



Application by One Earth Solar Farm Limited for One Earth Solar Farm The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Issued on 30 September 2025

Responses are due by deadline 4: 14 October 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – ExQ2. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex C** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 17 June 2025. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on General and cross topic issues is identified as Q2.1.0.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the [project page of the National Infrastructure website](#) and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)' when asked.

Microsoft Word version: [Examining Authority's Written Questions 1 ExQ2 \(Word, 107KB\)](#)



Abbreviations used:

PA2008	Planning Act 2008	LPA	local planning authority
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load	MP	model provision (in the MPO, see below)
Art	article	MPO	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009
ALA1981	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	NCC	Nottinghamshire County Council
BoR	the Book of Reference	NCR	National Cycle Route
CA	compulsory acquisition	NPS	National Policy Statement
D	Deadline	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CPO	compulsory purchase order	oCEMP	outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
dDCO	the draft Development Consent Order	oLEMP	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
DfT	Department for Transport	oPROWMP	Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges	PCS	Power conversion stations
EL	Examination Library	R	requirement
EM	the Explanatory Memorandum	RSA1	Road safety audit stage 1
ES	the Environmental Statement	SI	statutory instrument
ExA	Examining Authority	SoS	Secretary of State



FRA	Flood Risk Assessment	TA	Transport Assessment
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle	TP	temporary possession
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing	WFD	Water Framework Directive
LIR	the Local Impact Report	WRA	Water Resources Assessment

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [View examination library \(PDF, 501KB\)](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ2 1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index	
1. General and cross-topic questions.....	5
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development	5
3. The Environmental Statement (general)	5
4. Need.....	5
5. Site selection and alternatives	5
6. Air quality and emissions	5
7. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	5
8. Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	5
9. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations	6
10. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	6
10.1 Articles.....	6
10.2 Schedule 15 – Procedure for discharge of requirements.....	6
11. Historic environment.....	6
12. Hydrology and Hydrogeology and the Water Environment.....	6
13. Land use and Soils	9
14. Human Health	9
15. Landscape and visual	9
16. Noise and vibration	10
17. Socio-economic effects	10
18. Transportation and traffic	10
19. Cumulative Effects	12

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
Q1.0.1	The applicant	Consultation Throughout the examination concern has been expressed with regard to the suitability and extent of the consultation undertaken. The ExA have previously sought confirmation that a complete and comprehensive suite of documents is provided to ensure we have a full understanding of the consultation undertaken and the responses received. The inference from the submissions made indicates that a full suite has still not been provided to the examination. (1) Can the applicant reexamine their submissions in this respect, and to aid both the ExA and concerned IPs identify where within the documentation a full suite of consultation documentation can be found. The ExA wonder if a table with index may provide a simple way of identifying for all parties the full information with corresponding EL references. (2) In undertaking the review if documents are identified to be absent, please ensure any missing elements are provided.
Q1.0.2	Mr Stephen Fox	Consultation It would be helpful to understand further, how if at all, you consider the applicant has failed in its legal duties under the Planning Act. Could you please clarify how, exactly, the applicant failed (in your view) to consult properly by reference to the specific legal duties imposed by Chapter 2 of the Planning Act 2008 (sections 41-49 particularly s.42, 47 and 49) and the policy requirements of the relevant Guidance. You may find the following link of assistance in responding https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-the-consultation-report
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development		
Q2.0.1		No further questions at this time
3. The Environmental Statement (general)		
Q3.0.1		No further questions at this time
4. Need		
Q4.0.1		No further questions at this time
5. Site selection and alternatives		
Q5.0.1		No further questions at this time
6. Air quality and emissions		
Q6.0.1	The applicant	Air Quality – Planning Guidance The applicant’s response to ExQ1 6.0.1, stated that the guidance published by DEFRA remained interim. (1) Can the applicant please confirm this still to be the case? (2) If it has been updated, please advise what changes have occurred and if this leads to any change to the AQ Chapter or the conclusions reached.
7. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))		
Q7.0.1	The applicant	No further questions at this time
8. Habitats Regulations Assessment		

