

One Earth Solar Farm

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District Council

EN010159/APP/8.5.32

~~October~~ December 2025

One Earth Solar Farm Ltd

Contents

1. Introduction	2
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
2. Description of the Proposed Development	5
3. Record of Engagement	6
3.1 Summary of Consultation	6
4. Current Position	16
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council	16
1. Introduction	2
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
2. Description of the Proposed Development	5
3. Record of Engagement	6
3.1 Summary of Consultation	6
4. Current Position	16
4.1 Position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council	16

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 Bassetlaw District Council.

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

1.2.3 Collectively, the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3 Purpose of this document

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

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

1.3.3 Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4 Terminology

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

- "Agreed" indicates where an issue has been resolved;
- "Not Agreed" indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them; and

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

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

2. Description of the Proposed Development

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

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

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

3. Record of Engagement

3.1 Summary of Consultation

3.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation throughout the early stages of the Proposed Development. Table 01 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council in relation to the Application.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
General Catch Ups		
25 th August 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial introductions to the Project
25 th August 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council
11 th March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project overview• Ecology Survey programme overview• Summary of habitat information• Summary of bat surveys• Summary of bird surveys (breeding and wintering)• Summary of badger, otter and water vole surveys• Summary of great crested newt surveys• Identifying local conservation priorities (to include within landscape design)

- Approach to BNG, incorporating local priority species

19 th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development
8 th May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around socio-economic impacts
14 th May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Consultation briefing including an update on EIA, the masterplan and consultation programme
12 th July 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team; • Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing
9 th October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan and programme update • Adequacy of Consultation Milestone • Statement of Common Ground
1 st May 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps
Ongoing	Email Communication	Ongoing email communication to finalise the outstanding SoCG elements. This has been used as the method to finalise topics such as noise and air quality.

Cultural Heritage

29th- 30th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation on scope of cultural heritage assessment and discussion of proposed scope of heritage photomontages.
30 th April 2024	Correspondence (email)	Confirmation from Bassetlaw that the range of heritage assets are correctly identified.
21 st August 2024	Meeting (On Site)	<p>Discussion of the Proposed Development post PEIR consultation responses. Review of the potential effects and mitigation in relation to assets in Ragnall and Fledborough</p> <p><u>Ragnall</u></p> <p>Discussion and agreement to review how the development relates to contouring to the north and northwest of St Leonards Church. It was agreed that topography would be overlayed onto the masterplan to demonstrate the relationship between the two.</p> <p>Outcome: Order Limits are shown with topography overlay on page 8 of Technical Appendix 10.2 (APP-127). Discussion held on creating set backs to the east of Main Street and reviewing historic landscape context to inform screening.</p> <p>Outcome: Historic research shared with Statutory Consultee and informed revision of Order Limits to increase setback from Main Street.</p> <p><u>Fledborough</u></p> <p>Discussion held on the enclosed setting of St Gregory's Churchyard and the key view from this location being towards Fledborough Viaduct. Request for further review of views</p>

looking north from the PRoW located to the north of the Church.

Outcome: Agreement that Manor House and St Gregory's Church could be jointly assessed. Further review on screening of eastern Order Limit boundaries.

21st August 2024

Correspondence (email)

Bassetlaw Conservation Officer sharing Site Visit findings focused on mitigation and topography variance around Whimpton Moor Scheduled Ancient Monument. Response also included advice on Ragnall regarding the now included setback to the east of Main Street and topography review to the north of the Churchyard. Confirmation from the Officer that the impact to Flebrorough would not be directly visual.

19th November 2024

Meeting (Virtual)

Presentation of amended masterplan and response of revisions to masterplan. Discussion on anticipated conclusions of heritage impact and additional information required.

Air Quality

The parties have not been engaged directly in consultation on the topic of Air Quality, however responses have been provided via the Scoping Opinion and Relevant Representations. The methodology and approach has been agreed via this method.

Ground Conditions

27th November 2024

Email

Information was provided to Bassetlaw District Council relating to land and groundwater contamination issues.

The Scoping Opinion had indicated that potential impacts to existing geological units from contamination should be assessed within the ES for the construction phase and the decommissioning phase. The Applicant confirmed that the ES chapter provides an assessment of potential effects on existing geological units and provided a copy of the methodology for review.

