



# One Earth Solar Farm

**Draft Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire County Council**

**EN010159/APP/8.2.3**

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>21</b>
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council _____	21

# **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 Lincolnshire County Council.

1.2.2 Lincolnshire County Council is one of the host authorities for the application, and the remainder of the host authorities have separate Statements of Common Ground. Collectively, the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.2.3 Appendix 1 of this document includes the SoCG between the Applicant and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service.

## **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 Lincolnshire 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 Lincolnshire 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;
- "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 1 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
<b>General Catch Ups</b>		
29th August 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial introductions to the Project
29 <sup>th</sup> August 2023 – ongoing	Correspondence (Emails)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council
2 <sup>nd</sup> November 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussions around PPAs
9 <sup>th</sup> February 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Briefing on the Statement of Community Consultation
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> </ul>

- 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

19 <sup>th</sup> April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development
2 <sup>nd</sup> May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around drainage
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
15th August 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	General discussion around the status of the Statement of Common Ground.
8 <sup>th</sup> October 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on updates made to the Statement of Common Ground following topic specific meetings.

## Cultural Heritage

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 the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the ROC Post and Roman Vexillation Fortress and Marching Camps, Hall Farmhouse, and assets North and South Clifton.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> LCC correspondence with Historic England that the proposals would not diminish the ability to appreciate value (significance) of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> LCC confirmed previous concerns to Hall Farmhouse have been resolved.</p>

**Outcome:** LCC confirmed approach taken to North and South Clifton was suitable. Confirmation that assessment of views north would be cross referenced against the LVIA.

21 August 2024	Correspondence (email)	<p>Confirmation from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) to Historic England that LCC examined the views and setting of the Roman Vexillation Fort and ROC Scheduled Ancient Monument and determined that the proposals would not diminish the ability to appreciate either of these assets.</p> <p>Confirmation also given on the previous concerns to the setting of Hall Farmhouse have been resolved.</p>
19th November 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusions of heritage impacts and scope of additional information required.</p>
<b>Buried Archaeology</b>		
29/02/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>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 &amp; at Whimpton and to specific non-designated archaeological assets.</p>

01/03/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed to consider the current guidelines about flint scatters early within the evaluation design.</p>
24/04/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Fieldwork update on the geophysical survey.</p> <p>Draft trial trenching strategy presented by Iceni, LCC asked for a more detailed information regarding trenching sampling percentages.</p>
11/07/2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Meeting to discuss approach for trial trench evaluation and the One Earth Project Design, which presents the approach to the archaeological evaluation.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Discussion and agreement to move some of the proposed trenches to target specific anomalies detected by the geophysical survey.</p>

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.
04/09/2024	Email correspondence	Minor amendments requested to trench locations to the Site Specific WSI (SSWSI) for Area 1NE and Area 2SE and agreed.  Request and agreement on leaving each trench weather out and placing sondages into each trench if blank.
06/09/2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for Area 1NE and Area 2SE approved.
07/11/2024	Email correspondence	SSWSI for Area 3E and Area 4E approved.
28/11/2024	Site Visit	Site visit to Area 4E.  Discussion about the ongoing trial trenching at Ragnall and the sampling strategy.

12/06/2025	Email correspondence	Results of the trial trenching evaluation carried out south of the reservoir circulated.
30/06/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) presented and discussed.</p> <p>Amendments and clarification to the text regarding impact of the Proposed Development as presented in the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038], Control Measures, Archaeological Clerk of Work, and scope for additional trial trenching sought by LCC.</p>
	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Updated OWSI presented and discussed.</p> <p>Wording and clarification over the role of the ACoW, Control Measures sought by LCC.</p>
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

## Human Health

11/12/23	Meeting	Online meeting to discuss the following topics – <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Public Rights of Way (PRoWs);</li><li>- Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs);</li><li>- Decommissioning; and</li><li>- Visual Effects.</li></ul>
May 2024	Online meeting	Introduction to the project with public health officer; focusing on human health elements.
29/09/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	To discuss the outstanding 'under discussion' points associated with this SoCG.

## Ground Conditions and ALC

27 November 2024	Email	<p>Information was provided to Lincolnshire County Council relating to land and groundwater contamination issues.</p> <p>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</p>
------------------	-------	---

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 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. Response received from Lincolnshire County Council (flood and water team) on 19 June 2025, indicating that Lincolnshire County Council do not hold any records of this type, and referring the Applicant to either the Environment Agency or Anglian Water. A data request has been issued to the Environment Agency for an updated set of information (as indicated in the relevant SoCG), and a dataset from Anglian Water was received prior to preparation of the Environmental Statement chapter, so that information

has already been incorporated into the assessment.

Landscape and Visual

22nd March 2024

Technical Memorandum  
(AAH TM01)

Key Topics:

- Initial scoping and methodology for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)
- Compliance with GLVIA3 and Landscape Institute guidance
- 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

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	<p><b>Key Topics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LVIA Study Area</li><li>• Emerging design parameters</li><li>• Vegetation loss and mitigation planting</li><li>• Approach to solar replacement</li><li>• Approach to site access</li><li>• Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</li><li>• Scope of representative viewpoints</li></ul> <p><b>Key Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR</li><li>• Written comments to be provided as technical memorandum</li></ul>
18th November 2024	Virtual meeting and Technical Memorandum (AAH TM05)	<p><b>Key Topics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Response to applicant's revisions following TM04</li><li>• Updated LVIA methodology and ZTV figures</li><li>• Assessment of viewpoints beyond 2km</li><li>• Review of study area scoping photos</li><li>• Continued concerns about solar panel replacements and mitigation management</li></ul> <p><b>Key Outcomes:</b></p>

