One Earth Solar Farm

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Nottinghamshire County Council

EN010159/APP/8.3.3~~2~~

~~October~~ November 2025

One Earth Solar Farm Ltd

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the application for the Proposed One Earth Solar Farm Development Consent Order (the "Application") made by One Earth Solar Farm Ltd (the 'Applicant') to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").

1.1.2 The DCO Application is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) for the installation, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and associated grid connection infrastructure which will allow for the generation and export of electricity to the High Marnham substation (hereafter 'the Proposed Development').

1.1.3 The SoCG is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed draft between both parties involved. It will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council.

1.2.2 Nottinghamshire County Council is one of the host authorities for the application, and the remainder of the host authorities have separate Statements of Common Ground.

1.2.3 Collectively, the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council are referred to as 'the parties'.

1.3 Purpose of this document

1.3.1 This SoCG is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed draft between both parties. This SoCG is a 'live' document and will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.

1.3.2 The SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' Guidance on the examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects ('DLUHC Guidance')[1].

1.3.3 Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

"*A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree, or indeed disagree. A SoCG helps to ensure that the evidence at the examination focuses on the material differences between the main parties and therefore makes best use of the lines of questioning pursued by the Examining Authority*".

1.3.4 The aim of this SoCG is, therefore, to provide a clear position of the progress and agreement met or not yet met between Nottinghamshire County Council and the Applicant on matters relating to the Application.

1.3.5 The document will be updated as more information becomes available and as a result of ongoing discussions between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council.

1.3.6 The SoCG is intended to provide information for the examination process, facilitate a smooth and efficient examination, and manage the amount of material that needs to be submitted.

1.3.7 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate website.

1.3.8 Once finalised, the SoCG will be submitted to the Examining Authority concerning the Application under section 37 of the PA 2008 for an order granting development consent for the Proposed Development.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 In the table in the issues chapter of this SoCG:

- "Agreed" indicates where an issue has been resolved;

[1] Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (30 April 2024).

- “Not Agreed” indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them; and

- “Under Discussion” indicates where points continue to be the subject of ongoing discussions between parties.

2. Description of the Proposed Development

2.1.1 The Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation and maintenance, and decomissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) array electricity generating facility with a total capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW), a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with an import and export connection to the National Grid.

2.1.2 The principal components of the Proposed Development will consist of the following:

- Solar PV Modules;
- Mounting Structures;
- Power Conversion Stations (PCS);
- Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS);
- Onsite Substations and Ancillary Buildings;
- Low Voltage Distribution Cables;
- Grid Connection Cables;
- Fencing, security and ancillary infrastructure;
- Access Tracks; and
- Green Infrastructure (GI).

3. Record of Engagement

3.1 Summary of Consultation

3.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation throughout the early stages of the Proposed Development. Table 1 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
General Catch Ups		
18th July 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial introductions to the Project
18th July 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council
1st November 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	PPA Discussions
9th February 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Statement of Community Consultation Briefing
11th March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	• Project overview • Ecology Survey programme overview • Summary of habitat information • Summary of bat surveys • Summary of bird surveys (breeding and wintering) • Summary of badger, otter and water vole surveys

		• Summary of great crested newt surveys • Identifying local conservation priorities (to include within landscape design) • Approach to BNG, incorporating local priority species
19th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development
2nd May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around drainage with Lincolnshire County Council also in attendance
8th May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around socio-economic impacts
14th May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Consultation briefing including an update on EIA, the masterplan and consultation programme
12th July 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	• Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team; • Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing
9th October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	• Masterplan and programme update • Adequacy of Consultation Milestone • Statement of Common Ground
1st May 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps

15th August 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion to update the Statement of Common Ground
6th October 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on updates to the Statement of Common Ground following topic specific meetings.
4th November 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion updates to the Statement of Common Ground ahead of ISH3.
Cultural Heritage		
29th- 30th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation on scope of cultural heritage assessment and discussion of proposed scope of heritage photomontages.
21 August 2024	Meeting (on Site)	Discussion of the Proposed Development post PEIR consultation responses. Review of the potential effects and mitigation in relation to assets in Ragnall and Fledborough Ragnall Discussion and agreement to review how the development relates to contouring to the north and northwest of St Leonards Church. It was agreed that topography would be overlayed onto the masterplan to demonstrate the relationship between the two. **Outcome:** Order Limits are shown with topography overlay on page 8 of Technical Appendix 10.2 (APP-127). Discussion held on creating set backs to the east of Main Street and reviewing historic landscape context to inform screening. **Outcome:** Historic research shared with Statutory Consultee and informed

		revision of Order Limits to increase setback from Main Street. <u>Fledborough</u> Discussion held on the enclosed setting of St Gregory's Churchyard and the key view from this location being towards Fledborough Viaduct. Request for further review of views looking north from the PRoW located to the north of the Church. **Outcome:** Agreement that Manor House and St Gregory's Church could be jointly assessed. Further review on screening of eastern Order Limit boundaries.
02nd September 2024	Correspondence (email)	Confirmation from Conservation Officer that no comments to the minutes from the Site Visit on the 21st August 2024.
19th November 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusion of heritage impact and additional information required.
Buried Archaeology		
29/02/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Introduction to the Site, Proposed Development and the proposed scope of assessment. Discussion over the approach to the geophysical survey work at the Scheduled Monuments at Newton-on-Trent & at Whimpton and to specific non-designated archaeological assets.
01/03/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on further evaluation scope and strategies for trial trenching have been discussed at a high level.

		Agreed to include an assessment of geology and topography to inform the DBA. Agreed to consider the current guidelines about flint scatters early within the evaluation design.
24/04/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Fieldwork update on the geophysical survey. Draft trial trenching strategy presented by Iceni, LCC asked for a more detailed information regarding trenching sampling percentages.
11/07/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss approach for trial trench evaluation and the One Earth Project Design, which presents the approach to the archaeological evaluation. Discussion and agreement about the procedure for Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) submissions and sign-off; and on the approach for monitoring site visits agreed and weekly reporting. Discussion and agreement to add black and white imagery from the draft geophysical survey report as background to the trenches to the Archaeological Evaluation Strategy Discussion and agreement to move some of the proposed trenches to target specific anomalies detected by the geophysical survey.
02/08/24	Email correspondence	Agreement on the Archaeological Evaluation Strategy, asking for the approach to the trial trenching evaluation not be limited to than the high-impact areas.

23/08/2024	Email correspondence	Updated version of the One Earth Archaeological Evaluation Strategy issued for comments.
23/09/2024	Email correspondence	Request and agreement on all archaeological features to be investigated unless otherwise agreed. Request for the whole Order Limits to be subject to trial trench evaluation. Agreed a remote sign-off system for blank trenches on site visits for trench with buried heritage features or deposits.
23/09/2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for excavations in Nottinghamshire approved.
01/10/2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for Ragnall approved
25/10/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the sampling strategy for Ragnall. The following points were agreed: *- Ragnall is one of the areas that will require appropriate archaeological mitigation.* *- Where features form a definite arrangement a sample of features within the arrangement will be sample excavated. Features not suited to excavation in evaluation trenches will be investigated in plan only. This would typically apply to areas of complex, intercutting features such as structures with in-situ floor surfaces, kilns and other 'special' features, all of which benefit from open area investigation and suffer when excavated during trial trench evaluations. No features will be wholly excavated; similarly, structures and*

		features worthy of preservation will not be unduly excavated.
30/10/2024	Email correspondence	Further conversation of sampling strategy for Ragnall, agreeing to a limited number of slots through features that appear in multiple trenches on the geophysical survey, although if these appear to have a different form in other trenches, that will still need to be investigated.
07/11/2024	Site Visit	Discussion about the ongoing trial trenching at Ragnall and the sampling strategy.
08/11/2024	Email correspondence	Further review of sampling strategy for Ragnall by limiting to a sample excavation of approximatively 70% of the total linear features to be investigated in trenches with dense archaeology.
12/06/2025	Email correspondence	Results of the trial trenching evaluation carried out south of the reservoir circulated.
19/08/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Updated OWSI presented and discussed. Wording and clarification over the role of the ACoW, Control Measures sought by NCC.
09/09/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around the points raised in the Statement of Common Ground
27/10/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Update of Statement of Common Ground and review of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation

31/10/2025	Email correspondence	Statement of Common Ground agreed with the Archaeology Advisory Team to the LPA
Land and Groundwater		
27 November 2024	Email	Information was provided to Nottinghamshire County Council relating to land and groundwater contamination issues. The Scoping Opinion had indicated that potential impacts to existing geological units from contamination should be assessed within the ES for the construction phase and the decommissioning phase. The Applicant confirmed that the ES chapter provides an assessment of potential effects on existing geological units and provided a copy of the methodology for review. The Applicant also confirmed that the ES chapter provides an assessment of the potential contamination of groundwater for the construction and decommissioning phases of the project (including consideration of existing groundwater abstraction points). A copy of the methodology was attached for review. It was noted that the methodology had been amended for One Earth Solar Farm since it was presented in the PEIR.
10 December 2024	Email	Response from the Applicant (to all local planning authorities) further explaining the reasons for the amendments to the methodology.
16 June 2025	Email	The Applicant requested information held by the local authority relating to private water abstraction locations (licensed or unlicensed) in response to consultation comments that the original dataset may not have been

		complete. This query has been handed to the flood risk management team at the council, and a response is awaited from them.
19 June 2025	Email	A response was received from Nottinghamshire County Council flood risk management team to confirm that they do not hold a dataset of private water supply locations. It was confirmed that data of this nature was held for their area by the Environment Agency (the Applicant has requested for this information directly from the Environment Agency, as indicated in the relevant SoCG).
Human Health		
May 2024	Online meeting	Introduction to the project with public health officer; focusing on human health elements.
Landscape and Visual		
22nd April 2024	Virtual meeting	**Key Topics:** • LVIA methodology • LVIA Study Area • Landscape receptors • Visual receptors • Representative viewpoints • Photomontages **Key Outcomes:** • Request for LVIA study area refinement to be detailed in the LVIA • Suggestion of ZTV approach and agreement to share drafts for comment • Comments on consultation note to be provided in writing • Follow-up meeting to be scheduled following publication of the PEIR

14th November 2024	Virtual meeting	**Key topics:** • ZTV parameters • LVIA study area • LVIA criteria • Scope of receptors • Scope of cumulative assessment **Key outcomes:** • Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR • Outstanding issues to be provided as an interim note
19th November 2024	Interim Note	**Key Topics:** • Clarity of LVIA figures including ZTVs • Updated LVIA methodology including specific criteria • Approach to RVAA • Review of study area scoping photos **Key Outcomes:** • Acknowledgement of additional viewpoints added and some previous PEIR comments addressed (e.g., VP16, VP26). • Acknowledgement of updated methodology reviewed and partially improved. • Outstanding issues remain regarding ZTV figures, viewpoint locations, methodological clarifications, visualisation quality

19th August 2025	Virtual meeting	**Key Topics** - Approach to visual assessment - Impacts on landscape character areas - Approach to cumulative assessment - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment **Key Outcomes** - Applicant to provide written clarifications on approach to visual assessment for the Council to review. - Council to review assessment on landscape character areas to determine if varying levels of effect is justified. - Council to review Joint Interrelationships Report [REP1-074] submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1 to understand the approach to cumulative assessment across the wider ES. - Applicant to review how a detailed planting plan will be secured in the DCO - Council to review updated OLEMP [REP1-053] submitted at Deadline 1 to check if suggested items have been appropriately addressed. - Council to review approach to Residential Assessment and Design [REP1-077] to understand how Residential Visual Amenity has been considered.

17th September 2025	Virtual Meeting	**Key Topics** - Outstanding LVIA matters **Key Outcomes** - Council to review assessment of visual receptors to determine if levels of effects are justified - Agreed that the level of effects on landscape character areas are justified - Council to provide a written response to the Joint Relationship Report [REP1-074]. - Welcomed additional detail provided within the OLEMP. - Agreed that the mechanism for securing a detailed planting plan in the DCO was sufficient - Welcomed additional evidence provided within Chapter 11 of the ES regarding Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
1st October 2025	Virtual Meeting	**Key Topics** - Outstanding LVIA matters **Key Outcomes** - Agreed that the level of effects on visual effects are justified and that the alternative approach suggested by the Council would not give rise to differing levels of impacts. - Welcomed additions made to the OLEMP - Confirmed that additional detail provided within Chapter 11 regarding Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) justifies that an RVAA is not required.

Ecology		
18/08/2025	Virtual Meeting	Meeting with all LPAs to discuss the status of all SoCGs and points on ecology
28/08/2025	Virtual Meeting	Meeting to discuss deadline 2 submissions and the SoCG in terms of ecology
Flood and Drainage		
5th November 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on updates to SoCG.

Table 1 – Record of Engagement

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council

4.1.1 The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council, following a series of meetings and discussions with respect to the key areas of the Proposed Development. This includes matters where discussions are ongoing.

4.1.2 As noted above, this is a 'live' document, and some aspects have yet to be agreed upon between both parties. The intention is to provide a final position in subsequent versions of the SoCG, addressing and identifying where changes have been made, and ultimately, documenting agreement by both parties on relevant points.

Table 02 – Cultural Heritage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	Scope of Assessment	Nottinghamshire County Council have raised concerns around the scope of assessment.	Concerns have been addressed and no further comments raised on scope of assessment during further statutory consultation. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]	***Agreed***
02-02	Church and Parish Intervisibility	Nottinghamshire County Council believes that intervisibility between churches and rural fields should also be examined.	Detailed assessment on the historic and present setting of churches, including consideration of associated parishes and intervisibility between churches, has been	***Agreed***

	with the Proposed Development		undertaken and included within the supporting Technical Appendix and within this Chapter. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]	
02-03	Impacts on designated assets	NCC are particularly concerned about the identified impacts to the designated assets of Fledborough and Ragnall and the extent of proposed mitigation	Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]. Further mitigation of effects to designated assets in Fledborough and Ragnall were reviewed on Site with Officers (21 August 2024). The Proposed Development incorporates further setbacks from assets in Ragnall and Fledborough, as well as planted boundaries to mitigate impact. Mitigation is fully explained at Section 10.5 and asset assessment was conducted at Section 10.6 of ES Chapter 10 (APP-039).	***Agreed***
02-04	Overall Impact of the Proposed Development	NCC raise concerns that there will be an overall harmful impact on the setting and hinterlands of some heritage assets and that the cumulative impacts alongside other nationally significant projects in the Trent Valley and immediate area are likely to be considerable.	Recognition of the accuracy of the submitted information and the mitigation measures is appreciated. To clarify, ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) only found a single long term significant adverse effect would arise: to the	***Agreed***

			Whimpton Moor (Scheduled Monument) which is difficult to mitigate against as harm arising from perceptual changes in the setting, rather than visual changes. Identified harm would be at the mid – lower end of less than substantial harm and need to be balanced. against the public benefits of the scheme (NPS EN-1, paragraph 5.9.32; NPS EN-3, paragraph 2.3.8) The cumulative assessment found no additive or synergistic harm Further detail can be found in the Applicant's response to Relevant Representations [EN010159/APP/9.3].	

Table 03 – Buried Archaeology

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	-Archaeological Assessment	Nottinghamshire County Council raises concerns regarding the level of archaeological assessment undertaken to inform the applicants Archaeology ES Chapter and DCO - application. The Council acknowledges the applicant's assessment work to date, including a desk-based assessment (DBA), geophysical survey (magnetometry) and some targeted evaluation trenching.	**Final agreed position:** While agreement was not reached on the scope and extent of pre-determination archaeological evaluation to inform the Archaeology ES Chapter and DCO application, following consultation with the LPAs, an agreed position has been reached regarding future commitments for additional trial trenching to be undertaken as a pre-commencement condition. This will inform the requirement, scope, and timing of archaeological mitigation, as necessary. The information collected from the additional trial trenching will be provided in a timely manner to enable the required consultation and implementation of the agreed mitigation strategies. **Previous response from the Applicant:**	~~Under Discussion~~ **Agreed**

			Further detail regarding the approach to the archaeological data collection, including trial trenching, and the flexibility provided by the Proposed Development design can be found in Section 3 and Section 9 of the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]. The approach to archaeological data collection for the One Earth Solar Farm has been designed in compliance with national policy (NPPF, NPS EN-1, EN-3), and professional standards and guidance, including, but not limited to, the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) *Code of Conduct*. It has been developed in collaborative consultation with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. As per EN-1 Paragraph 5.9.11 and Paragraph 207 of the NPPF, this has been achieved by carrying out an appropriate desk-based assessment followed by proportionate evaluation work, which as per CIfA's Standard for Evaluation (2023), encompasses both non-intrusive and intrusive fieldwork.	