The Applicant also confirmed that the ES chapter provides an assessment of the potential contamination of groundwater for the construction and decommissioning phases of the project (including consideration of existing groundwater abstraction points). A copy of the methodology was attached for review. It was noted that the methodology had been amended for One Earth Solar Farm since it was presented in the PEIR.

10th December 2024

Email

Response from Applicant (to all local planning authorities) further explaining the reasons for the amendments to the methodology.

16th June 2025

Email

The Applicant requested information held by the local authority relating to private water abstraction locations (licensed or unlicensed) in response to consultation comments that the original dataset may not have been

complete. The response from Bassetlaw District Council was to pass this query onto Nottinghamshire County Council, therefore indicating that a dataset of this type is not held by Bassetlaw District Council.

Landscape and Visual

22nd April 2024

Virtual meeting

Key Topics:

- LVIA methodology
- LVIA Study Area
- Landscape receptors
- Visual receptors
- Representative viewpoints
- Photomontages

Key Outcomes:

- Request for LVIA study area refinement to be detailed in the LVIA
- Suggestion of ZTV approach and agreement to share drafts for comment
- Comments on consultation note to be provided in writing
- Follow-up meeting to be scheduled following publication of the PEIR

14th November 2024

Virtual meeting

Key topics:

- ZTV parameters
- LVIA study area
- LVIA criteria
- Scope of receptors
- Scope of cumulative assessment

Key outcomes:

- Welcomed updates and clarifications post-PEIR
- Outstanding issues to be provided as an interim note

19 th November 2024	Virtual meeting and Interim Note	<p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of LVIA figures including ZTVs • Updated LVIA methodology including specific criteria • Approach to RVAA • Review of study area scoping photos <p>Key Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of additional viewpoints added and some previous PEIR comments addressed (e.g., VP16, VP26). • Acknowledgement of updated methodology reviewed and partially improved. • Outstanding issues remain regarding ZTV figures, viewpoint locations, methodological clarifications, visualisation quality
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	---

19th August 2025	Virtual meeting	<p>Key Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approach to visual assessment - Impacts on landscape character areas - Approach to cumulative assessment - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment <p>Key Outcomes</p>
------------------	-----------------	--

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

17th September 2025	Virtual Meeting	<p>Key Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outstanding LVIA matters <p>Key Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council to review assessment of visual receptors to determine if levels of effects are justified - Agreed that the level of effects on landscape character areas are justified - Council to provide a written response to the Joint Relationship Report [REP1-074].
---------------------	-----------------	--

- Welcomed additional detail provided within the OLEMP.
- Agreed that the mechanism for securing a detailed planting plan in the DCO was sufficient
- Welcomed additional evidence provided within Chapter 11 of the ES regarding Residential Visual Amenity Assessment

1st October 2025

Virtual Meeting

Key Topics

- Outstanding LVIA matters

Key Outcomes

- Agreed that the level of effects on visual effects are justified and that the alternative approach suggested by the Council would not give rise to differing levels of impacts.
- Welcomed additions made to the OLEMP
- Confirmed that additional detail provided within Chapter 11 regarding Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) justifies that an RVAA is not required.

Ecology

18/08/2025

Virtual Meeting

Review of ecology elements of the Statement of Common Ground.

29/08/2025

Virtual Meeting

Review of ecology elements of the Statement of Common Ground.

Noise

29/09/2025	Virtual Meeting	Discussion on the noise elements that BDC hold concerns/comments around in terms of the SoCG.
29/10/2025	Virtual Meeting	Discussion on remainder of noise points that BDC hold comments around.

