

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: D6 Submission. I have resubmitted inadequately answered questions, made comments following ISH3, responded to ExAQ3, and attached the Mental Health Survey as requested.
Date: 08 December 2025 15:41:29
Attachments: [Mental Health Survey July 2024.docx](#)

Please use this

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@gmail.com](#)>
Date: Wed, Dec 3, 2025, 13:58
Subject: D6 Submission. I have resubmitted inadequately answered questions, made comments following ISH3, responded to ExAQ3, and attached the Mental Health Survey as requested.
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@gmail.com](#)>

TO: The Examining Authority **PROJECT:** One Earth Solar Farm
(EN010159) **FROM:** Heather Fox (Interested Party

Ref: [REDACTED] **) DATE:** 03.12.25 **SUBJECT:** D6 Submission. I have resubmitted inadequately answered questions, made comments following ISH3, responded to ExAQ3, and attached the Mental Health Survey as requested.

Dear Sirs

Heather Fox IP [REDACTED]

Summary of D6 Submission.

I have resubmitted inadequately answered questions, made comments following ISH3, responded to ExAQ3, and attached the Mental Health Survey as requested.

Response to Applicants responses to my D4 submission

The following 2 questions were not answered:

2.2.4 of the Sequential and Exception Test Addendum APP/9.26. If as the applicant states, “they considered flood risk at an early stage” why are we now only “hopefully” having enough time to discuss the FRA?

According to point 16.6.30 Chapter 16 Human Health APP/6.16.1, the ES Vol 2 Chapter 7 Hydrology and Hydrogeology APP/6.7 “considers flood risk and ensures there will be no increase off site”. Considering this statement, how does the applicant propose to ensure that the increases (which at the time were 2.3mms and

4.1mms) remain on site?

Although this did appear in the question section there was no explanatory answer about how the applicant would ensure the increases remain on site. Merely an assertion that the proposed development “will remain safe for its lifetime, and as such this part of the exception test is passed”. I felt this answer was not a satisfactory one.

I also asked the same question at ISH3 as it was pertinent to the discussion on the Exception Test. The answer at ISH3 01:27:38:22 by the applicant “We can respond to Mrs Fox’s point in writing. I don’t think there’s any suggestion that all water would remain on site. I think that that is the tolerances we’ve been discussing to date”.

These are the real increases that are not compensated for. The 5mm tolerance, as given by the EA is for “calculation uncertainty” (and is strongly disputed). Is an allowance for calculation error a deliberate allowance for flood levels to increase elsewhere by virtue of not remaining on site! Where are those increases going to go if not off site if not compensated for?

D4R2. An assertion of powering 200,000 homes is non-specific and leaves a lot to speculation. In the public interest and the assessment of “benefit” there should be more information about what this means in practical terms about how long this powers homes for and where this power is going. Is the applicant not in receipt of more detail?

D4R4. Why would the possibility that capacity at High Marnham would not be used be included in reasons for not choosing an alternative site? Sequential and Exception Test Addendum point REP3-069 APP/9.26, point 3.1.6. That site might have been at lower risk of flooding but not investigated.

D4R7. Yes, the panels face south but that was not the question. Are the panels going to be, in the majority, perpendicular to the slope of the land whereby water dropping from the drip edge will not align with the natural slope of the land? This will result in greater capacity for increased run off rate and erosion.

D4R10. Will the TR-XLPE cables themselves be encased in a sheath for added protection and what would that be please. The expected life of that cable has been tested for 25yrs and expected life of 40yrs. What then?

D4R12. What relevance, ref storm damage which I asked about, does the remark that `panels will now be above the design flood event` have. According to the dictionary a storm is `a violent disturbance of the atmosphere with strong winds, usually rain and often thunder and lightning`. How is being above the flood level relevant to the answer in terms of numbers and where the damaged panels would end up?

EN-1 Points 4.10.2, 4.10.8, both refer to impact of storms.

D4R13. The non-inclusion in the FRA of a 15cm wire stock fence is baffling, not only in terms of volume displacement but more especially as it encircles all solar panel areas. Aside from the debris accumulation caused by such fencing, if this fencing is dislodged the capacity for much greater debris accumulation exists, particularly as just downstream from the Order Limits the river has a 90* turn, where there is already the potential for the water to back up.