			The non-intrusive assessment is presented in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment [APP-110 to APP-115] and includes a review of the HER data, LiDAR and aerial photographic assessment, geoarchaeological deposit modelling, and a geophysical survey covering the entire DCO boundary. The methodology for this non-intrusive assessment is outlined in Section 11.3 of the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038]. This methodology has been agreed with relevant stakeholders, acknowledged in the Relevant Representations, and follows applicable legislative and policy requirements as well as best practice guidance. The non-intrusive work carried out to inform the Archaeology ES Chapter provides a holistic approach to the data collection, relying on different survey techniques to off-set the specific limitation. In line with CIfA's Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023), which advocates the complementary use of both non-intrusive and intrusive techniques, the geophysical survey informed a robust and proportionate programme of trial trenching.	

			The results of the archaeological assessment program programme informed a robust and proportionate trial trenching evaluation carried out to inform the DCO Application and the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038], which included, as appropriate, trenches targeting features identified by the geophysical survey as well as trenches targeting apparently 'blank' areas in the selected areas. Where trial trench evaluation was not undertaken in certain areas of the Order Limits it is not regarded as a limitation to the assessment. The impacts and any additional mitigation requirements in these areas can be adequately understood based on the data presented in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) and the results of the completed geophysical survey evaluation which, alongside the results of the trial trench evaluation of other areas, provide a robust basis for understanding the impacts and mitigation requirements of the Order Limits as a whole. This combined approach aligns with professional archaeological standards, including the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023)*, which recommends a complementary use of non-intrusive and intrusive techniques.	

			A further phase of trial trenching is currently being designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England and is included in the draft outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) (an advanced draft of which, reflecting discussions undertaken to date with the parties, is intended to be submitted at Deadline 3). This will inform the detailed design of the Proposed Development and guide the implementation of mitigation strategies to offset potential impacts on buried heritage assets. Additionally, in accordance with paragraph 2.10.115 of EN-3, to minimise the risk of encountering unknown archaeological remains beyond the 29 identified locations, archaeological trial trenching will be carried out in advance of construction. This will target areas where significant ground disturbance is expected as part of the final design of the Proposed Development. This second phase of intrusive evaluation will be delivered as a pre-commencement requirement, focusing on locations identified as having the potential to contain buried heritage remains.	

			The phased strategy aims to provide sufficient data to inform the DCO application while minimising unnecessary disturbance to the archaeological resource. It meets the robustness requirements set out in NPS EN-1 and EN-3 and aligns with professional standards and guidance. Crucially, it upholds the principle of avoiding disproportionate and unjustifiable harm to the historic environment, as set out in paragraphs 5.9.28, 5.9.32, and 5.9.33 of EN-1 and paragraphs 215 and 216 of the NPPF. In line with the Buried Heritage ES Chapter [APP-038], the selected mitigation strategy will consider the nature, sensitivity, and extent of the buried heritage assets; the nature and magnitude of the impacts arising from the Proposed Development; and the practicality and suitability of implementing the proposed mitigation.	

			A proportionate Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) will be defined for all locations where buried heritage assets will be fully or partially affected by the Proposed Development, within the footprint of that impact. An Outline AMS (OAMS) will be included in the OWSI and will be designed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. The applied mitigation measures are expected to avoid residual significant effects on archaeological assets, instead reducing impacts to negligible or minor. Providing a flexible strategy for the next phases of trial trenching evaluation and mitigation allows the approach to the archaeological evaluation and mitigation to remain flexible and responsive to any future potential environmental constraints, technological advancements, and updates in professional guidance. This flexibility also ensures that mitigation can be tailored to minimise harm to archaeological assets while enabling efficient project delivery.	

			The need for flexibility in design, layout and technology is recognised in National Policy Statement EN-1 is details of a development, such as the final design, may not be finalised until after consent is granted.	
03-02	Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report	The Preliminary Trial Trenching Evaluation Report (APP-124), is not a full report and offers a very brief summary of the results. It is essential that the full report for this work is submitted so that a proper assessment of the data can be scrutinised at Examination.	The results of the trial trenching evaluation carriued out to inform Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] and the DCO Submission are included in the One Earth Solar Farm: Archaeological Evaluation Post-Excavation Assessment Report (issued to the LPAs ad Historic England for comments on the 12/06/2025)	**Agreed**

03-03	Scope of Assessment	We recommend that areas that return 'blank' readings in the geophysics results be tested for reliability with evaluation trenching, particular in areas of high development impact. Section 9.3.36 confirms the need for this, however much of the site has not yet been tested and we strongly reject the assertion in Section 9.3.37 that the work to date delivers the required evidence. In this matter the document is contradictory in terms of recognising the issue but then accepting a limited level of intrusive work to address it. Given the essential nature of adequate evaluation as the basis to deal appropriately with the developmental impacts and effectively manage development risk, NCC and LCC are deeply concerned regarding the outstanding work, and we would expect the applicant to provide further details for completion of an acceptable programme of evaluation trenching.	**Final agreed position:** While agreement was not reached on the scope and extent of archaeological evaluation undertaken to inform the Archaeology ES Chapter and DCO application, following consultation with the LPAs, an agreed position has been reached regarding future commitments for additional trial trenching to be undertaken as a pre-commencement condition. This will inform the requirement, scope, and timing of archaeological mitigation, as necessary. The information collected from the additional trial trenching will be provided in a timely manner to enable the required consultation and implementation of the agreed mitigation strategies. **Previous response from the Applicant:** The non-intrusive work carried out to inform the ES Chapter provides a holistic approach to the data collection, relying on different survey techniques to off-set the specific limitation. The results collected during the desk-based have been ground-truthed and expanded upon by a geophysical survey evaluation carried out on the entire Order Limits.	**Agreed** ~~**Under discussion**~~

			Therefore, the Applicant does not believe that further assessment should be done to test the reliability.	
03-04	Timing of additional trial trenching evaluation in the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]	*The Applicant does make provision for additional trenching as part of the post-consent AMS, however this may leave the discovery of significant archaeology very late in the programme when it is difficult to accommodate, and leading to potential programme delays, additional cost increases and an unfavourable outcome for the archaeology discovered. Care will need to be taken to ensure the results are available in good time to inform a reasonable AMS which must be agreed prior to the commencement of any development or enabling works.*	The Applicant's position is that the Proposed Development retains enough flexibility to accommodate any significant archaeology discovered during the additional evaluation work to be carried out post-consent. The potential areas selected for the parameters of the Proposed Development that had less flexibility (BESS and Substations) have been evaluated via trial trenching as part of the evaluation work to inform the Archaeological ES Chapter and the DCO submission. This reflects that there was less flexibility in these locations to respond to trial trenching undertaken post consent in order to avoid likely significant effects. Areas where trial trenching is proposed post-consent, ahead of implementation, represent areas of lower risk for archaeological potential as well as where there is more flexibility at detailed design to avoid or minimise impacts on archaeology (in line with the effects assessed in the ES) if required as a result of the further trial trenching.	***Agreed***

			The Applicant is undertaking engagement with the Archaeological Advisors to the LPAs and Historic England to define the additional archaeological work, and the DCO requirement, to ensure the securement of appropriate procedures for the approval of the AMS following the additional trial trenching evaluation. Consultations with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England will be held during the undertaking of the additional trial trenching, to report on any significant discovery in timely manner. This will allow the design of any additional archaeological work, if required, to inform the AMS. The results of any additional trial trenching and any other required evaluation will be shared with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England enough in advance of works commencing in order to inform any mitigation required prior to the commencement of any development or enabling works as agreed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England.	

03-05	Impacts of the Proposed Development not fully assessed in the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]	*Impacts from construction activity have not been properly considered as part of the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038. These would normally include groundworks for temporary compounds and haul roads, compaction/vibration from vehicle/plant tracking and other related construction activity. Where these occur and archaeology is present, we maintain that the impact is likely to be significant, adverse and negative, especially in areas of poor or shallow ground conditions.*	**Final agreed position:** While agreement was not reached on the assessment results of the impacts arising from construction activities used to inform the Archaeology ES Chapter and DCO application, following consultation with the LPAs, an agreed position has been reached regarding the approach to future review. As the detailed design for the Proposed Development has not yet been finalised, the exact location, extent, and potential impacts are yet to be fully defined. Accordingly, it has been agreed with the LPAs that the requirements for reviewing such effects will be confirmed as additional design details become available through ongoing design refinement. The Outline WSI sets out the methodologies and control measures that will define the conditions under which these reviews will be undertaken, as well as the timing and approach for consultation with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England, to ensure that appropriate mitigation is identified and implemented in a timely manner. **Previous response from the Applicant:**	***Agreed*** ~~***Under Discussion***~~

			Section 9.6 of the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038] presents a list of the work packages proposed as part of the Description of the Proposed Development [REP3-011], and the Impact Assessment refers to the work packages rather than to the individual activities. Maximum (and, where relevant, minimum) parameters for the Order Limits are applied based on a reasonable worst-case scenario to determine the Significance of Effects, assuming that construction activities could take place anywhere on the Order Limits. The Parameters have been assessed for below ground archaeological remains, based on the maximum areas that will be disturbed, within the single work packages. The description of the proposed activities included in work packages have been considered in the assessment of potential ground impacts where archaeology may be present. This approach ensures that all direct ground disturbances likely to affect buried heritage assets are captured within the assessment, considering activities for which the extent and locations are not defined yet, and which details will be available at Detail Desing stage.	