Table 01 – Record of Engagement

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and Bassetlaw District Council

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

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

Table 02 – Human Health

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	Cross referencing human health with other chapters	<p>Human Health Chapter to also include cross-references to the following assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual Chapter – Impacts on alterations to the landform and the quality of the built and natural environment; • Socio-Economics Chapter – Impacts on education and training opportunities and local business activity; • Transport and Access Chapter - Impacts on accessibility and connections to jobs; • Hydrology and Hydrogeology Chapter – Impacts on water resources; 	Set out under “Other Environmental Matters” in section 16.6 of this chapter	Agreed

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Land and Soils Chapter – Impacts on land quality;• Air Quality Chapter – Impacts on human health from traffic, plant and dust during the Construction Phase and the Decommissioning Phase;• Noise and Vibration Chapter – Impacts on noise and vibration levels from traffic and operations		
--	--	---	--	--

Table 03 – Cultural Heritage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
03-01	Setbacks from assets	Following a site meeting back in August 2024, a range of changes were made to the proposed layout for this scheme. These changes largely related to the increasing of buffer areas around a range of heritage assets, and also the removal of certain areas of the scheme in order to help protect setting and to better reflect historically-significant views (particularly around Ragnall village and Whimpton Moor DMV). Those changes are very much welcomed.	Noted	Agreed
03-02	Harm of setting	Bassetlaw District Council is satisfied that in relation to above-ground heritage assets in this part of Bassetlaw, the harm caused to the setting of the various designated and non-designated heritage assets would be at the lower level of 'less than substantial' at worst and relate to experiential impacts rather than affects on direct setting or direct views to/from/between assets.	Noted.	Agreed

03-03	Harm	<p>It is acknowledged that whatever the level of harm, it is still harm, and in accordance with that harm should be avoided unless the public benefits outweigh that harm. In this case, the public benefits of the scheme are very substantial (employment creation and provision of renewable energy, as set out in national/local policy and in a series of recent Inspectorate decisions nearby). The view has been taken that those benefits would indeed outweigh the ‘less than substantial’ harm to setting identified.</p>	Noted.	Agreed
-------	------	---	--------	--------

Table 04 – Air Quality

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	ES Chapter Comments	<p>Dust during Construction:</p> <p>The construction phase could generate dust, which could adversely affect air quality and the health of nearby residents. Measures to mitigate dust emissions, such as water spraying, dust screens, and monitoring, should be thoroughly evaluated and implemented.</p>	<p>As presented in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13 – Air Quality [APP-042], a construction dust risk assessment was undertaken to identify the level of mitigation required to ensure there are no significant effects from dust and particulate emissions during construction. The mitigation measures, which are set out in ES Volume 2: Appendix 13.5 [APP-137], are included in, and secured by, Table 3.9 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-176].</p>	Under Discussion <u>Agreed</u>

Table 05 – Land and Groundwater

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	Methodology for Land and Groundwater assessment	No response received	In the absence of further queries, the methodology put forward by the Applicant was adhered to in the assessment of land and groundwater receptors, without any subsequent queries or concerns on the assessment having been submitted by Bassetlaw District Council	Agreed
05-02	Request for private water supply data	Response indicates that this dataset would be held by Nottinghamshire County Council, if available.	No data on private water supplies are held by Bassetlaw District Council, so no further action is required on this matter	Agreed

Table 06 – Landscape and Visual

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

06-04	Scope of visual receptors	The scope of visual receptors is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of visual receptors is agreed.	Agreed
06-05	Scope of representative viewpoints	The scope of representative viewpoints is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of representative viewpoints is agreed.	Agreed
06-06	Scope of photomontages	The scope of photomontages is appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The scope of photomontages is agreed.	Agreed
06-07	Assessment assumptions and limitations	The process of assessment is thorough and well explained in the volumes, which include a clear summary of assumptions and limitations of the assessment.	The assumptions and limitations of the LVIA are agreed.	Agreed
06-08	Level of effect on landscape receptors	Subsequent meetings with the Applicant along with a site visit have clarified the findings of the LVIA. We agree that some of the identified character areas would not have significant effects due to their being limited above ground development directly affecting these areas.	The level of effect on landscape receptors is agreed.	Agreed
06-09	Level of effect on visual receptors	Several receptors are judged to have significant adverse effects which have been identified, and subsequently through the consideration of sequential effects is unlikely to increase the overall findings.	The level of effect on visual receptors is agreed.	Agreed

