From:	[redacted]
To:	[redacted]@lincolnshire.gov.uk; [redacted]@nottscc.gov.uk; Enquiries
Cc:	One Earth Solar; Great North Road Solar; Tillbridge Solar Project
Subject:	Flood Risk
Date:	19 September 2025 11:49:57
Attachments:	An assessment of One Earth, Greatnorth road and Tilbridge flood risk and biodiversity. Accumulative impacts.docx

Stephen Fox

[redacted]

By email

19th September 2025.

To The Planning Inspectorate, Lincolnshire County Council, and Nottinghamshire County Council,

Subject: Submission of a Critical Analysis of Flood Risk Assessments for the One Earth, Tilbridge, and Great North Road NSIP Solar Proposals

Dear Sirs and Madams

I am writing to formally submit for your consideration the attached report, which provides a detailed critical analysis of the flood risk assessments (FRAs) for the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) concerning the One Earth, Tilbridge, and Great North Road solar proposals.

The report concludes that the FRAs for these projects are critically deficient. It presents a detailed case, supported by modern hydrological science, that the assessments significantly underestimate the flood risk and long-term environmental impacts of these developments. The core findings highlight that the proposed solar panels act as conduits for rainfall, leading to a dramatic increase in runoff speed and peak discharge rates that are not adequately accounted for in the project's drainage strategies. This poses a serious, unmitigated risk of surface water flooding and soil erosion to the areas for which you are the Lead Local Flood Authorities and examining authorities and, I would submit, requires urgent attention.

It is also critical to note that this report addresses only the projects for which detailed planning documentation is currently available. The problem of regional flood risk will be compounded exponentially as other major solar projects in the same geographic region, such as Cottam Solar Project, West Burton Solar Project, and Steeples Renewables Projects, come forward in the coming years. The cumulative effect of these developments on the area's hydrology presents a profound and unaddressed risk that extends far beyond the scope of any single project's assessment.

I urge you to consider the findings of this report as part of your ongoing scrutiny of these proposals. Given the scale and co-location of these projects, it is imperative that a unified, basin-wide hydrological study be conducted to fully assess the cumulative flood risk to the region.

I trust that you will take this matter into serious consideration. The findings presented in the attached analysis underscore the need for a comprehensive re-evaluation to ensure these projects do not increase flood risk or cause irreversible environmental damage over their sixty-year lifespan.

Sincerely,

Stephen fox

1.0 Summary

1.1 Summary of Key Findings

This analysis concludes that the flood risk assessments (FRAs) submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) applications for the One Earth, Tillbridge, and Great North Road solar projects are critically deficient. The primary flaw lies in their reliance on an outdated hydrological paradigm that assumes solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays have a negligible impact on surface water runoff. This assumption is directly contradicted by modern, peer-reviewed hydrological science, particularly the findings of Baiamonte et al. (2023). This research demonstrates that solar panels significantly increase runoff speed and peak discharge rates by acting as impermeable conduits, a phenomenon the project assessments fail to model or mitigate. Consequently, the flood risk to the projects and surrounding areas is profoundly underestimated.

Furthermore, the report identifies several systemic weaknesses within the planning and assessment processes for these Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). The proposed mitigation strategies, such as vegetation and swales, are designed for pre-development conditions and are likely to be overwhelmed by the concentrated, high-energy runoff from the panels. The immense scale of construction, involving the installation of millions of panels across thousands of hectares, presents an insurmountable challenge in preventing widespread soil compaction. This irreversible change to the soil's structure will permanently reduce its infiltration capacity, creating a chronic, long-term increase in surface runoff that extends beyond the operational lifespan of the projects. Finally, the NSIP process, with its accelerated timetable and siloed approach to assessment, is structurally unequipped to address the cumulative flood risk posed by all three large-scale projects operating within the same regional drainage system. This places an unmanageable burden on under-resourced local authorities, making effective long-term monitoring and enforcement highly improbable.

1.2 Overarching Conclusions

Based on a rigorous review of available documentation and informed by modern hydrological science, the DCO applications, in their current form, do not provide sufficient assurance that the proposed developments will not increase flood risk elsewhere or compromise long-term environmental objectives. The projects pose a significant, unmitigated risk of surface water flooding and soil degradation, which contravenes key tenets of the National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The failure to accurately model the hydrological impacts and to propose credible, long-term mitigation and monitoring plans renders the assessments insufficient for a project of this scale and sensitivity.