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q8.0.1		No further questions at this time
9. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations		
Q9.0.1	The applicant	<p>Connection point</p> <p>(1) In light of the position stated at CAH1 – and the information available for the proposed substation location, please provide clarity over why the whole High Marnham site remains identified as necessary for CA. Please consider providing a plan showing the areas of existing infrastructure and the area of land that National Grid have identified as required for the new substation to demonstrate with greater clarity those areas which potentially could be excluded, or provide further justification for including the whole area, when access for the corridor can only be achieved from the west/ north west and the cable corridor is indicated to be 20m.</p> <p>(2) While the ExA understand that the draft of the DCO would only allow land that is required to be subject to CA, please explain how this resolves the apparent discrepancy with the CA Guidance, where the justification for the land take is needed at the outset.</p>
10. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		
Q10.0.1	All local authorities	<p>Management Plans</p> <p>At the current time the management plans do not appear to be fully agreed. For example, LCC have raised issues in respect of the oCEMP with regard to breeding birds, and the oLEMP in respect of tree planting and replacement in the event of an unforeseen event or large-scale failure.</p> <p>The ExA are aware discussions on these topics are ongoing, however if the matters are not agreed, are the authorities content that the dDCO gives sufficient certainty through the requirements that these matters could be resolved in due course?</p>
10.1 Articles		
Q10.1.1	The applicant (1) The Environment Agency (2)	<p>Disapplication and modification of statutory provisions</p> <p>In their D3 response NCC (LIR Addendum [REP3-086]) express concern that the FRA indicates that flood risk activity permits and ordinary water course consents would be disappplied (paragraph 7 (a)).</p> <p>The dDCO seeks to disapply regulation 12 (requirement for an environmental permit) in respect of flood risk activity.</p> <p>(1) Can the applicant clarify that these 2 matters are one and the same or explain the distinction</p> <p>(2) Do the EA have any concerns in this respect</p>
10.2 Schedule 15 – Procedure for discharge of requirements		
Q10.2.1	The applicant and NCC	<p>Discharge of Requirements and the payment of fees</p> <p>It is not clear from the comments made by NCC in item LIR 172 at D3 in respect of the payment of a fee for requirement 15 being aligned with requirement 11, whether there is a detailed justification for the fee to be increased. Please can both parties set out their reasoning in the event this remains outstanding.</p>
11. Historic environment		
Q11.0.1	The applicant. NCC and LCC	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Can the applicant NCC, and LCC please provide an update on their respective positions with regard to the investigations for archaeology, the written scheme of investigation, and if there are any matters which remain outstanding?</p>
12. Hydrology and Hydrogeology and the Water Environment		
Q12.0.1	The applicant EA	Flood Risk Assessment