06-10	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>	Not Agreed
06-11	Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP)	Subsequent clarifications and meetings with the Applicant have provided additional detail. The OLEMP is now considered appropriate to the scale and context of the Site.	The landscape and ecology management strategy, prescriptions, and monitoring approach as set out within the OLEMP are agreed.	Agreed
06-10	Timescale of project and influence of the	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	It is agreed that the temporary nature of the project has not resulted in the residual effects being understated.	Agreed

	assessment of effects	judgement of effects is unlikely to change based on this.		
06-11	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>	Not agreed
06-12	Residential Visual Amenity	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	The approach to consideration of visual impacts on residential receptors has been agreed and therefore the LVIA fully and accurately reports the visual impact	Agreed

	Assessment (RVAA)	LVIA and constitutes an appropriate justification for not undertaking a full RVAA with regard to the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold.	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.	
--	-------------------	--	---	--

Table 07 – Noise and Vibration

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
07-01	Operational Noise Assessment	Further details on plant/mitigation will be required to ensure noise nuisance complaints do not arise from the operation of the solar farm. Whilst the report provides baseline noise monitoring for the development site, the location/type of plant to be incorporated within the development has yet to be firmed up.	<p>The final design of the development, including final plant selections and locations, will not be available until post-consent, therefore it is not currently possible to provide further detail on the design of the Proposed Development beyond that set out in the application documents (e.g., the outline Design Parameters [REP2-022 and REP2-023 REP5-016]).</p> <p>We recognise that this has the potential to create uncertainty with regard to the exact noise levels that are likely to be experienced at receptors, therefore an operational noise limit has been proposed (Requirement 16 of the draft DCO [REP3003 and REP3-004]) in order to limit maximum noise levels at residential properties.</p>	Under discussion Agreed

			<p><u>However, in terms of operational noise it is agreed that Requirement 16 of the draft DCO, which requires a noise assessment to be submitted to the local planning authorities prior to commencement detailing the noise mitigation that is required in order to achieve the operational noise limits set out Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-044] and the Outline Design Parameters [REP5-016], is sufficient control of operational noise at this stage.</u></p> <p>"Requirement 16 of the draft DCO also requires that an operational noise assessment is submitted to the relevant planning authorities for approval, to demonstrate that the final design incorporates suitable mitigation to control noise levels to the specified noise limit.</p> <p>On this basis, whilst there is still flexibility in the design of operational plant and equipment, we feel that potential operational noise levels are appropriately controlled.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

07-02	Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment	<p>Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment. Currently it seems that the development phase has the potential to give rise to nuisance complaints from existing residents from trenching, construction of the access track, piling etc. Further details will be required on the specific techniques to be applied and likely mitigation to ensure that impact is reduced appropriately.</p>	<p>Specific measures for the control of construction noise will be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). An Outline CEMP has been provided with the application documents and has been updated as the examination process has progressed (see [REP3-041 and REP3-042REP5-032]). The Outline CEMP includes consideration of measures to limit the potential impact of noise during construction, and will be developed further, in discussion with the Local Authorities<u>highlights specific receptors that have been identified in the ES as having the potential for elevated noise impacts.</u></p>	<p>Under discussion<u>Agreed</u></p>
-------	---	---	--	---

			<p>Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO [REP3-003 and REP3-004<u>REP5-006</u>] secures that prior to construction, a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. When the CEMP is produced, further information will be available on the precise construction plant and equipment required, construction methods to be employed, etc. For this reason, it will be possible to provide greater detail on noise mitigation measures at that stage than is currently possible. The submitted CEMP(s) are therefore the most appropriate place for detailed discussion of noise mitigation measures.</p> <p>We note the feedback from BDC that the oCEMP would benefit from further detail, particularly in relation to specifically noting receptors that have been identified in the construction noise assessment as having the greatest risk of elevated noise impacts during construction.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

07-03	Baseline noise survey locations	Agree with the Applicant's choice of noise survey locations assessed as part of Appendix 15.2.	The baseline noise survey was carried out at locations that were agreed as being appropriate (as shown in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [APP-044] and Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	Agreed
07-04	Baseline noise survey results	Agree with the survey data/results acquired by the Applicant, as demonstrated in Appendix 15.2.	Sufficient data was gathered at each of the baseline noise monitoring locations to form an appropriate basis for the noise assessment (see Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	Agreed
07-05	Study areas	Agree with the Applicant's choice of study areas.	The respective study areas and the associated sensitive receptors identified are appropriate for the basis of the following assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction traffic noise and vibration; • On-site construction noise and vibration; • Operational noise. 	Agreed
07-06	Standards and guidance	Agree that the Applicant has followed the appropriate standards and guidance.	The appropriate standards and guidance have been referenced for the following aspects of the assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction traffic noise and vibration; 	Agreed