- 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	<p><b>Key Topics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach to visual assessment</li> <li>- Impacts on landscape character areas</li> <li>- Approach to cumulative assessment</li> <li>- Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</li> <li>- Residential Visual Amenity Assessment</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applicant to provide written clarifications on approach to visual assessment</li> <li>- Council to review assessment on landscape character areas to determine if varying levels of effect is justified.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
------------------	-----------------	---

- 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 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	Group meeting with all LPAs to discuss matters around ecology
28/08/2025	Virtual Meeting	Discussion around Deadline 2 submissions, and Statement of Common Ground updates

Table 01 – Record of Engagement

## 4. Current Position

### 4.1 Position of the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council

4.1.1 The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and Lincolnshire 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	Query on scope of assessment around Kettlethorpe and Dunham. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	The concerns raised have been assessed and confirmed in Statutory Consultation responses.	Agreed
02-02	Hall Farmhouse, Newton on Trent.	Concern on encroachment of setting. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Concerns were discussed on Site and written confirmation received stating issue had been resolved. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Agreed

02-03	Consideration of NDHA Park Farm	Further consideration required on Park Farm to understand if the NHDA meets assessment threshold. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	NDHA assessed to not met threshold of assessment and scoped out on the basis of the agreed approach to scoping.  Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	<b>Agreed</b>
02-04	Fledborough Viaduct	Concern on cabling option around the viaduct	Proposed Development no longer proposes cabling that would attach to the viaduct. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	<b>Agreed</b>
02-05	Confirmation of scope and assessment	"The Council is satisfied that the proposals are acceptable in terms of their approach... and has no further comments"	Confirmation that the Council is satisfied and has no further comments is welcomed.	<b>Agreed</b>

Table 03 – Buried Archaeology

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Archaeological Assessment	<p><i>Concerns regarding the level of archaeological assessment undertaken to inform the applicants Archaeology ES Chapter and DCO application.</i></p> <p><i>The Council acknowledges the applicant's assessment work to date, including a desk-based assessment (DBA), geophysical survey (magnetometry) and some targeted evaluation trenching.</i></p>	<p>Final agreed position:</p> <p>While agreement was not reached on the scope and extent of pre-determination 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.</p> <p><u>Previous response from the Applicant:</u></p>	Agreed



			<p>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].</p> <p>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) <i>Code of Conduct</i>. It has been developed in collaborative consultation with the Archaeology Advisory Teams to the LPAs and Historic England.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>In line with ClfA'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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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) <i>Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (2023)</i>, which recommends a complementary use of non-intrusive and intrusive techniques.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>The applied mitigation measures are expected to avoid residual significant effects on archaeological assets, instead reducing impacts to negligible or minor.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The need for flexibility in design, layout and technology is recognised in National</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			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	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.	<p>Final agreed position:</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Previous response from the Applicant:</u></p>	<b>Agreed</b>



			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

03-03	Impacts of the Proposed Development not fully assessed in the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]	<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p><b>Final agreed position:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed
-------	---	---	---	--------

			<p><u>Previous response from the Applicant:</u></p> <p>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 [APP-034], and the Impact Assessment refers to the work packages rather than to the individual activities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Parameters have been assessed for below ground archaeological remains, based on the maximum areas that will be disturbed, within the single work packages.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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 Design stage.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
03-04	Potential impact from Maintenance and Decommissioning not properly accounted for in the Es Chapter	<i>Impacts from maintenance and decommissioning activities have not been properly considered as part of the ES Chapter 9: Buried Heritage [APP-038].</i>	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 [APP-034], and the Impact Assessment refers to the work packages rather than to the individual activities.	<b>Agreed</b>

			<p>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.</p> <p>The Parameters have been assessed for below ground archaeological remains, based on the maximum areas that will be disturbed, within the single work packages.</p> <p>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 Design stage.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>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.</p> <p>Additionally, the OWSI will include allowances for an ACoW to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

03-05	Concerns over the use the implementation of the mitigation measures.	<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In line with the Archaeological ES Chapter (Application Document 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.</p> <p>The AMS will be submitted for approval and secured through a Requirement of the DCO after consent is granted.</p>	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.	
03-06	Use of micrositings of piles for solar arrays	<i>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 micrositings 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</i>	As the Applicant recognises that the micrositings/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.	<b>Agreed</b>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

03-07	Concerns over the meaning of 'unplanned activities', as presented in the Archaeological ES Chapter [APP-038]	<p><i>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</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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].</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed
-------	--	---	--	--------

03-08	Decommissioning	<p><i>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?</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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].</p> <p>The OWSI will include allowances for an ACoW to oversee construction, maintenance, and decommissioning activities.</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p>
-------	-----------------	---	---	----------------------

		<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Allowances for the ACoW will be included in the OCEMP, OEMP and ODEMP.</p> <p>An OAMP will be submitted within the OWSI for approval and secured through a Requirement of the DCO, when consent is granted.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			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 04 – Human Health

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	Interaction of health with other chapters	In addition to health being considered in the other technical disciplines, anything significant should then be carried through to the health chapter.	<p>Chapter 16: Human Health [REP3-018] considers the following likely significant effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical activity (during all phases)</li> <li>• Community identity, culture, resilience and influence (during all phases)</li> <li>• Employment and income for vulnerable groups (during all phases)</li> <li>• Climate change mitigation and adaption (during all phases)</li> <li>• Electro-magnetic fields (during all phases)</li> <li>• Wider societal infrastructure and resource (during all phases)</li> <li>• Health and social care services (during construction phase)</li> </ul>	Agreed