1.3 High-Level Recommendations

It is recommended that the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State require a complete re-evaluation of the hydrological impacts for all three projects. This must include a revised drainage strategy based on accurate hydrological modeling that accounts for the effects of the solar panels themselves. A comprehensive, basin-wide cumulative effects study is essential to understand the combined regional flood risk. To address the long-term impacts, a legally binding, independently funded monitoring and enforcement plan must be secured for the lifetime of the projects, with enforceable provisions for post-decommissioning restoration.

2.0 Foundational Principles: Science, Law, and Practice

2.1 The Hydrological Impacts of Solar Panels: A Modern Scientific Paradigm Shift

The flood risk assessments for the One Earth, Tillbridge, and Great North Road proposals appear to be founded on a fundamental misinterpretation of the hydrological function of large-scale solar farms. This misinterpretation is rooted in the long-held assumption that because the land under and between the solar arrays remains "pervious" and unpaved, the overall hydrological response of the site is not significantly altered from its pre-development state. Sources suggest that solar farms are often considered to be as much as 95% permeable, with only the relatively small footprints of substations, access roads, and other compounds considered impermeable. The conclusion drawn from this assumption is that no significant increase in runoff volume or rate will occur, thereby requiring only standard drainage strategies to manage the minor increases from the truly impermeable infrastructure.

However, this paradigm is directly challenged and refuted by recent, detailed hydrological research. A key study by Baiamonte et al. (2023) provides a critical scientific basis for a revised understanding of solar farm hydrology. The research explicitly demonstrates that the panels themselves, while not permanently sealing the ground, act as highly efficient conduits for rainfall. They intercept rainfall that would otherwise be absorbed over a wide, dispersed area and concentrate it, discharging it as a high-velocity, high-volume flow at the lower, down-slope edge of each panel.

The quantitative findings of the Baiamonte et al. study are alarming and have been overlooked in the project assessments. Using a rainfall simulator on a sloped test plot, the research found that solar panels increased the peak discharge by approximately **11 times** compared to a bare soil hillslope. A moderate effect of panel arrangement was also observed, with cross-slope panels resulting in a peak discharge 11.7 times higher and aligned-slope panels 11.5 times higher than the bare soil reference. Crucially, the time for runoff to begin was drastically reduced, from 1.2 hours for bare soil to as low as 0.3 hours for the aligned-slope panels. This reduction in lag time means that a site with solar panels will contribute to flood peaks much more quickly than an agricultural field, compounding the risk to downstream areas.

The kinetic energy of the water is also a significant factor that the developers' assessments fail to consider. The Baiamonte et al. study found that the kinetic energy of the flow draining from the edge of the panels was greater than that of the rainfall itself, which can cause significant erosion at the base of the panels. This accelerated, high-energy flow will scour the soil, leading to the formation of gullies and ruts that concentrate flow even further. The assumption that grass and vegetation alone can manage this concentrated erosive force is a major misjudgement. The failure to incorporate these modern scientific findings means the hydrological models used for these projects are fundamentally inaccurate and provide a false sense of security regarding flood risk.

2.2 The UK Planning Framework for Flood Risk: Statutory Requirements and Guidance

The planning process for NSIPs is governed by the Planning Act 2008, with specific policy guidance provided by the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). These documents mandate a comprehensive approach to flood risk, requiring developers to demonstrate that their projects are resilient to the effects of flooding and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.

The core of this framework is the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests. These tests are designed to steer new development to areas of lower flood risk and, where this is not possible, to ensure that the project will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk to others. The documents for both One Earth and Great North Road reference the application of these tests, claiming compliance and justification for their locations. However, the efficacy of this process is entirely dependent on the accuracy of the underlying flood risk data. If the initial hydrological modeling fails to account for the unique runoff characteristics of the solar panels, then the entire application of the Sequential and Exception Tests becomes a technical formality rather than a substantive assessment of risk. The developers' conclusion that the projects will not increase flood risk elsewhere (a key requirement of EN-1) is therefore unsupported by sound science and renders their application of the planning tests invalid.

