanding this, NSDC note that an Outline Battery Safety Management Plan has been prepared (Document Reference: EN010159/APP/7.11.1) and that Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO (Document Reference: EN010159/APP/3.1.1) includes the obligation to produce and seek approval from the respective local authority (currently proposed as NCC) of a Battery Safety Management Plan, which must also be maintained over the operational life of this part of the proposed development. As such, we have no further comments to make at this stage.
Q1.0.21	The Applicant and all parties	<b>Consultation on National Policy Statements</b> The Government published on 24 April further consultation on each of the National Policy Statements, NPS – EN1, EN-3 and EN-5. The	NSDC have no comments to make on this matter.

Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		consultation period closed on 29 May 2025. Please advise if there are any areas of these documents that you consider the ExA should regard as important or relevant to the consideration of the Proposed Development.	
Q1.0.24	The Applicant, Environment Agency, Councils	<b>Waste</b> Can each party provide commentary on their views in respect to compliance with the Regulations: Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) 2013	As this is a matter of dealing with waste associated with the proposed development, NSDC consider that NCC as the relevant waste planning authority are in the best position to respond on this issue.  Notwithstanding this, NSDC would welcome any further clarity that can be provided by the Applicant on the responsible recycling and reuse and/or disposal of PV panels and other associated parts of the development during and at the end of the operational lifespan of the proposed development, including how this could be secured, through the Draft DCO.
Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development			
Q2.0.4	The Applicant, (1) The Councils (2)	<b>Design Principles</b> (1) To clearly understand the design parameters relied on for the	In respect of some overall comments, NSDC note that NPS EN-1 para 5.10.29 states as follows:  <i>‘The Secretary of State should take into consideration the level of detailed design which the applicant has provided and is</i>

		<p>assessment, would it not be beneficial for all parties for these to be set out in a single document to be certified?</p> <p>(2) Do the Councils agree that sufficient information has been provided in respect of design matters to meet the tests set out in NPS EN-1 para 5.10.29 and this is suitably secured to ensure that future consenting would meet landscape, visual and good design objectives?</p>	<p><i>secured in the Development Consent Order, and the extent to which design details are subject to future approvals.’</i></p> <p>NSDC consider that the implication of paragraph 5.10.29 of the NPS is that a balance should be reached between the extent of detailed design information available at examination stage and that provided as part of any Requirement discharge. As such, NSDC consider there is a level of over reliance on Requirement 5 (Detailed Design) and the Applicant’s desire to provide a greater balance of information at a later stage. Whilst accepting it is common place for matters of detailed design to be captured in discharge of the appropriate requirement within a DCO, the impacted community should be afforded the best possible opportunity to consider and understand the nature of the impacts of an NSIP project.</p> <p>NSDC would refer to its Summary of Verbal Representations of Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (submitted at Deadline 1) which included recommendations for a broad phasing plan to be provided to the examination and as also presented within our Local Impact Report, we consider the information provided on residential visual amenity is insufficient to clearly identify the potential effects in this regard. We note that the Applicant has submitted further evidence and explanation of residential visual amenity at Deadline One, but we have not yet had the opportunity to review this but intend to do so and make further representations at Deadline 3..</p> <p>Turning to specific landscape and visual matters, a suite of documents has been provided by the applicant setting out the design intent and explaining the design process that has been undertaken.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>The ES presents an assessment of a ‘worst case’ scenario of the Development, based on design parameters presented in <i>ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Document 5.9 Outline Design Parameters Document</i> and Works Plan areas shown on <i>Figure 2.3: Works Plan</i>.</p> <p>Section 5.2 of Chapter 5 describes the project parameters that the LVIA have assessed and clarifies in para. 5.2.1 that to “accommodate flexibility, a ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach is used” that “involves the technical assessments being undertaken and based on a defined ‘envelope’ within which the project will be delivered, featuring maximum and minimum parameters, so that an assessment of the reasonable worst-case scenario can be undertaken.”</p> <p>However, in landscape and visual terms, the LVIA is not explicit in this regard, and while chapters 11.3.38 to 11.3.40 provide some information on assumptions that have been used at each phase of the scheme, in no location is it stated or clarified that the LVIA has been undertaken on a worst-case scenario with regards to assessing the maximum parameters laid out in <i>Chapter 5, Document 5.9</i> and areas shown on <i>Figure 2.3: Works Plan</i>.</p> <p>It has been assumed that the maximum parameters have been used within the LVIA chapter, however it should be clarified by the Applicant.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.9 and 11.5.10 6 of the LVIA describes the embedded mitigation measures of the scheme which avoid, where practicable, adverse effects on the landscape and views. This process is described in more detail within ES</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Chapter 5. These mitigation proposals reference a series of documents within the DCO package, in particular the Design Approach document which lays out how landscape and visual matters have been addressed within the design.</p> <p>While the submission includes landscape proposals, these are indicative and are presented at a high level (i.e. not detailed), therefore it is expected that detailed landscape plans would <del>to</del> be submitted and subsequently agreed with NSDC prior to the commencement of any works, which would be secured by Requirement 8 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 <i>Figure 2.7: Illustrative Masterplan</i> and the <i>Mitigation Plan</i> within Appendix A of the OLEMP, secured via Work Order 8 on the Works Plans and DCO, 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.</p> <p>We emphasise the importance of the Design Principles remaining fully implementable and enforceable and not being diluted during later, detailed iterations up to and including the discharge of Requirements to ensure detailed design matters fully account for the impacts of the proposed development and mitigate (in so far as it is possible), the impacts upon the landscape character and visual amenity of the area.</p> <p>Therefore, while design matters have been partly addressed, we consider there are areas of further design</p>
--	--	--	---

## Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

			information that could be made available during the examination as indicated above and would also stress that effective delivery at detailed design stage is critical to ensuring that the scheme ultimately meets landscape, visual and good design objectives.
<b>The Environmental Statement (general)</b>			
Q3.0.2	The Applicant, the Councils, Environment Agency, Natural England	<p>Environmental Statement</p> <p>(1) With a 60 year lifespan please explain the frequency with which you would expect to have to replace components, for example BESS, Inverters, Panels.</p> <p>(2) It would appear that there is no specific assessment of replacements as it has been assumed it would be no worse than the initial construction period, is this a correct interpretation?</p>	<p>NSDC note and welcome the question of the ExA, which it considers to be an important area of clarification. As such, we consider that onus lies first with the Applicant to provide an explanation of the likely replacement of component parts and how this would be managed and mitigated.</p> <p>In terms of possible effects associated with these works taking place using biodiversity as one example, it can depend greatly on-site sensitivity such as proximity to ecological receptors e.g. designated habitats or watercourses and the nature of the replacement works (e.g. groundworks or above-ground replacement of panels). Accordingly, NSDC look forward to reviewing the Applicant’s response to this question and providing further comments in due course.</p>

		(3) Assuming this is correct, the controls in place during construction to mitigate any consequential effects, would appear to need to be in place during operation, unless there is a control mechanism in place that would prevent a large-scale replacement of components. What would be a reasonable threshold that would ensure adverse environmental effects do not occur?	
Biodiversity, ecology, and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))			
Q7.0.2	NE The Councils	<b>Bat Research</b> It is the ExA’s understanding that there is the intention to monitor bat	NSDC would make the following comments. (1) It is our understanding that monitoring surveys will comprise of paired static detectors monitoring in the same locations as those used to collate the baseline activity data, though it is uncertain whether this would be the 2023 and/or 2024 locations. This would be once during the construction