04-02	Public Rights of Way (PROWs)	From a mental health and physical health perspective, the Council is pleased to see that Public Rights of Way (PROWs) would be maintained through diversions during construction and decommissioning phases, and would be retained with green space enhancements, further connected through permissive paths (especially connecting Newton on Trent to Sustrans' national cycle route), during the operational period. There may be potential for improvements to be made such as hard surfaces to enable inclusivity and new bridges crossing streams.	Enhancement to the public right of way network is provided through the permissive paths proposed across the Order limits comprising 2.5km to the east of the River Trent and 3.6km to the west. The permissive paths have been designed to improve connectivity between communities and existing long distance routes, for example connecting Newton on Trent to the Sustrans route, enhancing access for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians. The proposed permissive paths also provide circular routes, such as on the west of the River Trent where a route is provided connecting Ragnall and Fledborough. The permissive paths have been designed to utilise existing field access points and watercourse crossings such than new crossings are not required.	Agreed
04-03	Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs)	More information required on why actual risk should be scoped out.	Chapter 16: Human Health [APP-045] explores the impacts of EMFs; precisely how the project affects actual and perceived exposure to electromagnetic and ionising radiation risks, including opportunities to adopt exposure guidelines and design measures that avoid or minimise actual risks. Given concerns expressed in stakeholder	Agreed

			<p>consultation around the perceived risks of EMFs, it also considers the mental health effects of widespread concerns about exposure from major electrical infrastructure.</p> <p>During the Construction Phase, there are likely to be feelings of anxiety about the operational scheme and the potential impacts of EMFs on human health.</p> <p>During the Operation Phase, there is a possibility of adverse mental health effects resulting from concerns that EMFs could be bad for health. For example, despite no recorded instance in the UK of harm resulting from power lines causing interference with active implanted medical devices<sup>1</sup>, health risks from EMFs have been raised as a concern by members of the community through the statutory and non-statutory stakeholder consultation exercises. In this regard, there could be adverse effects if the safety risks are not fully understood. There are no residential properties within the Order Limits. The nearest properties are at least 5m from the Order Limits and it is unlikely that cables will be installed that close to any property due to the need for construction vehicles to manoeuvre both sides of the trench within the working width. Cables</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>would be installed at a minimum of 10 m from the façade of any residential dwelling. Some PRowS do cross over the proposed Interconnecting and Grid Connection Cable Corridors. The presence of the public either directly above or adjacent to underground cables associated with the Scheme would be transient, with the individuals using the PRowS exposed to electro-magnetic fields from the cables for only very short periods of time. It is considered that the level of exposure to users of PRowS would be similar to that associated with general household appliances (and noticeably less than associated with the exposure when using a vacuum cleaner). Therefore, no significant effects to users of PRowS are predicted to occur. The cable route would cease to be operational during the Decommissioning Phase.</p> <p>Mental health effects during construction as a result of EMF are most likely to be felt as a result of anxiety towards EMF effects over the operational lifetime of the Scheme. The provision of suitable levels of information regarding EMF during consultation, the DCO application process, and then upon request by any</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			person during the construction period should help to alleviate much of this anxiety.	
04-04	Baselining data	In terms of data, the 'Lincolnshire Health Intelligence Data' is the most comprehensive data source and mental health data is published as part of the JSNA.	The Applicant can confirm that this dataset was not used within the baseline data. However, upon review, the Applicant will include data from the mental health & wellbeing section to further supplement the baseline.	<b>Agreed</b>
04-05	Relationship between solar arrays and residential properties	<p>Concerns raised around the relationship between the solar arrays and residential properties within proximity to the Order Limits.</p> <p>Concerns are raised around what the development will look like at various stages from a visual effect impact.</p>	<p>The Applicant would like to bring LCCs attention to entry 07-14 in Table 7 of this Statement of Common Ground which discusses how the Proposed Development would look at various stages.</p> <p>The significant adverse visual effects are expected for the first 15 years of operation. However, these will be limited to the residential receptors and recreational receptors in close proximity to the Order Limits, a minority of the Local Study Area.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

			There would be no significant visual effects on residential receptors by Year 15 of operation given the establishment of mitigation planting. Recreational receptors walking across the Order Limits would experience residual significant adverse effects for a short duration as they move through the Order Limits.	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 05 – Traffic and Transport

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	The traffic impact of the proposals has been adequately considered and reported.	The construction traffic has been estimated from first principles and the methodology (pages 12-30 [APP-136]) is acceptable. The impacts are summarised in Table 5 [APP-136] and show that the proposals would not cause a severe impact nor an unacceptable safety impact on the Lincolnshire County Council road network.	The Applicant notes [RR-077] and agrees with LCC.	Agreed
05-02	The assessment indicates that there are no significant effects and that the proposed mitigation is appropriate.	The construction traffic has been estimated from first principles and the methodology (pages 12-30 [APP-136]) is acceptable. The impacts are summarised in Table 5 [APP-136] and show that the proposals would not cause a severe impact nor an unacceptable safety impact on the Lincolnshire County Council road network.	The Applicant notes [RR-077] and agrees with LCC.	Agreed

05-03	The technical approval of the road works.	<p>Paragraph A12.3.38 [APP-136] confirms that the applicant would submit and pay fees for the Section 184 applications under the Highways Act needed for the new access points. Access Drawings (Street ROW Access Plans) [APP-024] for accesses 2, 3, 4 and 5 which are in Lincolnshire show layouts and swept paths. These layouts are acceptable in principle and the detail can be addressed at Section 184 stage.</p>	<p>Access drawings depicting the access bellmouth, visibility splays and vehicle swept path analysis are contained to the rear of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans, [APP-015].</p> <p>With respect to the creation of the proposed access junctions, a highways agreement will be entered into with the relevant Local Highway Authority pursuant to Article 16 of the draft DCO [APP-007] in order to secure the approval by the relevant Local Highway Authority of the detailed design of the works.</p> <p>With respect to the remaining works to the public highway (pursuant to Articles 10 and 12), the detailed design of such works must be submitted to the relevant Local Highway Authority for approval (either as part of the CTMP or separately).</p> <p>Any agreement pursuant to Article 16 of the draft DCO [APP-007] will provide for, and any other approval of detailed design pursuant to this outline CTMP will include:</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p>
-------	---	--	---	----------------------



