



# One Earth Solar Farm

**Draft Statement of Common Ground with Newark and  
Sherwood District Council**

**EN010159/APP/8.6.32**

~~October~~ November 2025

One Earth Solar Farm Ltd

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Overview	2
1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.3 Purpose of this document	2
1.4 Terminology	3
<b>2. Description of the Proposed Development</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Record of Engagement</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Summary of Consultation	6
<b>4. Current Position</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council	18
<del>1. Introduction</del>	<del>2</del>
<del>1.1 Overview</del>	<del>2</del>
<del>1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground</del>	<del>2</del>
<del>1.3 Purpose of this document</del>	<del>2</del>
<del>1.4 Terminology</del>	<del>3</del>
<del>2. Description of the Proposed Development</del>	<del>5</del>
<del>3. Record of Engagement</del>	<del>6</del>
<del>3.1 Summary of Consultation</del>	<del>6</del>
<del>4. Current Position</del>	<del>18</del>
<del>4.1 Position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council</del>	<del>18</del>

# 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 Newark and Sherwood District Council.
- 1.2.2 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District 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')<sup>1</sup>.

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 Newark and Sherwood District 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 Newark and Sherwood District 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;
- "Not Agreed" indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (30 April 2024).

- “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 decommissioning 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 01 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
<b>General Catch Ups</b>		
7th July 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial Introductions to the Project
7 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council
22nd August 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Follow-up introduction meeting to the Project
1st November 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project briefing for new officer</li><li>• PPA Discussion</li></ul>
8th February 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Statement of Community Consultation Briefing

11 <sup>th</sup> March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Ecology Survey programme overview</li> <li>• Summary of habitat information</li> <li>• Summary of bat surveys</li> <li>• Summary of bird surveys (breeding and wintering)</li> <li>• Summary of badger, otter and water vole surveys</li> <li>• Summary of great crested newt surveys</li> <li>• Identifying local conservation priorities (to include within landscape design)</li> <li>• Approach to BNG, incorporating local priority species</li> </ul>
19 <sup>th</sup> April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development
8 <sup>th</sup> May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around socio-economic impacts
14 <sup>th</sup> May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Consultation briefing including an update on EIA, the masterplan and consultation programme
12 <sup>th</sup> July 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team;</li> <li>• Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing</li> </ul>
9 <sup>th</sup> October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplan and programme update</li> <li>• Adequacy of Consultation Milestone</li> </ul>



- Statement of Common Ground

1 <sup>st</sup> May 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps
9 <sup>th</sup> September 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around the approach taken for the Statement of Common Ground and the updates for the upcoming deadlines.
6 <sup>th</sup> October 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on outstanding points associated with the Statement of Common Ground ahead of Deadline 4.
9 <sup>th</sup> October 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around next steps.
<a href="#">10<sup>th</sup> November 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting (Virtual)</a>	<a href="#">Discussion on outstanding elements of the Statement of Common Ground.</a>

## Cultural Heritage

19th December 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on selected scope of assessment and inclusion of recommended NDHAs of North Clifton Station and North Clifton Primary School. Agreement to assess group value of the Church of St Gregory's and the relationship held with North and South Clifton.
--------------------	-------------------	--

12th March 2024	Correspondence (email)	Confirmation on scope of assessment.
29th- 30th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation on scope of cultural heritage assessment and discussion of proposed scope of heritage photomontages.
21st August 2024	Meeting (On Site)	<p>Discussion of the Proposed Development post PEIR consultation responses. Review of the potential effects and mitigation in relation to assets in North and South Clifton, and Thorney.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> NSDC confirmed approach taken to North and South Clifton was suitable. Confirmation that assessment of views north would be cross referenced against the LVIA</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> NSDC confirmed no impact to assets within Thorney due to distance from the Order Limits and lack of visibility.</p>
19th November 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusions of heritage impacts and scope of additional information required.