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please provide an update on the progress of updating the FRA to address the issues raised by the EA at ISH2 and discussed in a meeting on 11 September 2025, on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Use of voided structures for inverters/pcs; (2) Impact of, and agreement of flood flows due to partially submerged solar panels and other equipment; (3) Interaction between the proposed development and existing flood defences; and (4) The draft requirement for the dDCO for the re-running of the FRA at the detailed design stage – is this approach compliant with policy?
Q12.0.2	The applicant	<p>Location of solar panels and equipment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Please explain why is it necessary for the inverters/pcs to be located in the areas of flood risk? (2) What is the reasoning for the inverters/pcs being located in the proposed locations? (3) How many inverters/pcs will be located in the areas that are subject to flooding – in answering please explain with reference to Flood Zone 2, Flood Zone 3 and areas of flood extent? <p>(The ExA understand that the detailed design has not yet been undertaken, and the final figure may yet not be known, however please in answering the above questions specify the maximum number and the range the final design may include).</p>
Q12.0.3	The applicant	<p>Flood Risk Assessment requirement</p> <p>Within the Written Summary of applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 2, page 27 states:</p> <p><i>“The Applicant plans to share the updated FRA with the EA in advance of Deadline 4 (to hopefully allow sufficient review time) and to submit it to the Examination at Deadline 4 (hopefully having had time to address any outstanding comments from the EA and/or to confirm the agreed position).</i></p> <p><i>At the same time the Applicant will submit a draft requirement for the dDCO. The draft requirement will essentially require that at detailed design the Applicant will re-run the FRA in order to demonstrate to the relevant planning authority and the EA that based on the detailed design, the impact on flood risk and flood plain storage is no worse than the outcomes included in the FRA. The Applicant wants to closely align the content of the FRA to the proposed requirement so that the FRA makes clear what the updated FRA at the time of detailed design is focussed on and what outcomes it needs to achieve. For this reason they will be provided side by side at Deadline 4. The Applicant will share the draft requirement with the EA alongside the FRA.”</i></p> <p>Can the applicant please provide details of how this approach is policy compliant, does the SoS not need to know at this stage that the scheme would not result in flooding elsewhere?</p>
Q12.0.4	The councils EA	<p>Sequential Test</p> <p>In ISH2 the applicant stated if the Sequential Test is failed, then this would be weighted against the application, but CNP comes into play. Do the councils and the EA agree with this statement in policy terms, with reference to NPS EN-1 Paragraph 4.2.15?</p>
Q12.0.5	The councils EA	<p>Sequential Test</p> <p>WLDC in their D3 submission following ISH2 maintain a lack of confidence that the current proposal has demonstrated that the sequential test has been followed in such a way that the exception test can also be shown to demonstrate an exception case.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Are the councils satisfied, that with applicant's Deadline 3 submissions relating to the approach taken for the Sequential Test? (2) Have all the issues raised on the Sequential Test/exception test been addressed satisfactorily? (3) If not, what additional work do you consider is required by the applicant? (4) Please explain should this be the case the policy basis for the council not being satisfied?
Q12.0.6	The applicant The councils	<p>PPG on flood risk was updated 17/09/25 including changes to the Sequential Test, see para 27a</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	The EA	<p>Paragraph 27a states. “For infrastructure proposals of regional or national importance the area of search may reasonably extend beyond the local planning authority boundary. It may also, in some cases, be relevant to consider whether large scale development could be split across a number of alternative sites at lower risk of flooding, but only where those alternative sites would be capable of accommodating the development in a way which would still serve its intended market(s) as effectively.”</p> <p>(1) Does this new guidance have any effect on the application for the proposed development or what the applicant has undertaken in the assessments provided?</p> <p>(2) Does the new guidance mean that any further work is required in respect of the Sequential Test?</p> <p>(3) If so what additional work do you consider would be required as a result of the changes?</p> <p>(4) Has the position of any party changed due to the amendments made to the PPG?</p>