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a programme for the works, method statement and any traffic management proposals;</li> <li>• detailed technical drawings;</li> <li>• any health and safety documentation required under the CDM Regulations [ref];</li> <li>• Stage 1 / 2 Safety Audit; and</li> <li>• details of the contractor.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant will agree to pay the relevant Local Highway Authority for the technical approval process at the time the approval is sought, in line with the relevant Local Highway Authority's costs at the time, and agrees for provision to be made in this respect in any agreement pursuant to Article 16 of the draft DCO [APP-007].</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Exact costs will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority through the Final CTMP or agreement pursuant to Article 16 (as appropriate) and will reflect the standard costs for the above types of works at the time approval is sought.</p> <p>The Final CTMP will confirm the process and which departments at the relevant Local Highway Authority the detailed design drawings will be issued to.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Table 06 – Land and Groundwater

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
06-01	Updating dataset for private water abstractions	Discrepancies were noted between the dataset reviewed by the Applicant, and records held by some local authorities, in relation to private water supplies	As Lincolnshire County Council have confirmed that they do not hold their own records of private water supplies, the dataset that needs to be updated for this area is just the Environment Agency dataset, which has been requested, and is covered in the appropriate SoCG.	Agreed
06-02	Best and Most Versatile Land	The whole area is productive farmland, which would be removed from mainly arable farming for 60+ years and at best, a lower intensity grass-based system would replace it. The loss of arable production is considered locally significant and in view of other projects in the wider District and County potentially cumulatively significant. For context, the total arable crops and uncropped arable land in Lincolnshire is 385,930ha according to figures published by DEFRA, the total land proposed to be covered by solar farms, NSIP (order limits) and TCPA applications, is approximately 13,620 ha. On the assumption that the majority of land	The Applicant considers the cumulative loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land in the Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects [APP-047]. The cumulative effects assessment concluded that if all the 'reasonably foreseeable' schemes within Lincolnshire proceed, the change in land use would be 6.54% (including both temporary and permanent schemes). The change in land use in Nottinghamshire (for both temporary and permanent schemes) would be 2.06%.	Under Discussion

		<p>proposed for solar farms is arable land (solar land take being around 3.5% of the arable total) and based on the total crop output figure of £1,564 million for 2023, the potential loss of crop output could be in the region of £50 million.</p>	<p>Tillbridge EXA concluded that even taking into account the other schemes in their cumulative assessment (and One Earth was included on their cumulative map), the loss of BMV would not be significant. The ExA concluded that over the lifetime of the development, there is likely to be a moderate beneficial effect on the soil resource at the site but that there would be a loss of use of BMV. Therefore, in balance, they ascribed neutral weight to soils and landuse in the planning balance.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the 60-year consent being sought, is temporary. This position has been supported by the Secretary of State in recent decisions confirming 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> <p>Therefore, the impact upon productive farmland would be for a temporary period.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Table 07 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
07-01	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.	<b>Agreed</b>
07-02	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.	<b>Agreed</b>
07-03	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.	<b>Agreed</b>

07-04	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.	<b>Agreed</b>
07-05	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.	<b>Agreed</b>
07-06	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>
07-07	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>
07-08	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>
07-09	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	The level of effect on visual receptors is agreed.	<b>Agreed</b>

		effects is unlikely to increase the overall findings.		
07-10	Approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impacts	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<b>Not Agreed</b>
07-11	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>

07-12	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>
07-13	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.	<p>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.</p> <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>	<b>Not agreed</b>



07-14	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 08 – Ecology and Biodiversity

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
08-01	The approach and delivery of ecological data is sufficient to inform a robust assessment and BNG calculation	LCC has reviewed the additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and is of the opinion that the information presented is sufficient to inform a robust assessment of the impacts of the development on ecology and to inform BNG calculations.	<p>The Applicant provided a range of desk study and field survey information at application and updated this at Deadline 1 (see Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]).</p> <p>The information provided has been appropriate to inform the mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements described in table 6.6 of Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023]) and enable the conclusions reached on the significance of potential effects in Table 6.11.</p> <p>All potential effects assessed were either Not Significant or were Significant Beneficial. Overall, the Proposed Development would have a positive effect on biodiversity.</p>	Agreed

08-02	Securing Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>LCC request within their Local Impact Report [REP1-089] that Requirement 9 is updated to ensure that levels of Biodiversity Net Gain well in excess of 10% are secured.</p> <p>LCC notes the applicant's intention to update the draft DCO and will provide any comments, as necessary, once it has been reviewed.</p>	<p>The Applicant updated Requirement 9 at Deadline 1 [REP1-007], and updated further at Deadline 2 [REP2-009].</p> <p>At Deadline 2 the requirement will read -</p> <p>9.—(1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a biodiversity net gain strategy for that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body.</p> <p>(2) The biodiversity net gain strategy must include details of how the strategy will secure a minimum of 50% biodiversity net gain in area-based habitat units, a minimum of 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units, and a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units for all of the authorised development during the operation of the authorised development, using the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' Statutory Biodiversity Metric to calculate those percentages (or such other biodiversity metric approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body).</p>	Agreed
-------	--------------------------------	---	---	--------