The EA state that the applicant and the applicant themselves claim that they have been conservative in their risk assessments. Given the gravity of the impact this scheme could have on the environment and local communities is that not what is expected or asked for by the EA, by govt policy, by the ExA and the SoS.?

D4R14. I was not asking about run off. I asked about loss of ground infiltration space due to all structures e.g. the concrete pads of all the inverters, the concrete bases of the BESS and substations, the underground sections of fence posts, the kms of cabling etc. Loss of infiltration space is not the same as loss of flood storage space above ground. Lost infiltration space is as well as lost flood storage capacity above ground. Consider the lost ground underground space 13 x 3 x 2mtrs deep of approx.170 inverter pads, plus the 2 x substation sites 170x 140 x 2 mtrs deep and 2 x BESS sites of 85,000mtrs square x 2 mtrs deep. Plus, access tracks 6.5 mtrs wide, unknown kms of buried cabling, 2 x construction compounds and 10 satellite construction compounds.

D4R18. Cleve Hill is not a relevant comparison to One Earth. It is affected by coastal flooding, is half the size of One Earth, has better flood defences, transformers were put on platforms that rise and fall and has not been in operation long enough to judge its efficacy.

D4R19. This answer has been superseded

D4R20. This answer talks only of raising panels on slender frames and clean ups after an event, not about how flood flows will be safely managed during a flood.

D4R21. An assessment on the structural design of the supports and voids indicating open spaces through which water could flow is not modelling and does not account for debris.

D4R22. Allowing a tolerance is controversial and an increase in flood level is not what policy strives for.

D4R28. The fencing proposed will be stock proof, which is a mesh design, expected to have negligible impact on flows. Expected is not secure enough given the circumstances. Where is the evidential modelling?

D4R29. I will be responding in full to this response after I have seen a final FRA.

D4R56. The updates to PPG seemed to contrast with the applicant's choices. The applicant has increased flood risk, not looked regionally for sites of lower risk, preferred non-compulsory purchase and a contiguous site, and not looked at several smaller sites with conviction. The argument for using capacity at High Marnham should only be valid if that capacity could be used without all other factors being contrary to guidance. The preference for such a large contiguous development along the Trent Valley, so late in the race for space, was always going to be problematic in a flood prone area already inundated with solar schemes.

D4R62. At this late stage the mitigation measure of lifting the solar panels has been found wanting and had to be altered. It is extremely concerning that so many inverters are in the design flood event, let alone flood zone 3. I hope in the final FRA there will be exact numbers and dimensions of all infrastructure and where they will be placed?

D4R65. The applicant refers to EN-1 paras 4.2.4 to 4.2.9. In consideration of the response perhaps the applicant should refer to EN-1 4.2.7, which should be read in conjunction with the applicants answer." The CNP policy does not create an additional or cumulative need case or weighting to that which is already outlined for each type of energy infrastructure. The policy applies following the normal consideration of the need case, the impacts of the project, and the application of the mitigation hierarchy".

D4R66. Permitting a tolerance is still questionable. The panel mitigation has proven

to be unsatisfactory and has had to be reassessed. If consent is granted, I can only hope that inverter mitigation, run off mitigation, climate change allowance doesn't escalate and allowing a tolerance do not prove to be unsatisfactory after the event. That's a lot of ifs.

I asked the following question in the August 21st submission but had no response.

In the Feb 2024 meetings between the EA and the applicant, the applicant asked the EA if they had a return period for the flood that had just occurred in Jan 2024. The EA said they would give them an answer. Did the EA ever respond to the applicant?

Speaking of no responses, I still have no response to my email to the EA of 4th August 2025, despite 14 phone calls and a further promise of receiving an answer by 31st October 2025. I do not know what to do to get an answer?

Comments following the ISH3 Virtual Meeting 6th November 2025

The updated EA guidance, "Accounting for residual uncertainty: an update to the fluvial freeboard guide" SC120014, Feb 2017.

