



One Earth Solar Farm

Volume 9.0: Other Post-Submission Documents [EN010159]

**Applicant's Response to Interested Parties Responses to ExA
Written Questions**

Document Ref: EN010159/APP/92.4

September 2025

Revision 01



Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose of the Report	3
2.	Applicant Response Table	4

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide additional comments on submissions by Interested Parties to the Examining Authority's Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ1) submitted at Deadline 2.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant's responses to the ExQ1 were provided at Deadline 2 [REF]. Those responses remain the Applicant's position, and where the Applicant has not commented further on the responses of Interested Parties to the ExQ1, that should not be taken as being acceptance of the Interested Parties' position by the Applicant – the Applicant has sought to focus its responses in order to avoid unnecessarily creating additional written responses that only reiterate its position, as already set out. Therefore, where the submissions by Interested Parties to the ExQ1 (1) do not raise new matters, or (2) raise matters which the Applicant considers it has already appropriately responded to in its original response to the ExQ1 [REF], no further response to those submissions has been included in this response document. This document only includes matters the Applicant has new or further comments on which arise from the submissions of Interested Parties.
- 1.1.3 To further minimise duplication, the Applicant has sought to cross-refer where appropriate to responses provided in other relevant submissions that have been entered into the Examination.

2. Applicant Response Table

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
Replacements and Maintenance			
ExQR1	Q.1.0.24 Nottinghamshire County Council	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 manner. Solar panels are considered as Electrical and Electronic Equipment and so should be handled in accordance with the Regulations. 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. 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	<p>The Applicant recognises that there is at present no significant capacity for large-scale PV panel recycling in the UK, but this is a function of the lack of demand for such facilities given the lack of end-of-life panels requiring management. We note that both specific regulations (e.g. the WEEE Directive) and overarching Government strategy (generally, such as DEFRA's Circular Economy Taskforce; and specifically, such as DESNZ's Solar Roadmap and Battery Strategy) all prioritise diverting waste from landfill and as such we are confident that the waste market will respond by bringing forward suitable recycling facilities in a timely fashion.</p> <p>Both the solar industry generally and the Applicant particularly are contributing to this future waste management. Solar Energy UK is establishing a focus group to help address the issue; and the Applicant is helping to stimulate the development of the recycling market by making a commitment to 100% panel recycling.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the statement in the East Yorkshire Solar Farm The Examining Authority's Recommendation Report, 17 February 2025 paragraph 3.13.50. <i>"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</i></p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		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.	<i>number of panels involved in the application scheme would lead to particular difficulties in this regard.”</i> The SoS agreed with this position.
ExQR2	Q1.0.24 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>The primary aim of the Waste Electric and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 is to reduce the environmental impact of electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) at the end of its life by minimizing the amount of WEEE going to landfills and encouraging the re-use, recovery, and recycling of electrical and electronic products and their components. The regulations place the responsibility on producers for the collection, treatment, and environmentally sound disposal of electronic waste. Schedule 2 of the WEEE Regulations identify that solar panels are considered as EEE and therefore should be handled in accordance with the Regulations.</p> <p>It is noted in the Outline Operational Environment Management Plan (oOEMP) ([APP-178] paragraph 2.9.2) the Applicant commits to 100% reuse and recycling of solar panels during operation. Paragraph 2.9.5 also commits the Applicant to working with Waste Planning Authorities to ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately. The County Council however would question how this would be tracked given that in paragraph 2.9.4 references that ‘All waste to be removed from the Order Limits will be undertaken by fully licensed waste carriers and taken to suitably licensed waste management facilities and managed in line with the requirements of</p>	<p>As stated in the Outline OEMP Table 3-13: Waste “A register of waste loads leaving the Site would be maintained to provide a</p> <p><i>suitable audit trail for compliance purposes and to facilitate monitoring and reporting of waste types, quantities, and management methods.”</i> The Applicant has also committed in Paragraph 2.95 of the oOEMP to work collaboratively to share data and reporting on waste types and volumes.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that there is at present no significant capacity for large-scale PV panel recycling in the UK, but this is a function of the lack of demand for such facilities given the lack of end-of-life panels requiring management. We note that both specific regulations (e.g. the WEEE Directive) and overarching Government strategy (generally, such as DEFRA’s Circular Economy Taskforce; and specifically, such as DESNZ’s Solar Roadmap and Battery Strategy) all prioritise diverting waste from landfill and as such we are confident that the waste market will respond by bringing forward suitable recycling facilities in a timely fashion.</p> <p>Both the solar industry generally and the Applicant particularly are contributing to this future waste management. Solar Energy UK is establishing a focus group to help address the issue; and the Applicant is helping</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations (2011) and the Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations (2005) (as amended).’.</p> <p>The applicant is relying on the development of suitable facilities to address the waste arising from decommissioning in 60 years’ time.</p> <p>These facilities currently do not exist at the scale required. No information is provided on the operational phase annual failure rates. Lincolnshire is currently home to 5 approved DCO applications, with a further 8 in various stages of the process. The potential annual failure rates of solar panels and how the recovery, re-use and recycling of these panels both alone and in combination with other solar farms (both DCO and TCPA) needs to be addressed. It is suggested that the applicant works with other solar developers to ensure that these facilities are available both in the short and long term to ensure that the both the Regulations and the statement in the oOEMP of 100% reuse and recycling of solar panels during operation, are fully adhered to.</p>	<p>to stimulate the development of the recycling market by making a commitment to 100% panel recycling.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the statement in the East Yorkshire Solar Farm The Examining Authority's Recommendation Report, 17 February 2025 paragraph 3.13.50. <i>“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.”</i> The SoS agreed with this position.</p> <p>The Applicant suggests an indicative annual panel failure rate of 0.05%, although in practice this may be a conservative estimate (i.e. the failure rate may be lower).</p>
ExQR3	Q1.0.24 Newark and Sherwood District Council	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.	As stated in the oOEMP paragraph 2.9.2 and oDEMP paragraph 2.8.2 the Applicant is committed to 100% reuse and recycling of solar panels. Details of the waste strategy are presented in the Outline Site Waste Management Plan [APP-184].
ExQR4	Q3.0.2 Environment Agency	Replacement of components is dependent on the design life recommended by the manufacturer, in combination with any maintenance or operational limitations which may affect this. We suggest the applicant confirms these details with their preferred suppliers and presents a proposed timescale for	Each year, starting 12 months after final commissioning, the Applicant will provide the relevant planning authority with a planned replacement schedule. This schedule will cover the components identified in Table 2-2 of the oOEMP and set out the works proposed for the year ahead.

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>any scheduled equipment replacement. The operational maintenance plans should include instruction to demonstrate how drainage systems, including penstocks and valves, will be checked, kept clean and operational functionality be ensured (for example, the “detailed SuDS Maintenance Schedule” mentioned in REP1-049 7.5.1 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (Rev 2), Table 3.4). This is something we would expect the applicant to provide an answer for. We would typically expect infrastructure such as panel mounting frames, buried cables, and foundations for the BESS site and any other structures to remain for the whole lifespan of the scheme. The applicant should confirm if this is the case for this scheme. As such, any replacement of components would be above ground only (panels, BESS containers, etc.), with minimal impact on the subsurface environment, and no more likely to cause harm than the initial construction period. We suggest the applicant includes this information in the operational maintenance schedules or OEMP.</p>	<p>As outlined in Table 3-10 of the oOEMP soil movement is not expected, but where localised small scale maintenance operations require excavations, etc, these works would be managed through a Risk Assessment Method Statement (RAMS), Operating Procedure or similar which would include measures for the sustainable management of soil resources.</p> <p>The oOEMP [REP2-052] states “The OEMP will include a detailed SuDS Maintenance Schedule that sets out maintenance tasks and their frequency. The detailed schedule will be based on the principles set out in Table 4-1 (Indicative SuDS Maintenance Schedule) of the Flood Risk Assessment.”</p>
ExQR5	Q3.0.2 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>(1) LCC are unable to comment as this is best addressed to the applicant.</p> <p>(2) LCC are unable to answer the question but would agree that the applicant needs to provide forecasts for the quantity of waste (e.g. failed PV panels) arising during the operational phase. This must include both unexpected failures and wider replacement at end of life as it is highly unlikely any of the components would last the full 60 years.</p> <p>(3) LCC are unable to give a specific threshold for the quantity of waste which is acceptable, particularly in light of the cumulative waste arisings from other solar NSIPs in our area. However, we agree that the applicant needs not only to forecast their waste arisings for each year during the various</p>	<p>Each year, starting 12 months after final commissioning, the Applicant will provide the relevant planning authority with a planned replacement schedule. This schedule will cover the components identified in Table 2-2 of the oOEMP and set out the works proposed for the year ahead. The Applicant (in paragraph 2.9.5 of the oOEMP) has also committed to work collaboratively:</p> <p>Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;</p> <p>Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>phases of the project (construction, operation and decommissioning) but also to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek to minimise those arisings and otherwise to follow the waste hierarchy in choosing their fate, and • Phase works (e.g. routine replacement of PV panels) to spread the waste arisings and thus limit the impact on waste processing capacity 	<p>strategies and capacity constraints; and Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent.</p>
Fire Safety			
ExQR6	Q1.0.19 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>LFR will require further details on battery technology as plans develop to support on-going engagement and development of emergency plans and procedures.</p> <p>All remaining areas appear compliant at this stage of the development, but again recognise site plans are indicative, with further details required for LFR to acknowledge compliance.</p>	<p>The applicant has committed to further engagement with LFR during detailed design of the scheme, this will include updating the BSMP in line with the technology to be used for the scheme and the Applicant will welcome input from LFR and aim to agree BSMP, emergency action plans and procedures prior to construction of the BESS.</p>
ExQR7	Q1.0.19 West Lindsey District Council	<p>WLDC defer on the detail of this matter to Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service, and UK Health Security Agency. However, WLDC would also note from the submissions on behalf of Exolum Pipeline System Limited [REP1-108, 109 and 110], that there is a major fuel pipeline passing under much of the eastern half of the project, including directly under the substation/BESS location in West Lindsey. WLDC also note that the layouts shown on the site layout plans (titled height parameter plans) [APP-016] do not appear to make allowance for this pipeline. WLDC's is therefore unclear whether the interaction between the high pressure fuel pipeline and the substation/BESS increases fire management and risk control.</p>	<p>The Applicant is fully aware of the Exolum pipeline and will be including Exolum in ongoing engagement prior to any construction of equipment near the pipeline. An offset from the Exolum pipeline of 30m has been used throughout the project, with protective provisions being agreed. Any works near the pipeline will be subject to consultation with Exolum.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
ExQR8	Q1.0.19 Environment Agency	<p>It would provide us greater surety of design if there is a backup manual operation of the penstock valve, in case the automatic activation fails. The maintenance schedule should also include periodic inspection and testing of the automatic penstock closure to minimise the risk of the mechanism seizing.</p> <p>Section 4.8 on Post-incident Recovery and End of Life Management could have reference to after a fire event it should be made clear that both the lined detention basin and SuDS system would ideally need to be thoroughly drained and cleaned, prior to the penstock re-opening and allow flow of drainage water. Therefore, we would advise against gravel substrates used in the BESS and Substation compounds and surrounding drainage system as contaminants can more easily bind to their surfaces.</p> <p>Post-incident Recovery and End of Life Management</p> <p>Section 5.1.3 should clarify that all drainage features associated with the BESS, not only the detention basins but also the swales, will have impermeable lining.</p>	<p>A backup manual penstock valve will be included within the final drainage design and the FRA will be updated to make reference to this for deadline 4 (including making reference to maintenance requirements for the penstock valve).</p> <p>The oBSMP has been updated to include penstock valve back up and cleaning of drainage features in the event of contaminants being identified during testing of fire water run off.</p>
ExQR9	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	<p>Concerns over Infrastructure Fires in BESS or large scale inverters The siting of a large Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) together with 196 solar inverters within a designated Drinking Water Protected Area poses a serious pollution risk in the event of fire. Fires involving lithium-ion batteries and inverter components are known to generate toxic leachates and firewater runoff containing heavy metals, fluorinated compounds (such as HF), and persistent organic pollutants. In an area underlain by permeable soils and hydrologically linked to the River Trent and its tributaries, such</p>	<p>Consideration of polluted runoff from a fire within the BESS areas has been made within the surface water drainage design. Firstly, the SuDS features serving these areas will have an impermeable lining to impede the infiltration of potential contaminants to the ground and groundwater.</p> <p>Should a fire occur, and the fire suppression system is activated, a penstock valve downstream of the attenuation basins will be automatically triggered to isolate potentially contaminated discharges to the surrounding watercourses.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		contaminants could infiltrate groundwater or be transported via surface ditches and drains, directly threatening drinking water supplies and the ecological status of the river system. This creates a clear potential pathway of harm that is inconsistent with the statutory protections afforded to Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive.	<p>Should this occur, contaminated water would be retained within the basins and tankered away.</p> <p>Furthermore, the potential for a fire to occur at the same time as a rainfall event has been considered and the basins have been sized to provide sufficient storage to attenuate the 1 in 10 year event plus 228m³ of firewater (based on firefighting at 1,900 l/minute for 2 hours), with no discharge.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-043] sets the above out in further detail.</p>
Community Engagement			
ExQR10	Q1.0.20 West Lindsey District Council	<p>WLDC note the recent consultation by the UK Government in respect of commitments made in the Planning and Infrastructure Bill. The UK Government is currently consulting on a scheme for those living near new overhead transmission lines across Great Britain to receive up to £2,500 off their electricity bills over 10 years.</p> <p>The proposals make households within 500 metres of new or upgraded electricity transmission infrastructure (including substations, convertors, switching stations and sealing-end compounds) eligible for a discount of up to £250 via their electricity bill every year for 10 years. The discounts, which would be assigned to the home and apply to the occupant, could be provided every 6 months and continue for up to 10 years, adding up to £2500.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to developing a community benefit package to support local priorities and initiatives, that would be developed through further engagement with local stakeholders.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware of the proposals for community benefit from National Grid for those who live near power lines, as well as the recent consultation the government led on mandatory community benefit packages for low-carbon energy developments. Should this policy become enacted, the Applicant would of course comply with any requirements.</p>
Design, parameters and other details of the Proposed Development			
ExQR11	Q2.0.4	We recognise the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.10.29 in respect of securing good design and ensuring that	The assessment of effects on landscape character and visual amenity is based on consideration of a reasonable