			<p>(3) The biodiversity net gain strategy must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecology management plan and must be implemented as approved and maintained throughout the operation of the relevant part of the authorised development to which the plan relates.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the levels of BNG secured within the requirement are sufficient to ensure a moderate positive effect can be considered within the planning balance. The Applicant also notes that the delivery will result in uplifts greater than the percentages stated as the habitat design will accord with the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP1-053].</p>	
08-03	Delivery of BNG and other biodiversity enhancements	LCC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-089] that they would welcome the Applicant working with a steering group to deliver the BNG / biodiversity enhancements and to liaise with other developers and stakeholders to take advantage of any strategic benefits that could be realised.	<p>The Applicant has noted within their response to the Local Impact Reports [REP2-083]) that they are happy to engage with LCC to identify the best stakeholders for a steering group and the range of other developers and stakeholders where strategic benefits could be realised through open discussions.</p> <p>The Applicant has included within the oLEMP [REP4-024] at paragraph 7.1.16 that “<i>To ensure that the creation and</i></p>	<b>Agreed</b>

			<i>management of new habitats and those subject to enhancement is delivered effectively a steering group will be created. The Applicant will invite the relevant Local Planning Authority ecologists, Natural England and the Environment Agency to be members of the Steering Group".</i>	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 09 – Principle of Development / Site Selection

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
09-01	Sequential Test	<p>Currently the methodology appears to discount land which is not capable of being leased by the applicant and a wider search area above the 10km radius from the High Marnham substation does not appear to have been considered. As such there is considered to be insufficient information / evidence provided in the One Earth DCO application to properly interrogate the assertion that the sequential test has been passed regarding site selection.</p> <p>Neither guidance nor policy states a fixed land size to be included within searches for reasonably available land. As such LCC cannot identify any policy basis for why the sequential test has not been met.</p> <p>LCC notes and welcomes, the applicants extensive submissions</p>	<p>The Applicant prepared further submissions demonstrating how the Sequential Test has been applied and satisfied as part of the Site Selection. This was provided at Deadline 2 [REP2-080] and Deadline 3 [REP3-069] following on from discussions arising during the ISH1 and within the Local Impact Reports.</p> <p>The Applicant notes LCCs response at Deadline 4, confirming that they cannot identify any policy basis for why the sequential test has not been met.</p>	<b>Under discussion</b>

		<p>regarding the sequential test provided at deadline 2 and 3, REP2-080 and REP3-069 respectively. LCC continues to raise concern over the extensive areas of the proposed development site falling within flood zones 2 and 3. LCC maintains its previous concerns as to whether smaller areas of land, within lower flood risk could be collated to form the wider Order Limits. As referenced within LCCs response to ExQ2, it is noted that the applicant has considered smaller sites of 250ha, but nothing smaller, as has been seen within other NSIP solar schemes in Lincolnshire, Cottam for example.</p> <p>LCC would again refer to its ExQ2 submission, regarding the conclusions drawn from REP2-080 and REP-069. It appears the alternative sites considered here have only been considered in their entirety then discounted, the lower constrained areas in flood zone 1 from the discounted sites do not appear to have been considered collectively as a separate scenario.</p> <p>LCC does however acknowledge that Neither guidance nor policy states a</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		fixed land size to be included within searches for reasonably available land. As such LCC cannot identify any policy basis for why the sequential test has not been met.		
09-02	Mineral safeguarding	In relation to mineral resource safeguarding and the requirements of policy M11, it is noted that the majority of the development site within the LCC administrative boundary is located in the MSA. In the absence of the applicant undertaking any detailed assessment of the mineral resources to demonstrate otherwise, it has to be assumed that there are viable mineral resources in the underlying land. The potential for mineral sterilisation is therefore significant, albeit temporary in nature.	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel, as identified in Appendix 2 of the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175]. This MSA forms part of a much larger designated in the adopted Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (June 2016).</p> <p>The Applicant has not undertaken any detailed assessments of the mineral resources in the specific area located within the Order Limits because, as set out in the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175], the Proposed Development would not result in the permanent sterilisation of sand and gravel resources within the Order Limits. The development comprises ground-mounted solar PV infrastructure, which is non-intrusive and reversible. Upon decommissioning after the 60-year</p>	<b>Under discussion</b>



			<p>operational period, the land will be restored, and the underlying mineral resource will remain accessible for future extraction if required. Other solar projects are 60 years and impacts are treated as temporary (see for example the Secretary of State's decision in Cottam, another 60 year consent "4.74 The Secretary of State agrees that the Proposed Development would revert back to agricultural use once the operational time-period has expired and agrees with the ExA that any effects would be temporary and reversible.").</p> <p>Therefore, given the temporary nature of the Proposed Development, the minerals within the Order Limits will not be permanently sterilised, and the land could be worked for minerals post-decommissioning.</p>	
09-03	Newton on Trent Oil Well	It is also noted that underground cables may remain in situ following decommissioning, which could potentially therefore lead to the permanent sterilisation of mineral resources through introduction of a constraint on potential future extraction	<p>The Proposed Development does not conflict with the operation or safeguarding of Newton on Trent Oil Well Ref: 32 and is considered compliant with Policy M12. Relevant engagement and consultation with regulatory bodies and technical consultees has already been</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