The following is quoted from the first 3 lines of the document referenced above,

"We are the Environment Agency. We operate at the place where environmental change has its greatest impact on people's lives. We reduce the risk to people and properties from flooding".

This guidance ensures calculation and measurement errors are considered and managed rather than being covered by an added tolerance; instead, it provides a structured approach to identifying and managing all sources of uncertainty so that they are explicitly addressed and not duplicated. If a change in flood risk is identified as part of the model calculation, robust technical analysis and reporting are required to support the findings, not a tolerance allowance. Official guidance on using modelling for flood risk assessments explicitly states that analysis should be carried out using raw results, without including any allowance for calculation error.

The following are quotes from recordings of ISH3 of the EA representatives (ref the 5mm tolerance applied to the applicants increase in flood level(s)).

Time 00.35.44.22. "We did have discussions with the applicant regarding calculation tolerance and also what might constitute a negligible increase in flood risk. And we did agree a 5mm threshold.....it was associated with any calculation error and any sort of volumetric assessment that the applicant has undertaken"

00:39:20:29 "Just in this case, this tolerance is specifically in reference to the volumetric calculations that they have undertaken. So, it's not necessarily prescribed to a certain flood zone or a certain type of development. It is prescribed to that calculations they have undertaken. So, the work they have done to look at the loss of floodplain due to the solar panel legs and the stilts from the inverter station,

uh voids. And then the calculations they have done to convert this into a depth difference.”

00:49:36:27. “We see the increases that have been presented are within tolerances for calculations”

00:45:57:08. The discussion is ongoing over the 5mm tolerance. An IP asks specifically about the impact that inverter pads will have on floodwaters and if they have been taken into account in the modelling. The following is the applicant’s response:

00:47:09 “With regard to any sort of pad foundations for the pcs they will be localised to those areas where we have the pcs. And the reality I think or the reality in a flood event of this nature as in within the design flood event. Water isn’t really infiltrating, or water wouldn’t fully infiltrate to the ground. And the reality is, it will drain back naturally towards the watercourse and be that the ordinary watercourse within the order limits or the river Trent. So, I think the view on that is that they will have a negligible effect”

This was a bewildering reply, which in no way answered the straightforward question yet managed to make sure it was asserted that the impact would be negligible. The ExA replied “Thank you” and moved on. It seemed an incomprehensible reply, not addressing the question at all, confusing in its substance, not least the section about it draining back to the river in a flood event of this nature. I point this out because I had asked one question 3 times and still not received a relevant response. I feel that the applicant can disguise giving an adequate answer by cloaking it in relevant phrases such as those used in the example above; “design flood event” and “within the order limits”. It is very frustrating when this is the only opportunity we have to physically put questions to the applicant.

At 00:53:38:08. The ExA quotes EN-1 5.8.41 “Energy projects should not normally be consented within flood Zone 3b or Zone C2 in Wales, or on land expected to fall within these zones within its predicted lifetime. This may also apply where land is subject to other sources of flooding (for example surface water.) However, where essential energy infrastructure has to be located in such areas, for operational reasons, they should only be consented if the development will not result in a net loss of floodplain storage, and will not impede water flow”, and asks the EA to comment. Their response:

“So all development is being outside of the flood zone 3b, there is no development being proposed within flood zone 3b so that kind of negates that conversation as all developments are being placed outside of it”.

The ExA would not have quoted this policy needlessly. The policy primarily deals with the most restrictive areas for development, the functional floodplain 3b. The footnote attached to 3b explains the functional floodplain as “where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood”. The phrase “this may also apply where land is subject to other sources of flooding (for example surface water) dictates that the same strict presumptions against development be applied to land that is subject to other sources of flooding. Since the site is at risk from surface, groundwater and reservoir flooding the policy does apply and the proposal must abide by “not result in a net loss of floodplain storage and will not impede water flow”. It ensures that the risk of flooding from other sources is not overlooked. Essentially the policy recognises that while flood maps typically focus on river and coastal risk other sources of flooding can present risk to energy infrastructure. The applicant cannot

rely on structures being outside of the functional floodplain 3b to satisfy this policy. They must consider all sources of flood risk. It is worrying that the EA believed this policy question was not deserving of an answer. It calls in to question the understanding of all policy and guidance, and whether the flood risk assessment because of this belief, would be influenced by that interpretation?