			The Applicant's decision to present the potential effects as work packages has been done to keep a degree of flexibility in assessing the effects, and their extent, and to guarantee proportionality and responsiveness to any future potential environmental constraints, technological advancements, and updates in professional guidance. The approach ensures a reasonable worst-case assessment has been undertaken and does not result in under reporting or under assessment of likely significant effects from the Proposed Development. The need for flexibility in design, layout and technology, and therefore in the approach to mitigation, is recognised in National Policy Statement EN-1 is details of a development, such as the final design, may not be finalised until after consent is granted. As further design details become available, specific activities can be further considered through ongoing design refinement and consultation to ensure appropriate mitigation is identified and implemented.	

			The OWSI will include allowances for the assessment included in ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] to be reviewed, and relevant control systems to define the conditions for said reviews to be undertaken.	
03-06	Potential impact from Maintenance and Decommissioning not properly accounted for in the ~~Es~~ ES Chapter	*Impacts from maintenance and decommissioning activities have not been properly considered as part of the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038].*	Section 9.6 of the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038] presents a list of the work packages proposed as part of the Description of the Proposed Development [[REP3-011] and the Impact Assessment refers to the work packages rather than to the individual activities. Maximum (and, where relevant, minimum) parameters for the Order Limits are applied based on a reasonable worst-case scenario to determine the Significance of Effects, assuming that construction activities could take place anywhere on the Order Limits. The Parameters have been assessed for below ground archaeological remains, based on the maximum areas that will be disturbed, within the single work packages.	***Agreed***

			The description of the proposed activities included in work packages have been considered in the assessment of potential ground impacts where archaeology may be present. This approach ensures that all direct ground disturbances likely to affect buried heritage assets are captured within the assessment, considering activities for which the extent and locations are not defined yet, and which details will be available at Detail Desing stage. The Applicant's decision to present the potential effects as work packages has been done to keep a degree of flexibility in assessing the effects, and their extent, and to guarantee proportionality and responsiveness to any future potential environmental constraints, technological advancements, and updates in professional guidance. The approach ensures a reasonable worst-case assessment has been undertaken and does not result in under reporting or under assessment of likely significant effects from the Proposed Development.	

			The need for flexibility in design, layout and technology, and therefore in the approach to mitigation, is recognised in National Policy Statement EN-1 is details of a development, such as the final design, may not be finalised until after consent is granted. As further design details become available, specific activities can be further considered through ongoing design refinement and consultation to ensure appropriate mitigation is identified and implemented. The OWSI will include allowances for the assessment included in ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] to be reviewed, and relevant control systems to define the conditions for said reviews to be undertaken. Additionally, the OWSI will include allowances for an ACoW to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities.	

			Specifically, the ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks. If such works are expected to affect known archaeological remains identified during evaluation or are expected to have a high magnitude of impact in areas where no remains were identified, an appropriate evaluation and/or mitigation strategy will be agreed with Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP.	

03-07	Concerns over the use the implementation of the mitigation measures.	*The document (*Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]) *repeatedly uses the phrase 'When appropriate and practicable', or 'where necessary and practicable,' in relation to mitigation work. We object to the use of this phrase where mitigation requirements are identified and deemed necessary. It would lead to development impacts being significant, adverse and negative where archaeology is present and an unenforceable programme of work.*	A suitable and proportionate mitigation strategy will be defined for all locations containing buried heritage assets that will be totally or partially affected by the Proposed Development, within the footprint of that impact. This will be informed by the evaluation work carried out to inform the AMS and will be agreed with Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. In line with the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038], the selected mitigation strategy will take into account the nature, sensitivity and extend of the buried heritage assets, the nature and magnitude of impact of the effect arising from the Proposed Development, and the suitability and practicability of implementing said mitigation. The AMS will be submitted for approval and secured through a Requirement of the DCO after consent is granted.	***Agreed***

			The effectiveness and practicability of the array of mitigation options available (i.e. avoidance areas, 'no-dig construction', archaeological mitigation,...) will be informed by the archaeological evaluation results, and by the Detail Design of the Proposed Development and will be discussed and agreed with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England.	

03-08	Use of micrositing of piles for solar arrays	*Paragraph 9.5.8 of the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038] states that in Areas of Archaeological Constraint (AAC) 'where necessary and practicable, the mounting structure for solar arrays will involve micrositing of piles in order to avoid specific archaeological features and/or it will be supported by concrete footings rather than piles, avoiding ground intrusive impact.' The Council objects to the use of the phrase 'where necessary and practicable,' it is unenforceable and unacceptable. It will also depend on the nature, depth, state of preservation and sensitivity of the archaeology as to whether concrete footings would be appropriate and would not damage or destroy surviving archaeology without allowing it to be preserved by record*	As the Applicant recognises that the micrositing/concrete footings are not mitigations that can be applied thorough the entire DCO, these will be implemented when effective and practicable, within areas of Archaeological Constraints as per Paragraphs 9.5.8 – 9.5.11 of ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038], and as defined in the AMS. Effectiveness and practicability will be informed by the archaeological evaluation results and Detail Design of the Proposed Development and will be discussed and approved with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. The use of micrositing/concrete footings will be included in the AMS and in the CEMP. Any mitigation option, including micrositing, would be deployed on the assumption that the ground conditions are suitable, and compaction or vertical movement would be avoided.	***Agreed***

03-09	Concerns over the meaning of 'unplanned activities', as presented in the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]	*Paragraph 9.5.15 the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038] goes on to say that 'Where non-intrusive trenching methods are proposed for cable routes, the CEMP(s) will include a contingency for archaeological intervention/mitigation in the event that unplanned activities threaten the preservation of known buried heritage remains.' Please clarify what specifically is meant by 'unplanned activities.' The full extent of proposed impact of the cable route like the rest of the redline boundary extent of the site will need adequate assessment and evaluation to inform reasonable mitigation of currently surviving archaeology which would be damaged or destroyed by the development*	Paragraph 9.5.15 of ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038] covers the event of unplanned and/or contingency ground works that might be required during the construction works, not known at the time of the OCEMP submission. The OWSI presents allowances to report any such requirements for unplanned and/or contingency ground works to the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPA and Historic England, and the mechanism in place to assess and mitigate any effect on buried heritage assets, not considered as part of the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]. This control measures will be implemented and monitored by the ACoW during the Construction, Maintenance and Decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, as presented in the draft OWSI.	***Agreed***

03-10	Decommissioning	*In reference to Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038] Paragraph 9.5.22 LCC states that 'Decommissioning is anticipated to commence in 2090, and the majority of the Order Limits would be returned to its original use after 39 decommissioning and will be available for its original use.' Details are required on how this will be undertaken in order to understand the ground impacts. If it will revert to agricultural land for example, will the hundreds of thousands of piles be removed, what ground impacts would occur for cabling, would tree planting for ecological mitigation and landscaping be retained or pulled out?*	As detailed within ES Chapter 5 [APP-034], the decommissioning works will involve the removal of all above ground infrastructure including the BESS and substation foundations. There are no plans to remove trees and hedgerows as part of the decommissioning of the project. In consideration of the Environmental Measures presented in Section 9.5 of ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage (APP-038, pp. 39-44), and in consideration of the currently unknown technologies or requirements for Operation and Maintenance and Decommissioning phases, it's the Applicant's position that there will be no likely significant effects in excess of the construction phase. The Applicant has also outlined the approach to mitigating potential impacts upon built heritage assets in the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Plan [APP/7.6.1]. The OWSI will include allowances for an ACoW to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities.	***Agreed***

		Additionally, we agree that archaeological remains which have been removed would not experience any further effects. We are concerned that as there is no detail on the ground impacts of decommissioning there can be no understanding or effective mitigation measures to protect archaeology that survives across this landscape. Other solar NSIP schemes have provided indications that decommissioning will include works which would impact on surviving archaeology such as removal of all concrete, hardstanding areas, infrastructure foundations and internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m, or at if necessary temporary bunding and/or settlement ponds will be installed to allow for isolation and onsite treatment of any sediment laden or contaminated water prior to discharge to the drainage system	Specifically, the ACoW will be notified of any development works during the Maintenance and Decommissioning phases that fall outside areas previously disturbed by Construction-phase groundworks. If such works are expected to affect known archaeological remains identified during evaluation or are expected to have a high magnitude of impact in areas where no remains were identified an appropriate evaluation and/or mitigation strategy will be agreed with Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England. Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the OCEMP, OEMP and ODEMP. An OAMP will be submitted within the OWSI for approval and secured through a Requirement of the DCO, when consent is granted. The AMP will be agreed with the Archaeological Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England to ensure that protective measures presented in this OWSI stay in place and are adhered to throughout the development	

			Impacts at the phase of decommissioning are expected to be no greater than in construction. The oDEMP further details the approach to infrastructure removal in Section 3 [AS-051].	