		<p>in surrounding land. This should be given due consideration when determining the final route/method of the grid connection. Wherever possible the cable route should follow existing constraints and infrastructure corridors such as roads, railways, drainage routes or existing pipelines or cable routes or alternatively follow the edge of significant landscape features rather than directly crossing open fields. This would ensure minimal sterilisation of resources.</p> <p>With regard to Policy M12 and the safeguarded Newton on Trent Oil site, this site is surrounded on all sides by the proposed Order limits, and whilst the site is currently inactive, it has extant planning permission and could recommence operations at any time until the end-date of June 2036. The Council are of the view that insufficient information has been provided in the assessment undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed development would not prejudice or detrimentally impact upon the operation of the safeguarded site.</p>	<p>undertaken with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Environment Agency, and Local Environmental Health Officers. No objections or issues have been raised regarding the Proposed Development adjoining the existing mineral site. In light of the above, the Applicant considers that the Proposed Development would not prejudice or detrimentally affect the access or maintenance, or potential future operations of the safeguarded mineral sites. As set out above and in the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment [APP-175], discussions with the landowner and status of the oil well are ongoing, however the discussions to date confirm that the oil well is not currently active and has not been for 10 years. Site visits from the team confirm this and a review of the current lease has been undertaken. The leasehold document refers to an exploration licence for petroleum which has a term of 20 years from 14/01/1998 so this has now expired and does not appear to have been renewed on the title. There remains an open dialogue between the Applicant and the landowner should there be any further comments raised.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		The Council suggest contacting the site operators and relevant experts such as the Health and Safety Executive, the Environment Agency and local Environmental Health Officers to accurately determine the detailed matters that should be considered and any necessary mitigation. At this stage, the Council has not seen any evidence that such engagement has been undertaken and would wish to see further evidence to confirm that such engagement has taken place, and a satisfactory outcome achieved.		
09-03	Temporary nature of Proposed Development	The Council would stress that although the development is considered to be temporary, 60 years is a significant duration, and further applications could come forward to extend this timeframe.	At this stage there is no intention to seek an extension of the operational period of the Proposed Development beyond the 60-year timeframe, however even if this were to be sought, the impacts of any future extensions would need to be assessed through a separate process.	<b>Not Agreed</b>
09-04	Grid Connection	The applicant has received a grid connection offer from National Grid to connect to the proposed High Marnham Substation. The new High Marnham Substation does not form	The Applicant considers that the Secretary of State can be satisfied there is no obvious reason why the High Marnham substation works would not come forward, and there is	<b>Under discussion</b>

		<p>part of the DCO application and will be subject to planning permission through the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, for which a planning application is yet to be submitted. This presents potential concerns regarding the information available to inform the Environmental Statement (ES), the timing of the two related projects and the deliverability of the One Earth Solar project.</p>	<p>no justification for any requirement being imposed on the Proposed Development in this respect.</p> <p>National Grid has indicated it is pursuing an application for planning permission for the High Marnham substation, and the Applicant understands this will be submitted in Q4 of 2025, and the Applicant anticipates planning permission being granted, having regard to relevant planning policy.</p> <p>The application for the High Marnham substation would be determined in accordance with the Development Plan (Bassetlaw Local Plan 2024) and any material considerations, which include the NPPF and the NPSs (EN1, EN3 and EN5).</p> <p>Policy ST49 of BLP supports renewable energy development (including transmission) in general subject to the satisfactory resolution of all relevant site specific and cumulative impacts upon: a) location, setting and position in the wider landscape, resulting from its siting</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>and scale; b) natural and heritage assets and their settings; c) air and water quality; d) hydrology and hydrogeology; e) the best and most versatile agricultural land; f) existing highway capacity and highway safety; g) noise, light, glare, smell, dust, emissions or flicker; h) aviation and radar; i) recreation and local amenity. Proposals must take into account operational and approved developments, as well as any proposed intensification to operational or approved proposals.</p> <p>NPS EN1, EN3 and EN5 will also be important material considerations in any decision. This includes that the new substation would be defined as CNP infrastructure, for which there is an urgent national need. The starting point in favour of CNP infrastructure would also apply as a material consideration to the application for the High Marnham substation.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.11.8 of NPS EN-1 anticipates and allows for the circumstance in which <i>“it may not be possible to coordinate applications”</i> and paragraphs 4.11.8 and 4.11.9 go</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>on to set out what the Applicant needs to satisfy the decision maker of in that situation. The Applicant has addressed the requirements of these paragraphs, including that there is no obvious reason why the application for the High Marnham substation should be refused.</p> <p>On this basis, no obvious reason why the substation would be refused (paragraph 4.11.8 of NPS EN1).</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Table 10 – Waste Management

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
10-01	Outline Site Waste Management Plan	Further details of expected waste arisings, and of their proposed fate, from all phases of the project will need to be included in the final SWMP.	<p>Waste estimates have been undertaken on the basis of information available at the time of the writing.</p> <p><b>Construction</b></p> <p>Table 4.1 within Outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP) [APP-084] summarises the anticipated waste streams from construction. The oSWMP including waste estimates will be updated by the Principal Contractor into a final Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) prior to commencement of works, as secured through a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p><b>Operation</b></p> <p>Operational (including Maintenance) Effects are discussed in paragraphs 1.9.15-1.9.21 in 6.21 Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082]. For the</p>	<b>Under discussion</b>

			<p>purpose of assessment, it is assumed that one full replacement of the solar panels during operation will be required and batteries would be replaced every 5-15 years. The quantity of waste associated with replacement of solar panels and batteries is the same as those outlined in the Decommissioning Effects section (paragraph 1.9.22-1.9.28)</p> <p>Solar panels, 1.6 million panels, 179,200 m<sup>3</sup> based on a panel weight of 33.6kg and a density of 0.31 tonnes/m<sup>3</sup> (based on panel dimensions).</p> <p>Batteries, 764 Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) containers, 51,417 m<sup>3</sup> based on a 40ft container volume of 67.3m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>As outlined in the 7.5.1 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (Clean) (Rev 2) (oOEMP) [REP1-049] paragraph 2.9.5 <i>"To ensure the cumulative generation of waste is managed appropriately, the Applicant commits to working collaboratively to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Share data and reporting on waste types and volumes to support</i></li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p><i>regional waste planning and avoid overburdening local waste infrastructure;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Engage with the host authorities and waste planning bodies to ensure consistency with regional waste management strategies and capacity constraints; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Review and update waste mitigation measures regularly through continued dialogue with other developers post-consent.”</i></li> </ul> <p><i>As outlined in oOEMP [REP1-049] Section 2.14 Replacement Schedule, “every 12 months from the date of final commissioning and before undertaking the replacement of components for the year ahead, the Applicant will submit a planned replacement schedule for the components identified in Table 2-2 for the year ahead to the relevant planning authorities, excluding unforeseen circumstances that require replacement throughout the year.”</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><b>Decommissioning</b></p> <p>The quantity of waste associated with decommissioning is outlined in the Decommissioning Effects section (paragraph 1.9.22-1.9.28) of 6.21 Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082].</p> <p>Solar panels, 1.6 million panels, 179,200 m<sup>3</sup> based on a panel weight of 33.6kg and a density of 0.31 tonnes/m<sup>3</sup> (based on panel dimensions).</p> <p>Batteries, 764 Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) containers, 51,417 m<sup>3</sup> based on a 40ft container volume of 67.3m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>.</p>	
10-02	Scope of assessment	The Council has concerns about some aspects of the Applicant's assessment and consider that further work is needed in order to adequately demonstrate that the impact of the development in terms of waste would not be significant.	<p>Waste estimates are discussed in Ref 10-01 above.</p> <p>As outlined in paragraph 1.4.2 of 6.21 Appendix 2.3 Materials and Waste Impact Assessment [APP-082] "The applicant has a commitment to achieve 100% reuse and recycling of solar panels for construction, operation and decommissioning.</p>	<b>Under discussion</b>