Further the applicant's legal representative's response in relation to the same policy question at 00:57:24:05, "Also, I want to reiterate the point that the EA made, that there are no solar panels or inverters or PCs in there, within the functional floodplain and therefore para 5.8.41 of EN-1 is irrelevant" !

At 00:59:32:02 I asked how committing to doing detailed survey equates to mitigation. The EA states "the applicant has committed to undertaking surveys at detailed design phase, which will provide additional detail to the condition and composition of the embankments, which in conjunction with the proposed construction practice, will mitigate for any impacts". On the understanding that construction practice refers to maintaining a distance of 16mtrs from the top of the bank, how does simply undertaking a survey mitigate for impacts unless there is explicit intent to act on the survey? Does the wording need to enforce acting on the survey results?

The monitoring is only for the construction phase. Why, when damage may only become apparent after the drilling? It seems unreasonable that surveying the embankments at this late stage is considered acceptable. The embankments are fundamental flood defence devices. Not to have investigated their integrity after 75yrs, beyond assessing their condition as fair and good is belated from the point of view of public safety. Has drilling under them and the riverbed taken place before.? It is crucial for the scheme. According to NSDC SFRA Level 1 Report 1st July 2009, 7.1.1 Standard of protection of Flood Defences and 7.1.2 According to the R.T. CEMP Pre and Published Report 2008 "many of the defence assets along the Trent and its tributaries are no longer providing the level of protection that they were originally designed for". That is failing the level they were designed for 75 yrs ago, not accounting for current climate change figures or that building has and will be taking place over the floodplain. The applicant has not provided enough evidence that the development will not adversely affect the stability of flood defences on site.

A floodplain acts like a sponge or reservoir. When a river overflows the floodplain stores the excess water but by building on it, the storage space is reduced. That excess water has nowhere to go. The result of this is the flow in adjacent areas rises faster and higher, spreads further. This can worsen or trigger flooding in areas that might not have flooded otherwise or cause floods to happen more frequently and intensely. The calculation that a flood risk increase is negligible is often based on models that struggle to account for the increasing frequency and intensity of weather events driven by climate change. Given the scientific uncertainty about the extent of future climate change impacts, applying the precautionary principle suggests erring on the side of caution, meaning no increase should be permitted. In dealing with a high consequence event like flooding the word negligible should be rejected because it masks the cumulative impact and catastrophic potential of even the smallest deliberate increase.

EN-1 policy implicitly and explicitly encourages a risk aversion approach concerning the safety and environmental impacts of NSIPs. A risk averse approach means avoiding uncertainty with a preference for known outcomes over uncertain ones. En-1 provides the framework for enabling new energy infrastructure and the regulatory

decision-making process incorporates a risk averse perspective to ensure public safety.

Allowing the arbitrary tolerance transforms mandatory stringency designed to ensure no net loss of storage into a negotiable cap, eroding stringency and public trust in the FRA. The underlying principle of a FRA is to ensure all sources of uncertainty are identified and addressed. Is the EA saying the original hydrological models are not certain in the first instance? In which case adding more uncertainty compounds the uncertainty allowing for greater flood risk depth. Freeboard is an allowance for added security and safety for a range of factors including calculation errors. Inherent uncertainty in hydraulic modelling has occurred in measurements taken prior to the FRA.

Response to ExAQ3

Q1.0.1 Health Survey

In their rule 8 letter submission Deadline 1, South Clifton Parish Council 1st August 2025, refer to the study conducted by Dr, which was discussed at a meeting 1st August 2024 in the Coronation Hall, South Clifton, organised by SCPC, with about 6 members of the applicant's team in attendance. "Her (Dr.....) findings were sent to the applicant". The entire meeting was sound recorded, and a written copy was also sent to the applicant. The applicant stated they would respond. I attended this meeting.