## Air Quality

The parties have not been engaged directly in consultation on the topic of Air Quality, however responses have

been provided via the Scoping Opinion and Relevant Representations. The methodology and approach has been agreed via this method.

## Ground Conditions

27th November 2024      Email

Information was provided to Newark and Sherwood District 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.

2nd December 2024      Email

Response from Newark and Sherwood District Council with two follow up queries relating to the

information that was provided on 27 November 2025.

10th December 2024	Email	Response from the Applicant (to all local planning authorities) further explaining the reasons for the amendments to the methodology and providing a response relating to the query on the outline BSMP.
16th 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. Response awaited as to whether any information is available from Newark and Sherwood District Council.
19th June 2025	Email	Dataset received from Newark and District Council showing locations of private water abstractions. Notes also provided about limitations of dataset, which will be considered as part of data assessment.

**Landscape and Visual**

22nd March 2024	Technical Memorandum (AAH TM01)	<b>Key Topics:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Initial scoping and methodology for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)</li><li>• Compliance with GLVIA3 and Landscape Institute guidance</li></ul>
-----------------	---------------------------------	--

- Use of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and fieldwork
- Identification of receptors (residents, PRow users, road users)
- Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)
- Selection of viewpoints and photomontages
- Consideration of ancillary infrastructure (e.g., substations, battery storage)
- Recommendations for additional viewpoints and receptor categories

#### **Key Outcomes:**

- Agreement on methodology and RVAA approach
- Recommendation to include viewpoints beyond 2km due to potential visibility
- Request for further details on design elements (e.g., PV arrays, substations)
- Emphasis on iterative consultation as design evolves
- Highlighted need to assess impacts on heritage assets and railway views

22<sup>nd</sup> 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

9th July 2024

Technical Memorandum  
(AAH TM02)

### Key Topics:

- Review of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Project overview: 740MW solar farm across 1500Ha
- Design evolution and consultation feedback
- Landscape and visual baseline conditions
- Use of Rochdale Envelope principle
- Assessment of construction, operation, and decommissioning impacts
- Mitigation planting and management plans
- Viewpoint selection and ZTV analysis

### Key Outcomes:

- Recognition of evolving design and need for ongoing consultation
- Concern over lack of viewpoints beyond 2km and potential underestimation of impacts
- Request for detailed management plans for mitigation planting

- Emphasis on character-sensitive mitigation rather than blanket screening
- Recommendation for robust long-term vegetation management (15+ years)
- Identification of gaps in assessment, especially regarding panel replacement and access impacts

14<sup>th</sup> November 2024

Virtual meeting

**Key Topics:**

- LVIA Study Area
- Emerging design parameters
- Approach to solar replacement
- Scope of representative viewpoints
- Ancient woodland, and veteran or ancient trees

**Key Outcomes:**

- Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR
- Written comments to be provided as technical memorandum

18th November 2024

Technical Memorandum  
(AAH TM05)

**Key Topics:**

- Updated LVIA methodology and ZTV figures
- Assessment of viewpoints beyond 2km
- Review of study area scoping photos
- Continued concerns about solar panel replacements and mitigation management

**Key Outcomes:**

- Acknowledgement of improved ZTV analysis and fieldwork
- Acceptance of revised LVIA methodology as best practice
- Critique of viewpoint selection beyond 2km (suggested better locations)
- Request for more strategic viewpoint placement at submission stage
- Outstanding issues remain regarding long-term management and equipment replacement impacts

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.