			=	
10-03	Cumulative Waste	LCC request further consideration of cumulative impacts alongside other similar projects in the area, particularly in terms of PV panel waste.	Discussions ongoing between LCC and the Applicant.	<b>Under Discussion</b>

Table 11 – Flood and Drainage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
11-01	Surface Water Runoff from Solar Farm Areas	<p>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.</p> <p>Inspection and maintenance of vegetated cover and any SuDS to be considered.</p>	The approach to management of surface water runoff from the solar farm areas has been agreed and is in line with that set out within Section 4.2.1 of the FRA [REP2-043].	<b>Agreed</b>
11-02	Surface Water Runoff from BESS and Substation Areas	Applicant to consider how surface water runoff from the BESS and Substation areas will be managed in line with local policy requirements.	The approach to management of surface water runoff from the BESS and Substation areas has been agreed and is in line with that set out within Section 4.2.2 of the FRA [REP2-043].	<b>Agreed</b>
11-03	Firewater Containment	Applicant to ensure that potential firewater runoff from BESS compounds is contained adequately.	The approach to management of firewater runoff has been agreed and is in line with that set out within Section 4.2.2 of the FRA [REP2-043] as well as within Section 5 of	<b>Agreed</b>

			the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-183].	
11-04	Surface Water Flood Risk / Assessment	LCC as LLFA have reviewed the relevant documents and conclude that the information submitted to date is acceptable for LCC as LLFA. Surface water flood risk has been considered in principle in accordance with NPPF and SUDs guidance. Detailed surface water assessment design and mitigation will be required at the detailed design stage of the submission.	Noted.	<b>Agreed</b>

Table 12 – DCO Requirements

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
12-01	Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General), Article 39	A schedule of trees known to be required to be removed to be included in the DCO and referenced in Article 39. Subsequent approval of the Relevant Planning Authority should be required for any further tree removal beyond those trees identified in the schedule and as shown on the removal plans in the oLEMP. The Council are of the view that paragraph 5.3.6 the oLEMP could be amended to incorporate requirements to update the removal plans in the final LEMP which would be the subject of approval under Requirement 8 of the DCO.	<p>The Applicant has responded to a similar point raised by NSDC in its relevant representation, and that response is provided at the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-075], ref RR.135, page 116 – 121.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that a schedule of all trees or shrubs which may be removed is necessary or proportionate, and that there are adequate controls in place with respect to the operation of the power in Article 39, as set out in REP1-075.</p>	Agreed
12-02	Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General), Article 40	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report [APP-134] does not identify any TPOs within the development boundary. The report does identify quite a few Grade A trees / groups either within or near the boundary that may over the course lifetime of the site come to be worthy of TPO consideration (Section 3.1).	<p>The Applicant has updated the outline OEMP to include a new section which includes a commitment to provide an annual planned maintenance schedule.</p> <p>This would require the Applicant to report to the relevant planning authorities on its</p>	Under discussion

		<p>The Council therefore consider it would be appropriate for the article to be amended to require consultation with the relevant planning authority prior to the removal of any trees that may become subject to a TPO in the future. There should also be an expectation of replacement of any TPO tree removed, and an obligation that the relevant planning authority Tree Officer should be informed where any tree subject to a post February 2025 TPO is pruned/ felled, to allow records to be updated.</p> <p>The ExA is referred to the wording of article 40 for The A38 Derby Junctions DCO 2023 which provides for consultation with the relevant planning authority and seeks to ensure replacement of felled TPO trees.</p> <p>Suggested wording for article 40(2):</p> <p><i>(2) In carrying out any activity authorised by paragraph (1)—</i></p> <p><i>(a) the undertaker must do no unnecessary damage to any tree or shrub and must pay compensation to any person for any loss or damage arising from such activity;</i></p>	<p>expected activities in the upcoming twelve months, including waste generation, transport requirements, and details of any trees that require removal and if they are proposed to be replaced. The schedule would also confirm what the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of the proposed maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant can also confirm that in the oLEMP at paragraph 4.1.15, the Applicant would need to agree any replacement of trees ahead of removing a TPO tree. Therefore, LCC would be given notice and be aware of any removal under this paragraph.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p><i>(b) the duty contained in section 206(1)(a) (replacement of trees) of the 1990 Act is not to apply although where possible the undertaker is to seek to replace any trees which are removed; and</i></p> <p><i>(c) the undertaker must consult the relevant planning authority prior to that activity taking place</i></p> <p>LCC welcome the inclusion of the replacement schedule to inform the Council of any anticipated vegetation removal. However, LCC notes that should we wish for a replacement, and the applicant does not propose one there is no recourse to resolve or discuss with the applicant.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.15 of the oLEMP satisfies LCC in terms of TPO tree removal, however LCC are also concerned about mature trees within the Order Limits that have the potential to become TPOs over the 60 year period/as an example, current grade A trees. The oLEMP does not currently cover this scenario or provide any similar protections to trees that do not benefit from the status.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--