Table 03 – Human Health

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Cross referencing human health with other chapters	Human Health Chapter to also include cross-references to the following assessments: • Landscape and Visual Chapter – Impacts on alterations to the landform and the quality of the built and natural environment; • Socio-Economics Chapter – Impacts on education and training opportunities and local business activity; • Transport and Access Chapter - Impacts on accessibility and connections to jobs; • Hydrology and Hydrogeology Chapter – Impacts on water resources; • Land and Soils Chapter – Impacts on land quality; • Air Quality Chapter – Impacts on human health from traffic, plant and dust during the Construction Phase and the Decommissioning Phase; • Noise and Vibration Chapter – Impacts on noise and vibration levels from traffic and operations	These references are set out under "Other Environmental Matters" in section 16.6 of this chapter.	**Agreed**

Table 04 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	LVIA methodology with regard to landscape assessment	The LVIA Methodology with regard to landscape assessment is aligned with GLVIA3.	LVIA methodology with regard to landscape assessment is agreed and is considered to be in accordance with best practice guidance.	**Agreed**
04-02	LVIA Study Area	The Council has not identified anything on Site or within the wider landscape to contradict the Applicant's position that there would not be Significant effects of the One Earth scheme in isolation beyond 2km. Typically distance reduces the likelihood of Significant effects occurring. Therefore, we agree that a 2km study area for the One Earth scheme in isolation is appropriate.	The 2km LVIA Study Area is agreed.	**Agreed**
04-03	Scope of landscape receptors	The scope of landscape receptors is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of landscape receptors is agreed.	**Agreed**
04-04	Scope of visual receptors	The scope of visual receptors is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of visual receptors is agreed.	**Agreed**
04-05	Scope of representative viewpoints	The scope of representative viewpoints is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of representative viewpoints is agreed.	**Agreed**
04-06	Scope of photomontages	The scope of photomontages is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of photomontages is agreed.	**Agreed**

04-07	Assessment assumptions and limitations	The process of assessment is thorough and well explained in the volumes, which include a clear summary of assumptions and limitations of the assessment.	The assumptions and limitations of the LVIA are agreed.	**Agreed**
05-08	Level of effect on landscape receptors	Subsequent meetings with the Applicant along with a site visit have clarified the findings of the LVIA. We agree that some of the identified character areas would not have significant effects due to their being limited above ground development directly affecting these areas.	The level of effect on landscape receptors is agreed.	**Agreed**
04-09	Level of effect on visual receptors	Several receptors are judged to have significant adverse effects which have been identified, and subsequently through the consideration of sequential effects is unlikely to increase the overall findings.	The level of effect on visual receptors is agreed.	**Agreed**
04-10	Approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impacts	The Council is promoting an approach to extract common landscape attributes of the area from the multiple character area assessments that cover the region, enabling a reasoned, evidence-led baseline, and subsequently assessment, of cumulative landscape effects across the wider area. The Council disagree with the findings of the Joint Interrelationships Report from the Tillbridge examination as visual effects relate only to “in combination views” where two schemes may be seen in the same view. The report does not consider	The Applicant has explained during the Examination how its approach to cumulative assessment aligns with the related PINS Advice, and the approach adopted by other solar DCO schemes that have been consented in the wider area. Further information regarding the Applicant’s position on the approach to cumulative assessment is provided within the Applicant Response to Local Impact Reports [REP2-083] at LIR122.	**Not Agreed**

		sequential views of multiple schemes, nor does it consider landscape effects through extensive land use change, or perceptual changes through the introduction of above-ground built elements.		
04-11	Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP)	Subsequent clarifications and meetings with the Applicant have provided additional detail. The OLEMP is now considered appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The landscape and ecology management strategy, prescriptions, and monitoring approach as set out within the OLEMP are agreed.	**Agreed**
04-12	Timescale of project and influence of the assessment of effects	The Applicant clarified at ISH2 that the LVIA assessment has not reduced the assessment of effects due to being either temporary or permanent, and therefore the judgement of effects is unlikely to change based on this.	It is agreed that the temporary nature of the project has not resulted in the residual effects being understated.	**Agreed**
04-13	LVIA methodology with regard to visual assessment	The Council maintain the position that the visual assessment does not fully align with guidance provided within LI Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01, but judges that the consideration of sequential effects is unlikely to increase the overall findings.	The Applicant has explained during the Examination how its approach to visual assessment aligns with industry guidance in ensuring the most important issues including the sequential and varying experiences are reported.	**Not agreed**

			Further information regarding the Applicant's position on the approach to visual assessment is provided within the Applicant Response to Local Impact Reports [REP2-083] at LIR121. Despite a difference of opinion regarding the alignment of the LVIA methodology (specifically consideration of sequential views) to LITGN-2024-01, both parties agree with the final assessment findings as presented.	
04-14	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)	The Applicant has now provided additional information to evidence an iterative design process and consideration of residential amenity. This clarifies how residential receptors have been assessed within the LVIA and constitutes an appropriate justification for not undertaking a full RVAA with regard to the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold.	The approach to consideration of visual impacts on residential receptors has been agreed and therefore the LVIA fully and accurately reports the visual impact of the Proposed Development on residential receptors. It is also agreed that sufficient evidence has been provided by the Applicant to support these findings and therefore that the RVAA threshold has not been met. It is therefore agreed that a RVAA is not required.	**Agreed**

Table 06 – Ecology and Biodiversity

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	Scope of Assessment	NCC has reviewed the Biodiversity Chapter and relevant appendices of the ES and is concerned about some the assessment methodology that has been used and inadequacy of some of the proposed mitigation. It is considered that there are gaps in the impact assessment and these mean that the impact upon biodiversity has not been robustly assessed, and that the full extent of required mitigation has not been properly established. This also makes it difficult to conclude whether the impacts of the proposal will be positive, neutral or negative.	The Applicant provided at Deadline 1 additional information on field survey. This information was provided in response, in part, to NCC comments in their relevant representation [RR-154]. The updated information is currently being considered by NCC and the Applicant will seek to discuss the issues raised as part of discussions regarding Statements of Common Ground. The Applicant and NCC note that this overarching issue will be the last to be agreed due to its nature.	**Under discussion**

05-02	Survey Locations	There is a very large area which has not been subject to detailed surveys, further clarification to whether these areas are subject to protected species surveys should be sought. Specifically, why the area around the High Marnham Substation has not been surveyed, when access issues were the constraint.	In terms of the High Marnham Substation, National Grid is planning to construct a new substation close to the existing High Marnham substation as part of the North Humber to High Marnham project (case reference EN020034), which is itself part of the Great Grid Upgrade. The latest proposals see the proposed substation lying within the large arable field immediately to the west of the substation. This means that the habitat that may be affected is a single arable field and potentially its boundary features. As described in paragraph 6.9.2 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [APP-035] the local wildlife site and any other habitats of interest (e.g. hedgerows) would be crossed by trenchless techniques. Therefore, the only potential effects associated with a connection at this point is associated with the loss of arable land. This is not considered a particular constraint from the biodiversity perspective. It is suggested that the use of trenchless techniques may still require loss of hedgerow, scrub etc. However, this would not be	**Agreed**

			the case as access either side of the LWS would (i.e. launch and retrieval pits) would be taken to the south of the LWS using National Grid's existing access road and to the north of the LWS using the existing field entrance (which has been subject to survey). The Applicant has confirmed that the area that was not subject to field survey has been included within the assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain. Although NCC would have preferred full survey coverage, the overall outcome would not have been unduly influenced by lack of access.	