Q12.0.7	The applicant	<p>NCC Addendum to Local Impact Report (Flooding)</p> <p>Can the applicant please provide a full response to the points raised in the NCC Deadline 3 submission Addendum to Local Impact Report (Flooding) [REP3-086], in particular, paragraph 7?</p>
Q12.0.8	The applicant Anglian Water	<p>Water Resources Assessment (WRA)</p> <p>Please provide an update of progress made on the WRA, including a timescale for its completion and submission to the examination.</p>
Q12.0.9	Anglian Water	<p>Drinking Water</p> <p>Are Anglian Water satisfied with the addition within the dDCO, submitted by the applicant at Deadline 3, relating to them being a consultee on the approval of management plans for the proposed development?</p>
Q12.0.10	EA Anglian Water	<p>Water Framework Directive (WFD)</p> <p>Following meetings with the applicant on 11 and 12 September 2025, and the subsequent submissions by the applicant at Deadline 3, can you please confirm, whether you are now satisfied with the WFD Screening Assessment [REP3-021]?</p> <p>If you are not yet satisfied, please provide full details of the deficiencies that remain.</p>
Q12.0.11	The Environment Agency	<p>Water Environment</p> <p>(1) In light of the ongoing concerns identified by ‘Say No to One Earth’ in their D3 submission [REP3-079], please provide a full and detailed response to each of the points they make, and where appropriate cross reference to submissions already provided.</p> <p>(2) Can the EA confirm its position with regard to the suitability of the outline Management Plans and monitoring and management regimes they are proposed to provide to secure the mitigation and ensure that the environment is appropriately protected through the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development.</p>
Q12.0.12	The applicant	<p>Water environment</p> <p>In her D3 submission [REP3-098], Mrs Heather Fox raises a number of issues relating to the water environment. Please provide a full and detailed response to all issues raised.</p> <p>It was indicated at ISH2 that issues raised previously had not been fully addressed, please review previous submissions and confirm that full responses have been received where necessary cross referencing to previous submissions.</p>
Q12.0.13	The applicant	<p>Sequential Test Addendum [REP3- 069]</p> <p>Can the applicant please provide the full legal cases referenced.</p>
Q12.0.14	The applicant	<p>D3 representations from Mr Fox</p> <p>At D3, Mr Fox made a number of submissions [REP3-100, REP3-101, REP3-102, REP3-103, REP3-104, REP3-105, REP3-106, REP3-107, REP3-108, REP3-109, REP3-110,] regarding potential issues relating to the water environment as a whole. Can the applicant please provide a detailed response to all the points, including, stating if any changes are necessary as a result, or if any further assessments are needed.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
13. Land use and Soils		
Q13.0.1	The applicant	No further questions at this time
14. Human Health		
Q14.0.1	The applicant	No further questions at this time
15. Landscape and visual		
Q15.0.1	The applicant	<p>Proposed Screening fence along A1133</p> <p>The ExA note that further information providing greater clarity for this mitigation is due to be provided at D4.</p> <p>(1) It would be helpful to understand further in designing this mitigation, what other forms of redress to resolve the problem that arises were considered and why they were excluded. For example siting the fence further away from the road, planting greater screening at the outset, earlier in the process to reduce the time the fence would be required for, providing a larger proportion of larger plants as part of the mix to achieve a shorter period of needing a fence, or removing panels which the glint and glare assessment identifies as causing the problem?</p> <p>(2) Are there further options that could further alleviate the potential harm that may arise? Which in worst case scenario would result in a 4m high solid fence, being present for 15 years along several km?</p> <p>(3) Please confirm that there are no other boundaries where this mitigation has been identified as necessary, or point out where they might be and the extent, location and likely length of screening required.</p> <p>(4) In providing mitigation, can it be mitigation if it creates a harm in itself?</p> <p>In responding to the above please address the advice within NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.10.26 in particular the final sentence which states <i>“In these circumstances, the Secretary of State may decide that the benefits of the mitigation to reduce the landscape and/or visual effects outweigh the marginal loss of function.”</i></p>