12-03	Schedule 2 (Requirements), Requirements 3, 4, 5 and 20	The Council would wish to be a consultee on these requirements.	<p>The Applicant added the County as a consultee at Deadline 1 for requirements 3 and 4.</p> <p>The Applicant has added the Counties to requirement 5 at Deadline 2, reflecting their scope as local highway authority, and to requirement 20 reflecting the Counties' role as local highway authority and local waste authority.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>
12-04	Schedule 2 (Requirements), Requirement 9	<p>Proposed BNG Requirement</p> <p>1. The authorised development may not commence until a biodiversity net gain strategy has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body.</p> <p>2. The biodiversity net gain strategy must include details of how the strategy will secure a minimum of xx% biodiversity net gain in area habitat units and a minimum of yy% in hedgerow units and zz% in watercourse units for all of the authorised development during the operation of the authorised development, and the metric that has been used to calculate that those percentages will be reached.</p>	The updated draft DCO submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2 adopts this approach.	<b>Agreed</b>

		3. The biodiversity net gain strategy must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological management plan and must be implemented as approved and maintained throughout the operation of the authorised development to which the plan relates.		
12-05	Schedule 15 (Procedure for Discharge of Requirements Article 3)	Due to the capacity and availability of consultees, it is requested that (6)(a) to 15 working days.	This has now been updated within the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003].	<b>Agreed</b>
12-06	Schedule 15 (Procedure for Discharge of Requirements Article 5 (Fees))	<p>The Council considers that the fee schedule should be update to reflect the fees due to be introduced in April 2025 and requests that a proportionate increase is reflected in the fees set out in Schedule 16.</p> <p>Suggested Wording:</p> <p><i>5. (1) Where an application is made to the relevant planning authority for a discharge, a fee is to apply and must be paid to the relevant planning authority for each application.</i></p> <p><i>(2) The fee payable for each application under sub-paragraph (1) is as follows—</i></p>	The Applicant agrees and has made these changes in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-007].	<b>Agreed</b>

		<p><i>(a) a fee of £2,578 for the first application for the discharge of each of the requirements 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19;</i></p> <p><i>(b) a fee of £588 for each subsequent application for the discharge of each of the requirements listed in paragraph (a) and any application under requirement 5 in respect of the requirements listed in paragraph (a); and</i></p> <p><i>(c) a fee of £298 for any application for the discharge of—</i></p> <p><i>(i) any other requirements not listed in paragraph (a);</i></p> <p><i>(ii) any application under requirement 4 in respect of requirements not listed in paragraph (a); and</i></p> <p><i>(iii) any approval required by a document referred to by any requirement or a document approved pursuant to any requirement.</i></p>		
12-07	Schedule 14	<p>There is currently no Protective Provision for The Protection of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue included within the DCO.</p> <p>Heckington Fen approved DCO Schedule 13 Part 9, para 104 to 107 includes appropriate wording.</p>	<p>The Applicant is agreeable in principle to the protective provisions sought by the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service. However, it would first like to understand how the arrangements would work alongside Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service and it is seeking to discuss this point with both services.</p>	<b>Under discussion</b>

		<p><b>FOR THE PROTECTION OF LINCOLNSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation</b></p> <p>104.— (1) For the protection of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue as referred to in this Part of this Schedule the following provisions have effect, unless otherwise agreed in writing between the undertaker and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue.</p> <p>(2) In this Part of this Schedule— “Index Linked” means an increase in the sums payable on an annual basis or pro rata per diem in accordance with the most recent published figure for the Consumer Price Index, or during any period when no such index exists the index which replaces it or is the nearest equivalent to it; and “Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue” means Lincolnshire County Council in its capacity as a fire and rescue authority pursuant to section 1(2)(a) of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004.</p> <p><b>Site visits</b></p> <p>105.— (1) The undertaker must, prior to the date of final commissioning of Work No. 2, use reasonable endeavours to facilitate a site familiarisation exercise in connection with Work No. 2 of the authorised development for Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue for the purposes of providing the necessary assurance to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue that all the required systems and measures are in place in accordance with the battery safety management plan.</p> <p>(2) Following the first anniversary of the date of final commissioning of Work No. 2 of the authorised development, the undertaker must use reasonable endeavours to facilitate an annual review of Work No. 2 by Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue at the reasonable request of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, up until the year in which the undertaker commences decommissioning of Work No. 2.</p> <p>Costs</p> <p>106.— (1) Pursuant to the provisions set out at paragraph 105, the undertaker must pay to Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue—</p> <p>(a) £16,665 in the first year of operation of the authorised development for, or in connection with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue’s attendance at the site familiarisation exercise facilitated by the undertaker pursuant to paragraph 105(1), such sum to be paid within 30 days following the date of the site familiarisation exercise; and</p> <p>(b) £1,530 in each subsequent year of operation of the authorised development until the date of decommissioning of Work No. 2, such sums to be paid within 30 days of the date of the annual review for that year, if in</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>that year an annual review has taken place pursuant to paragraph 105(2).</p> <p>(2) The costs payable under this subparagraph (1)(b) are to be Index Linked.</p> <p>Arbitration 107. Any difference or dispute arising between the undertaker and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue under this Part of this Schedule must be determined by arbitration in accordance with article 38 (arbitration).</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

## Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Lincolnshire County Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



**one earth**  
solar farm