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>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. The ES presents an assessment of a 'worst case' scenario of the Development, based on design parameters presented in ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Document 5.9 Outline Design Parameters Document and Works Plan areas shown on Figure 2.3: Works Plan. 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". 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 Chapter 5, Document 5.9 and areas shown on Figure 2.3: Works Plan. It has been assumed that the maximum parameters have been used within the LVIA chapter, however it should be clarified by the applicant. 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. 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</p>	<p>worst-case scenario. This is reflected in the assumptions, exclusions and limitations section of the LVIA [REP2-026] which include items such as the construction phase assessment being based on winter conditions to be reflective of worst case. A clarification has been added to the methodology section under the Assumptions, Exclusions and Limitations section starting at para. 11.3.41, including reference to the Works Plan, Height Parameter Plan and Outline Design Parameters.</p> <p>It is correct that the design of the Proposed Development has followed an iterative design process, as set out in the Design Approach Document [REP2-021] and that details regarding the location and extent of the proposed planting in the final design will be provided under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO. This is confirmed within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, paragraph 1.3.5 [REP2-055].</p> <p>The Design Principles will continue to inform the design throughout the delivery stage. The Design Principles have directly informed the Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022] which will in turn control the detailed design which is to be approved under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>character area reports and feedback from community events and statutory consultees where possible. 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. 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 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 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, 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. 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. Therefore, while design matters have been addressed, we do stress that effective delivery at detailed design stage is critical to</p>	

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		ensuring that the scheme ultimately meets landscape, visual and good design objectives.	
ExQR12	Q2.0.4 West Lindsey District Council	<p>WLDC have reviewed the Design Approach Document [AS013], the Illustrative Masterplan [APP-018] and the Outline Design Parameters [REP1-021]. However, there are several aspects that are unclear. As set out in WLDC LIR, the height parameter plans [APP-016] show a maximum height of 13.5m across the “Substation/BESS location” which extends to an area of approximately 20 hectares. For scale, immediately northwest of the eastern BESS area is the existing 10m high Anglian Water building at the Hall Water Treatment Works. Without any information to the contrary, WLDC have to assume that the 13.5m maximum height indicated on the plans will extend across all of the BESS area and therefore that the BESS area would introduce a major new element in the countryside, akin to distribution warehousing. Additionally, it is not clear from the application documentation whether or not there will be a substation in the area within WLDC defined on the height parameter plans [APP-016] as the “Substation/BESS location”, and, if there will be a substation, there is no information on its intended location.</p> <p>(1) WLDC consider that it would be beneficial for all parties for these to be set out in a single document to be certified. The document should include locationally based parameters which set out the proposed location of key infrastructure such as substations and BESS infrastructure.</p> <p>(2) Given the potential for significant landscape and visual effects associated with a substantial 13.5m high structure potentially across 20 hectares in the “Substation/BESS location” the lack of clarity set out above does not provide</p>	<p>This matter has been clarified via discussion between WLDC and the applicant as part of the progression of SoCG. Through such discussion the applicant has clarified that whilst the extent of Work Area 3 is shown on the Height Parameter Plan as having potential to measure up to 13.5m high, this is limited to the footprint of the substation (up to 23,800m²) as secured in the Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022].</p> <p>The location of Work Number 3 (substations) has been derived through analysis of the designed flood event, maintaining a 300m offset from residential dwellings, and seeking to minimise the use of BMV land.</p> <p>A precise location for the substation within Work Number 3 has not yet been defined since flexibility is required to allow an optimal layout to be designed throughout the detailed design phase. The final location of the substation will be subject to approval under Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		WLDC with comfort that future consenting would meet landscape, visual and good design objectives.	
ExQR14	Q2.0.4(2) Nottinghamshire County Council	<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. The ES presents an assessment of a 'worst case' scenario of the Development, based on design parameters presented in ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Document 5.9 Outline Design Parameters Document and Works Plan areas shown on Figure 2.3: Works Plan. 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". 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 Chapter 5, Document 5.9 and areas shown on Figure 2.3: Works Plan.</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. The scheme has been presented as</p>	<p>The assessment of effects on landscape character and visual amenity is based on consideration of a reasonable worst case scenario. A clarification has been added to the methodology section under 'Magnitude of Effect'.</p> <p>It is correct that the design of the Proposed Development has followed an iterative design process, as set out in the Design Approach Document [REP2-021] and that details regarding the location and extent of the proposed planting in the final design will be provided under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO. This is confirmed within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, paragraph 1.3.5 [REP2-055].</p> <p>The Design Principles will continue to inform the design throughout the delivery stage. The Design Principles have directly informed the Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022] which will in turn control the detailed design which is to be approved under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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. 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. 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 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 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, 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>	

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<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>	
ExQR15	Q2.0.4 Newark and Sherwood District Council	<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>The ES presents an assessment of a 'worst case' scenario of the Development, based on design parameters presented in ES Chapter 5: Description of the Proposed Development, Document 5.9 Outline Design Parameters Document and Works Plan areas shown on Figure 2.3: Works Plan.</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</p>	<p>The Applicant will await NSDC's comment on the information provided regarding residential visual amenity at the previous deadline. This matter is also subject to ongoing discussion with NSDC as part of the progression of the SoCG.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on landscape character and visual amenity is based on consideration of a reasonable worst case scenario. A clarification has been added to the methodology section under 'Magnitude of Effect'.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided detail regarding the Proposed Development through several secured documents, providing clarity regarding the spatial extent of different features through the Works Plan [REP2-007], the design of individual elements through the Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022], the height of different elements through the Site Layout Plans [APP-016] and details about implementation through the suite of management plans. This information is summarised on the Illustrative Masterplan to allow stakeholders to visualise a realistic scenario of how the Proposed Development may be</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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 worstcase scenario with regards to assessing the maximum parameters laid out in Chapter 5, Document 5.9 and areas shown on Figure 2.3: Works Plan.</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>Therefore, while design matters have been partly addressed, we consider there are areas of further design 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.</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</p>	<p>brought forwards. Explanation of the Proposed Development was also provided to stakeholders throughout the pre-application phase through as part of consultation. This was supported by a series of visualisations and a virtual 3D model.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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>	
ExQR16	Q10.2.1 Newark and Sherwood District Council	<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 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. 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 being in accordance with 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. This updated version includes the addition of paragraph 1.3.5, which clarifies that a detailed</p>	<p>The Applicant updated the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP2-055] at Deadline 2 and again at Deadline 3 to provide for a steering group to be set up that includes representation from the Local Planning Authorities and, potentially, Natural England and the Environment Agency. The steering group includes for discussions and agreements to be reached on the design of habitats (and other landscape and biodiversity mitigations), methods of implementation and establishment, adaptive management and ongoing monitoring. The Applicant considers that this provides all parties with the ability to influence the detailed landscape design to address points of interest particular to each party.</p> <p>The Applicant disagrees with the comments about “substantially” in the DCO requirement and refers to its position as set out in its Written Summary of Oral Submissions made at ISH1 [REP1-077], page 15 and following.</p> <p>The LVIA has been undertaken to consider the elements secured in the DCO, including embedded mitigation measures. These are set out in Section 11.5 of the LVIA [REP1-025], including a record of how different measures are secured. The Mitigation Plan included within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (REP2-055) will be updated as part of detailed design as part of the</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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>commitment made in para 1.3.5 of the OLEMP: “The LEMP will detail the location and extent of proposed planting by inclusion of planting plans and species lists”.</p>
The Environmental Statement (general)			
ExQR17	Q3.0.1 West Lindsey District Council	<p>(1) WLDC would note that 60 years or less is the general timespan of the coal powered power stations along the River Trent valley which have been decommissioned in recent years. These power stations have never been treated as or seen as temporary structures. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Marnham – commissioned 1959, decommissioned 2003 – lifespan 43 years • Cottam – commissioned 1968, decommissioned 2019 – lifespan 50 years • Ratcliffe on Soar – commissioned 1968, decommissioned 2024 – lifespan 56 years • West Burton A – commissioned 1966, decommissioned 2023 – lifespan 57 years 	<p>As outlined in the Local Impact Report [REP2-083] (Reference LIR2), the Applicant has already provided a response to WLDC on this matter, which remains both applicable and valid. For ease of reference, the Applicant’s previous response is set out below:</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>
ExQR18	Q3.0.2 West Lindsey District Council	(3) WLDC consider that the Outline Operational Management Plan [REP1-049] does not reflect the potentially significant effects associated with major replacement of equipment such	For Deadline 2 the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [REP2-051] was updated to include details on the replacement schedule; this wording



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>as transformers and switchgear, or large scale replacement of solar panels or cabling.</p> <p>WLDC suggests anything involving the replacement of transformers or switch gear, or more than 10% of the panels in one event should be subject to additional controls.</p>	<p>has also been updated for Deadline 3 [EN010159/APP/7.6.3]</p> <p>During the operational phase, some solar infrastructure components will need to be replaced in line with their expected design life. Instead of wholesale replacement, this will be carried out in stages to ensure the continued export of electricity to the National Grid.</p> <p>Each year, starting 12 months after final commissioning, the Applicant will provide the relevant planning authority with a planned replacement schedule. This schedule will cover the components identified in Table 2-2 of the oOEMP and set out the works proposed for the year ahead. It will include information on the scope and nature of replacements, any tree removals (and proposed replanting), transport requirements, the anticipated timing of works, and confirmation that environmental effects will not exceed those assessed in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>If unforeseen emergency works are required—for example, to address operational failure, health and safety risks, or environmental issues—the Applicant will notify the planning authority as soon as possible, and no later than 14 days after the works have taken place. This notification will explain the nature and extent of the emergency replacement.</p> <p>Other than in emergency circumstances, and unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority, the Applicant will only carry out replacement activities in accordance with the agreed annual schedule.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (Including HRA)			
ExQR19	Q7.0.2 Lincolnshire County Council	(3) LCC is of the opinion that whilst the proposed scheme of monitoring is intended to assist in furthering the wider understanding of the effects of solar developments on local bat populations, it is also an important element of the overall mitigation scheme which will be able to inform adaptive management proposals during the lifetime of the proposed development. LCC is of the opinion that this should not be afforded any significant positive weight in the planning balance	The Applicant notes this response. Positive weight from the perspective of biodiversity is associated with the provision of a range of environmental measures (as laid out in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) for the benefit of local conservation priorities and the provision of a minimum of 50% BNG for habitat units and hedgerow units as described in Requirement 9 of the draft DCO [REP2-009].
ExQR20	Q7.0.2 West Lindsey District Council	(3) Whilst of general interest in relation to solar generation schemes, WLDC do not consider this research to be a benefit that should be considered as part of the planning balance for this scheme specifically.	The Applicant notes this response. Positive weight from the perspective of biodiversity is associated with the provision of a range of environmental measures (as laid out in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) for the benefit of local conservation priorities and the provision of a minimum of 50% BNG for habitat units and hedgerow units as described in Requirement 9 of the draft DCO [REP2-009].
ExQR21	Q7.0.2 (3) Nottinghamshire County Council	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. The Council wouldn't consider this matter to weigh in favour of the scheme from our perspective. Such a large	The Applicant notes this response. Positive weight from the perspective of biodiversity is associated with the provision of a range of environmental measures (as laid out in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) for the benefit of local conservation priorities and the provision of a minimum of 50% BNG for habitat units and hedgerow units as described in Requirement 9 of the draft DCO [REP2-009].