		<p>activity in advance and then post construction to assist in developing an understanding of the effect on bats from solar array sites? (C33 in commitments register)</p> <p>(1) How is this information to be collated and shared and over what time frame is this intended to take place?</p> <p>(2) Do NE agree that this would give robust data which would assist in developing understanding?</p> <p>(3) Do NE or the Councils regard this as a benefit that could weigh in favour of the scheme?</p>	<p>period (though it is unknown at what point), and in years 3, 5 and 10 post-construction (operational period). The reports will be made public, but it is unknown at this stage as to how these will be distributed and utilised to deal with any mitigation or interventions required. For C33 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 (Biodiversity) it is stated that the securing mechanism would be via the oCEMP, within a Biodiversity Management Section, and the oLEMP. Therefore, it is assumed that the results will be provided within full versions of these documents and updated over the 10-year monitoring period.</p> <p>(2) Whilst noting this point is primarily directed at NE, NSDC would comment that the mitigation measures may offer some insight into their effectiveness; however, there are limitations due to the uneven distribution of static detectors across the OL, with some now located outside the final OL boundary. These detectors were originally paired, and it would be beneficial to have a dataset comparing bat activity along boundary features and open fields before and after construction. To help address the distribution limitations it may be beneficial to add in additional locations to provide further coverage of the OL and there may be a possibility of still recording further baseline data ahead of construction.</p> <p>This dataset will be valuable for understanding how landscape-scale changes from solar developments of this magnitude influence local bat populations in terms of foraging and commuting. However, it remains uncertain whether it will offer any insight into impacts on roosting bats, as the potential effects on tree roosts are currently not quantified.</p> <p>(3) While this is a welcome addition, we consider that given the current uncertainty surrounding the proposed methodology it</p>
--	--	--	--



Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

			should not be given positive weight in support of the scheme at this stage.
<b>Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations</b>			
Q9.0.5	Affected Persons Interested Parties	<b>Any Other Inaccuracies</b> Are any parties aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR, SoR or Land Plans?	NSDC have no comments to make.
Q9.0.11		Can all statutory undertakers who do not have agreement on the wording of protective provisions, please provide their preferred wording and the justification for such wording where it differs from that proposed by the Applicant.	NSDC have no comments to make.
<b>The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>			
	Schedule 1 – Authorised development		
Q10.1.1	The Councils	Work No. 4 By including (b) ‘the laying down of construction	NSDC would make the following comments in respect of potential noise impacts and any equivalent impacts on biodiversity.

## Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		<p>areas’ this would appear to allow the whole of the area defined for Work No.4 on the Work Plans to be used as construction areas?</p> <p>(1) If the ExA’s understanding is correct that the construction areas can be over a significant proportion of the site, are the Councils content that the construction activities would be controlled to an acceptable degree by the proposed mitigation and management plans?.</p>	<p>In respect of noise, we note that an assessment has been made of noise levels arising from construction activity at the closest receptors. A buffer zone has also been assessed, outside of which noise is not considered to cause significant disturbance. Provided construction areas are located in accordance with these areas, disturbance arising will be sufficiently controlled.</p> <p>Turning to Biodiversity, In terms of the protection of ecological receptors we consider that the proposed CEMP would likely control construction activities to an acceptable degree providing that there is clear phasing and zoning of construction activities and monitoring and reporting mechanism to track compliance and effectiveness of mitigation.</p>
	Schedule 2 - Requirements		
Q10.2.1	The Councils	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Noting the Applicant</p>	<p>(1) NSDC note that generally, the content within the OLEMP already provides flexibility to the development and maintenance of the detailed aspects of the planting</p>

		<p>response to ISH1 (page 16 of post ISH1 written submission) and the current explanation given by the Applicant that it is not only preferable to retain the phrase ‘substantially in accordance with’ but this allows for the management plans to be evolved as more detail comes forward.</p> <p>(1) Do the Councils have any concerns with the retention of this phrase in each of the Requirements.</p> <p>(2) Do the Councils agree that the Management Plans as drafted give the certainty and clarity required at this</p>	<p>scheme and habitat creation. The content of the OLEMP is more aligned with good practice, rather than laying out restrictive measures that would stifle flexibility.</p> <p>Throughout the document phrases or words are used to provide for this, such as: “at least..,” or “some,” or includes design intent, aims and intentions, rather than clear specific actions or designs.</p> <p>NSDC consider that the term ‘substantially in accordance with’ is open to interpretation and has the potential to result in disagreement. It is unclear as to how <i>being in accordance with</i> the outline guidance in the OLEMP would be restrictive to the detriment of developing a detailed LEMP or landscape and ecology scheme. The LVIA has been assessed with the mitigation planting in place and established as outlined in the landscape plans and management and subsequently would expect that the scheme would be provided as presented in the OLEMP as a minimum. As such NSDC consider the term ‘substantially should be removed from the draft requirement wording, leaving the phrase ‘in accordance with.’</p> <p>(2) NSDC note the OLEMP has been updated for DL1: Revision 2 dated July 2025.</p> <p>This updated version includes the addition of paragraph 1.3.5, which clarifies that a detailed LEMP will be provided post consent in accordance with Requirement 8 of the DCO. This links the OLEMP (and subsequent detailed LEMP) back to the DCO. The detailed LEMP must be secured under Requirement 8.</p>
--	--	--	---

## Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		stage of the process, noting that they have been revised at D1.	This updated version also includes the addition of paragraph 5.4.3, which clarifies that all existing and proposed habitats will be managed and maintained for the operational duration of the scheme. This is a key clarification – we expect that the planting and associated habitat be appropriately managed for the full duration of the scheme.
Q10.2.3	The Councils	<b>Requirement 8</b> (1) Noting the Applicant response to ISH1 (page 16 of post ISH1 written submission) Do the Councils have any concerns in respect of the wording of the Requirement, or that the certainty for maintenance would be delivered through the LEMP?	<p>NSDC note the wording in DCO Requirement 8 is very much focussed on written management and does not include for a detailed planting scheme. Subject to gaining approval for the scheme, we would expect at the detailed design stage the applicant is required to develop detailed planting plans clearly showing the location and types of planting (species), as well as number, density, and specification, along with planting details and specifications. This provision of detailed planting, and subsequent agreement with relevant authority must be explicit in the OLEMP.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2.5 of the OLEMP clarifies that “<i>vegetation that is likely to be planted as part of the Proposed Development as part of the wider mitigation and enhancement strategy</i>” is shown on the Landscape Mitigation Plan with Appendix A.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.2 of the OLEMP also References the Landscape Mitigation Plan contained with Appendix A, clarifying it only provides indicative locations. This is understood; however, a clear statement in the OLEMP is required stating clearly that this mitigation plan will subsequently be developed in more detail for approval by the authority and we would welcome the early discussions in this regard. We would expect as a minimum a detailed planting scheme that would show location and types of</p>

Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

			planting, along with species, number, and specification as well as planting details and notes.
Historic environment			
Q11.0.2	The Applicant 1,2 and 4 The Councils and Historic England 3 and 4	<b>Design Proposals/ Alternative Foundation Designs</b> (1) The application appears to indicate that piles will be used for the foundations for the supporting frames for the solar panels. Have alternative solutions been explored such as shoes as referenced in paragraph 2.10.110 of NPS EN-3 and Historic England 2021 Commercial renewable energy development and the historic environment. Historic England	NSDC have not previously raised any concerns in respect of points (3) and (4) and as such, have no comments to make in this regard.

		<p>Advice Note 15. Swindon. Historic England.?</p> <p>(2) If the use of ‘shoes’ has not been investigated, please provide an explanation of their suitability or otherwise in the context of this proposal.</p> <p>(3) Can HE and the Councils advise whether the use of ‘shoes’ (if confirmed as an appropriate method of securing the panels) would overcome the concerns identified in respect of the extent of investigations?</p> <p>(4) Is there an agreed position on what is regarded as low level piling? And</p>	
--	--	--	--

Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		whether the 3m depth specified by the Applicant would be regarded as low level piling?	
Q11.0.4	The Councils, the Applicant	<p><b>Non Designated Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>(1) Can the Councils confirm they are content all non designated heritage assets have been properly identified and considered as part of the heritage assessment?.</p> <p>(2) The WR at D1 from The Station makes reference to North Clifton Station and the Station Masters House, indicating both properties form a group, the ES Chapter 10 in section 10.6 appears to only</p>	<p>(1) NSDC consider that the existing Non-Designated Heritage Assets have been properly identified and correctly assessed. Further to this, NSDC agree with the Applicant’s conclusion that no adverse effects will result on these Non-Designated Heritage Assets.</p> <p>(2) North Clifton Station and Station House have been identified as potential Non-Designated-Heritage Assets. These have been considered by NSDC, and we have concluded that these would not qualify. The buildings in question do have industrial historic value, but their low architectural merit and changes that have occurred over time are not considered significant enough for these buildings to be locally listed.</p> <p>As such, NSDC do not consider further assessment to be necessary in this regard.</p>

Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		reference the Station, is further assessment required?.	
Hydrology and hydrogeology and the Water Environment			
Q12.0.4	Councils Trent Valley IDB Environment Agency	<b>Ongoing Maintenance</b> Are IPs satisfied that the details within the OEMP are satisfactory to ensure that the drainage infrastructure will be maintained to a suitable level for the duration of the Proposed Development.	NSDC consider this is a matter for NCC to comment upon in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority and as such, we have no specific comments in this regard.
Q12.0.5	Anglian Water, The Environment Agency, Local Planning Authorities	<b>Compliance with the Water Framework Directive</b> A number of IPs [including RR-007, RR-095] have expressed concern of the potential adverse effect on soil health, the environment and drinking water.	NSDC would defer to the Environment Agency on this matter, as the relevant responsible regulatory authority and with the appropriate technical expertise, to be able to provide a response. NSDC are aware of the concerns raised by Ip’s and given the nature of these concerns, would welcome a robust consideration of these points from the Environment Agency.



Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		<p>(1) Please advise if there are any concerns that arise from the proposed development in respect of any effects that may arise on drinking water, either during construction, operation, or subsequent decommissioning.</p> <p>(2) Please advise on whether you consider the Water Framework Directive would be complied with, and if you are content that mitigation offered through the DCO would meet with any concerns identified</p>	
Q12.0.6	The Applicant, Environment Agency, the Councils.	Water Framework Directive NPS EN-1 states at paragraph 5.16.14 “ <i>The</i>	NSDC would again defer to the Environment Agency and NCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority on this matter, as the relevant responsible regulatory authority and with the appropriate technical expertise, to be able to provide a response.

		<p><i>Secretary of State should be satisfied that a proposal has regard to current River Basin Management Plans and meets the requirements of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 (including regulation 19). The specific objectives for particular river basins are set out in River Basin Management Plans. The Secretary of State <b>must refuse development consent</b> where a project is likely to cause deterioration of a</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>water body or its failure to achieve good status or good potential, unless the requirements set out in Regulation 19 are met. A project may be approved in the absence of a qualifying Overriding Public Interest test only if there is sufficient certainty that it will not cause deterioration or compromise the achievement of good status or good potential.”</i></p> <p>(our highlighting)</p> <p>(1) Can each party advise on its position in respect of the Proposed Development, it’s relationship to any relevant River Basin</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Management Plan and the requirements of the WFD.</p> <p>(2) Can each party confirm their position in respect of whether there is likely to be any deterioration of a water body, or that any water body would not achieve a ‘good status’ or ‘good potential’ as a consequence of the Proposed Development, and</p> <p>(3) The relevant position in respect of whether Regulation 19 is /would be met?</p> <p>(4) In light of the current position of the Stage 1 WFD screening assessment recently</p>	
--	--	--	--

Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		submitted to the EA, whether it is likely the outcome of the screening assessment will be known prior to the end of the examination.	
<b>Land use and soils</b>			
Q13.0.2	The Applicant (1) The Councils (2)	<b>BMV</b> NPS EN-1 at paragraph 5.11.34 states that <i>“The Secretary of State should ensure that applicants do not site their scheme on the best and most versatile agricultural land without justification. Where schemes are to be sited on best and most versatile agricultural land the Secretary of State should take into account the</i>	(2) In respect of development of BMV land, NSDC have made it clear in both our Relevant Representations and Local Impact Report regarding our concerns on the effects on BMV land, with a total of 53% of BMV being impacted. NSDC have previously made reference to the lack of clear information on alternative sites considered in this regard, that may have resulted in a reduced impact on BMV land. In addition, we continue to hold a related concern on the potential cumulative impacts of loss of BMV land district wide, which we do not consider has been addressed by the Applicant. As such, NSDC consider there is a lack of clear evidence thus far presented in the Applicant’s submission, that provides reasoned and robust justification of BMV land loss, which remains a key concern for the authority.