## Noise

29th September 2025	Virtual Meeting	Discussion on noise elements of the Statement of Common Ground
---------------------	-----------------	--

## Ecology

9th October 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on ecology elements of Statement of Common Ground.
------------------	-------------------	---

Table 01 – Record of Engagement

## 4. Current Position

### 4.1 Position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council

- 4.1.1 The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District 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 of NDHAs	Written comments received on 12 <sup>th</sup> March 2024 confirmed NSDC are in agreement with scope shown in Table 10.6 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039]	Noted.	Agreed
02-02	Scope of Assessment	Request of a full assessment of impact and detailed mitigation of Proposed Development within the ES Chapter.	Full assessment was provided in ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] and Technical Appendix 10.2 [APP-127 and APP-128].	Agreed

02-03	Query on Phrasing of introduction text	The phrasing which has been applied to all heritage assets within the district states: 'Significance heavily linked and similarity of potential effects.' This statement reveals the strong impact and significance of the assets the proposed development will have on these heritage assets. The impact of the project is heavily linked to their significance.	<p>For clarity, the quoted phrasing is located within the tabulated introduction pages [14-19] of the Technical Appendix (ref. APP-128).</p> <p>The purpose and context of this text is the grouping of assets for assessment later in the report and in the ES Chapter (APP-039). The phrasing is not assessing the value (significance) or effects, nor does it imply that the Proposed Development would affect these assets.</p> <p>The assessment of effects occurs within the Technical Appendix (ref. APP-128) and ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]</p>	Agreed
02-04	Perceived impact to Church of St George the Martyr and Church of St Helen	Further consideration required on setting of both assets and further mitigation required – specifically for the impact on Church of St George the Martyr, and Church of St Helen.	<p><u>Church of St George the Martyr</u> Effects of the Proposed Development on St George the Martyr are located within paragraphs 4.136 – 4.139, page 66 of Technical Appendix 10.3 [APP-128] and paragraphs 10.9.9 and 10.6.98.100 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039].</p> <p><u>St Helen Church</u> This asset has been assessed in ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) at paragraphs 10.6.7 and</p>	Agreed

			<p>10.6.126, in paragraph 4.191 of the Technical Appendix [APP-128].</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping [Figure 10.3 (APP-055)], the Proposed Development would hold no visibility.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]</p>	
02-05	Ruins of Old Church in Churchyard	Recommendation of further mitigation to protect any views.	<p>This asset has been assessed in ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039) at paragraphs 10.6.7 and 10.6.126 and on page 85 of Appendix 10.2 (grouped with other assets in Thorney, as agreed with stakeholders – see Table 10.5 [APP-128]).</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility, there would be no impact to the value (significance) of this asset, further mitigation is not required as no harm can feasibly exist which requires screening.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-075]</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

02-06	Lychgate at Church of St George	“Impact of proposal This listing would not be as impacted as the Church of St George due to its location, but it still forms part of the wider setting.... Recommended Mitigation None would be required for this heritage asset.”	<p>The Zone of Theoretical visibility (Figure 10.3 [APP-055]) confirms no intervisibility of the Proposed Development. There would be no effect on the appreciation of the church, churchyard and lychgate</p> <p>Therefore, this asset would not change the assessed effects (or lack thereof) on the Church of St George the Martyr (Grade II*).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]</p>	Agreed
02-07	Fledborough Viaduct	The impact of solar panels either side would be detrimental to the wider setting of the viaduct.	<p>No solar arrays are to be located on either side of the viaduct as the land is not included within the Order Limits. It is unclear which northern small parcel is recommended for removal; to clarify the nearest Order Limit north of the Site is at c.660m.</p> <p>As noted within paragraphs 10.6.68 – 10.6.71 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039], the industrial historic interest of the asset is not reliant on views of a particular character of the landscape to understand its value.</p> <p>The Proposed Development would hold a negligible neutral effect and result in no change to the contribution of the wider setting to asset’s value.</p>	Agreed

			Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]	
02-08	Firs Farmhouse (Grade II)	Small strip of the solar farm seems encroach towards the heritage asset	Figure 10.1 [APP-055] of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] confirms that the Order Limits stand at c.930m to the west of this asset. There is no stretch of the Order Limits which stand within the vicinity of the asset and no harm will arise.  Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]	<b>Agreed</b>
02-09	Hall Farmhouse (North Clifton. Grade II, NHLE: 1302529)	There may be possible views from this heritage asset.	As illustrated within Viewpoint 25a (Figure 11.13.7 <sup>a</sup> [APP-068]) and assessed at paragraph 10.6.96 of ES Chapter 10 (ref. APP-039), the Order Limits would stand distant from the asset and hold no intervisibility.	<b>Agreed</b>
02-10	Trent Lane Farmhouse (North Clifton. Grade II, NHLE: 1369937)	There will be views in nearby field. Recommended mitigation suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.	The Order Limits would stand at distance from the asset (over 280m to the north), would not backdrop views of this asset from the Viaduct, and would hold no adverse effect on the appreciation of the asset as an agriculture farmhouse.	<b>Agreed</b>

			<p>No harm is identified and therefore no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]</p>	
02-11	The Old Manor House (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1046018)	Mitigation Suggest increased hedging to the south of the heritage asset.	<p>The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
02-12	Thorney War Memorial. (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1462827)	Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation.	<p>Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
02-13	Cottage at Thorney Hall (Thorney.	Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation.	Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would not affect the value (significance) of	<b>Agreed</b>



	Grade II, NHLE: 1369961)		<p>the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]</p>	
02-14	House at Thorney Hall. (Thorney. Grade II, NHLE: 1046017)	Suggestion to increase hedging to the south of the asset for mitigation.	<p>Figure 10.3 [APP-055] confirms that there would be no intervisibility with the Order Limits. The Proposed Development would -not affect the value (significance) of the asset and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
02-15	Summary of response	Request for further information on the impacts to the Church of St George the Martyr, and Fledborough Viaduct.	<p>Further information provided to support the assessment that the Proposed Development would not be seen in views of St George the Martyr from the Viaduct.</p> <p>Confirmation of where the assets mentioned have been assessed within ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] and accompanying appendices has been provided to demonstrate that there would be no harmful effects to any of these assets and, as such, no further mitigation is required.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

			Further detail can be found in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [ REP1-075]	
--	--	--	---	--

Table 02 – Air Quality

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	ES Chapter Comments	<p>Whilst NSDC are generally content with the majority of measures proposed, we would expect to be provided with 6 monthly (as a minimum) summary updates of complaints, significant incidents, and logs in relation to air quality and dust rather than upon request as is specified in the OCEMP.</p> <p>At an overall level, NSDC accept the findings of the assessment, based on work undertaken thus far. Notwithstanding this, we note that a dust management plan is an area of further work that will be prepared, and we look forward to the opportunity to comment on this document in due course.</p>	The construction dust mitigation measures, which are set out in ES Volume 2: Appendix 13.5 [APP-137], are included in, and secured by, Table 3.9 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-176]. At this stage, the CEMP is in outline. Prior to construction, the final measures will be agreed with the council before the final CEMP is submitted. The request to be provided with 6 monthly updates can be included.	Agreed
08-01	Dust Management Plan	It is noted that a Dust Management Plan (DMP) is proposed as part of the oCEMP. This is not yet available to view.	As noted within the oCEMP [REP3-049] at table 3.9, the Dust Management Plan will be produced as part of the final CEMP. It is not currently available for the LPAs to review, but it will be available ahead of the formal discharge of the relevant requirement.	Agreed

			The Dust Management Plan will include monitoring of dust deposition, dust flux, realtime PM10 continuous monitoring and/or visual inspections.	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 03 – Ground Conditions

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Methodology for Land and Groundwater assessment	Queries on methodology and outline BSMP	The Applicant provided a response to further explain the reasons for the amendments to the methodology and provided a response relating to the query on the outline BSMP	Agreed
03-02	Request for private water supply data	Response awaited to confirm if any data are held by Newark and Sherwood District Council or not	A set of records was supplied by Newark and Sherwood District Council (19 June 2025). These have been assessed and no private water supplies are present within the Order Limits or study area for land and groundwater assessment.	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.	<b>Agreed</b>
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.	<b>Agreed</b>
04-08	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.	<b>Agreed</b>
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.	<b>Agreed</b>
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 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.	<b>Not Agreed</b>