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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>	
ExQR22	<p>Q7.0.2 Newark and Sherwood District Council</p>	<p>NSDC would make the following comments.</p> <p>(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 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</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response. Positive weight from the perspective of biodiversity is associated with the provision of a range of environmental measures (as laid out in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) for the benefit of local conservation priorities and the provision of a minimum of 50% BNG for habitat units and hedgerow units as described in Requirement 9 of the draft DCO [REP2-009].</p> <p>The Applicant further notes that the shape of the monitoring effort would be refined by the steering group described within Section 7 of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP2-055] within which the relevant local planning authorities will have input.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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. 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 should not be given positive weight in support of the scheme at this stage.</p>	
The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
ExQR23	Q9.0.7 Network Rail	<p>At present the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) does not contain any protective provisions in respect of Network Rail and their statutory undertaking. Accordingly, the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers over Network Rail's land and interests is at present unrestricted. Therefore, without the inclusion of Network Rail's standard Protective Provisions, NR must maintain its objection to the DCO on the basis that the proposed compulsory acquisition of rights over railway property does not satisfy the test in section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 in that:</p>	<p>Please see the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions made at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 [EN010159/APP/9.21] which provides an update on the position with all statutory undertakers.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>(a) the rights over NR land cannot be acquired without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking; and</p> <p>(b) such detriment cannot be made good by Network Rail by use of other railway property. The reason for which is that:</p> <p>1) all of the plots (over which rights are proposed to be compulsorily acquired) comprise an operational railway line, or are in respect of railway or equipment or are in respect of a restriction on title against disposition by reason of the same;</p> <p>2) unless Network Rail has the ability to require its prior consent and/or require the Applicant to enter into an asset protection agreement prior to the acquisition of such rights in order to ensure any such rights can be carried out in harmony with the operational railway (as is provided for in Protective Provision 4), the compulsory acquisition of such rights would be adverse to the operational railway and would cause a serious detriment to the carrying on of NR's undertaking as it could interfere with the operational railway line and take the safe running of trains out of Network Rail's control; and</p> <p>3) as this is an operational railway line such detriment cannot be made good as the line cannot be relocated to other land in the possession of NR (and not least to say requiring NR to relocate its operational railway to facilitate such rights would be entirely disproportionate both in cost and nature).</p> <p>Accordingly, in order for such proposed compulsory acquisition of new rights over of the plots referred to in our Written Representations dated 29 July 2025 below to satisfy the test in section 127 Planning Act 2008, paragraph 4 of Network Rail's standard Protective Provisions (and particularly paragraph 4(1) requiring NR's consent to be</p>	



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		sought before powers authorising the compulsory acquisition of such rights are exercised) must be included in the draft Order. Network Rail's position is that in the absence of paragraph 4, the test in section 127 is not satisfied. Network Rail is investigating the extent of rights and restrictions for the benefit of Network Rail which are proposed to be extinguished, suspended and/or interfered with in delivering the proposed development. On this basis, Network Rail reserves its position in regard to whether or not the test in section 138 of the Planning Act 2008 is satisfied. Network Rail hopes to confirm its position on these matters within the next 28 days.	
ExQR24	Q9.0.11 National Grid	It is noted that the draft Order as applied for did not include suitable protective provisions for the benefit of NGET, NGET has therefore issued its Protective Provisions to the Applicant and is awaiting a response. In light of the interactions with NHHM project and the project to deliver the new 400kV High Marnham Substation, NGET requires that the Protective Provisions include cooperation provisions for its future assets including the future assets to be provided by the NHHM project and the project to deliver the new 400kV High Marnham Substation . The recently granted Awel Y Mor Development Consent Order ("AYM DCO") and Mona Offshore Wind Development Consent Order ("Mona DCO") provide precedents for the protection of NGET future assets via protective provisions. NGET will require the Applicant's collaboration to safeguard its ability to deliver future assets related to the One Earth Solar Project's connection.	The Applicant is continuing active negotiations with National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC regarding the terms of their protective provisions. Discussions are ongoing, with the intention to include protective provisions for the benefit of NGET in the draft DCO once these provisions are formally agreed.
ExQR25	Q10.2.3	NSDC note the wording in DCO Requirement 8 is very much	

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
	Newark and Sherwood District Council	<p>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 “vegetation that is likely to be planted as part of the Proposed Development as part of the wider mitigation and enhancement strategy” is shown on the Landscape Mitigation Plan with Appendix A. 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 planting, along with species, number, and specification as well as planting details and notes.</p>	<p>The Applicant has amended the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) to state at paragraph 1.3.5 that the detailed LEMP will describe the habitats to be created alongside detailed information on their establishment, management and monitoring. The LEMP will also detail the location and extent of proposed planting by inclusion of planting plans and species lists.</p>
ExQR26	Q10.2.3 Lincolnshire County Council	<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</p>	



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		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. Paragraph 1.2.5 of the OLEMP clarifies that “vegetation that is likely to be planted as part of the Proposed Development as part of the wider mitigation and enhancement strategy” is shown on the Landscape Mitigation Plan with Appendix A. 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.	
ExQR27	Q10.2.3 West Lindsey District Council	WLDC suggest the following textual amendment to paragraph (3) of Requirement 8 (see underlined text): “(3) The landscape and ecology management plan must be implemented as approved and the measures contained within the plan maintained throughout the operation of the relevant part of the authorised development to which the plan relates”.	The Applicant does not consider the amendment is necessary for reasons previously given, however, it has made this amend at Deadline 3.
ExQR28	Q10.2.3 Nottinghamshire County Council	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	The Applicant has amended the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) to state at paragraph 1.3.5 that the detailed LEMP will describe the habitats to be created alongside detailed information on their establishment, management and monitoring. The LEMP

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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 “vegetation that is likely to be planted as part of the Proposed Development as part of the wider mitigation and enhancement strategy” 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>	<p>will also detail the location and extent of proposed planting by inclusion of planting plans and species lists.</p>
Historic Environment			
ExQR29	Q11.0.1 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Baseline evidence from trial trenching results are required to inform a reasonable and appropriate agreed mitigation strategy which can adequately deal with the developmental impact of this scheme upon the currently surviving significant archaeology. Standard archaeological mitigation includes preservation in situ (where an area of archaeological sensitivity is located and its extent is determined by evaluation then mitigation measures are taken to ensure there are no detrimental impacts for the duration of the scheme) or preservation by record (where an archaeological</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the importance of ensuring that an appropriate evidence base informs a proportionate and effective Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS).</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>area is archaeologically investigated by for example Strip, Map and Record (SMR) or Excavation then the site is released for use by the Developer). Additional mitigation measures requiring flexibility such as micro-siting undertaken, and why either further trial trenching or other form of investigation should or should not be carried out. require enough baseline evidence to know the extent of an archaeological area to move out of and also blank areas to know where it's safe to move into. Mitigation measures which propose preservation in situ while using archaeological areas for the development, such as concrete shoes, require enough baseline evidence for an understanding of the nature, depth, significance and extent of the archaeology so that the mitigation area can be determined. There must also be demonstrable adequate proof that the proposed mitigation measures would not detrimentally impact the surviving archaeology in any way throughout the lifetime of the scheme. It is not only groundworks and compaction but also for example changes to the hydrology or soil chemistry which can damage and destroy surviving archaeology without allowing for their preservation by record. For this scheme, 29 sites of archaeological interest have so far been identified and further trenching evaluation has yet to be undertaken allowing for further sites to be identified across the Order Limits. The archaeological sites themselves will need to be sufficiently investigated to be understood enough to deal with the developmental impacts on these sites, and each site will need sufficient baseline evidence of its nature, significance, depth and extent to inform the fit for purpose mitigation measures necessary to protect and/or investigate these currently surviving areas of archaeology</p>	<p>To date, a phased programme of archaeological evaluation and assessment has been undertaken for the One Earth Solar Farm. This programme has been designed to meet the requirements of the NPPF (2023), NPS EN-1 (2024) and EN-3 (2024), and aligns with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standards and Guidance for Evaluation. The results have informed the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038] and the DCO submission, in accordance with EN-1 paragraph 5.9.11 and EN-3 paragraph 2.10.113.</p> <p>The evaluation has included a desk-based assessment and a proportionate programme of field work combining non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023).</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that additional evaluation is required to fully inform the AMS. Accordingly, an additional phase of trial trenching is secured as a pre-commencement requirement through the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI). This will be carried out in the remaining 20 of the 29 currently identified areas of archaeological interest, and the areas where the impact of the Proposed Development is expected to be high.</p> <p>The results of this additional trenching will be used to finalise the AMS, ensuring it is supported by a proportionate and robust evidence base describing nature, significance, depth and extent of the archaeological assets present.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>Mitigation will then be tailored to the findings and will follow the standard archaeological hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance/preservation in situ, achieved through design flexibility (including micro-siting, exclusion zones and, where appropriate, use of alternative foundation methods such as concrete shoes in Areas of Archaeological Constraint). • Preservation by record, through targeted excavation methods such as Strip, Map and Record or full excavation, where preservation in situ is not feasible. • Monitoring and watching briefs, applied in lower-sensitivity areas where residual risk remains. <p>The OWSI also secures the appointment of an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) to oversee all ground-disturbing activities (including construction, maintenance and decommissioning) and to ensure that mitigation remains effective throughout the project lifetime. This includes safeguarding of preserved areas from secondary effects such as compaction, drainage changes or soil chemistry alteration that have the potential to pose a risk to archaeological assets.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>This phased approach will ensure that informed decisions can be made about where development can proceed without risk to the archaeological resource, where archaeological assets require protection, and where further investigation or mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>On this basis, the Applicant is confident that an appropriate mitigation strategy can be agreed and secured through the DCO. This strategy will ensure that the surviving archaeology is either protected in situ or preserved by record, in a manner proportionate to its significance, and safeguarded throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p>
ExQR30	Q11.0.1 Nottinghamshire County Council	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. 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 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.	The Applicant acknowledges the importance of establishing a robust and proportionate baseline to inform the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) and agrees that evaluation trenching is essential to determine the presence, character, and significance of archaeological remains. An additional phase of trenching is therefore secured through the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) as a pre-commencement requirement. This will investigate the remaining locations of archaeological potential identified through desk-based and geophysical assessment, and the areas where the impact of the Proposed Development is expected to be high.



