

This matter is being dealt with by:

Will Lawrence

T [REDACTED]

E [REDACTED]@nottscc.gov.uk

W nottinghamshire.gov.uk

Sent via email to

oneearth solar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

21st August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**ONE EARTH SOLAR FARM DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER EN010159 – THE
EXAMINING AUTHORITY’S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION
ExQ1**

I write in response to the Examining Authority’s (ExA’s) written questions and requests for information (ExQ1) issued on 7th August and to provide the response of Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) (Interested Party FD2E7A44C) in relation to those questions which are addressed directly to NCC or the Councils, where deemed relevant to the responsibilities of the County Council.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	NCC Response
1. General and cross-topic questions			
Q.1.0.16(3)	NCC/LCC	Mitigation The outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) Revision 2 (submitted at D1) indicates at paragraph 2.6.2 that <i>“In the event of large-scale replacements of components being required, it is anticipated that the procedure will be done gradually over a period of time to minimise the number of HGVs movements to the site.”</i> (3) Can the Councils confirm whether the management of operational traffic as currently proposed is consider suitable?	The proposal to stagger the replacement of large scale components over a period of time in order to minimise HGV movements during the operational phase of the project is accepted in principle however the OEMP should define what is meant by ‘large scale’ replacements by reference to a threshold and should include a trigger at which further engagement is required with the LHA to ensure that construction traffic is appropriately managed.
Q.1.0.24	The Applicant, Environment Agency, Councils	Waste Can each party provide commentary on their views in respect to compliance with the Regulations: Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) 2013	The WEEE regulations (2013) seek to reduce the environmental impact of electronic and electrical waste by ensuring that waste from such goods is handled correctly and re-used, recycled and recovered as much as possible to help promote the circular economy. The regulations also place responsibility on producers to collect, treat and recycle such goods in a safe

			<p>manner. Solar panels are considered as Electrical and Electronic Equipment and so should be handled in accordance with the Regulations.</p> <p>The County Council note that the applicant has committed to delivering the circular economy and recovering, re-using and recycling as many as the solar panels as possible. This is the preferable solution to the absolute worst case of needing to landfill and dispose of the panels. However, such technology and industry at a large scale to do so is not yet established, with the applicant reliant upon the industry developing by the time of decommissioning in 2069. It though should be noted that some panels will fail and need replacing during the operational phases meaning they will be some WEEE waste, albeit on a smaller scale compared to decommissioning. With the reliance on the development of recycling facilities developing, the County Council would ask whether the applicant, and other solar schemes in the area, should be more proactive to ensure the development of such recycling facilities to ensure full adherence with the regulation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that whilst the absolute worst-case scenario would be disposal of the panels, this too would require some treatment facility to process the solar panels and WEEE items to ensure any hazardous components are removed and so disposed of safely. Again, such facilities do not exist currently at the scale required.</p>
Q1.0.25(1)	NCC/LCC	Waste Planning (1) In light of the number of solar schemes already approved, and the number in the pipeline, what plans are being prepared as	Nottinghamshire County Council intends to prepare for the management of the waste anticipated from this solar scheme, and others, in the following ways.

		<p>waste authorities to manage this over the coming years?</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council have prepared a joint new Waste Local Plan with Nottingham City Council. The new Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan has been found sound and capable of adoption following the examination, with the Plan to be taken to Full Concill for consideration for adoption in September 2025. Whilst the development of the multiple solar farms was not directly considered by the Plan as it was developed prior to the schemes coming forward, policies within the Plan would enable appropriate facilities to come forward to manage the associated waste. Policy SP2: Future Waste Management Provision seeks to prioritise the new or extended recycling waste facilities in the area, despite sufficient recycling capacity being identified. This policy would therefore enable any new dedicated development for potentially recycling or reusing the waste from the solar farm developments to be developed in appropriate locations. Whilst disposal of waste material is the least preferable option, the Plan does also include Policy SP4: Managing Residual Waste, enabling sites to come forward for the recovery or disposal of waste should there be a need and there are no harmful impacts.</p> <p>As per the Monitoring and Implementation Chapter of the Waste Local Plan, the Plan will be monitored annually, with consideration given to changes in local circumstances. As the solar schemes develop and waste arisings from these become clearer, the monitoring report will be able to indicate whether the above-mentioned policies have enabled sufficient waste capacity to come forward</p>
--	--	---

