

APPLICATION BY ONE EARTH SOLAR FARM LIMITED

POST HEARING SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL [ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING THREE]

Introduction

1. Lincolnshire County Council (“LCC”) attended the third Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) on 6th November 2025. A summary of LCC’s oral representation for ISH3 appears below.

ISH3

Item 4 – The draft Development Consent Order

LCC notes that there has been no progress to date with including protective provisions for the Fire and Rescue Service but welcomes the Applicant’s commitment to including this within the next draft DCO.

Item 5 – Hydrology, Flood Risk, Water Resources and the application of the sequential test

Agenda item 5, Hydrology (i) sought clarification from the Council as Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) on the assessment of water run off and the suitability of the proposed mitigation measures. LCC confirmed satisfaction and raised no concerns

Agenda item 5, Flood Risk (i) sought views from the Council as LLFA on the overall potential flood risk from the proposed development, the modelling carried out within the FRA, and the conclusions that have been reached. LCC confirmed satisfaction and raised no concerns.

Item 5, Sequential Test (i) sought the views of the Council on the approach taken to the sequential test and its compliance with national policy, including any implications from the recently updated PPG.

LCC maintains its objections in relation to the scope of the sequential test as set out within its written response to the ExA’s Second Written Questions. LCC would highlight that neither EN-1 nor EN-3 treat flood risk or the sequential test element of flood risk policy as irrelevant or in any way optional even for infrastructure which falls within the definition of CNP. Paragraph 4.1.7 of EN-1 does not very clearly differentiate between the two elements of the Government’s policy on flood risk (i.e. sequential and exceptions tests) but instead discusses broadly a reference to ‘flood risk’ without further definition. Even if ‘flood risk’ is interpreted as relating to only part of the Government’s policy on flood risk, EN-1 and EN-3 treat the sequential test as a key policy test to be considered and weighed properly in the balance overall. Paragraph 5.8.36 requires the Secretary of State to consider, in relation to all applications for development consent (CNP or otherwise) whether the sequential test has been applied to site selection.

Item 5, Exceptions Test (i) sought the views from the Council on the approach taken to the exceptions test and its compliance with national policy including any implications from the updated PPG.

In terms of flood risk overall, LCC would note that paragraph 5.8.41 would apply given the application boundary includes functional flood plain, even if no panels are proposed to be constructed in this area. Moreover, the ExA and Secretary of State will need to scrutinise whether there is any residual reduction in storage contrary to 5.8.41, LCC would defer to the EA's review of additional modelling on this matter.

Item 7- Landscape and Visual Amenity

LCC will submit a summary note as soon as possible as requested by the ExA within the hearing, addressing LCCs position on the cumulative landscape and visual assessments.

Item 8 – Cumulative effects

LCC remains concerned as to cumulative effects on BMV, waste and landscape and visual effects for the reasons set out in its written submissions. The Applicant's update to the cumulative effects chapter of the ES at DL2 demonstrates the significant quantum of BMV land that will be taken out of agriculture for the next 60 years or so as a result of solar schemes in Lincolnshire – at well over 6% this is statistically significant and meaningful to Lincolnshire where the economy is rooted in agriculture.