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>Footnote 94 of NPS EN-3 states 'The results of pre-determination archaeological evaluation inform the design of the scheme and related archaeological planning conditions.' 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 postconsent, of escalating costs, significant construction delays, delivery issues and damage to archaeological remains that could otherwise be avoided.</p>	<p>To date, evaluation trenching has been carried out in areas of greatest sensitivity and limited design flexibility (such as the substation and BESS locations), and in locations identified by the Local Planning Authorities and Historic England as being of particular archaeological interest, including Ragnall. This targeted approach ensured that the most critical areas were investigated prior to submission, providing sufficient evidence to inform the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038] of the Environmental Statement and the DCO submission, in accordance with EN-1 paragraph 5.9.11, EN-3 paragraph 2.10.113, and with paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that the significance of heritage assets is understood through proportionate investigation, including intrusive evaluation where appropriate.</p> <p>The evaluation strategy followed the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023) and comprised a combination of non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that additional evaluation is required to complete the baseline and inform the final Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS). Accordingly, an additional phase of trenching is secured through the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) as a pre-commencement requirement. This will investigate the remaining locations of archaeological potential identified through desk-based and geophysical assessment, and the areas where the impact of the Proposed Development is expected to be significant.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>This additional phase of trenching ensures that the level of evaluation will be sufficient to fully inform the AMS and the mitigation strategy prior to the commencement of development. This approach is consistent with national policy, professional guidance, and established practice across other solar DCO schemes.</p> <p>Additionally, the Proposed Development retains sufficient flexibility in its design and layout to respond to archaeological constraints identified through this additional evaluation, ensuring that the results of the trial trenching and subsequent AMS can be effectively implemented without introducing new likely significant effects. The areas allocated for elements with the least flexibility in design (such as BESS and substation sites) have already been subject to full trial trenching evaluation, in line with the scope agreed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. This reduces risk and provides robust baseline evidence in these critical locations.</p> <p>The OWSI also secures the appointment of an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW), who will oversee all ground-disturbing activities, including construction, maintenance, and decommissioning, and ensure that mitigation measure remain effective throughout the lifetime of the scheme, including safeguarding preserved areas from indirect impacts such as compaction, hydrological change, and soil chemistry alteration</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>On this basis, the Applicant is confident that the risks identified in relation to cost, programme or delivery can be appropriately managed, and that surviving archaeological remains will be safeguarded through a proportionate and robust strategy agreed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England.</p>
ExQR31	Q11.0.1 Historic England	<p>Q.11.0.1 asks that 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. Our position would be that in locations where there remains high potential for sensitive and important remains unquantified by trial trenching, if the investigation of these areas is to be pushed to post DCO, it is important that this work is secured through requirements, such that the results of those investigations carried out promptly post-DCO can inform adaptive detailing of the scheme and / or mitigation as appropriate.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that additional evaluation is required to inform the final Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS). An additional phase of trenching is therefore secured through the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) as a pre-commencement requirement. This will investigate the remaining locations of archaeological potential identified through desk-based and geophysical assessment, and the areas where the impact of the Proposed Development is expected to be significant.</p> <p>The evaluation work to inform the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038] and the DCO submission, as per EN-1 Paragraph 5.9.11, EN-3 Paragraph 2.10.113 and Paragraph 207 of the NPPF, included an appropriate desk-based assessment followed by proportionate evaluation work which, in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023), encompasses a combination of non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant's decision to undertake this additional evaluation at post-consent stage was taken to avoid unnecessary and disproportionate harm to the archaeological resource, which could result from extensive intrusive trenching being undertaken at a time when there is no certainty that the Proposed Development will proceed, or in areas subsequently removed from the DCO Order Limits (such are the fields around the Roman Fort and Two Marching Camps Scheduled Monument). This approach follows the ethical principle set out in ClfA guidance to minimise harm, and reflects accepted practice in comparable DCO solar schemes.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that where post-consent evaluation is proposed, it must be secured through enforceable requirements and carried out enough in advance to inform adaptive detailing of the scheme and/or appropriate mitigation. The flexibility retained within the Proposed Development layout allows for the required mitigation to be implemented in response to the results of further evaluation. The final Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) will be informed by this evidence and agreed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England</p> <p>On this basis, the Applicant considers that the investigations undertaken to date are proportionate and adequate to inform decision-making at the DCO stage, and that the secured post-consent evaluation provides a clear and enforceable mechanism to ensure that significant archaeological remains are identified, understood and safeguarded through a fit-for-purpose AMS.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
ExQR32	Q11.0.2 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>(3) Regarding concrete shoes, there must be sufficient evaluation to provide baseline evidence for any areas where concrete shoes are proposed. Some currently surviving archaeology may be to a sufficient depth and of a nature that would not be detrimentally impacted by concrete shoes, their placement, settlement across many decades or removal. In other cases the placement of concrete shoes would not mitigate developmental impact, rather it would destroy surviving archaeology through compaction and any associated groundworks. On another solar NSIP in Lincolnshire when trenching commenced unexpected Saxon skeletons were found within 20cm of the ground surface. Concrete shoes, and indeed any plant tracking over this area would have resulted in their being crushed and unrecorded as a direct impact of the development works. Regarding the use of concrete shoes then, like any potential mitigation measure its use must first be informed by sufficient evaluation to understand the nature, depth, extent and significance of the surviving archaeology or it cannot be proved that the impact is not harmful. (4) Any type of piling will go deeper than the archaeological horizon. Surviving archaeological deposits are usually less than a metre from the ground surface and often significantly shallower particularly in agricultural land where topsoil has been reduced. As well as the piling itself there is the potential impact of the removal of the piles during decommissioning and potentially during repowering through the operational period of the scheme. As a detailed methodology has not yet been provided by the Applicant, the potential impacts are also not known.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the effectiveness of any mitigation measure, including concrete shoes, piling or micrositng, depends on the understanding of the archaeological baseline. For this reason, the programme of archaeological investigations undertaken to date, and those to be carried out pre-commencement and secured through DCO Requirements, has been designed to provide proportionate and sufficient evidence to inform the final AMS.</p> <p>The evaluation work to inform the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038] and the DCO submission was undertaken in accordance with EN-1 Paragraph 5.9.11, EN-3 Paragraph 2.10.113, and Paragraph 207 of the NPPF. It included a desk-based assessment followed by proportionate field evaluation work which, in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023), encompasses a combination of non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>With regard to concrete shoes, the Applicant does not propose these as universal solutions but as options that may be appropriate in specific Areas of Archaeological Constraint. Their use will only be considered where evaluation demonstrates that such measures would not cause harm to significant remains. As such, their application will be informed by the results of further trenching evaluation, presented in the OWSI. Additionally, the OWSI will also secure an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) to monitor implementation and ensure that any mitigation applied is demonstrably effective throughout construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>On this basis, the Applicant considers that the approach adopted provides a proportionate and enforceable framework for managing archaeological risk, ensuring that mitigation measures are informed by sufficient evaluation and tailored to the nature, depth, extent, and significance of surviving remains.</p>
ExQR33	Q11.0.2 Historic England	Q.11.0.2 asks that the applicant discuss whether alternative solutions been explored to piling, such as shoes. We would emphasise that shoes are part of a palette of techniques for mitigating risk to archaeological features, with open space, excavation etc also being options. However, in order for this post-DCO approach to be successful, there needs to be staged yet flexible approach, informed by the additional archaeological data collected to present a measured and justified approach to minimising harm to the historic environment.	The Applicant confirms that alternatives to piling have been considered as part of the Proposed Development's mitigation strategy. Concrete shoes are one such option, but they are not proposed as a universal solution. Instead, they form part of a suit of mitigation techniques, which also includes micrositeing, preservation in situ (through design refinements or archaeological exclusion zones), and preservation by record (such as Strip, Map and Record or excavation). The choice of technique in any given location will depend on the nature, depth, significance and extent of the archaeological remains identified through evaluation.

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant has not committed to any single 'no-dig' foundation solution. Flexibility has been retained in the design of the Proposed Development to ensure that the most appropriate and proportionate mitigation measure can be applied on a case-by-case basis, informed by the results of additional evaluation and in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams and Historic England.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the effectiveness of any mitigation measure depends on the understanding of the archaeological baseline. For this reason, the programme of archaeological investigations undertaken to date, and those to be carried out pre-commencement and secured through DCO Requirements, has been designed to provide proportionate and sufficient evidence to inform the AMS.</p>
ExQR34	Q11.0.2 (3-4) Nottinghamshire County Council	(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	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the effectiveness of any mitigation measure, including concrete shoes, piling or micrositng, depends on the understanding of the archaeological baseline. For this reason, the programme of archaeological investigations undertaken to date, and those to be carried out pre-commencement and secured through DCO Requirements, has been designed to provide proportionate and sufficient evidence to inform the AMS.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>cannot be evaluated once constructed making 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 encountered at between 25cm and 1m in depth. Therefore, 3m deep piles will go through and certainly impact any archaeological remains present</p>	<p>The evaluation work to inform the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038] and the DCO submission, as per EN-1 Paragraph 5.9.11, EN-3 Paragraph 2.10.113 and Paragraph 207 of the NPPF, included a desk-based assessment followed by proportionate evaluation field work which, in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023), encompasses a combination of non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork.</p> <p>With regard to concrete shoes, the Applicant does not propose these as universal solutions but as options that may be appropriate in specific Areas of Archaeological Constraint, and only where evaluation demonstrates that such measures would not cause harm to significant remains. As such, their application will be informed by the results of further trenching evaluation, presented in the OWSI. Additionally, the OWSI will also secure an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) to monitor implementation and ensure that any mitigation applied is demonstrably effective throughout construction, operation and decommissioning.</p>
ExQR35	Q11.0.3 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>(3) The usefulness of the ability to microsite is entirely informed by the results of sufficient archaeological evaluation: one has to know where the significant archaeology is, and is not, in order to microsite effectively. Like every other mitigation technique there needs to be site-specific understanding of where there are archaeological areas and a working understanding of their nature, significance, depth and extent in order to inform reasonable fit for purpose mitigation measures. Given that trenching results are the basis for mitigation solutions through the design process are proposed for this scheme we recommend that the evaluation work is undertaken earlier rather than later to build capacity and to manage archaeological risk: the earlier the evaluation fieldwork is undertaken the more flexibility there is and the work is informed by the baseline evidence of the trenching results. A trenching evaluation shortly before the commencement of the main construction</p>	

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		work programme would leave little time or adaptability for design changes.	<p>The Applicant recognises that microsites is only effective when informed by robust evaluation data. For this reason, the trenching carried out to date has already targeted the areas of least design flexibility (including the BESS and substation sites) to ensure that baseline evidence is available where it is most critical. In the remaining areas, which retain greater flexibility of design and layout, additional trial trenching will be undertaken post-consent but secured as a pre-commencement requirement. This will provide the necessary baseline evidence to inform microsites and other mitigation measures, ensuring that avoidance of sensitive archaeology remains practicable and effective.</p> <p>The timing of this additional trenching reflects a balanced approach: carrying out extensive intrusive evaluation pre-consent would risk unnecessary harm to the archaeological resource at a stage when there is no certainty the scheme will proceed. Postponing it to the pre-commencement stage avoids this disproportionate impact, while ensuring that results are available in sufficient time to inform detailed design and mitigation. This approach aligns with ClfA's requirement to minimise harm to the historic environment and reflects established practice in comparable solar NSIP projects.</p>
ExQR36	Q11.0.3 (3) Nottinghamshire County Council	(3) Microsites 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 microsites is intended to promote. Microsites 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.	
ExQR37	Q11.0.4 Lincolnshire County Council	(2) The former North Clifton Station and the associated Station Master's House are historically and functionally linked, forming a coherent group with shared architectural and historic value. While the Environmental Statement references the Station, it does not appear to fully address the	The Applicant's Response to Q11.0.4 is provided in [REP2-084] which summarises the approach to the assessment of these heritage assets.

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		group value or the contribution of the Station Master's House/associated assets. The proposed development may result in harm to the significance of this group through changes to their setting, particularly in views from the south and east, due to the introduction of solar arrays in adjacent grassland. LCC would recommend, further assessment work for these assets. Mitigation measures, such as targeted screening, should be explored to reduce potential harm. As these buildings lie outside Lincolnshire, the Council defers to the professional advice of Nottinghamshire County Council regarding their assessment and management.	NSDC have subsequently confirmed in their Response to ExQ1 [REP2-087] that they no longer believe the former North Clifton Station to qualify as a non-designated heritage asset. NCC, in their response to ExQ1 [REP2-088], do not raise specific comments and defer to NSDC in this regard. Therefore, given that LCC defer to NCC, and NCC defer to NSDC - who have confirmed that further assessment is not considered to be necessary - is the Applicant considers that the information already provided is proportionate and sufficient.
Hydrology and Hydrogeology and the Water Environment			
ExQR38	Q12.0.4 Lincolnshire County Council	There are no details provided yet. The oOEMP [REP1-050] states on Page 26: "The detailed SuDS Maintenance Schedule will include a regular schedule for visual inspection and maintenance of the surface water drainage network." When this is provided we can confirm if the details are satisfactory to ensure surface water drainage will be maintained acceptably.	Table 4-10 of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-043] sets out an indicative SuDS Maintenance Schedule and will form the basis of the detailed schedule which will be provided within the OEMP.
ExQR39	Q.12.0.4 Nottinghamshire County Council	The SuDS Maintenance proposals outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment (ref: 14529A30-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. 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 longterm effectiveness. We would also expect to see	As indicated by NCC's response, Table 4-10 of the FRA and Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-043] sets out an indicative SuDS Maintenance Schedule and will form the basis of the schedule which will be provided within the OEMP. The maintenance activities set out within Table 4-10 are based on guidance provided within the CIRIA SuDS Manual.