05-03	Assessment	There are 34 LWS within the 2 km study area, one of which occurs within the Site itself, with a further eight immediately adjacent to the Site. Details of those sites that occur either within or adjacent to the Site are summarised in Table 6.3. However, NCC considered this to be incorrect as Marnham Railway Yard LWS, Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS and Road Wood LWS all fall into the Order Limits Boundary.	The Applicant can confirm that currently all areas within fields proposed for solar PV deployment adjacent to LWS are arable fields. They are separated from the adjacent LWS by hedgerows or scrub. The Applicant can confirm that Marnham Railway Yard LWS, Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS and Road Wood LWS are all listed as within the Order Limits within the versions of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] and Appendix 6.2 Ecology Desk Study [REP1-030] published at Deadline 3.	**Agreed**

05-04	Survey of Skylarks	Impacts on ground nesting birds, particularly Skylarks, seem to be of greatest concern, but it does not appear that an attempt has been made to estimate how many Skylark territories there will be post-development, with mitigation. Furthermore, with regards to para 6.10.92 of the Biodiversity Chapter, further detail is needed of the extrapolation of Skylark territories has been carried out, given only a quarter of the site was surveyed and the extrapolation form 66 pairs to 115 pairs suggests that half the Limit Order is unsuitable for Skylarks, which seems unlikely. In summary, the approach to breeding birds represents a significant area of concern.	With regards skylark, the mitigation proposed is considered appropriate to provide breeding opportunities to all pairs that may be displaced from the solar array areas. An updated extrapolation for skylark was provided at Deadline 1 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] (see paragraph 6.10.105). Yellow wagtail are considered in the 'Other breeding bird section of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. This species has been shown to occur within solar farms and should benefit from measures such as the provision of SuDS, temporary ponds and scrapes (see C21 in Table 6.6 Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]), and positive management of ditches (see C22 in Table 6.6 Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) due to their feeding preferences.	**Under discussion**

05-05	Reptile surveys	A sampling approach was used to assess the highest quality habitats within five locations across the Order limits. Grass snake (peak count of 2 adults) and common lizard (peak count of 3 adults) were confirmed to occur within these habitats. However, no reptiles were identified along the Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway LWS. Considering that reptiles were identified to be present within these areas, and therefore present within the order limits, it is unclear why no further surveys undertaken in wider areas.	Reptile survey was not proposed within the Scoping Report [APP-080]). Following NSDC response to the scoping report, reptile surveys were undertaken. The targeted nature of these surveys was discussed in a meeting held on the 11 March 2024 with the relevant planning authorities. During the meeting it was acknowledged that reptile populations are unlikely to be at particular risk of solar development (allowing for usual mitigation during construction) and that there were long term opportunities to benefit this species group. Although there were limitations to the survey (mainly due to survey equipment being removed and/or moved by members of the public), neither the outcome of the assessment nor the approach to mitigation or enhancement would change. As the type or level of mitigation proposed would not likely change regardless of the extent of survey (i.e. sampling all ditches or hedgerow bottoms) the Applicant considers it	**Agreed**

			would be disproportionate to have undertaken a wider survey effort. Although NCC would have preferred additional survey to be undertaken, however, it is noted the addition of more data would not have altered the assessment outcomes or the design of the mitigation put in place.	

05-06	Baseline Bat Survey Approach	NCC is unclear as to why static 10 for the bat baseline survey was positioned outside of the Order Limits and seek clarification to why only of the locations 2 (locations 11 and 12) incorporated arable fields, when this forms the majority of the on-site habitats.	The Applicant is content that the bat data provided is adequate to understand the types of bats present within the Order Limits and their general level of activity both in habitats where you would typically expect to record higher levels of activity (e.g. woodland edge) and low levels of activity (within arable fields). Further data collection would not alter the approach to design, mitigation or enhancement as the retention and buffering of habitats of most interest to bats have largely been retained. The enhancements proposed will be beneficial for bats by providing more connection and structure in the landscape and by providing better feeding opportunities. NCC would have preferred a greater level of survey coverage for bats, although it is agreed that the design of mitigation and assessment outcome would not have changed should further survey have been completed. The Applicant has added reference to dark corridors to the Outline Landscape	~~Under discussion~~Agreed

			and Ecology Management Plan to be submitted at Deadline 3 as requested by NCC.	
05-07	Impacts on badgers	The preference is for suitability sized holes rather than gates to be used to facilitate movement of badgers around the order limits.	Noted – environmental measure C9 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] allows for either. C9 was updated to remove references to gates at Deadline 1.	**Agreed**

05-08	Environmental Measures	C13 - This type of fencing would not stop animals from entering active works. Other methods of mitigation need to be considered. C15 – Not considered sufficient – would also disturb ground nesting birds too much. Mitigation to prevent nesting birds should be undertaken - i.e. cutting of any longer grassland habitats or other vegetation outside of the nesting bird season and then management of any grassland swards to a low height to deter nesting (grassland habitats) Areas of habitats such as scrub, hedgerows etc should be cut in the reptile active period, immediately following suitable nesting bird surveys by experienced Ecologists. C16 – Are these areas going to be protected once these works have been completed – they need to be fenced or have a specific phasing to prevent any encroachment during construction and decommissioning. C17 – To be created 12 months prior to the installation of the modules. What protection are these going to have? Management works to the grassland during the establishment period will need to be undertaken which could impact any skylark nests	The Applicant and NCC have discussed updates to environmental measures C13, C15, C16, C17, C18, C19, C20, C24. These updates have been included within Table 6.6 of Chapter 6: Biodiversity, the Commitments Register and the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan at Deadline 3.	~~Under discussion~~Agreed

		C18 – Consideration of different types to be created currently all will just be sown with a species rich grassland Could some be made with sandy substrate and have an acid grassland mix created? C19 & 20 – Clarification sought for the numbers to be used and locations. 50 and 25 doesn't seem to be enough C24 – 50 including 3 barn owl boxes doesn't seem to be enough		

05-09	Impacts on Lampreys	6.10.8 of the ES Chapter states: Changes in EMF and heat are unlikely to be detectable within a few metres (likely under 1.5 m) from each cable. At the minimum specified depths no effects would be expected. To inform future consideration of lamprey and EMF, monitoring will be implemented (C12) in coordination with the Environment Agency and Natural England (as has been requested of other solar developers in the general locale). The requirement for monitoring suggests that the exact impacts to lamprey cannot be determined. Although the ES chapter has reviewed the literature and provided justification and mitigation to be used, the use of the word likely does not provide complete confidence that there will be no impacts to this species. Lamprey populations will be monitored for no more than 5 years – we would question whether this is sufficient considering their life cycle. Larvae live downstream for 3-7 years and then go to the ocean, before returning to freshwater to spawn and die. 5 years wouldn't be sufficient to monitor any impacts to the population. Especially with the impacts of the cabling under the Trent. There has been no baseline survey to establish the	The Applicant and NCC agree that following the monitoring protocol agreed with the Environment Agency for other large solar farms with cables that go under the River Trent (e.g. Cottam Solar Project etc.) is appropriate.	**Agreed**

		number of lampreys and therefore cannot determine impacts through any monitoring. Impacts to lamprey during the decommissioning phases have not been considered		

05-10	Impact on Otter and Water Vole	Otters ES chapter Paragraph 6.10.116 states: The permanently wet ditches where effects would be manifest will be impacted by construction activities (C1) but will be protected through the implementation of One Earth Solar Farm Environmental Statement Volume 2: Chapter 6: Biodiversity Application Document Ref: EN010159/6.6 Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: EN010159 Page 87 buffers, and good housekeeping as detailed within the CEMP (C4 and C14) to control dust, prevent pollution and reduce the risk of spreading invasive nonnative species. At the point of decommissioning the likely significant effects will be similar to construction, although will be less intrusive as cables, piles and other below ground infrastructure is proposed to remain in place. No information on the size of buffers, location of artificial holts to be impacted during decommissioning has been provided or assessed. Water vole More details on control of mink – how long for? Where will this take place?	The Applicant has updated the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and environmental measure C38 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP3-009] at Deadline 3 following discussions with NCC. The Applicant has updated the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and environmental measure C23 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP3-009] at Deadline 3 following discussions mink control and specifies how it would be administered with NCC. This secures the and the duration of the control project. The locations of trapping would be determined by an expert in trapping mink (via the Steering Group) post-consent, but this could be both within and outside of the Order Limits based on the best opportunity for enhancing the local water vole population.	~~Under Discussion~~Agreed