			<p>to handle the waste streams or whether further action is required, such as an early review of the Plan. The Plan will also be reviewed every five years, which will be reflect and consider future waste management requirements. It should be noted though that the Plan does not include forecasts for individual waste streams, such as WEEE, as it is difficult to derive such figures from the data.</p> <p>Finally, it is recognised that the solar schemes will extend beyond the life of the new Waste Local Plan, with decommissioning of the multiple solar schemes expected primarily in the 2060's and 2070's and so well beyond the Plan Period of 2038. Whilst some panels will need to be replaced during the operational phase, it is the decommissioning phase which is expected to yield the highest volumes of waste. Therefore, when a new Plan is embarked upon, consideration will be given at this time to the relevant phases of the solar farm and potential waste arisings as part of the background evidence as to whether the Plan will need to make any specific provisions to ensure sufficient capacity to meet the equivalent of the Plan areas identified needs.</p>
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development			
Q2.0.4(2)	The Councils	<p>Design Principles</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>We recognise the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.10.29 in respect of securing good design and ensuring that landscape and visual considerations are fully addressed. 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'</p>

			<p>scenario of the Development, based on design parameters presented in ES <i>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 “<i>accommodate flexibility, a ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach is used</i>” that “<i>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</i>”.</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 states or clarifies that the LVIA has been undertaken on a worst-case scenario 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>The scheme has been presented as evolving through an iterative process, with the landscape and visual findings feeding back into the design. Paragraphs 11.5.9 and 11.5.10 of the ES describe how the scheme has responded to landscape and visual matters.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>The design appears to have a clear evolution through different stages of the masterplan. The mitigation has responded to the recommendations of the local landscape character area reports and feedback from community events and statutory consultees where possible.</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 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 to be submitted and subsequently agreed with the appropriate consultee/authority 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 enforceable and not being diluted during later, detailed iterations and seek continued involvement at the discharge of Requirements to ensure detailed design matters contribute positively to the landscape character and visual amenity of the area.</p> <p>Therefore, while design matters have been addressed, we do stress that effective delivery at detailed design stage is critical to ensuring that the scheme ultimately meets landscape, visual and good design objectives.</p>
7. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))			
Q7.0.2 (3)	The Councils	<p>Bat Research It is the ExA's understanding that there is the intention to monitor bat 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>(3) Do NE or the Councils regard this as a benefit that could weigh in favour of the scheme?</p>	<p>The County Council considers that if data is collected in a standardised approach and is replicated throughout the life of the scheme then yes, any consistent data over a period of time to monitor bat activity levels at baseline, during construction, post-development, during decommissioning and then after would be beneficial to understand impacts to bats over time.</p> <p>The Council wouldn't consider this matter to weigh in favour of the scheme from our perspective. Such a large scheme should be monitoring throughout the life of the scheme, as this will inform the decommissioning constraints in relation to bats. As monitoring will be undertaken and there are so far very few schemes of this scale then research into the impacts that a scheme of this size should be undertaken to fully understand the impacts to bats whether positive or negative, and where improvements for this species can be made.</p>

10. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Q10.0.2	NCC	<p>Street Works</p> <p>Can NCC confirm whether they are content with the provisions in the dDCO relating to Street Works?</p>	<p>It is noted that the undertaker may perform various street works as listed at Part 3 Paragraph 1 of the dDCO, however, under Part 3 Paragraph 2, this would be subject to the application of the County Council Permit Scheme Order which requires a permit to be obtained before commencing the works. This will ensure the ability to coordinate street works is retained by the LHA and, on this basis, is acceptable. However, it must be noted that the streets that are subject to street works listed at Schedule 4 is not currently agreed as it is based on the transport assessment, which is not currently agreed, as reiterated in our response to Q18.0.8.</p>
Q10.2.1	The Councils	<p>Requirements</p> <p>Noting the Applicant 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 stage of the process, noting that they have been revised at D1</p>	<p><u>Outline LEMP</u></p> <p>In terms of ecology, the outline LEMP provides clarity and certainty on the mitigation measures proposed at the order limits for this stage, however further details, more measures and finalised enhancements i.e. sources of seed mixes still need to be provided.</p> <p>In terms of landscape, Generally, the content within the OLEMP already provides flexibility to the development and maintenance of the detailed aspects of the planting 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. It is unclear as to how <i>being in</i></p>

			<p><i>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.</p> <p>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> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Outline PROWMP</u></p> <p>The outline PROW MP has been considered, and several issues have been noted:</p> <p><i>3.2.2 It should be noted that pedestrian footpaths, byways, bridleway and cycle routes will be maintained and remain unobstructed at all times when in use, to ensure the continued safe passage of the public when</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><i>using PRow within the Order limits</i></p> <p>Comment: Cycle paths are not part of the PROW network and are managed by others.</p> <p><i>3.2.8 Any temporary diversions will be 2m in width and would be expected to allow a 10m buffer from the edge of the works area to safely separate PRow users from construction works</i></p> <p>Comment: Bridleways have a minimum width of 3m and while the buffer zone will accommodate this satisfactorily, this legal width should be noted in any diversions of bridleways.</p> <p>2.1.2 & Streets, Rights of Way, and Access Plans [EN010159/APP/2.4] Marham Byway 8 is identified in the MP but not shown correctly on the Access Plan, only shown as a private road.</p> <p>Generally, the outline PROWMP is a positive plan for managing the PROW and will benefit from other access and permissive routes managed by the development. It is felt that the MP gives the certainty and clarity required at this stage.</p>
Q10.2.3	The Councils	<p>Requirement 8</p> <p>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>	<p>The wording in the 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 OLEMP is required stating clearly that this mitigation plan will subsequently be developed in more detail for approval by the authority. We would expect as a minimum a detailed planting scheme that would show location and types of planting, along with species, number and specification as well as planting details and notes.</p>
11. Historic Environment			
Q11.0.1	The Applicant, Historic England, LCC, NCC	<p>Extent of investigation NPS EN-3 at paragraph 2.10.113 states “<i>the applicant should submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be carried out using expertise where necessary and in consultation with the local planning authority, and should identify archaeological study areas and propose appropriate schemes of investigation, and design measures, to ensure the protection of relevant heritage assets.</i>” (1) Can each party provide evidence to support their position in respect of the suitability of the investigations that have been undertaken, and why either further trial trenching or other form of investigation should or should not be carried out.</p>	<p>Desk-based assessment (DBA) and non-intrusive survey (geophysics) can only provide information on the location of significant archaeology and only then if it has previously been recorded (DBA) or is susceptible to identification through magnetic variation (Geophysics). This is not sufficient to establish significance of archaeological remains, which is the key metric for assessment. This necessarily requires evaluation trenching to establish presence/absence, extent, state of preservation, date and character of the archaeological remains and only then can significance be determined appropriately.</p> <p>The applicant themselves have identified 29 sites of high archaeological potential through the DBA and geophysical survey. They have undertaken trenching on 9 of those sites</p>