		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 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.	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.	
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.	<b>Agreed</b>
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.	<b>Agreed</b>
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.	<b>Not agreed</b>



			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
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 05 – Ecology and Biodiversity

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	Extensive woodland creation cannot be delivered within the Order Limits without compromising other ecological features (e.g. skylark).	NSDC would like to see substantial areas of woodland created within the Order Limits as part of the Proposed Development, as described within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094].	The Applicant addressed this issue within the 'Applicant's response to relevant representations' [REP1-075]. In response to relevant Representation number RR-135 the Applicant states ' <i>There is an inherent tension between creation of more woodland for the project which is associated with (a) ensuring that there is enough open habitats to mitigate skylark and (b) avoiding overshadowing areas of PV. It is also noted that the landscape design is currently indicative as the detailed design has not come forward. Opportunities for more tree planting will be considered at the detailed design phase.</i> '	Agreed
05-02	The habitat survey information	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the	The Phase 1 survey / UK Habitats Classification, Habitats Condition Assessment and Hedgerow Survey	Agreed

	provided is sufficient to inform a robust assessment and BNG calculation	opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1.	<p>provide sufficient information for a robust Ecological Impact Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.</p> <p>The provision of additional habitat survey via environmental measure C36 (Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) gives confidence that the detailed design and finalised BNG calculations will be accurate and baseline information available for ongoing monitoring up to date.</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.3 Extended Habitat Survey [REP1-032] and Appendix 6.10 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040]</p>	
05-03	The bat survey information provided is sufficient to	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the	The bat survey as described in Appendix 6.4 Bat Baseline [APP-087] provides sufficient information on bat types, activity levels (across a range of habitats) and	<b>Agreed</b>

	inform a robust assessment	opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	<p>distribution of bats to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on this species group. This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C1, C2, C3, C3, C5, C8, C11, C14, C16, C18, C21, C22, C24, C25, C27, C28, C29, C30, C31, C32, C33, C37) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.4 Bat Baseline [APP-087] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that NSDC's position is that they would still have expected to have seen a greater level of bat survey than was provided. However, it is agreed that the addition of further survey data would not alter the overall outcome of the assessment or the design of the environmental measures described within the application.</p>	
--	----------------------------	--	--	--

05-04	The breeding bird survey information provided is sufficient to inform a robust assessment	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	<p>The breeding bird survey described in Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034] was updated at deadline 1 with further survey data collected in 2025.</p> <p>Appendix 6.5 provides sufficient information on breeding bird density and distribution to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on this species group. This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C1, C2, C3, C3, C4, C5, C6, C8, C14, C15, C16, C17, C18, C21, C22, C24, C25, C27, C28, C29, C30, C31, C32, C34, C37) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
-------	---	--	--	---------------

05-05	The great crested newt survey information provided is sufficient to inform a robust assessment	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	<p>The great crested newt survey described in Appendix 6.6 Great Crested Newt Baseline [REP1-036] was updated at deadline 1 with further survey data collected in 2025.</p> <p>Appendix 6.6 provides sufficient information on great crested newt distribution to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on this species. This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measure C15) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.6 Great Crested Newt Baseline [REP1-036] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
05-06	The information provided on badger, otter and water vole is sufficient to	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	The badger, otter and water vole survey described in Appendix 6.7 Badger, Otter and Water Vole Baseline [APP-090] provides sufficient information on badgers, otters and water vole distribution to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on these species.	<b>Agreed</b>

	inform a robust assessment		<p>This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see environmental measures C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C10, C13, C14, C16, C18, C21, C22, C23, C25, C26, C27, C28, C29, C30, C31, C32, C38) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.7 Badger, Otter and Water Vole Baseline [APP-090] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</p>	
05-07	The information provided on wintering birds is sufficient to inform a robust assessment	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	<p>The wintering bird survey described in Appendix 6.8 Wintering Bird Baseline [REP1-038] was updated at deadline 1 with additional data from 2025. It provides sufficient information to undertake a robust assessment of the effects of the proposed development on these species (as described within Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]). This is in light of the mitigation measures integrated within the project design (see</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