05-11	River Trent Buffer	River Trent ES chapter Paragraph 6.10.53 states: Habitats within the River Trent will not be directly impacted by construction activities (C1) and will be protected from indirect impacts through the implementation of buffers (minimum 16 m) This buffer is not considered sufficient considering the species the River Trent supports.	The 16m stand-off distance is that specified by the Environment Agency for tidal rivers for control of potential effects associated with works. This distance has been accepted by both Natural England and the Environment Agency as appropriate. It is noted that the realistic worst-case scenario is that the fence line demarcating construction would be a minimum of 16m from the bank top. This means that physical works (e.g. the launch or retrieval pits for the HDD) would inevitably set back further from the river. Potential impacts on the river are associated mainly with loss of pollutants from the working area due to run-off or flooding. These elements are all managed through the Construction Environment Management Plan [REP3-041].	~~Under Discussion~~Agreed

05-12	Biodiversity Net Gain	BNG Modified grassland in good condition – habitat summary states : Grassland field with high species diversity though evidence of agricultural heritage. How many species per m2? Should this not be other neutral grassland? Missing information to define this (see below)– habitat type in UK Habs is not solely based on agricultural use but through the composition. BNG condition assessment sheets also require the use of Condition sheet 6 and not 5 if there are more than 9 species per m2. The modified grassland in good condition underneath the solar panels is not feasible. Under the solar panels will require regular management to keep the sward height low and therefore will not be able to meet condition criteria B and D – therefore the maximum is moderate condition for this habitat. It should be noted that UK Hab Guidance for Solar Arrays page 326 states: Record the strips of panels as u1b6 and the strips of vegetation in between the rows separately.	The Applicant has responded to this issue within 'The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]'. This response is copied below. 'The Applicant notes that regardless of any changes to Appendix 6.10 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP3-037] in previous responses, there is no doubt that the level of BNG that will be provided by the proposed development will be way in excess of a typical uplift of at least 10%. Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO [REP3-003] secures that prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development, a biodiversity net gain strategy must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The Applicant considers that the assumption of modified grassland in good condition is achievable within the Order Limits. Other solar farms that have Development Consent have had more biodiverse grassland types under solar panels accepted (using similar seed	~~Under Discussion~~Agreed

		No information on the size of the trees inputted into the metric has been provided. As per BNG User Guidance on post-development tree planting, newly planted individual trees should be classed as 'small', unless 'medium' size or above at the time of site-planting and trees planted with a DBH less than 7.5cm are considered to be 'small. No species lists / results of the quadrats undertaken for the grassland conditions, provided within the BNG assessment or condition sheets provided as an appendix A1 Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets. Many of the condition assessment sheets are also lacking in justification for the pass or fail of each condition criteria. In addition Appendix 6-3 extended habitat survey does not contain a direct translation into UK Habs, with references to older Phase 1 habitat types (JNCC 2016), and not UKHabs, therefore finding species lists for the relevant habitat type for comparison is difficult. Although over a 10% net gain is definitely feasible for this solar farm, modifications to the post development habitat types needs to	mixes), whilst others using grass seed mixes with no wildflower component has had modified grassland in moderate condition (as suggested by NSDC) considered reasonable. For example: Longfield Solar Farm (EN010118) - beneath solar panels assigned other neutral grassland in poor condition. Established using a wildflower seed mix. Heckington Fen Solar (EN010123) - beneath solar panels assigned either other neutral grassland in moderate condition or modified grassland in moderate condition dependent on height of solar panels (range from 3m to 3.5m). Established using a wildflower seed mix. Mallard Pass Solar Project (EN010127) - beneath solar panels assigned modified grassland in moderate condition. Grass seed mix only. East Yorkshire Solar (EN010143) - beneath solar panels assigned modified grassland in moderate condition. Grass seed mix with clover. West Burton Solar Project (EN010132) - beneath solar panels assigned modified grassland in moderate condition. Long term diversification	

		be undertaken to provide a more realistic percentage of net gain.	approach (with elements to be decided) with small amount of wildflower seed in mix only (95/5 ratio of grass to wildflower). Cottam Solar Project (EN010133) - beneath solar panels assigned modified grassland in moderate condition. Long term diversification approach (with elements to be decided) with a small amount of wildflower seed in the mix only (95/5 ratio of grass to wildflower). Based on what has been accepted as reasonable elsewhere, it would be a disincentive for a developer to commit to using wildflower mixes, when the same benefit in terms of BNG could be delivered (e.g. modified grassland in moderate condition) using a simple grass mix The Applicant considers that the habitats specified represent a reasonable and precautionary approach, whilst giving the best opportunity to deliver for biodiversity. The Applicant acknowledges that the Outline Landscape and Ecology Plan (oLEMP) [REP3-047] does not contain detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of each area. However, the level of information provided is akin to other similar	

			projects and provides an understanding of the types of techniques that would be employed. Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO [REP3-003] secures that prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development, a LEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Environmental Measure C17 and C29 within Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP3-009] will be updated at Deadline 1 to note the need to undertake soil testing prior to habitat creation and use this data to inform the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan that will need to accompany the Biodiversity Gain Plan post consent.' It is the Applicant's view that modified grassland in good condition can be delivered and downgrading to moderate is a disincentive to maximising biodiversity value.	

05-13	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	Further clarity requested around the oLEMP in terms of what will be provided as part of the finalised LEMP (i.e. seed mixes etc.). In addition, will a HMMP also be produced?	The finalised LEMP will provide all information necessary in order to deliver the specified habitats. This will include seed mixes and planting schedules on a field by field basis. It will be the overarching document for agreement with the relevant planning authorities. An HMMP will also be written that provides the practical information for delivery. This will remain a live document that will be updated over the life time of the project to reflect monitoring results and adaptive management as necessary. The HMMP is secured via wording in the oOLEMP.	~~Under Discussion~~Agreed

Table 06 – Traffic and Transport

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
06-01	Access strategy used for construction access	NCC queried the access strategy, in ~~particular , the~~particular, the bypass of Ragnall.	The Applicant has prepared a review report for the A57 junction and details of the access strategy to avoid Ragnall. This information is set out within the A57 Access Note submitted at deadline 5. ~~are set out in this report which is with NCC for consideration~~ The Applicant and NCC agree that construction access will not pass through Ragnall and that an access on the A57 is the agreed means of access.	~~**Under discussion**~~ **Agreed**
06-02	Access junction drawings	NCC requested that all access drawing be appended to the ~~TA~~Transport Assessment.	The Applicant has updated the Transport Assessment [REP2-114] with the access junction drawings. Updated drawings are being appended to the Transport Assessment being submitted at deadline 5.	**Under discussion**

06-03	Road Safety Audits	NCC have requested a Stage 1 ~~RSA at Gates A and H (A57 and Roadwood Lane)~~Road Safety Audit at all accesses.	The Applicant has undertaken a Stage 1 RSA at both ~~locations~~ Gates A and H (A57 and Roadwood Lane) and this is included in the A57 access review report. Updated drawings are being appended to the Transport Assessment being submitted at deadline 5.	~~**Under discussion**~~ **Not Agreed**
06-04	Barred Routes	NCC noted concerns about roads not on the barred routes and that this could allow traffic to bypass the suggested routes and lead to ~~under estimates~~underestimates in the impact review.	The Applicant has updated the barred routes in the Transport Assessment [REP2-114] and oCTMP [REP3-049] to address the NCC comments and understand that matters relating to routing and traffic impacts are addressed by these changes.	~~**Under discussion**~~**Agreed**
06-05	Passing Places	NCC have requested passing place details for Crabtree Land and Moor Lane.	The Applicant has provided plans illustrating passing place provision on both roads in the Transport Assessment [REP2-114]	**Agreed**
06-06	Wear & Tear Agreement	NCC request that the oCTMP includes a Wear & Tear Agreement and that this includes drain gullies within 500m of an access point.	The oCTMP ~~[REP3-049] has been updated to include this.~~has been updated at Deadline 5 as per discussions between the Applicant and NCC on this point.	~~**Under discussion**~~**Agreed**

06-07	Accident data	NCC requests that the accident data is updated to summer 2025.	The Applicant has provided this information in the A57 access junction review report.	~~Under discussion~~Agreed
06-08	Staff Travel Plan	NCC requested further details on travel plan monitoring and remedial actions.	The oCTMP [REP3-049] ~~has~~ was ~~been~~ updated to include this additional information on travel plan monitoring and remedial actions.	~~Under discussion~~Agreed