Q15.0.2	The applicant	<p>Proposed Screening fence along A1133</p> <p>(1) Could the need for the fence be avoided if the panels were set a minimum distance back from the road?</p> <p>(2) If so, what would the distance be, and what would the consequence be of removing the affected panels from the scheme?</p>
Q15.0.3	The applicant	<p>Site compound locations</p> <p>In her D3 submission [REP3-087], Mrs Walker raises issues relating to the proposed locations of site compounds. Can the applicant please provide a full reasoning and evidence, for why the site compound in question must be at the location indicated?</p>
Q15.0.4	The applicant	<p>Residential Properties</p> <p>(1) In order to aid the ExA understand fully the approach that has been taken to the assessment of effect on visual amenity for residential receptors can the applicant provide clarification on how the approach taken addresses the following sections of the NPS. NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.7.4 states <i>“For energy NSIPs of the type covered by this NPS, some impact on amenity for local communities is likely to be unavoidable. The aim should be to keep impacts to a minimum, and at a level that is acceptable.”</i> Paragraph 5.10.6 states <i>“Projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate.”</i> Paragraph 5.10.21 states <i>“The assessment should include the visibility and conspicuousness of the project during construction and of the presence and operation of the project and potential impacts on views and visual amenity.”</i> (Our highlighting)</p> <p>(2) To date a full list of properties within the Order Limits appears to be outstanding, with a corresponding map identifying the properties. If it has been provided, please provide the appropriate EL reference. In the event it remains outstanding please ensure it is provided.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The response provided in [REP1-077] and [REP1-078] explains the approach taken in respect of a number of the properties affected, the ExA are currently not confident this includes all properties.</p> <p>(3) Within these documents separation distances for residential properties to solar panels appears to vary considerably for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheet 1 Farhill Farm 413m, Grey Oak and the Grove 259-290m, Whimpton House 314m, • Sheet 2 Properties east of Main Street Ragnall 235-252m, Hall Farm Cottage 226-242m, • Sheet 3 Farhill Farm 155m, Vicarage Farm 180m – 363m, farm west of Main Street 273m • Sheet 4 properties west of Main Street 195-198m, north of George Street 173m • Sheet 7 Skegby House 38-58m • Sheet 10 1 Collingham Road 206-208m • Sheet 14 The Hall 245m, The Station 80m • Sheet 15 Moor Farm 195m-289m • Sheet 16 The Chase 132m <p>Can the applicant please explain further the justification for the significant variance in distance between residential properties and the proposed arrays. If in some circumstances it is recognised a separation distance of 413m is an appropriate separation distance, how can 38m or 132m be appropriate?</p>
16. Noise and vibration		
Q16.0.1	The applicant	<p>North Clifton Hall</p> <p>(1) Can the applicant direct the ExA to where in the noise and vibrations assessments, potential impacts from construction, operation and decommissioning on North Clifton Hall are provided?</p> <p>(2) Given the proximity of a proposed access road to North Clifton Hall, can the applicant please provide details of the mitigation measures that will be secured in the DCO, to provide mitigation from potential noise and vibrations effects at North Hall Farm during construction, operation and decommissioning?</p>
Q16.0.2	The applicant	<p>Location of Power Conversion Systems (PCS)</p> <p>In her D3 submission [REP3-073], Mrs Walker raises the issue of inconsistencies in information provided by the applicant in responses to questions regarding the proposed locations of PCS. Can the applicant please clarify which response is correct, and provide a full and detailed response to all issues raised?</p>
Q16.0.3	The applicant	<p>Noise at property</p> <p>In his D3 response [REP-084], Mr Walker provides details of a noise phenomenon that occurs at his property. Can the applicant please provide a detailed response to this matter.</p>
17. Socio-economic effects		
Q17.0.1	The applicant	No further questions at this time
18. Transportation and traffic		
Q18.0.1	NCC The applicant	<p>Safety audits for new access points</p> <p>At ISH2, NCC confirmed an RSA1 being undertaken on the proposed access points on classified roads within Nottinghamshire would be an acceptable fall-back position. Can both parties confirm whether they consider this to be an acceptable position? If so, can the applicant please provide an RSA1 for the proposed access points in Nottinghamshire on classified roads? If the applicant does not agree, please explain why not.</p>
Q18.0.2	NCC	Gate A access point