			<p>environmental measures C8, C21, C22 and C29) Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Further detail can be found in Appendix 6.7 Badger, Otter and Water Vole Baseline [APP-090] and Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023])</p>	
05-08	The information provided on reptiles is sufficient to inform a robust assessment	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1.	<p>Information on reptiles was provided in the application and remained unchanged at Deadline 1. Responses with regards survey approach, mitigation and outcome of assessment (in light of any survey limitations) was provided in the Applicant's responses to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>Regardless of survey limitations the mitigation for reptiles would not alter and the proposed habitat creation and enhancement measures will be beneficial for this species group.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>



05-09	The information provided on fish is sufficient to inform a robust assessment	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	<p>Information on fish was added to Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] as requested by the Environment Agency and a fish habitat survey completed in 2025 at crossing points of permanently wet ditches and the River Trent (Appendix 6.11 Fish Habitat Baseline [REP1-042]).</p> <p>The mitigation integrated within the design including use of trenchless crossings, clear span bridges and stand-offs to ditches / watercourse other than at crossings (see environmental measure C7 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>No significant effects on fish due to the construction, operation or decommissioning of the project were predicted.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
05-10	Adequacy of assessment of sea and river lamprey associated with the Humber Estuary SAC	NSDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094] that they welcome the opportunity to review additional data submitted by the Applicant at Deadline	Information on lamprey was provided at application and further added to at Deadline 1 in Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]. A fish habitat survey completed in 2025 at crossing points of permanently wet ditches and the River	<b>Agreed</b>

	and Ramsar site		<p>Trent was also provided (Appendix 6.11 Fish Habitat Baseline [REP1-042]).</p> <p>The mitigation integrated within the design including use of trenchless crossings (including minimum depth requirements), clear span bridges and stand-offs to ditches / watercourse other than at crossings are appropriate for negating potential effects of the Proposed Development (see environmental measure C7 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>Due to general low level of available information on the effects of EMF on lamprey a 5 year monitoring programme has been committed to in line with those agreed with the Environment Agency and Natural England for other Development Consent Order projects with transmission cables crossing the River Trent (see environmental measure C12 in Table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]). With this commitment in place it is appropriate to conclude that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar site.</p>	
--	-----------------	--	---	--

			The approach taken is supported by Natural England and the Environment Agency.	
05-11	Biodiversity net gain	NSDC raise various technical points with regard the calculation of Biodiversity Net Gain within their Local Impact Report [REP1-094]	<p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP1-040] was updated at Deadline 1 to address comments made within Relevant Representations.</p> <p>Response to NSDC's relevant representation was provided in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [REP1-075].</p> <p>It is clear that the Proposed Development would result in the delivery of BNG considerably in excess of 10%.</p> <p>The Applicant has agreed with NSDC that, should consent be granted, the BNG information to be delivered via Requirement 9 of the DCO will include large scale mapping with each polygon, line and point feature legibly numbered to allow detailed review of the finalised calculations.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

05-12	LWS selection criteria	There is no consideration within Chapter 6 to LWS selection criteria and the nonstandardised sampling approach has not considered large parts of the OL. This has potential to underestimate the number of territories for species such as skylark and other rare/scarce farmland bird species that have not been recorded to date such as corn bunting.	<p>Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at deadline 1 with consideration of LWS selection criteria of both Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire (see Table 6.8).</p> <p>Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] was updated at deadline 1 to include new information on breeding birds gathered in 2025. The outcome did not change the conclusions drawn. The additional data gathered was provided in an updated version of Appendix 6.5 Breeding Bird Baseline [REP1-034].</p>	Agreed
-------	------------------------	--	--	--------