EN-1 also stipulates that mitigation measures should make use of natural flood management techniques and that there should be no net loss of floodplain storage. While the project documents mention the use of natural features like swales and the avoidance of flood zones for certain infrastructure, this appears to be based on a flawed premise. The rapid, high-volume flows from the solar panels, as identified in the Baiamonte et al. study, are fundamentally different from the slow, diffuse sheet flows that natural flood management techniques are designed to manage. This disconnect between the proposed solutions and the actual problem further demonstrates the inadequacy of the assessments.

2.3 The Water Framework Directive and its Application to Land-Based Developments

The Water Framework Directive (WFD) is the cornerstone of water protection legislation in Europe, with a core objective of achieving "good ecological and chemical status" for all surface waters and groundwater. A key tenet of the WFD is the requirement for Member States to prevent any deterioration in the status of water bodies. The land-intensive nature of solar farms, combined with the hydrological changes they induce, poses a direct and unaddressed threat to WFD compliance.

The increased runoff and soil erosion resulting from the concentrated water flow off the panels, as detailed by Baiamonte et al. (2023) , have direct and severe implications for water quality. When soil erodes, it carries sediment and other pollutants into local watercourses. This sediment loading can smother aquatic habitats, reduce light penetration for photosynthesis, and alter the physical and chemical composition of the water, thereby degrading its ecological status. The developers' claims of biodiversity net gain for terrestrial habitats are therefore undermined if the hydrological impacts compromise the health of local rivers and streams, which are integral to the wider ecosystem. The absence of a robust, scientifically-sound assessment of these water quality impacts in the flood risk documents suggests a critical failure to comply with the overarching principles of the WFD.

3.0 Project-Specific Analysis and Critique

Project	Hydrological Assumption	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Explicit Claims/Partnerships
One Earth	Land is permeable; focus on small impermeable areas.	Low ground pressure vehicles, post-construction soil amelioration with farm equipment, regular soil inspections.	Acknowledges "inevitable" damage but proposes standard remediation; claims compliance with EN-1.
Tilbridge	Land is permeable; focuses on small impermeable areas.	Swales, piped drainage, and a Construction Environment Management Plan.	Collaboration with other projects to "minimise land take and environmental impacts"; references a PEIR with a chapter on flood risk and drainage.
Great North Road	Assumes vegetation and other passive measures are sufficient; no mention of panel-specific runoff effects.	Sward, swales, constructed wetlands, and a piped drainage network.	Collaboration with Trent Rivers Trust on "Natural Flood Management" and biodiversity enhancements; claims to have moved electrical infrastructure out of flood zones.

3.1 One Earth Solar Farm: Assessment of Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy

The DCO application for the One Earth Solar Farm is currently in the examination phase, having been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate in March 2025. The available documentation includes an Outline Soil Management Plan (OSMP) and a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA correctly references the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and outlines the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests. However, a detailed critique of the OSMP reveals a critical vulnerability in the project's long-term hydrological planning.

The OSMP for the One Earth project acknowledges that a key potential impact on the land will be trafficking by construction vehicles, which "has the potential to compact and damage soils". While the document proposes mitigation methods such as using low ground pressure vehicles and avoiding work in unsuitable conditions, it candidly admits that "some damage or compaction is inevitable". This is a crucial admission. Given the sheer scale of the project, which is designed to produce 740MW of energy , the installation of millions of solar panels and associated infrastructure will necessitate extensive and dispersed vehicle movements across the site. The aggregation of this "inevitable" localized damage will lead to a widespread and permanent reduction in the land's infiltration capacity. The proposed remedy—the use of "standard farm cultivation equipment" and periodic inspections by a soil scientist —is a short-term, reactive approach that is fundamentally insufficient to reverse a permanent, large-scale change to the land's hydrological function. This leaves the site with a lasting legacy of increased surface runoff potential that extends beyond the project's operational phase and is not adequately accounted for in the FRA.

3.2 Tillbridge Solar Farm: Critique of Preliminary Environmental Information

The Tillbridge Solar project, which was accepted for examination in May 2024, has produced a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) that includes a chapter on Flood Risk, Drainage, and Surface Water. The documentation references an Outline Drainage Strategy that includes "Micro Drainage Quick Storage Estimates for Swales". This reliance on generic drainage software and passive systems highlights a significant deficiency in the project's hydrological assessment.