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		who will be responsible for maintaining the SuDS drainage features going forward.	The FRA indicates on page 53 that “Post construction, the Applicant would be responsible for the SuDS included within the Proposed Development” and it is confirmed that the Applicant will be responsible to ensure that the proposed SuDS features are maintained. This may be through the instruction of a third party maintenance operator.
ExQR40	Q12.0.4 Environment Agency	The applicant proposes to produce a “detailed SuDS Maintenance Schedule” (REP1-049 7.5.1 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (Rev 2), Table 3.4). In principle, this document should be sufficient, but we cannot provide further comment until it is available for review. We look forward to seeing this and providing comment in due course. We expect to see information on maintenance of the BESS, including systems to capture firewater and ensure serviceability of any automatic penstock valves.	Table 4-10 of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-043] sets out an indicative SuDS Maintenance Schedule and will form the basis of the schedule which will be provided within the OEMP.
ExQR41	Q12.0.5 Anglian Water	The application submission documents, oCEMP, oOEMP and oDEMP do identify risks, mitigation and a monitoring regime regarding these issues but in general terms only. Anglian Water ask that the detailed versions of these documents make specific reference to the fact that there is an abstraction location nearby and that there is the potential for contamination affecting water quality to be caused, depending on different practices as demonstrated above. We would wish to be able to comment on the further versions of the document prior to their finalisation.	<p>The oCEMP, oOEMP and oDEMP are outline in nature however, the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP will provide further detail with regards to risks, mitigation and monitoring requirements. In preparing the final detailed management plans, reference will be made to the specific abstraction location that Anglian Water refer to.</p> <p>Anglian Water has been added as named consultee for the management plans referred to in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		Anglian Water request to be added as a named consultee on these documents under the requirements in the DCO to discharge these documents.	
ExQR42	Q12.0.5 Environment Agency	<p>We would expect all the normal pollution prevention protocols in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP, and fluid breakout plan for HDD. This is discussed in the WFD report (sections 4 and 5). BESS drainage design is also mentioned; the relevant documents are not referenced but we know they exist and have seen them. Assuming all these are in place, sufficiently robust, and adhered to, I would anticipate any risks to WFD Groundwater bodies are not significant and the WFD can be complied with.</p> <p>The WFD Screening Assessment contains sufficient pollution prevention which are also listed in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP. There is one discrepancy between section 5.1.7 of the WFD Assessment and the CEMP for the minimum distance below the bed of the watercourse for cable crossings that needs to be clarified. Additionally, the bentonite fluid breakout plan and the Water Management Plan have not yet been submitted and will need to be reviewed, however we consider that providing these are compiled with there are no outstanding WFD concerns.</p>	<p>The discrepancy in Section 5.1.7 will be addressed within an updated WFD Screening Assessment submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>With regards to the Bentonite Fluid Breakout Plan and Water Management Plan, it is intended that these be produced at detailed design as part of the management plans.</p>
ExQR43	Q12.0.7 Anglian Water	Anglian Water recommends the Applicant undertakes further engagement on its requirement for potable water (domestic and non-domestic purposes) at the different stages of the Project. Given the preliminary estimation of water demand figures quoted in the ES and Project delivery timescales, it would be prudent to undertake this as soon as possible and	The Water Resource Assessment is being prepared and will be submitted for Anglian Water's review as soon as possible. Anglian Water is aware of this, following a call on 12 September 2025.

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		submit a pre-planning enquiry including a completed WRA. This should indicate those temporary requirements for water supply at the construction stage. Given the nature of the scheme, it is likely this will require the most amount of water resource in the shorter term.	
ExQR44	Q12.0.11 Environment Agency	In general, yes, we are content that all measures listed provide sufficient mitigation for the protection of controlled waters. However additional containment measures around storage of materials and clarifying details about the foul water strategy should be provided in the CEMP.	<p>Table 3.5 of the oCEMP [REP2-049] includes the following statements with regards to containment around material storage and foul runoff:</p> <p><i>“Storage of Materials The CEMP(s) will incorporate measures set out in relevant Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) Guidance (Ref. 12 in References). In addition to those measures set out above in this table, examples of such measures include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Placing arisings and temporary stockpiles outside of the Flood Zone 3 flood extent and away from drainage systems. If areas located within Flood Zone 2 are to be utilised for the storage of construction materials, then a standard rules permit will be sought from the EA;</i> <i>• Containment measures will be implemented, including drip trays, bunding or double-skinned tanks of fuels and oils;</i> <i>• All chemicals would be stored in accordance with their Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) guidelines, whilst spill kits will be provided in areas of fuel/oil/minor chemicals storage;</i> <i>• An emergency spillage plan will be produced, which site staff will have read and confirmed that they understand, via the site induction;</i>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mixing and handling of materials would be undertaken in designated areas and away from surface water drains; • Plant and machinery will be kept away from surface waterbodies wherever possible and would have drip trays installed beneath oil tanks/engines/gearboxes and hydraulics, which would be checked and emptied regularly. Refueling and delivery areas would be located away from surface water drains; • No machinery or spoil/materials would be stored within the identified flood extent, to ensure no impact to contractors, or deviation in flow routes due to the proposed works. • Exposed ground and stockpiles would be protected as appropriate and practicable to prevent windblown migration of potential contaminants. Water suppression would be used if there is a risk of fugitive dust emissions.” <p>and</p> <p>“foul water from any site compound (including temporary toilets) will be tankered away to an appropriate disposal facility by a licensed waste disposal contractor.”</p> <p>However, further measures can be discussed and agreed with the EA at detailed design and in preparation of the CEMP, and it is noted in this respect that the EA would be a consultee to the approval of the CEMP under Requirement 13.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
ExQR45	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	Local communities, including parish councils and residents within the vicinity, have expressed significant concern that the proposed 4,000-acre One Earth Solar Farm development presents an unacceptable risk to this protected water environment. Potential sources of pollution, including from large-scale construction activity, 2 massive BESS sites (totalling 740MW), 196 large solar inverters, extensive buried cabling and infrastructure, and the long-term degradation of synthetic materials, raise legitimate questions regarding compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires planning decisions to avoid pollution and to contribute to the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes and natural assets.	<p>As set out in Items 7.4.32 to 7.4.34 within Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [REP2-024]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drinking Water Protected Areas (Surface Water) are defined as locations where raw water is abstracted from rivers, lakes, canals or reservoirs for human consumption. The Order Limits are partially located within the Drinking Water Protected Area (Surface Water) associated with the 'Trent from Carlton-on-Trent to Laughton Drain' waterbody. This Protected Area covers the majority of the eastern area of the Order Limits and portions of the western area. The Protected Area is classified as 'currently not at risk'. • Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (Surface Water) are defined as catchment areas that influence the water quality for their respective Drinking Water Protected Area (Surface Water), and are identified where the Protected Area is classified as "at risk" of failing the WFD drinking water protection objectives. The Order Limits are not located within or nearby to any Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Surface Water). • Drinking Water Groundwater Safeguard Zones are established around public water supplies where additional pollution control measures are needed. The Order Limits are not located within or nearby to any Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater). <p>With regards to potential sources of pollution and mitigation during construction and operation, a response covering these points has already been provided to Relevant</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>Representation RR.050 within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the Proposed Development complies with the relevant paragraphs in the NPPF, in terms of avoiding pollution and contributing to the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes and natural assets.</p>
ExQR46	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	<p>Given the scale of the proposed development and its proximity to critical water infrastructure, there is a clear and overriding need to ensure that statutory protections are upheld and that precautionary principles are applied. The safeguarding of the River Trent corridor, its ecosystems, and its role in securing drinking water supplies must be regarded as paramount considerations in the planning balance.</p> <p>Given the potentially significant impacts of constructing a large-scale solar development in close proximity to critical water infrastructure and protected ecosystems, a rigorous precautionary approach is warranted. Planning authorities and inspectors must weigh renewable energy benefits against statutory duties to protect water quality, ecological integrity, and public supplies.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the need to protect the River Trent, its ecosystems and abstractions and considers the measures set out within the management plans (oCEMP, oOEMP and oDEMP), WFD Screening Assessment [APP-097] and Flood Risk Assessment (including Drainage Strategy) [REP2-043] address these satisfactorily and the Proposed Development is therefore considered acceptable with regard to its impact on water quality, supply and ecological integrity.</p>
ExQR47	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	<p>Surface conditions and construction-sourced runoff from a development of this scale present a significant pollution risk to both groundwater and the network of dykes, drains, and ditches that ultimately feed into the River Trent. Large areas of soil disturbance, heavy vehicle movements, and vegetation clearance can mobilise sediments, oils, fuels, and other</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant's responses to Internal Reference Numbers ExQR45 and ExQR16 within this document.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		contaminants, which in turn can enter surface water pathways. Given the permeability of the underlying soils and the hydrological connectivity of agricultural drains to groundwater and the river system, such runoff can accelerate the transfer of pollutants into Drinking Water Protected Areas, degrading water quality and undermining the ecological and chemical objectives set out under the Water Framework Directive. The cumulative effect could compromise both sensitive habitats and the integrity of the public water supply.	
ExQR48	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	<p>The proposed development also raises wider concerns regarding the disruption of key water cycle components, particularly soil moisture redistribution and local hydrological balance. Large-scale groundworks, compaction from construction traffic, and the installation of extensive impermeable and semi-permeable infrastructure can alter natural infiltration patterns, reduce soil water retention, and accelerate surface runoff. Such changes risk modifying the flow regimes of connected ditches, drains, and groundwater pathways, with potential knock-on effects for both water availability and water quality. In a sensitive catchment feeding directly into the River Trent and a designated Drinking Water Protected Area, these hydrological alterations could undermine the resilience of local ecosystems and compromise the long-term security of the public water supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The imperviousness of solar panels alters how rainwater is distributed: moisture tends to accumulate at the fronts of panels while under-panel areas may be drier. • Simulations in arid regions (e.g., American Southwest) show net reductions in evapotranspiration, yet altered local 	<p>The difference in soil moisture and microclimatic change is expected to be negligible. As there is reduced agricultural pressure the soil organic matter and overall soil health will improve during the duration of the scheme. The increased soil organic matter will help to improve soil moisture and retention capacity. Runoff is also expected to be negligible if the SMP is followed due to the increased soil organic matter.</p> <p>Measures to manage runoff during construction are included within Table 3.5 of the oCEMP [REP2-049]. With regards to impacts on drinking water protected areas, refer to the Applicant's responses to Internal Reference Numbers ExQR45 and ExQR16 within this document.</p> <p>With regards to surface water runoff, refer to the following responses already provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant's response to ExA question 12.0.9 within [REP2-084].