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	The applicant	<p>The submission at Deadline 3 from NCC [REP3-085] includes comments on the applicant's previous response to the LIR. These comments include the following:</p> <p><i>"Access 1 (Gate A) – The need for a ghost island in accordance with DMRB is queried as the construction peak period daily traffic flow shown in Table 4 of the TA exceeds that indicated as acceptable for a simple priority junction in Figure 2.3.1 of DMRB CD123. The swept paths should identify corresponding opposing movements on the same viewport. There appear to be conflicts between opposing movements."</i></p> <p>(1) Is a ghost island an appropriate junction type for the operational and decommissioning phases of the proposed development?</p> <p>(2) Are there any potential risks to road safety of a ghost island junction with the likely number of vehicle movements that will occur during the operational and decommissioning phases of the proposed development?</p> <p>(3) If the applicant does not provide a ghost island, would NCC consider the access point to be safe?</p> <p>(4) Can the applicant confirm the duration that vehicle movements at this access point would be above the threshold for a simple priority junction? Alternatively provide evidence why the threshold would not be met</p> <p>(5) Would the provision of a ghost island in this location lead to any additional land take, over and above what is currently proposed in the dDCO?</p> <p>(6) What other issues, aside from highways-related issues, would be caused by the use of a ghost island? For example, would there be landscape or visual impacts that need to be assessed?</p>
Q18.0.3	The applicant	<p>Swept path analysis</p> <p>The submission at Deadline 3 from NCC [REP3-085] includes comments on the applicant's previous response to the LIR. These comments include the following:</p> <p><i>"A common theme throughout the drawings appears to be an issue with the swept paths. Right turning exiting vehicles commence the turn prior to reaching the give way which means that this manoeuvre is being started prior to visibility being available. At the point that visibility is available, the cab of the vehicle would be at an oblique angle to the major road meaning that the driver may not be able to see vehicles approaching from the left. If the vehicle was at 90° to the give way at the point where visibility would be available, it would be in the path of an entering vehicle. It also appears that a right turning exiting vehicle would not be able to make the turn from the give way at a number of the accesses due to the narrowness of the road on to which it is turning. This suggests that the proposed accesses are not wide enough to accommodate all turning manoeuvres and/or that the roads onto which they turn do not accommodate the required manoeuvres and may need localised widening."</i></p> <p>Can the applicant please provide a response to the issue raised above, and what work is required to overcome it?</p>
Q18.0.4	National Highways	<p>AIL Route</p> <p>(1) Are National Highways satisfied with the information on AIL routes, provided by the applicant in their letter to them dated 4 September 2025?</p> <p>(2) Are there any outstanding matters relating to AIL routes remaining?</p> <p>(3) Is further work required by the applicant to reach an agreement on the acceptability of the proposed AIL routes, if so please advise what is considered to be outstanding?</p>
Q18.0.5	The applicant	<p>NCR 647</p> <p>The submission at Deadline 3 from NCC [REP3-085] includes comments on the applicant's previous response to the LIR. These comments included the following:</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>“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.”</i></p> <p>Can the applicant please provide their response to the ExA, on the need for temporary signage in this location or confirm amendment to the oPROWMP?</p>
Q18.0.6	The applicant	<p>Barred routes</p> <p>The submission at Deadline 3 from NCC [REP3-085] includes comments on the applicant’s previous response to the LIR. These comments include the following:</p> <p>(1) <i>“Paragraph A.12.4.27 of the Transport Assessment (TA) states that the data has been independently crosschecked against DfT traffic data and maintains that there are 792 HGVs south of South Clifton. This is contrary to DfT information, which identifies there are 320 (annual average) HGVs to the south of South Clifton. As per our previous responses, the increase in HGVs is therefore over 60% and the applicant should review the need for assessment on the route between Besthorpe Quarry and Sand Lane, Spalford on this basis. It is thought that addressing this is unlikely to require amendments to highway, but its exclusion means that this length of road would not be included in the Wear and Tear agreement (see response to LIR 150 and 151.”</i></p> <p><i>“As per response to LIR131, whilst HGVs will not impact the settlement of Collingham, the additional HGVs may impact the smaller settlements along this route. It is not thought likely that addressing this omission would result in any amendments to highway being necessary, but the route will need to be considered in terms of Wear and Tear.”</i></p> <p>Can the applicant please confirm whether the roads should be included in a wear and tear agreement and if not provide a justification?</p> <p>(2) <i>“With regards to the additional barred routes, please note that the diagram of the barred routes is referred to in both the TA and oCTMP as being in Figure 2 but are in Figure 4.1. The figure is helpful to identify potential routes missing and it would be beneficial to include routes leading to South Scarle in these.”</i></p> <p>(3) Can the applicant please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which is the correct figure reference?• Whether routes to South Scarle should be included on the diagram of barred routes? <p>(4) Can the applicant please ensure that when the next iteration of the TA and oCTMP are submitted at Deadline 4, the errors highlighted by NCC and those raised by Mrs Walker [REP3-088] are corrected.</p> <p>(5) Can the applicant ensure a clear plan is included that is sufficiently clear and precise it can be used for enforcement purposes.</p>
Q18.0.7	The applicant	<p>Visibility splays</p> <p>In their D3 submission Comments on responses to LIRs 1[REP3-085], NCC raise a number of issues in response to LIR141.</p> <p>Can the applicant please provide a full and detailed response to all issues raised under LIR141, including the query regarding land outside of the red line boundary for visibility splay.</p>
19. Cumulative Effects		
Q19.0.1		No further questions at this time