Table 07 – DCO Requirements

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
07-01	Timeframe for requirements	NCC considers that notification of a decision within 10 weeks as a standard approach is insufficient. NCC is particularly concerned with the resourcing of such requirements and therefore consider that a more appropriate default period equating to Major Environment Impact Assessment development for a planning application of 16 weeks is more appropriate. Whilst NCC note that Part 2(c) includes for the ability to agree an alternate period, the expectation for 10 weeks would be set by its inclusion in the standard wording. The project is significant in size and scale and the information submitted for many of the requirements is likely to involve a significant amount of information and an appropriate time period must be afforded for NCC to consider this. This issue would be compounded by the combination of other NSIP projects within the county (an outlined briefly in Section 2), should they gain development consent. These projects follow a similar timeline and will place cumulative	The Applicant appreciates the points raised by the Council and at Deadline 2 has extended the time from ten to twelve weeks. The Applicant does not agree that the time allowed should be any longer than this, for the reasons previously set out in support of the ten-week period. The Applicant has also made consequential amendments to the time periods in Article 45 and Requirement 20 (Decommissioning and restoration).	~~Under discussion~~Not Agreed

		pressure on the statutory functions of the planning department.		
07-02	Fee Structure	*NCC notes that where an application to discharge a requirement is made a fee is to apply and must be paid to the relevant planning authority for each application. However, the fees vary significantly between each requirement. In relation to those requirements where NCC is the relevant planning authority, the highest fee of £2535 applies to Requirements 7 (Battery Safety Management), 12 (Archaeology), 18 (PROW Management Plan) and 19 (Soil Management Plan). Whereas Requirements 11 (Surface and Foul Water Drainage) and 15 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) would be subject to a fee of £145. This fee is considered to be too low and the rationale for adopting a differential approach between requirements is not clear. NCC would recommend applying the same fee structure to all of its requirements, unless evidence can be provided to the contrary. The costs to the council should be adequately covered through a suitable fee structure in the DCO and the fees should also be index linked from the date of the DCO.*	The Applicant has updated the fees associated with the first application to discharge all requirements within the DCO (requirements 1 to 22) to £2578.00. This is set out in Schedule 15, paragraph 5(2) of the DCO submitted at Deadline 5. ~~The fees set out in Schedule 15, paragraph 5(2) are £2578 for the first application of the discharge of requirements 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19. Any other requirements are £298 – this relates to R3 (phasing plan), 6 (community liaison group), 9 (BNG), 11 (drainage), 15 (CTMP), 16 (operational noise), 17 (skills, supply chain and employment), and 21 (ground conditions). These listed requirements are expected to typically be less onerous to discharge, having regard to the amount of material likely to be submitted, and the complexity of the subject matter. The approach taken is fairly well established for Orders made in Lincolnshire.~~	~~Under discussion~~Agreed

			~~Paragraph 5(3) is included to ensure fees captured within the Schedule are updated to increase in line with inflation, as per the regulatory approach.~~ The Examining Authority has submitted their proposed changes to the dDCO, including the addition of requirement 11 to schedule 15, paragraph 5(2). The Applicant has amended paragraph 5(2)(a) of Schedule 15 to include requirement 11, as noted within REP4-053. ~~The Applicant is reviewing these comments and will update the dDCO accordingly should it be required.~~	

Table 08 – Flood and Drainage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
08-01	Surface Water Runoff from Solar Farm Areas	Applicant to consider how surface water runoff from the solar farm areas will be managed through the use of vegetated areas and also strategic SuDS features to encourage natural infiltration. -The LLFA's comments on the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy were provided in an Addendum to the NCC Local Impact Report submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-086]. The approach to assessing flood risk at the site is reasonable and proportionate for the planning stage, however further information has been requested as set out within the Addendum to the LIR [REP3-086].	NCC prepared an addendum on flood risk [REP3-086] to which the applicant provided responses at Deadline 4 [REP4-051]. ~~A meeting was held on 5th November to discuss matters.~~ NCC officers have outlined that in principle ~~they agreed~~NCC agree with the approach taken to managing surface water runoff from the Solar Farm areas. An updated FRA and Drainage Strategy is being prepared for Deadline 5. Following NCC officers review of this document, this matter can be updated to agreed. ~~The approach to management of surface water runoff from the solar farm areas is under discussion.~~	**Under Discussion**

			~~NCC has now prepared an addendum on flood risk [REP3-086] and the Applicant is reviewing before re-commencing discussions with NCC.~~	
08-02	Surface Water Runoff from BESS and Substation Areas	Inspection and maintenance of vegetated cover and any SuDS to be considered. - The LLFA's comments on the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy were provided in an Addendum to the NCC Local Impact Report submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-086). The approach to assessing flood risk at the site is reasonable and proportionate for the planning stage, however further information has been requested as set out within the Addendum to the LIR (REP3-086).	~~The approach to management of surface water runoff from the BESS and Substation areas under discussion.~~ NCC ~~has now prepared~~ prepared an addendum on flood risk [REP3-086] to which the applicant provided responses at Deadline 4 [REP4-051]. ~~These matters were discussed further on 5th November.~~ NCC ~~had~~have no concerns with the principle of surface water management but requested the following clarifications be provided. - Clarification within the report that infiltration testing and groundwater monitoring will be undertaken to inform detailed design. - Written clarification of the inclusion of BESS and substation access tracks within the calculations undertaken.	**Under Discussion**

			- Extend exceedance plans to show the direction of exceedance routes beyond the compounds. - Additional maintenance information relating to flow control devices, pipework, penstock valves and SuDS features. An updated FRA and Drainage Strategy is being prepared for Deadline 5. It was agreed that subject to the changes being included within the updated FRA and Drainage Strategy, the approach to management of surface water management of the BESS and substation areas could be updated to agreed.~~and the Applicant is reviewing before re-commencing discussions with NCC.~~	
08-03	Firewater Containment	Applicant to consider how surface water runoff from the BESS and Substation areas will be managed in line with local policy reuirements.	The approach to management of firewater runoff has been agreed and is in line with that set out within the FRA as well as within Section 5 of the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan.	~~Under Discussion~~ Agreed

Table 9 – Waste Management

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
09-01	Assessment Methodology	NCC agree with the assessment methodology proposed by the Applicant.	Noted.	***Agreed***
09-02	Future hazardous and non-hazardous capacity	The Council considers that future hazardous and non-hazardous capacity in Nottinghamshire is more uncertain, with the Table 11 of emerging Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan, as modified by the main modifications proposed following examination, identifying a deficit in non-hazardous disposal capacity by 2038. As raised in paragraph 5.58 and paragraphs 7.38 – 7.41 of the emerging Plan, due to underlying geology of the area and wider environmental constraints, the scope to provide hazardous and non-hazardous capacity in Nottinghamshire is extremely unlikely. It is noted that the assessment considers the capacity in the East Midlands area for non-hazardous and nationally for hazardous, but we believe that the applicant should recognise the potential that non-hazardous capacity could be significantly reduced in the future.	As outlined in Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082] paragraph 1.6.7, the sensitivity of waste relates to availability of landfill capacity in the absence of the Proposed Development as outlined in the IEMA Guidance, "landfill capacity is recognised as an unsustainable and increasingly scarce option for managing waste." As outlined in paragraph 1.6.9 waste receptor sensitivity is determined as "very high" and a worst-case scenario for sensitivity is considered for landfill capacity. The criteria for very high is: *"the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is:* • *expected to reduce very considerably (by >10%);*	***Under Discussion***

		We would request that the applicant recognises that the potential for new non-hazardous capacity is limited within Nottinghamshire due to the geology of the area and other environmental constraints, and therefore future capacity may be significantly lower than current capacity.	• *end during construction or operation;* • *is already known to be unavailable; or would require new capacity or infrastructure to be put in place to meet forecast demand"* The recognition of the potential that non-hazardous capacity could be significantly reduced in the future was therefore inherent ~~in~~ throughout the waste assessment as outlined in Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]~~.~~	

Table 10 – Cumulatives

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
10-01	Baseline assessment of cumulatives	The updated document – Inter-project Effects with other NSIP and Major Development Schemes [REP4-050] - considers relevant NSIPs within the area and we agree this is a suitable basis for assessing cumulative impacts.	Noted.	***Agreed***
10-02	Conclusion of cumulative assessment	NCC agree with the conclusion that there will be no significant cumulative impacts in relation to the environmental matters covered within our SOCG, with the exception of Landscape and Visual Impact.	Noted. The Applicant to discuss this further with Nottinghamshire County Council.	***Under Discussion***
10-03	Management of cumulative effects	NCC accept that the management measures prescribed in the management plans, together with the applicant's commitment to work collaboratively with other developers, will control potential cumulative impacts in the majority of cases. However, this argument does not extend to visual impact and landscape character. As set out under Table 04 of the SOCG, the approach to cumulative LVIA is not agreed.	Noted. The Applicant to discuss this further with Nottinghamshire County Council.	***Under Discussion***

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:

one earth

solar farm