As established by the Baiamonte et al. (2023) research, the concentrated discharge from the solar panels creates an entirely new set of hydrological conditions that traditional drainage models are not designed to simulate. The proposed use of swales and other passive measures, which rely on the land's natural infiltration capacity, is likely to be ineffective against a peak discharge that can be over 11 times higher than an unpanelled hillslope. The high-energy, channelized flow from the panels will likely scour and overwhelm these systems, rendering them incapable of mitigating flood risk during high-intensity rainfall events. Furthermore, while the project documents mention "opportunities for collaborative working" with neighbouring solar projects to minimize land take and environmental impacts , this collaboration is explicitly stated as being for grid connection and cable routes, not for a unified, basin-wide hydrological assessment. This demonstrates a siloed approach to environmental impact that fails to address the very real cumulative risk of these co-located projects.

3.3 Great North Road Solar Park: Scrutiny of Hydrological and Cumulative Effects

The Great North Road Solar Park, accepted for examination in July 2025, has produced documentation that attempts to present a progressive and environmentally sensitive approach to flood risk. The developer claims to have collaborated with conservation partners, including the Trent Rivers Trust, to develop and implement "Natural Flood Management (NFM) interventions" such as "sward, swales and constructed wetlands". The project also claims to have moved all above-ground electrical infrastructure out of areas with a higher flood risk, demonstrating a positive application of the Sequential Test.

However, a closer look at these proposals reveals a profound disconnect between the claimed solutions and the actual hydrological problem. Natural Flood Management is a valid and effective approach for managing slow, diffuse flows across a catchment area. It is, however, fundamentally mismatched with the high-velocity, high-energy, and concentrated runoff generated by solar panels. A simple sward of grass is unlikely to withstand an 11-fold increase in peak discharge, and the proposed swales and wetlands will be quickly overwhelmed by a flow regime they were not designed to manage. This suggests that while the developer has correctly identified the need for a more environmentally conscious approach, the proposed mitigation measures are based on a flawed hydrological understanding and will not be sufficient to manage the actual flood risk. The relocation of above-ground infrastructure, while a welcome move, does not address the surface water runoff from the vast majority of the site, which remains a primary and unmitigated risk factor.

4.0 Systemic Challenges and Unaddressed Impacts

4.1 The Problem of Soil Compaction and Permanent Hydrological Change

The process of installing ground-mounted solar farms on a massive scale presents a significant and often unaddressed risk of permanent hydrological change due to soil compaction. Best practice guidelines for solar construction emphasize the need for careful management to prevent soil damage, including the use of low ground pressure vehicles and the avoidance of work on wet soil. The One Earth project's Outline Soil Management Plan acknowledges these measures but also admits that "some damage or compaction is inevitable."

Given the scale of the Great North Road project, which will occupy approximately 1,025 hectares for solar array development, the logistical challenge of installing millions of panels and associated cabling without causing widespread soil compaction is practically insurmountable. The distributed, but extensive, ground disturbance from vehicles and machinery will inevitably alter the soil's structure, reducing its porosity and ability to infiltrate water. This is not a temporary effect that can be fully reversed with short-term "amelioration measures". The permanent alteration of the land's capacity to absorb rainfall will lead to a chronic increase in surface runoff, creating a long-term flood risk that the assessments fail to acknowledge. This permanent hydrological legacy directly contradicts the principle of ensuring projects do not increase flood risk over their lifetime, a core requirement of EN-1.

4.2 The Limitations of Proposed Mitigation: Beyond Vegetation and Swales

A central theme in the project documents is the reliance on passive, vegetation-based mitigation measures to manage surface water runoff. While the concept of using grass and swales to slow and infiltrate water is sound in traditional contexts, it is critically insufficient when applied to the unique hydrological conditions created by solar panels. The Baiamonte et al. (2023) research found that the concentrated flow from the panels' drip edge possesses higher kinetic energy than the original rainfall. This high-energy flow will inevitably lead to soil erosion and gully formation, undermining the very vegetation and soil structure that the mitigation strategies depend on.

The assumption that the proposed systems will be able to manage a peak discharge that is **11 times higher** than a pre-development hillslope is deeply flawed. The passive, nature-based solutions proposed are designed for a gradual, dispersed flow, not a rapid, concentrated torrent. In a high-intensity rainfall event, it is highly probable that the swales and vegetated areas would be quickly overwhelmed and scoured, leading to an uncontrolled increase in downstream flood risk. The failure of the developers' assessments to model for these specific, scientifically validated effects indicates a fundamental disconnect between their proposed solutions and the actual, on-site hydrological problem.