Table 06 – Principle of Development

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
06-01	Lifetime of the Proposed Development	Given that 60 years is comparable to at least two generations, there is some considerable strength to the consideration that this would amount to a permanent project, as opposed to a temporary one, especially considering the average lifespan of building design is circa 50 years. If deemed a permanent Development, which it is our position, this is likely to have a bearing on the judgements of effects, as typically a temporary scheme reduces the magnitude of a change. Therefore, the majority of judgements on longer term effects (15 years+) need to be re-visited and adjusted so as to be permanent, and not partly reversible.	<p>The Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects including consents granted for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass solar farms, which have all been granted 60-year consents. It is important to be clear that EN-3 para 2.10.65 states that “An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time periods of operation” and does not impose or suggest a 40-year limit is required.</p> <p>In recent decisions the Secretary of State has confirmed that the 60- year consent lifespan is ‘temporary and reversible for the majority of the land’ (paragraph 4.167 of the Gate Burton decision) and it is the case for this Proposed Development as noted in paragraph 3.6.2 of the Planning Statement [ref. APP-168] that at the time of decommissioning the land will be reverted back to its original condition.</p>	<b>Not Agreed</b>

			<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the residual effects would be long term but disagrees that the project should be classed as a permanent project. The DCO application is for a time-limited consent thus following decommissioning and removal of all above ground infrastructure from within the Site the associated landscape and visual effects would cease. The justification for partly reversible effects is based on the assumption that trees and hedgerows planted as part of the Proposed Development would be retained.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 07 – Cumulative Effects

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
07-01	Cumulative effects on Landscape Character Areas	We also have concerns regarding cumulative effects on the national, county, and regional landscape character areas from multiple solar projects both approved and also in the system, having the potential to be constructed across the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire regions. While this has been identified in the baseline review, it is important to re-iterate this point.	As explained during Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) and detailed within the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077), the Applicant's approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects is consistent with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance on cumulative effects. With regard to cumulative impacts with other NSIP solar projects, the Applicant also explained that this has been considered within the DCO examinations for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Tillbridge, which all found there to be no potential for significant cumulative effects with One Earth Solar Farm. The Joint Interrelationships Report from the Tillbridge has been submitted to the One Earth Examination Library at Deadline 1 and is found at Appendix D of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077) as well as the Technical Note on Cumulative Effects of	Under discussion

			Additional Schemes that was submitted to the Cottam Solar Project Examination which is found at Appendix E of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 (REP1-077).	
07-02	Approach to creating the shortlist	Requesting some further information upon the approach taken to creating the short-list of cumulative projects for the benefit of the Parish Councils, local councillors and local communities.	<p>The Applicant <a href="#">produced a technical note at Deadline 4 – Inter-project Effects with other NSIP and Major Development Schemes [REP4-050] – which set out the approach that was taken to assess the cumulative applications to create the short-list taken forward within the Environmental Statement for the One Earth Solar Farm.</a></p> <p><del>to produce a technical note for Deadline 4 setting out the approach that has been taken to assessing the cumulative applications to create the short-list taken forward within the Environmental Statement for the One Earth Solar Farm.</del></p>	<b><u>Under Discussion</u></b> <b><u>Agreed</u></b>



Table 08 – DCO Requirements

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
08-01	Discharge of Requirements	<p>In respect of Article 45, NSDC would ask that the Applicant define or indicate what type of approvals this may encompass. In any event, NSDC view a 10-week approval period as unlikely to be sufficient.</p> <p>NSDC consider that 16 weeks is a more appropriate period for the discharge of requirements (akin to a Major EIA Planning Application). At the present NSDC have 4 NSIP's within their administrative area and another project determined under the Electricity Act. As such, we are very concerned about the resourcing obligations of all these projects in respect of discharge of requirements, on the assumption that development consent is forthcoming. This is complicated by the need to co-ordinate with all the other host authorities in the discharge of requirements.</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciates the points raised by the Council and at Deadline 2 extended the time for discharging requirements 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).</p>	<p><b>Under discussion</b></p> <p><b><u>Not Agreed</u></b></p>