		<p><i>economic and other benefits of that land.”</i></p> <p>(1) Please explain how the economic and other benefits of the BMV has been assessed.</p> <p>(2) Do the Councils agree that there is sufficient justification provided?</p>	
Q13.0.4	The Applicant, the Councils, Natural England	<p><b>Soil Health</b></p> <p>The depth of cables was discussed during the Hearings of the week commencing 7 July 2025, and there appeared to be some disagreement as to what a suitable depth should be to ensure ploughing could take place post development in</p>	<p>NSDC note that this point is primarily directed at the Applicant and NE but have taken advice that a precautionary approach should be followed, and any retained cables should be buried at a depth of 1- 1.2m to ensure no interference in future agricultural practices.</p>

		<p>the event cables were left in situ.</p> <p>(1) Please provide evidence of the depth of ploughing that has occurred across the land within the Order Limits.</p> <p>(2) In order to ensure ploughing would be possible post development in the event cables were to remain – what would the minimum depth require to be to facilitate this, (Is there a recognised best standard or advice note for the soil type across the Order Limits?)</p> <p>(3) How is this secured?</p>	
Landscape and visual			
Q15.0.2	The Applicant Natural England	<b>National Landscapes</b>	The nearest National Landscape to the scheme is the Lincolnshire Wolds, located over 30km to the east. Due to

Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

	The Councils	Do the Councils and NE agree there is no effect on the setting of national landscapes and that the duty under s245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 (LURA) do not apply?	distance, we have not identified any landscape or visual effects upon the setting of the National Landscape.
Q15.0.3	The Applicant, The Councils	<p><b>Veteran Trees</b></p> <p>At ISH1 the Applicant indicated that there were no veteran trees within the Order Limits. This has now been confirmed not to be correct in the D1 submissions. (1) In light of the fact 13 veteran trees are present within the Order Limits, should the DCO and or supporting mitigation document be</p>	<p>As noted in our Local Impact Report, NSDC do not consider there is currently a clear understanding of the impact upon important trees (TPO and Veteran Trees) and the starting point should be to update the historical stage one arboricultural work, with stage two assessment that properly considers the impacts upon trees.</p> <p>In addition, the DCO and mitigation should include explicit protection for veteran and TPO trees. Any such trees should be fully surveyed and protected to <b>BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction</b> throughout the construction period. Detailed proposals should be designed so as to align with BS 5837 to ensure these trees are fully protected and proposals are located with an appropriate offset. We would also expect that any maintenance operations, or replacement for the lifetime of the project respect and protect these trees in line with this, or subsequently updated guidance on protecting trees from construction activities. We would support full consultation to be undertaken with the LPAs prior to undertaking any work when this might be deemed necessary.</p>



Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response

		worded to afford additional protection for such trees, by way for example of requiring no construction activity within root protection zones and/or for consultation to be undertaken with the LPAs prior to undertaking any work when this might be deemed necessary.	
Socio-economic effects			
Q17.0.3	The Applicant (1) The Councils (2)	<b>Employment and skills</b> (1) Within their LIR, BDC refer to their expectations on employment during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant please provide a response to the issues raised,	As noted in our Local Impact Report, NSDC are seeking more information from the Applicant on job creation and note that at the time of writing, further meetings are being arranged directly with the Applicant in this regard.

**Newark and Sherwood District Council – Examining Authority’s Written Questions & Requests for Information (ExQ1) – Deadline 2 Response**

		<p>including whether the measures outlined by BDC should be incorporated into the application documentation.</p> <p>(2) Can the Councils please confirm whether they are satisfied with the measures proposed, or are there more requirements needed?</p>	
--	--	---	--