5.0 Cumulative Effects and Oversight Capacity

Hydrological Principle (Baiamonte et al. 2023)	Project-Specific Deficiency	Potential Outcome
Solar panels increase peak discharge by up to 11x.	One Earth FRA assumes standard runoff coefficients; fails to model panel-induced discharge.	Catastrophic underestimation of peak runoff and flood risk, rendering the FRA invalid.
Time to runoff is significantly reduced (down to 0.3 hours).	Tilbridge PEIR relies on generic drainage models and systems not designed for accelerated runoff.	Swales and other passive mitigation measures are overwhelmed and fail during high-intensity rainfall.
Concentrated runoff has higher kinetic energy, leading to soil erosion.	Great North Road proposes vegetation and NFM, which are ill-equipped to manage high-energy flows.	Widespread soil erosion, gully formation, and sediment loading of local watercourses, contravening WFD objectives.
Construction inevitably leads to soil compaction and reduced infiltration.	All three projects' assessments fail to model the permanent, long-term hydrological change caused by widespread compaction.	Chronic increase in surface water runoff potential for the projects' lifetime and beyond, increasing regional flood risk.
The NSIP process is siloed, and assessments are project-specific.	No comprehensive, basin-wide hydrological study for the cumulative effects of One Earth, Tilbridge, and Great North Road.	A single, large rainfall event could lead to a catastrophic regional flood as the combined runoff from all three projects overwhelms shared watercourses and drainage infrastructure.

5.1 Cumulative Flood Risk: Overwhelming Regional Drainage Systems

The DCO process, by design, evaluates each project on its own merits, and the available documentation for One Earth, Tillbridge, and Great North Road reflects this siloed approach. While the Tillbridge project mentions a collaborative effort with neighbouring schemes , this collaboration is explicitly limited to grid connection and land take, not a unified environmental or hydrological assessment. The absence of a single, comprehensive, basin-wide hydrological study for the regional drainage system that will bear the cumulative impact of these projects is a critical oversight.

Each of these solar farms is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project due to its immense scale—One Earth at 740 MW and Great North Road at 800 MW. When the cumulative effect of an 11-fold increase in peak discharge from thousands of hectares across all three projects is considered, the potential for a catastrophic flood event becomes a profound and unaddressed risk. The aggregate increase in runoff volume and peak discharge, compounded by the reduced time to peak, could overwhelm existing watercourses and drainage infrastructure that were not designed to handle such a rapid influx of water. This creates a regional-scale flood risk that has been entirely ignored by the project-specific assessments, which focus narrowly on their individual sites.

5.2 The Long-Term Monitoring Challenge: Local Authority Resource Constraints

The successful implementation of any mitigation strategy, particularly for large-scale, long-term projects, is contingent on effective monitoring and enforcement. However, the NSIP regime, with its accelerated timetable and national-level determination, creates a fundamental power and resource imbalance that leaves local authorities ill-equipped to provide this critical oversight.

The process is structured to be fast, with a six-month examination period and a recommendation delivered to the Secretary of State within a tight timeframe. In stark contrast, a 2023 survey of local authority planning departments in England found that over 90% had difficulty recruiting, and over 70% had difficulty retaining staff. Local authorities are required to prepare a Local Impact Report (LIR), but as acknowledged in the documents, these are often a "broad overview" rather than a "precise technical document". The immense volume and technical complexity of the developer-submitted DCO applications and Environmental Statements mean that under-resourced local councils are given an impossible task of providing detailed, technically rigorous scrutiny in a short period. This structural weakness means that the hydrological and environmental flaws identified in this report are likely to go unnoticed in the formal review process, leaving the public and environment vulnerable to the long-term consequences of inadequate planning and a lack of effective, post-consent monitoring.