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-site construction noise and vibration; Operational noise. 	
07-07	Significance criteria	Bassetlaw District Council wishes to review the stance of the other LPAs before confirming their stance on the significance criteria. Agree with the significance criteria set out.	<p>Appropriate significance criteria have been adopted for the assessment of the significance of effects associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction traffic noise and vibration; On-site construction noise and vibration; Operational noise. 	Under discussion Agreed
07-08	Control of noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic	Agree that the control of noise and vibration will be adequately controlled by the CTMP.	Potential noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). An outline CTMP has been included as part of the application documents [REP1-005 REP5-040], for further discussion and agreement.	Agreed

07-09	Control of on-site construction noise and vibration	<u>-Following the additions to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP5-032], the control of on-site construction noise is agreed.</u>	Potential impacts of on-site construction noise and vibration can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). An outline CEMP has been included as part of the application documents [REP2-049 ; <u>REP5-032</u> for further discussion and agreement.	<u>Under discussion</u> <u>Agreed</u>
-------	---	--	--	--

Table 08 – DCO Requirements

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
08-01	Discharge of Requirements	Further to comments made within this report, it is considered that as this is a cross boundary application site, covering three local authorities and two County Councils, the Local Planning Authority request that in the event of a DCO consent, a period of at least 13 weeks is given to consider all applications to discharge conditions. This is respectfully requested as the submission to approve conditions will require each authority to discuss and agree the scheme in order to get the best outcome for this large cross boundary proposal. It is also requested that the proposed application fees shall reflect officers time spent reaching a decision on those matters.	The Applicant appreciates the points raised by the Council and at Deadline 2 has extended the time from ten to twelve weeks. The Applicant does not agree that the time allowed should be any longer than this, for the reasons previously set out in support of the ten week period. The Applicant has also made consequential amendments to the time periods in Article 45 and Requirement 20 (Decommissioning and restoration).	Under discussion Not Agreed

Table 09 – Ecology and Biodiversity

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
09-01	The approach and delivery of ecological data is sufficient to inform a robust assessment and BNG calculation	BDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-087] that that full details of survey methods and field survey results have been provided within the application documents.	<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

09-02	Biodiversity Net Gain outcomes	BDC question whether grassland underneath solar panels can be considered to reach modified grassland in good condition within their Local Impact Report [REP1-087].	<p>The Applicant responded to this question in the 'Applicants response to relevant representations' [REP1-075] (relevant representation number RR 135).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that other Development Consent Order projects have recieved consent with more ambitious target conditions (e.g. other neutral grassland in moderate condition), whilst others use grass seed mixes with no wildflower component to achieve target conditions of modified grassland in moderate condition.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident with the correct seed mixes and management that achieving the following criteria is possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 6 species can be established under solar panels using a shade and drought tolerant mix • Sward height can be managed to ensure variance in height 	Agreed
-------	--------------------------------	---	--	--------

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrub can be controlled to ensure it accounts for less than 20% • Physical damage of grassland is less than 5% • Bare ground can be controlled to be within 1 and 10% • Bracken can be controlled to be less than 20% cover • Invasive non-native plant species can be controlled if they occur. 	
09-03	Delivery of BNG and other biodiversity enhancements	BDC note within their Local Impact Report [REP1-087] that <i>'On balance then it appears the impact of the Proposed Development will from an ecological perspective be positive; local wildlife sites will be buffered, landscape connectivity improved, a variety of habitats enhanced, and new higher quality habitats created. The Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain.'</i>	<p>The Applicant concludes within Chapter 6 Biodiversity [REP1-023] in Table 6.11 that the potential effects on biodiversity will either be Not Significant or Significant Beneficial.</p> <p>Overall, the Proposed Development would have a positive effect on biodiversity and contribute towards local</p>	Agreed

			conservation priorities on a landscape scale.	
--	--	--	---	--

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Bassetlaw District Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



one earth
solar farm