			<p>and therefore only have sufficient data to understand the significance on those 9 sites. They are unable to describe the development impacts on the remaining 20 sites and what the scale of harm will be. Footnote 94 of NPS EN-3 states '<i>The results of pre-determination archaeological evaluation inform the design of the scheme and related archaeological planning conditions.</i>' Without the data from trenching, the applicant does not have sufficient information, to inform design, or make reasonable statements regarding the development impacts or to design appropriate mitigation strategies. This leaves significant risk post-consent, of escalating costs, significant construction delays, delivery issues and damage to archaeological remains that could otherwise be avoided.</p>
Q11.0.2 (3-4)	The Councils, Historic England	<p>Design Proposals / Alternative Foundation Designs</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 whether the 3m depth specified by the Applicant would be regarded as low level piling?</p>	<p>(3) Concrete shoes still can have a significant impact on shallow archaeological remains. Ground preparation for installation and then compaction from several tonnes of concrete over the lifetime of the development is destructive to sensitive remains such as human burials and structures. If this method is proposed, the area should still be trenched to establish the depth and character of any archaeology present so that the use of concrete shoes can be assessed for appropriateness. 'No dig' solutions such as trays that sit on the ground and are weighted down with ballast offer a more acceptable mitigation option. However, there can still be issues regarding compaction and if the area is un-evaluated, the archaeology present is still at risk from operational activity (maintenance and refits) and decommissioning. The site cannot be evaluated once constructed making</p>

			<p>mitigation measures during operation difficult and uninformed. There is also an element of 'kicking the problem down the road' for someone else to deal with if the site has not been properly investigated during assessment.</p> <p>(4) Piling at any level, on areas that have not been evaluated, will result in the loss of archaeological remains with no understanding of the scale of loss or harm. Most archaeological remains in rural locations are encounter at between 25cm and 1m in depth. Therefore, 3m deep piles will go through and certainly impact any archaeological remains present.</p>
Q11.0.3 (3)	NCC/LCC	<p>Archaeology Paragraph 2.10.137 of NPS EN-1 states that the ability of the Applicant to microsite specific elements during the construction phase should be an important consideration by the SoS when assessing the risk of damage to archaeology. (1) Please could the Applicant provide its consideration of the potential for micrositing, including the practical feasibility in relation to the foundations of the solar panels? (2) Please could the Applicant ensure that any micrositing mitigation is explicitly secured in the Outline CEMP? (3) Could the County Archaeologists comment please?</p>	<p>(3) Micrositing does offer flexibility for the developer to alter layout relatively easily. However this does require a good understanding of the archaeological resource across the site to allow for effective design flexibility and will certainly require trenched evaluation to inform it. We always recommend avoidance of sensitive archaeological areas where possible (very much in the interest of the developer and the archaeology), but this does anticipate that these areas have been properly identified and characterised during assessment. Leaving this to post-consent reduces the effectiveness and flexibility that micrositing is intended to promote.</p> <p>Micrositing without sufficient trenched evaluation to inform it will lead to the destruction of unknown heritage assets, especially in areas of high ground disturbance associated with infrastructure elements of the development.</p>

Q11.0.4	The Councils, the Applicant	<p>Non Designated Heritage Assets</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 reference the Station, is further assessment required?.</p>	NCC defers to the District Councils in respect of these questions.
12. Hydrology and hydrogeology and the Water Environment			
Q.12.0.4	Councils Trent Valley IDB Environment Agency	<p>Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The SuDS Maintenance proposals outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment (ref: 14529A-30-R13-06 dated 30th April 2025) whilst in principal are satisfactory, they are only a guide outline of the proposals which are stated to be confirmed in greater detail at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>We would look for maintenance proposals which align with the CIRIA SuDS manual and PPG, to ensure the features are able to function after completion and for the lifetime of the development, to ensure long-term effectiveness. We would also expect to see who will be responsible for maintaining the SuDS drainage features going forward.</p>
Q12.0.6	The Applicant, Environment Agency, the Councils	Water Framework Directive (Q1-4).	NCC defers to the EA with respect to River Basin Management Plans
15. Landscape and Visual			
Q15.0.2	The Applicant Natural England The Councils	<p>National Landscapes</p> <p>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?</p>	The nearest National Landscape to the scheme is the Lincolnshire Wolds, located over 30km to the east. Due to distance, we have not identified any landscape or visual effects upon the setting of the National Landscape.
Q15 0 3	The Applicant,	At ISH1 the Applicant indicated that there were no veteran trees within the Order Limits. This has	The DCO and mitigation should include explicit protection for veteran trees. Any veteran trees