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Summary of Critical Findings

The flood risk assessments for the One Earth, Tilllbridge, and Great North Road NSIPs are demonstrably flawed and do not provide a credible basis for development consent. The core of the issue is a fundamental failure to incorporate modern hydrological science into the assessments, leading to a severe underestimation of flood and soil erosion risks. The proposed mitigation measures are mismatched to the problem they are intended to solve, and the long-term impacts of soil compaction and cumulative regional flood risk are either ignored or unmitigated. The NSIP process, as currently applied, exacerbates these problems by placing an unmanageable burden on local authorities and failing to mandate comprehensive, basin-wide studies for co-located projects.

6.2 Recommendations for the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State

- **Mandate New Hydrological Modeling:** Require the developers for all three projects to submit a revised Flood Risk Assessment based on the Baiamonte et al. (2023) research. The revised modeling must explicitly quantify and mitigate the effects of the solar panels' impact on peak discharge, runoff speed, and time to peak.
- **Require a Unified Cumulative Effects Study:** The Examining Authority should mandate a single, independent, basin-wide hydrological study for the entire regional drainage network that will be affected by the cumulative effects of the One Earth, Tilbridge, and Great North Road projects. This study should assess the combined flood risk and propose integrated, regional-scale mitigation measures.

- **Secure a Long-Term Monitoring and Restoration Plan:** The DCOs, if granted, should include a legally binding, independently funded and managed plan for the long-term monitoring and maintenance of all hydrological mitigation measures and soil conditions for the lifetime of the projects. This plan must include enforceable provisions for post-decommissioning restoration of the soil to its pre-construction state.
- **Suspend Examination Pending Re-evaluation:** The examination of all three projects should be suspended until the required re-evaluation of hydrological impacts and cumulative effects is completed to a standard that can withstand rigorous, independent, and scientific scrutiny.

6.3 Recommendations for Local Authorities and Statutory Consultees

- **Coordinate Formal Submissions:** Local authorities and statutory consultees should coordinate their formal submissions to the Planning Inspectorate, focusing their objections on the systemic flaws and cumulative impacts identified in this report.
- **Leverage Scientific Evidence:** Use the scientific evidence and analysis presented herein as the basis for formal objections and technical questions during the examination process, challenging the developers to provide a scientifically robust justification for their flood risk claims.
- **Demand Independent Oversight:** Advocate for the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State to mandate independent, third-party technical review of the hydrological and environmental assessments, given the documented resource and skills shortages within local planning departments.

Footnotes

1. Based on the findings of Baiamonte et al. (2023) on solar panel runoff generation.
2. Based on the assessment of permeability in the Flood Risk Assessments for Great North Road and Tilbridge.
3. Based on guidance for managing solar farms' flood risk and developer assumptions.
4. Based on the Baiamonte et al. (2023) study on the kinetic energy of runoff from solar panels.
5. Based on the National Policy Statements for Energy (EN-1) and Renewable Energy (EN-3).
6. Based on the Flood Risk Assessment for One Earth and EN-1 guidance on flood risk and the Sequential and Exception Tests.
7. Based on the application of Sequential and Exception Tests as outlined in the EN-1 and a Preliminary Environmental Information Report.
8. Based on claims of collaboration with conservation partners and biodiversity enhancements for the Great North Road project.
9. Based on the proposed use of natural flood management techniques, such as swales and wetlands, for the Great North Road project.
10. Based on the objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive.
11. Based on the Outline Soil Management Plan for the One Earth Solar Farm.
12. Based on the Outline Drainage Strategy for the Tilbridge project and general guidance for solar developments.

13. Based on a solar project's construction environment management plan and best practice guidance.
14. Based on the documented collaborative efforts between the Tilbridge and other solar projects in the area.
15. Based on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and Environmental Statement documents for the Tilbridge project.
16. Based on project information from the Newark and Sherwood District Council website and the One Earth project's DCO application acceptance.
17. Based on the documented NSIP process timetable and a report on the accelerated nature of the process.
18. Based on the project size mentioned in the Great North Road documentation.
19. Based on the documented timetable for the Great North Road project and its acceptance by the Planning Inspectorate.
20. Based on best practice guidelines for preventing soil compaction during solar farm construction.
21. Based on the proposed land area for solar development for the Great North Road project.
22. Based on the documentation for the DCO process and the focus of the Tilbridge project on its own merits.
23. Based on a 2023 survey of local authority planning departments in England.
24. Based on the purpose of a Local Impact Report as a broad overview rather than a precise technical document.
25. Based on the documents submitted as part of the DCO application for One Earth and Great North Road.