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>humidity and wind patterns—highlighting complex effects on the water cycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil moisture, temperature, evaporation: LSSFs significantly alter these components, potentially compromising natural moisture retention and local climate regulation. • Such disruptions could influence river levels or groundwater balance critical for drinking water supplies. <p>Runoff, Infiltration, and Erosion Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSSFs, with their large impervious surfaces, can increase surface runoff, particularly under certain panel orientations and land slopes. • Infiltration suffers, especially in compacted or denuded soil, reducing groundwater recharge—a red flag if a reservoir depends partially on aquifer recharge. • During both installation and operation, soil erosion and sedimentation can spike, risking clogging or contaminating nearby water sources with sediment-laden runoff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant's response to Written Representation REP1-131 (internal reference WR71) within [REP2-082]. <p>The responses above conclude that the surface water drainage measures set out are anticipated to provide sufficient mitigation to ensure that there would be a negligible impact on surface water runoff when compared to the existing situation. With this in mind, there are no anticipated impacts on the receptors raised by SCPC.</p>
ExQR49	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	<p>Chemical and Thermal Pollutants • Potential chemical runoff—from panel-cleaning agents, lubricants, herbicides, or dust washoff—that could degrade water quality in the drinking water aquifer and ditches feeding the river.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elevated surface or water temperatures—particularly in floating PV setups—can raise water temperature, harming aquatic ecosystems and possibly contributing to chemical imbalances or reduced oxygen levels. 	<p>During the operational life of each solar panel, maintenance operations will ensure that no chemicals or heavy metals will be released from within the panels. Any damaged panels would be removed and replaced in accordance with the oOEMP [REP2-051]. Panels that are correctly maintained will not result in any release of chemicals or heavy metals to the environment. If there is any unexpected contamination from activities on site, this would be managed through measures detailed and secured within the oCEMP [REP2-049], oOEMP [REP2-051], and oDEMP [REP2-053], with these measures ensuring that there will be no adverse impacts to the groundwater receptors or any surface water features.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>Solar PV panels will be cleaned using only clean deionised water (as specified in the oOEMP [REP2-051]), therefore there will be no cleaning agents used during this process. With respect to herbicides, if the use of these is required, it will be restricted to small quantities, and the use of these will be managed to ensure protection of ground and surface water. Method statements or operating procedures to detail how herbicides should be used are secured as part of the oOEMP [REP2-051], with mitigation to include having exclusion buffers close to watercourses, working in dry conditions, and not working during high winds.</p> <p>The presence of the ground-mounted solar PV arrays will not result in any alteration to normal atmospheric temperatures, so will not result in an increase in the temperature of groundwater or surface water features. Floating solar PV set-ups do not form a part of the proposed One Earth Solar Farm.</p>
ExQR50	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	Microclimate and Heat Island Effects • LSSFs can create photovoltaic heat island effects, elevating local night-time temperatures by 3–4 °C in some regions. This alteration can change local humidity and wind patterns, indirectly affecting evaporation, moisture retention, and hydrological balance. • In water-scarce regions—where water availability is already fragile—these effects are amplified, posing heightened risk to ecosystems and drinking water reserves.	The Proposed Development includes significant landscape planting, groundcover management, and biodiversity enhancements, all of which help moderate localised microclimatic effects and avoid bare ground heat accumulation typical of desert-based studies. Recent studies undertaken by Lancaster University has shown solar panels may actually dampen temperature extremes, reducing soil and air temperatures under the arrays during summer months and stabilising microclimatic conditions, rather than intensifying them. For other Solar DCO projects, such as Springwell Solar Farm [EN010149], PINs have agreed heat and radiation can be scoped out from

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			further consideration due to the scale and nature of the Proposed Development being unlikely to result in significant sources of heat and radiation.
ExQR51	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	Thermal-runaway and firewater contamination from BESS and inverter fires. Lithium-ion battery failures release toxic gases (notably hydrogen fluoride generated from LiPF ₆ electrolytes) and particulates; firefighting run-off can entrain dissolved fluoride, organics and metals to surface drains, ditches, dykes and shallow groundwater. Incidents at large BESS sites have required evacuations and extensive environmental response, illustrating realistic source-term magnitudes. With only “2 hours” of on-site containment capacity, credible multi-container or prolonged reignition events could exceed containment, discharging to the DWPA catchment, adjacent reservoir and the water treatment works’ intake. This creates a pathway for deterioration of chemical status and for DWPA treatment-burden increases contrary to Article 7/WFD objectives transposed in the Regulations.	<p>The Applicant has received a response from the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) who have outlined that they are comfortable with the impact of the Hydrogen Fluoride plume that has been modelled for the scheme and conclude that the overall potential for impact ‘would probably be low’.</p> <p>The 2 hour guidance is the current direct guidance from the NFCC and should this guidance change between consent and construction then the Applicant has committed in its outline Battery Safety Management Plan to following the prevailing guidance at the time of construction.</p>
ExQR52	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	Construction and operational runoff over 4,000 acres. Major greenfield solar schemes routinely identify risks of siltation, hydrocarbon/chemical spills and altered hydrology during construction and maintenance; these affect small ditches and ordinary watercourses that feed the main river and, in a DWPA, can drive status deterioration and failure of protected-area objectives if not fully controlled. The scale here (4,000 acres; 196 inverter/transformer compounds; extensive tracks) increases cumulative runoff and spill pathways; any exceedance of temporary controls (e.g., during intense	<p>Measures to manage runoff during construction are included within Table 3.5 of the oCEMP [REP2-049].</p> <p>The WFD Screening Assessment [APP-097] considers the objectives of the RBMP and concludes that: “Taking into account the embedded measures and construction mitigation, it is concluded that neither the operational or construction stages of the development will cause or contribute to deterioration of the existing watercourses or groundwater bodies or jeopardise their potential to achieve good status.”</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		rainfall) could undermine RBMP measures and the “no deterioration” duty	The principles of the WFD Screening Assessment have been agreed with the EA as set out in the EA’s response to the ExA’s question 12.0.5 (internal reference 103) of this document.
ExQR53	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	Permanently buried polymeric infrastructure (up to 7,800 tonnes XLPE cables). While XLPE itself is inert in normal service, long-term ageing, mechanical damage, and water-treeing can generate fragments and microplastics; soils are recognised sinks and vectors for microplastics with demonstrated ecological and biogeochemical effects. In a high-water-table, sandy agricultural setting with episodic ponding/waterlogging, any progressive release from damaged sheathing or decommissioned cables left in situ could contribute to diffuse pollution loads to drains and shallow groundwater—antithetical to DWPA objectives to avoid deterioration and reduce treatment burdens. (This mechanism warrants a precautionary assessment given the volumes proposed.)	<p>The decommissioning approach will be reviewed before this phase of work begins and carried out in accordance with industry guidance, relevant legislation, and government policy in force at the time – see paragraph 1.1.7 of the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [REP2-053] which provides:</p> <p><i>The mode of cable decommissioning for the grid connection and other underground cables will be dependent upon government policy and best practice at that time. Currently, the most environmentally acceptable option is leaving the cables in situ, as this avoids disturbance to overlying land and habitats and to neighbouring communities. Alternatively, the cables can be removed by opening the ground at regular intervals and pulling the cable through to the extraction point, avoiding the need to open cut the entire length of the cable route.</i></p> <p>The current approach taken is the industry standard that is currently employed on most if not all solar NSIPs. The applicant is aware of some research that suggests the potential for contamination. In any event if industry standards recommend the removal of cables at the time of decommissioning this approach will be reconsidered. The current approach is adopted as it minimises soil damage</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			and disturbance and is considered less impactful environmentally, as recorded in the oDEMP extract above. Since the cables are buried below the depth of agricultural activity, and in agreement with Natural England, it is currently considered best to leave them in situ to further reduce soil disturbance.
ExQR54	Response to ExAQ1 South Clifton Parish Council	Why this risks failure against specific WFD duties 1. No-deterioration & good-status objectives (regs. 13–15). The combination of large hazardous sources (two BESS compounds, 196 inverter/transformer locations), limited onsite containment (“2 hours”), and proximity to surface pathways to a reservoir/intake means that credible single- or multi-point incidents could cause short-term chemical spikes and longer-term diffuse loading, amounting to deterioration or preventing the achievement of good status. 2. Protected-area (DWPA) objectives. Article 7/DWPA duties (as implemented) aim to avoid deterioration to reduce required purification at the works. Introducing persistent risk sources inside the DWPA/Safeguard Zone conflicts with these aims unless the applicant evidences that (i) containments are robust for credible worst-case scenarios, (ii) pathways are interrupted in all hydrological conditions, and (iii) residual risk does not increase treatment need. On current parameters (scale; hazardous inventory; limited containment), that evidential burden is unmet. 3. Regulation 19 (derogation) test. If the scheme would cause deterioration or prevent achieving objectives, the promoter would need to seek a reg. 19 exemption. They must prove overriding public interest, lack of significantly better environmental options, and full mitigation of adverse impacts. The availability of alternative	<p>The WFD Screening Assessment [APP-097] considers the objectives of the RBMP and concludes that: “Taking into account the embedded measures and construction mitigation, it is concluded that neither the operational or construction stages of the development will cause or contribute to deterioration of the existing watercourses or groundwater bodies or jeopardise their potential to achieve good status.”</p> <p>The principles of the WFD Screening Assessment have been agreed with the EA as set out in the EA’s response to the ExA’s question 12.0.5 (internal reference 103) of this document.</p> <p>See responses to each point raised below:</p> <p><u>Item 1</u></p> <p>Consideration of polluted runoff from a fire within the BESS areas has been made within the surface water drainage design. Firstly, the SuDS features serving these areas will have an impermeable lining to impede the infiltration of potential contaminants to the ground and groundwater (i.e. removing the pathway).</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>siting/layouts outside the DWPA/reservoir influence and/or with materially greater containment capacity would make passing the “no better environmental options” limb difficult.</p> <p>Given: (a) siting within a DWPA catchment and adjacent to a reservoir and a water treatment works; (b) the scale of hazardous inventory (two BESS compounds; 196 inverter/transformer units; 7,800 t of buried polymers); and (c) only two hours’ on-site firewater containment, there remains a material risk of deterioration of water-body status and of failure to secure DWPA protection aims. On the evidence base and applicable guidance, the proposal is liable to conflict with the WFD Regulations’ environmental objectives. Any attempt to rely on regulation 19 would need a rigorous alternatives assessment and robust, independently verified demonstration that all feasible mitigation has been incorporated to the maximum extent—standards the current parameters do not appear to meet.</p>	<p>Should a fire occur, and the fire suppression system is activated, a penstock valve downstream of the attenuation basins will be automatically triggered to isolate potentially contaminated discharges to the surrounding watercourses (i.e. removing the pathway). Should this occur, contaminated water would be retained within the basins and tankered away.</p> <p>Furthermore, the potential for a fire to occur at the same time as a rainfall event has been considered and the basins have been sized to provide sufficient storage to attenuate the 1 in 10 year event plus 228m3 of firewater (based on firefighting at 1,900 l/minute for 2 hours, which is in line with current guidance), with no discharge.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-043] sets the above out in further detail.</p> <p><u>Item 2</u></p> <p>Section 8 (2) of the WFD Regulations 2017 indicates the following:</p> <p><i>“For each drinking water protected area, the programme of measures for the river basin district within which it is located must include measures with the aim of avoiding deterioration in the quality of the water in that area, in order to reduce the level of purification treatment required in the production of drinking water abstracted from it.”</i></p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			<p>It is considered that the measures outlined within the WFD Screening Assessment provide mitigation sufficient to avoid the deterioration of water quality in the area.</p> <p><u>Item 3</u></p> <p>The Applicant's position on Regulation 19 has already been set out in their response to ExA question Q12.0.6 within REP2-084.</p>
Land Use and Soils			
ExQR55	Q13.0.1 West Lindsey District Council	WLDC note that the WMS emphasises consideration for solar development of the cumulative impacts on BMV agricultural land where several proposals come forward in the same locality, with the WMS specifically referencing these issues in Lincolnshire "we are increasingly seeing geographical clustering of proposed solar developments in some rural areas, such as in Lincolnshire". The potential impacts on BMV agricultural land of both the One Earth proposal and cumulatively with other NSIP projects in WLDC are of significant concern to the Council.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a cumulative assessment of the impact on BMV land as part of the ES submitted with the Application.</p> <p>The region of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire have significantly high proportions of BMV land compared to the rest of the country. Natural England estimates that around 42% of agricultural land within England is of BMV. The proportion of BMV in Lincolnshire is estimated to be around 71.2%, which is significantly above the national average. The proportion of BMV in Nottinghamshire is calculated to be approximately 49.0%, which is also significantly higher than the national average. The percentage of agricultural land within Lincolnshire was approximately 73.7% of all total land area (based on data from 2022). For Nottinghamshire, this percentage was approximately 85%. If all the 'reasonably foreseeable' schemes within Lincolnshire proceed, the change in land use would be 0.26%. The change in land use in</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			Nottinghamshire (for temporary and permanent schemes) would be 0.14%. A change in land use in the range 0.05% to 5.0% is considered to be 'normal'. Therefore, as the change of land use is considered to be within the normal range the cumulative effects of BMV land is not significant.
ExQR56	Q13.0.2 Lincolnshire County Council	Planning Statement [APP-168] paragraph 11.1.5 to 11.1.7 references the NPS with regard to BMV agricultural land. National policy requires applicants to demonstrate that development of agricultural land is necessary and that impacts are minimised on BMV agricultural land. The applicant then goes on to identify Appendix 1 of APP-168 (site selection report) and ES chapter 4 Alternatives and design evolution as document that set out the justification and necessity to use agricultural land and that the use of BMV has been minimised with no permanent loss. The applicants site selection focused around three fundamental attributes, irradiance and topography, a connection to the National Grid, and available land. The applicant states within section 3, site selection assessment of the site selection report (appendix 1 of APP168)that when determining the location of the proposed development it 'would as far as possible be located outside of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land based on the information known at the time taken from Provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) (England) Map produced by Natural England, noting that this could not always be avoided depending on the overall land quality in the area'. Paragraph 3.2.20 identifies a 10km search area from the developments identified point of connection (PoC). LCC notes the applicant's statement regarding the lack of consistency surrounding search area	<p>In terms of the area of search identified within the Site Selection Report, Appendix 1 of the Planning Statement [APP-168], further work has been undertaken to justify the original 10km distance, and an additional search area of 15km has now been assessed in the Sequential Assessment submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-080]. The Applicant has also provided further justification on the search areas used within the Sequential Test Addendum submitted at Deadline 3 [REP2-080].</p> <p>In terms of the indirect economic impacts, 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.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>size relating to adopted solar NSIPs. However, the main driver for the initial search area appears to be the desire to be in close proximity to the PoC and suitable locations where landowners were agreeable in principle to leasing their land for the proposed development. Further justification could be provided as to why a wider area of search was not considered. Paragraphs 3.3.4 - 3.3.11[APP-168] consider site selection with regard to agricultural land classification and land type. The applicant's approach when considering site location has been to avoid the higher grade 2 land to the south of the development, focusing on the grade 3 and 4. LCC would however highlight that grade 3a is still classified as BMV agricultural land. It is unclear whether a wider area of search was Commented [AR1]: Has the applicant demonstrated the economic argument? All examinations seem to focus on BMV and the direct and indirect jobs created by the solar farm. The Socio Economic chapter considers direct impact of the solar farm on agricultural employment, but not the indirect economic impacts, ie the removal of land from agriculture would also have an impact on the upstream inputs (supply of seed fertilisers, farm machinery etc) and downstream supply chains. This does not seem to have been addressed. adopted, and if so, would there have been suitable land pockets with lower grade classification available for development which would have reduced the impact on BMV land. LCC notes Paragraph 3.3.8 [APP-168] , which states 'Consideration was given as to whether alternative land could be found with less impacts on agricultural land in proximity to the High Marnham Substation. However, from the published information and professional judgement of the technical soils specialists the</p>	<p>This scale of loss is not considered likely to have a significant effect on supply chain farming employment, given the small number of jobs the existing farming practice currently creates and the small amount of loss across the counties.</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>same type of grading is found throughout much of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire and so sites further from the point of connection would be likely to have very similar soil characteristics.' Further justification should be provided as to the area of search and clarification should be given in regard to paragraph 3.3.8, what was the area of search considered from High Marnham substation and what was the justification/reasoning for the distance applied? Neither the socio-economic chapter (chapter 17) nor the Land and Soils chapter (chapter 8) of the ES considers the direct impact of the proposed development on agricultural employment, but not the indirect economic impacts, ie the removal of land from agriculture would also have an impact on the upstream inputs (supply of seed fertilisers, farm machinery etc) and downstream supply chains. This does not seem to have been addressed within their assessment, LCC considers further assessment is needed in relation to this.</p>	
ExQR57	Q13.0.2 Newark and Sherwood District Council	<p>(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,</p>	<p>The Applicant has now provided a full Alternative Site Assessment within the Sequential Test Assessment document submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-080] which considers alternatives, including BMV land as an assessment criterion. It confirms that on balance, no reasonably alternatives sites have been identified.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		that provides reasoned and robust justification of BMV land loss, which remains a key concern for the authority.	In terms of the cumulative impact of the loss of BMV land, the Applicant has provided a district-level breakdown, including the impact of other NSIPs in the relevant districts and counties, at Deadline 3 in the Applicant's Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 2 [EN010159/APP/9.22] (ExA Action 6).
ExQR58	Q13.0.4 Lincolnshire County Council	Generally 'ploughing' would only be affected by cables shallower than 45cm depth. However, it is more likely to be subsoiling and moleploughing activities, both of which can operate at depths of 80+cm, that would be restricted by shallow depth cables. To be on the safe side, cables that are not to be removed should be buried at depths of 1metre-1.2metre depth to ensure no interference in future agricultural practices.	Cables will be buried at sufficient depth to avoid any agricultural activities; industry standards will be followed, where a deeper cable depth is required, a deeper cable will be buried as 900mm is the minimum as agreed with Natural England.
ExQR59	Q13.0.4 Newark and Sherwood District Council	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.	
ExQR60	Q13.0.4 Natural England	(2) For cables, if they are installed deep enough, Natural England would be satisfied for them to remain in situ, as they would be avoiding the soil disturbance altogether at decommissioning. The main requirement would be that they 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	