08-02	Fees	<p>NSDC raises concerns around the fees proposed for the discharge of requirements.</p> <p><u>NSDC requested the Applicant to consider whether all requirements with the fee of £298.00 could be increased to match the higher fee of £2578.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant <u>has</u> updated the fees for the discharge of requirements at Deadline <u>51</u>.</p> <p>The fees set out in Schedule 15, paragraph 5(2) are £2578 for the first application of the discharge of <u>requirements 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19</u>. <u>all requirements associated with the Proposed Development (requirements 1 to 22).</u></p> <p><del>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, however, the Applicant considers that the higher fee should be applicable in relation to the CTMP and that change has been made at Deadline 2. The approach taken is fairly well established for Orders made in Lincolnshire.</del></p> <p>Paragraph 5(3) is included to ensure fees captured within the Schedule are updated to</p>	<p><b>Under Discussion</b></p>
-------	------	--	---	--------------------------------

			<p>increase in line with inflation, as per the regulatory approach.</p> <p><del>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 is reviewing these comments and will update the dDCO accordingly should it be required.</del></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 09 – Noise

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
09-01	Baseline noise survey locations	Agree with the Applicant's choice of noise survey locations assessed as part of Appendix 15.2.	The baseline noise survey was carried out at locations that were agreed as being appropriate (as shown in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [APP-044] and Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	Agreed
09-02	Baseline noise survey results	Agree with the survey data/results acquired by the Applicant, as demonstrated in Appendix 15.2.	Sufficient data was gathered at each of the baseline noise monitoring locations to form an appropriate basis for the noise assessment (see Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	Agreed
09-03	Study areas	Agree with the Applicant's choice of study areas.	The respective study areas and the associated sensitive receptors identified are appropriate for the basis of the following assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction traffic noise and vibration;</li> <li>• On-site construction noise and vibration;</li> </ul>	Agreed

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational noise.</li> </ul>	
09-04	Standards and guidance	Agree that the Applicant has followed the appropriate standards and guidance.	<p>The appropriate standards and guidance have been referenced for the following aspects of the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction traffic noise and vibration;</li> <li>On-site construction noise and vibration;</li> <li>Operational noise.</li> </ul>	<b>Agreed</b>
09-05	Significance criteria	Newark and Sherwood District Council agrees with the significance criteria adopted for the assessment.	<p>Appropriate significance criteria have been adopted for the assessment of the significance of effects associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction traffic noise and vibration;</li> <li>On-site construction noise and vibration;</li> <li>Operational noise.</li> </ul>	<b>Agreed</b>
09-06	Control of noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic	Agree with how noise and vibration impacts of construction traffic will be controlled.	Potential noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).	<b>Agreed</b>

09-07	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan	Awaiting further discussions around the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.	An outline CTMP has been included as part of the application documents [APP-181]. A CTMP will be produced and submitted for approval prior to development commencing.	<b>Under discussion</b>
09-08	Control of on-site construction noise and vibration	Agree with how noise and vibration impacts of on-site construction will be controlled.	Potential impacts of on-site construction noise and vibration can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	<b>Agreed</b>
09-09	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	Awaiting further discussions around the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan.	An outline CEMP has been included as part of the application documents [REP3-041 and REP3-042], for further discussion and agreement.	<b>Under discussion</b>
09-10	Control of operational noise	Awaiting further discussions around the operational noise controls.	Potential impacts of operational noise can be controlled by requirement. A noise requirement (Requirement 16), based on appropriate standards and guidance, has been proposed.	<b>Under discussion</b>

## Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Newark and Sherwood District Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



**one earth**  
solar farm