	The Councils	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 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.	should be fully surveyed and protected to BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction 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.
18. Transportation and Traffic			
Q18.02	NCC	Crabtree Lane and Moor Lane Are NCC satisfied with the passing places proposed by the Applicant in the revised oCTMP at Deadline 1?	The Highway Authority do not think that any references to passing places are included in the oCTMP. The only reference appears to be in the Transport Assessment in paragraph A.12.5.18 which identifies an existing passing place on Crabtree Lane. The Highway Authority do not consider that this is acceptable, and no consideration has been given to Moor Lane. Our response given in the LIR still therefore applies in respect to Crabtree Lane and Moor Lane. As per our response to Q18.0.8, the Highway Authority has subsequently met with the applicant's transport consultant and identified suitable standards for them to consider with regards to the provision of passing bays. Further information has not been provided as yet so in conclusion, we are not satisfied with the passing places currently proposed by the Applicant.
Q18.0.7	NCC	National Cycle Route (NCR) 647 Within their LIR, NCC state the following: "NCC wishes to secure	Having reviewed the oPROWMP (EN010159/APP/7.12.1 Rev02)

		<p><i>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”</i></p> <p>Are the NCC content that the ability to approve the PROWMP give sufficient control to ensure that the appropriate measures sought would be in place? If NCC consider there are currently gaps in what the oPROWMP, please advise what needs to be added. In order to ensure that the PROW is returned to an appropriate standard, are you seeking a survey of the current condition and an agreement of the standard you would expect it to be returned to?</p>	<p>and Streets, rights of way and access plans (EN010159/APP/2.4 Rev 01), we are satisfied that there are no impacts on NCR 647 where it passes through/adjacent to the DCO area (and within the management of Nottinghamshire County Council); it is evident that the offroad section of the NCR is not to be crossed by construction traffic, which was our primary concern.</p> <p>Our only request is that at the western end of the NCR, where it leaves the disused railway line and joins the public highway, temporary signage should be installed by the developer to warn cyclists of the presence of construction traffic. This is the location annotated 07/22 and 07/23 on Sheet 7 of 16 of the Streets, rights of way and access plans. We would suggest that para. 3.1.3 of the oPROWMP is amended to include this specific provision.</p>
Q18.0.8	The Applicant, NCC	<p>NCC LIR</p> <p>Within their LIR, NCC raise a number of issues. Can both parties please explain what the latest position is in respect of the Transport Assessment (TA) and provide a timeframe towards providing a clear statement to the examination. In the event that additional work is needed, when</p>	<p>The applicants Transport Consultant requested a meeting with the Highway Authority to discuss the matters related to the TA as set out in the NCC LIR and this was held on the 22 July 2025. The following was discussed / agreed in respect of the main points:</p>

		<p>might this expect to be submitted to the examination?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collingham and Sutton on Trent would be added to the barred routes list, which will address our concerns on the study area and routing. This will however necessitate redistribution of HGVs set out in Table 4 of the TA and will add 199 HGVs to the routes to the north which will need to be considered. • The access drawings in EN010159-000121- 2.4 are not cross referenced in the TA or the oCTMP. There are disparities between these and the access points identified in the TA. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to GG119 on each access point has been requested. • Justification for barring traffic through Ragnall has been requested as doing this results in a new access on the Nottinghamshire Major Road Network, introducing a conflict point. <p>In addition to the above which we consider to be the main issues, we anticipate the other issues highlighted in the LIR to also be addressed.</p> <p>We are not aware of the applicants timetable for addressing the above matters.</p>
--	--	--	--

NCC defers to Newark & Sherwood District Council and Bassetlaw District Council on any other questions to the Councils that have not been responded to within this letter, as appropriate.

I trust that our responses assist but please contact me should you have any queries.

Yours faithfully,

Will Lawrence MRTPI
Planning and Infrastructure Manager
Nottinghamshire County Council