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		900mm is recognised as the industry standard and one we would suggest is followed as a minimum.	
ExQR61	Q13.0.6 Say No to One Earth Solar Farm	<p>The environmental implications of decaying XLPE (cross-linked polyethylene) cables are increasingly recognized. Recent studies indicate that XLPE degradation can generate microplastics and leach chemical additives into soils and groundwater. XLPE cables contain not only polyethylene but also additives such as antioxidants, cross-linking agents (e.g., peroxides), and sometimes flame retardants. Aging, heat, and environmental exposure can cause these materials to fragment or leach, potentially impacting soil health and water quality.</p> <p>Even at depths of around one metre, microplastics and chemical additives can migrate through soil layers. Natural soil processes exacerbate this risk: earthworms burrow to depths of up to two metres, transporting microplastics vertically, while many crop root systems extend beyond one metre, providing pathways for chemical and microplastic uptake into the rhizosphere. Evidence shows that such contamination can disrupt soil microbial communities and nutrient cycling, potentially affecting soil fertility and crop productivity.</p> <p>Several studies support the link between XLPE degradation and microplastic formation: • Li et al., 2021: Synthetic polymers in soil and water can degrade into micro- and nano-plastics, including polyethylene. • Academia review on water treeing: Confirms XLPE degradation through water treeing and oxidative aging, leading to eventual fragmentation. •</p>	<p>The decommissioning approach will be reviewed before this phase of work begins and carried out in accordance with industry guidance, relevant legislation, and government policy in force at the time – see paragraph 1.1.7 of the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [REP2-053] which provides:</p> <p><i>The mode of cable decommissioning for the grid connection and other underground cables will be dependent upon government policy and best practice at that time. Currently, the most environmentally acceptable option is leaving the cables in situ, as this avoids disturbance to overlying land and habitats and to neighbouring communities. Alternatively, the cables can be removed by opening the ground at regular intervals and pulling the cable through to the extraction point, avoiding the need to open cut the entire length of the cable route.</i></p> <p>The current approach taken is the industry standard that is currently employed on most if not all solar NSIPs. The applicant is aware of some research that suggests the potential for contamination. If industry standards recommend the removal of cables at the time of decommissioning this approach will be reconsidered. The current approach is adopted as it minimises soil damage and disturbance and is considered less impactful environmentally, as recorded in the oDEMP extract above. Since the cables are buried below the depth of agricultural</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>Environmental microplastic surveys: Microplastics have been found in soils near buried infrastructure, suggesting degraded plastic cables may contribute.</p> <p>The degradation of XLPE cables thus produces persistent pollutants capable of impacting soil, water, and broader ecosystems. These risks underline the need for careful consideration of environmental impacts in planning and regulatory assessments.</p> <p>Since the announcement of the One Earth Solar Farm application, we have been systematically studying microplastic pollution, including its sources, transport pathways, and ecological impacts. The following pages provide responses to Planning Inspectorate question Q13.0.6, citing news reports and peer-reviewed studies that substantiate concerns over potential soil and water contamination from decaying XLPE infrastructure. [SEE RESPONSE]</p>	<p>activity, and in agreement with Natural England, it is currently considered best to leave them in situ to further reduce soil disturbance.</p>
Human Health			
ExQR62	Q14.0.5 West Lindsey District Council	<p>WLDC note from the submissions on behalf of Exolum Pipeline System Limited [REP1-108, 109 and 110], that there is a major fuel pipeline passing under much of the eastern half of the project, including directly under the substation/BESS location in West Lindsey. WLDC also note that the layouts shown on the site layout plans (titled height parameter plans) [APP-016] do not appear to make allowance for this pipeline. In Chapter 2 of the EIA relating to Methodology [APP-031], Table 2.1 Technical Aspects</p>	<p>The below-ground oil pipeline has been considered as part of the design of the Proposed Development. The pipeline is identified and addressed in Chapter 8: Land and Soils [APP-037]. The Applicant has engaged with Exolum's solicitors to agree appropriate protective provisions for inclusion within the DCO. With protective provisions in place, the Applicant would need to have any works in the vicinity of Exolum's assets approved and Exolum would be able to place conditions on any approval to ensure the safe</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		Scoped Out of the ES indicates that 'Risk of Major Accidents and Disasters' as a topic has been scoped out of the ES. However, the explanatory text does not appear to make reference to this fuel pipeline. WLDC consider that a robust justification is required for scoping out Risk of Major Accidents and Disasters given the presence of this major fuel pipeline.	operation of its assets. With this protection in place, no likely significant effects related to the risk of major accidents and disasters are anticipated.
Landscape and Visual			
ExQR63	Q15.0.3 Lincolnshire County Council	The DCO and mitigation should include explicit protection for veteran trees. Any veteran trees 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. Due to the proposed longevity of the scheme, it is possible for currently well-established trees within the order limits to reach veteran status by meeting specific criterion within the 60-year timeframe, protection measures should be in place for this eventuality secured within the LEMP.	<p>Protection of veteran trees is provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022] which preclude works within the Root Protection Area for veteran trees. - The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP2-055] which states (at para 5.3.6) that the "Root protection areas for individual trees (including identified veteran trees) will be accounted for during construction and habitat creation to ensure tree retention and to avoid damage, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction." <p>The LPAs will inform the Veteran Tree protections through the detailed design process under Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO and preparation of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan under Requirement 8. This will ensure appropriate protections are in place for Veteran Trees before construction commences.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
ExQR64	Q15.0.3 West Lindsey District Council	<p>From a review of the information provided, it appears that there are five veteran trees within the WLDC administrative area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T246 (sheet 4) – appears outside Order limits • T267 (Sheet 6) – appears to be part of excluded woodland with operational development set back • T320 (sheet 6) – appears to be part of excluded oil well area with operational development set back • T370 (sheet 6) – appears to be on edge of excluded area but within Order limits, although in area of operational development set back • T426 (sheet 6) - appears to be on edge of small woodland area, although in area of operational development set back – possibly in Newark and Sherwood administrative area <p>Whilst it does not appear that the veteran trees within WLDC will be directly affected by the works, WLDC considers that, for veteran trees, the Applicant should explicitly confirm the protection around each veteran tree, and whether this will be to BS5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction (2012) or whether enhanced protection is proposed during construction, during operation (including any large scale equipment replacement activity) and during decommissioning. Root protection areas (RPAs) for an average tree are calculated as 12 x stem diameter measured at 1.5m above ground level. For veteran trees the area for protection is increased, and is often calculated to be at least 15 x its stem diameter (at 1.5m agl), or 5 metres beyond the outer reaches of its crown spread, whichever is the greatest distance from its stem. Ideally greater distances should be allowed between any veteran trees and their protective fencing where there is any risk of wind-blown materials, or</p>	<p>Protection of Veteran Trees is provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Outline Design Parameters (REP2-022) which preclude works within the Root Protection Area for veteran trees. - The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (REP2-055) which states (at para 5.3.6) that the “Root protection areas for individual trees (including identified veteran trees) will be accounted for during construction and habitat creation to ensure tree retention and to avoid damage, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.” <p>The LPAs will inform the Veteran Tree protections through the detailed design process under Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO and preparation of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan under Requirement 8.</p> <p>Regarding the extent of the Root Protection Area for veteran trees, this will be confirmed as part of the arboricultural assessment that will be provided to LPAs based on the detailed design progressed under Requirement 5. This will ensure appropriate root protection areas will be in place before construction commences.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		chemical spills (including fuel and mortar/cement) near the trees. Therefore, WLDC request that an RPA of 15x stem diameter (at 1.5m agl) or 5 metres beyond the outer reaches of its crown spread, whichever is the greatest distance from its stem is included as a minimum requirement.	
ExQR65	Q15.0.3 Nottinghamshire County Council	The DCO and mitigation should include explicit protection for veteran trees. Any veteran trees 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.	<p>Protection of Veteran Trees is provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022] which preclude works within the Root Protection Area for veteran trees. - The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP2-055] which states (at para 5.3.6) that the "Root protection areas for individual trees (including identified veteran trees) will be accounted for during construction and habitat creation to ensure tree retention and to avoid damage, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction." <p>The LPAs will inform the Veteran Tree protections through the detailed design process under Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO and preparation of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan under Requirement 8.</p> <p>Regarding the extent of the Root Protection Area for veteran trees, this will be confirmed as part of the arboricultural assessment that will be provided to LPAs based on the detailed design progressed under Requirement 5. This will ensure appropriate root protection areas will be in place before construction commences.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
ExQR66	Q15.0.3 Newark and Sherwood District Council	<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 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.</p>	<p>It has been confirmed that there are no TPO trees within the Order Limits.</p> <p>Protection of veteran trees is provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Outline Design Parameters [REP2-022] which preclude works within the Root Protection Area for veteran trees. - The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP2-055] which states (at para 5.3.6) that the "Root protection areas for individual trees (including identified veteran trees) will be accounted for during construction and habitat creation to ensure tree retention and to avoid damage, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction." <p>The LPAs will inform the Veteran Tree protections through the detailed design process under Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO and preparation of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan under Requirement 8.</p> <p>An arboricultural assessment will be provided to LPAs based on the detailed design progressed under Requirement 5.</p>
ExQR67	Q10.2.1 Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>Outline LEMP 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. In terms of landscape, Generally, the content within the OLEMP already provides</p>	<p>The detail regarding proposed landscape works, such as more measures and finalised enhancements, including matters such as the sourcing of seed, and specific management actions will be provided in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan secured under Requirement 8.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>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. 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 being in accordance with 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. The OLEMP has been updated for DL1: Revision 2 dated July 2025. 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. 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>Outline PROWMP</p>	<p>The LVIA has been undertaken to assess the reasonable worst case based on what is secured within the Draft DCO. This includes offsets from sensitive receptors and mitigation planting secured under Work Number 5 and 8. The Illustrative Masterplan and Mitigation Plan present a reasonable interpretation of how the Proposed Development may be brought forwards. The detailed design will be subject to approval under Requirement 5.</p> <p>In regard to the comments raised in respect of the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan [REP1-061], the Applicant notes the comment in respect to cycle paths and that these are managed by others. In regard to the bridleway buffer, the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan has been updated for Deadline 3 to note the minimum width of 3m.</p> <p>Concerning the comment raised in respect of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plan [APP-015], Marnham Byway 8 is included in the Order Limits, however the Applicant is not seeking to implement any diversions or management measures for this route and therefore only the existing alignment of this byway, denoted by the continuous brown line alongside the linework depicting the private road, is shown for information purposes.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>The outline PROW MP has been considered, and several issues have been noted: 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 using PROW within the Order limits Comment: Cycle paths are not part of the PROW network and are managed by others. 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 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. 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. 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>	
Noise and Vibration			
ExQR68	Q16.0.2 West Lindsey District Council	<p>WLDC disagree with the construction noise thresholds for significance that have been set in this ES. These are however matters that WLDC is seeking to progress with the applicant through the Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>(1) The list of BPM shown in Table 3.7 of the Outline CEMP appears to be comprehensive, although it may not completely</p>	<p>The Applicant is seeking to engage further with all LPAs, including West Lindsey District Council, on the SoCG relating to noise issues. The Applicant's position is that the criteria used for evaluating the magnitude of construction noise impacts, and hence significance of construction noise effects, are consistent with those set out in BS 5228: 2009 +A1: 2014. Further, the Applicant's position is that the</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>reflect the mitigation described in para A.15.3.26 in Appendix 15.3 or potential restrictions on piling methods.</p> <p>(2) Where impacts are shown to be minor, the measures outlined should be adequate to control noise and vibration. However, if the assessment were more in line with BS5228 there is potential for significant noise impacts, requiring specific mitigation for some works near to some receptors</p>	<p>CEMP(s) will be the most appropriate form of controlling construction noise, which are required to be submitted to and approved by the LPAs under Requirement 13 of the draft DCO [REP2-009]. The CEMP(s) will therefore include the details of noise mitigation that are relevant to the precise works activities, construction plant and equipment, etc., which will be known in more detail at the time that the CEMP(s) are produced.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes further discussions on this point, however, and is seeking to arrange meetings with all of the LPAs, including West Lindsey District Council, to discuss and agree the SoCGs on Noise. A further update will be provided to the ExA on progress made on agreeing the noise SoCGs at Deadline 4</p>
ExQR69	Q10.1.1 Newark and Sherwood District Council	<p>NSDC would make the following comments in respect of potential noise impacts and any equivalent impacts on biodiversity. 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</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant will be seeking to engage further with the LPAs, including Newark and Sherwood District Council, to agree the SoCG on noise issues. A further update will be provided to the ExA on progress made on agreeing the noise SoCGs at Deadline 4.</p> <p>As noted, a CEMP will be produced and submitted for approval prior to construction commencing, which will include measures to control both noise and impacts on biodiversity.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		construction activities and monitoring and reporting mechanism to track compliance and effectiveness of mitigation.	
Socio-economic Effects			
ExQR70	Q17.0.3 Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Ongoing engagement with host local authorities and local education and training providers and business sector groups is welcome, to promote recruitment (at least for the operational stage) and to establish programmes with young people etc.</p> <p>(2) Continued further engagement with LCC and WLDC in the development of a comprehensive Employment and Skills Plan is welcomed. LCC agrees with Bassetlaw's assertion in its LIR that, 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. As drafted, the OSSCP broadly covers the measures that LCC would expect, however, as written there is very little firm commitment to undertake anything. Therefore, we would expect that there is a firm commitment to undertake specific measures listed in the draft. We support the response from BDC, there is a significant opportunity for the improvement in skill levels and employment opportunities within the affected area, which will be a direct benefit to residents especially as such skills are likely to be transferable. The use of social media in advertising jobs seems to be very limited in the applicant's thoughts. This could be a much more central element of promoting jobs locally, given the prominence of social media. We recommend that someone from our Employment & Skills</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to many of these items in the Response to the Local Impact Reports [REP2-083].</p> <p>In summary, the Applicant has developed an outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan [REP2-057]. This will be updated throughout examination to reflect engagement with local authorities. The Applicant has committed to working with host authorities to develop appropriate key performance indicators and mechanisms to monitor performance against them. Through the engagement with the host authorities and subsequent updates to the plan, specifics around use of social media, engagement with training establishments, targeted support etc will be agreed.</p>

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>team is included as a contact in the Primary Public Sector Partner category to ensure efficient use of the forums we host. Previous comments from the pre-examination stage included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - i) Accessibility of employment sites to rural communities: Consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -• Information and Collaboration; • Access to Construction Employment, Up-skilling and Re-skilling; • Opening up the Supply Chain. <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ▪ Funded travel to work schemes – LCC is able to help scope and identify suitable projects in the study area. ▪ Engagement and partnership with local transport providers ▪ Support for local people to access private transport at reduced cost, where the above solutions are not possible (last resort). ▪ Where possible, these transport schemes should encourage use of a low carbon vehicle and ensure there is provision for EV charging at the site to encourage use of EVs for the journey to work. <p>i)Consideration should be given to preparing the local labour market for the forthcoming opportunities. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Local provider engagement at an early opportunity. o Sector development support, to allow local supply chain to prepare existing workforce, and build and encourage opportunities to grow the workforce. o Bespoke activity that encourages our evidenced 'hard to reach' and opportunity potential workforce (over 50's, retired military etc) to access new skills and jobs. 	



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		o Raising aspirations within the local communities: Evidence shows that low aspirations in the communities is a key blocker to accessing employment. Such a high profile project can help raise aspirations in local communities by supporting local incentives and schemes. This will support the project by unblocking barriers to local people accessing employment. This will need to be funded activity by the developer.	
ExQR71	Q17.0.3 West Lindsey District Council	WLDC agree with Bassetlaw District Council that there should be more structured measures related to employment and skills. WLDC would like to see a target percentage of employees on site being from the host districts, with a further target percentage of employees being from within 50km of the Order boundary. WLDC would also like to see a target set for apprenticeships as a proportion of the workforce. WLDC would like to see monitoring and reporting mechanisms to ensure transparent delivery against key performance indicators (KPIs).	<p>We note WLDC's comments on setting specific local employment and apprenticeship targets. While the Applicant is committed to maximising local employment and skills opportunities, setting rigid percentage targets at this stage is not practicable. The Applicant is keen to maximise opportunities within a 50 km radius. However, the availability of suitably skilled workers and apprentices in the host districts or within a 50 km radius cannot be guaranteed and will vary depending on the timing, trade, and level of the role.</p> <p>Instead, the Project will deliver a flexible, responsive approach through the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (SSCEP), which will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise local recruitment where possible; • Engage with local training providers to develop skills and prepare the workforce; • Include apprenticeships and targeted support for underrepresented groups where feasible; and • Establish monitoring and reporting mechanisms to track progress against achievable, evidence-based metrics.

App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			This approach ensures that employment and skills measures are realistic, deliverable, and adaptable, maximising local benefits without being constrained by arbitrary numerical targets that may not reflect the local labour market.
Transportation and Traffic			
ExQR72	Q18.0.2 Nottinghamshire County Council	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.	<p>The updated Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, [EN010159/APP/7.9.2] contains plans illustrating the passing places.</p> <p>In Issue Specific Hearing 2, the Council's witness noted that sufficient information had now been provided to address any remaining passing place queries.</p>
ExQR73	Q18.0.5 National Highways	We need to understand if the proposed development will require abnormal loads for specific equipment and materials (elements such as transformers) to the site on the SRN. We encourage the Applicant to engage with National Highways as soon as possible to establish an effective movement strategy.	<p>Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) are required and this is clearly set out in Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, [EN010159/APP/7.9.2] and the ES Vol 2 APP 6.12.1: Transport Assessment [EN010159/APP/6.21].</p> <p>Correspondence relating to National Highways queries on AIL movements was issued prior to the ISH on 28th August</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
			2025 and a letter reiterating these points and address the new queries raised in the ISH was issued following the transport session on 4 th September 2025. A copy of this letter is available at [Appendix C to EN010159/APP/9.21].
ExQR74	Q18.0.7 Nottinghamshire County Council	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.	The Applicant confirms that the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan [REP1-061] will be updated to include this specific provision at Deadline 3.
ExQR75	Q18.0.8 Nottinghamshire County Council	<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> <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. 	<p>Discussions between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council have progressed and it is understood that only two matters remain outstanding, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NCC wish Stage 1 Road Safety Audits (RSA) for all access and crossing points within their road network; and 2) Further details relating to the A57 access junction and the bypass of Ragnall. <p>The Applicant is providing Stage 1 RSA for the A57 junction and for the Roadwood Lane junction. Further RSA will be provided to NCC post determination, noting that LCC do not require RSA for junctions on their network.</p> <p>The A57 junction justification is being prepared and will detail the traffic effects, Stage 1 RSA findings, geometric</p>



App Ref	ExQ1 Ref	Question Summary	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. 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. We are not aware of the applicants timetable for addressing the above matters.	design elements and further justification on this access point and the ability to bypass Ragnall. This will be set out as mini-EIA Chapter to provide a comparison between the results found in ES Chapter 12: Transport & Access [APP-044] and those reported in the briefing note. The Applicant is seeking to provide this at Deadline 4.



one earth
solar farm