SCPC mentions the study again in their D2 submission 27th August 2025, saying "We feel the applicant was dismissive of these concerns, especially as no feedback was received to the mental health study conducted by Dr"

At the ISH1 meeting part 6, EV5-012, of July 2025 I asked the ExA to remind the applicant, (as the applicant was protesting that it was not possible to ask people about their mental health and the ExA was querying the lack of a more local survey,) that the applicant had attended the 1st August 2024 Coronation Hall meeting where Dr had spoken about the Mental Health study she had conducted and that the applicant had subsequently received a written copy and a copy of the meeting.

At this ISH1 meeting EV05-012, after I finished saying the above, at approx. 16 mins 40secs in, the ExA turned his head towards the applicant, lifted his opening hands from the table, eyebrows raised and eyes widened, looking for an explanation. If the applicant had included the study in the consultation document, as the important and relevant item it was, then the ExA would not have been put in the position of being taken by surprise by my statement.

Mr ... rep NSDC at the same ISH1 meeting, reminded the ExA that the council had received direct representations from the local community about the consultation, and he had added them onto his letter of Adequacy of Consultation.

As far as the applicant deciding that a survey on how Mental Health was being affected by the proposal was not important and relevant enough to be put before the ExA, defies explanation. The non-inclusion of unpalatable responses does not constitute a just consultation report. Is only the applicant permitted to define relevant? If the applicant does not include all inoffensive, material responses how can that be fair minded? Can there be an acceptable reason that such a survey, undertaken by an experienced doctor in the field of mental health, representing the feelings of a community, would not be submitted for the ExA to decide whether it was apposite? Pls find attached survey

ExAQ3 Sequential Test

Q5.0.1

REP1-017 Consultation Report. Appendices J1 and J-2: Regard had to statutory consultation responses. APP/5.1.1 July 2025, page 73

“Environment Agency. PEIR, Chapter 8, No reference in report- Sequential Test.

Issue. No evidence of the Sequential Test having been applied.

Impact. Failure to properly apply the Sequential Test could lead to aspects of the development being put at risk of flooding where lower flood risk alternative sites are available, which could also increase the reliance on measures such as flood defences. Failure to apply the Sequential Test would put the development in breach of Paragraph 161 and 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (REF-4).”

It would appear to have been a concern on behalf of the EA that there was no evidence in the PEIR of the Sequential Test having been applied. How then could the ExA and the Statutory Consultees have been confident in their appraisal of the PEIR? Is it a requirement or expectation that details of the application of that test should have appeared in the PEIR considering the EA remark on its absence? Is the PEIR not the foundation of subsequent environmental statements? The proposal does not avoid flood risk areas and flood risk has always been a significant environmental factor. While the PEIR is a preliminary document, the application of the Sequential Test is directly related to the assessment of flood risk, and its inclusion would have demonstrated its early consideration,

The applicant decided on the High Marnham connection point and the desired size of the proposal. The scheme would require a suitable and large area of land next to a river well known for its propensity to flood. Those choices immediately put “avoid” in peril, as did the following self-imposed restrictions: the desire for a contiguous site with land acquired voluntarily, restricting the search to 10kms, which considering the size of the project and the vast area prone to flooding was extremely limiting. There was no preference for noting the policy of utilising brownfield sites, previously developed land, contaminated or industrial land. The updated PPG put looking regionally, having multiple smaller sites and using compulsory purchase forward and if these points were to be considered there would be more room to avoid the effects that have subsequently had to be mitigated, when policy aims to avoid in the first instance.

Flood risk avoidance would always be problematic in this area and having decided on this site there is river, tidal, surface, groundwater and reservoir failure to contend with. It seems that reservoir failure is dismissed as a rarity, but data published by the govt in Feb 2021 includes disconcerting detail. The most significant recent reservoir failure in the UK was at Toddbrook reservoir in Whaley Bridge in August 2019. The reservoir was overwhelmed by a 1:10,000 yr rainfall event and the immense force of the water gushing over the top washed away the spillway, creating a large hole and significant damage and meant 1,500 people from Whaley Bridge had to be evacuated for several days. Extreme rainfall in the summer of 2007 caused damage to Ulley reservoir in Rotherham, with 1,000 people evacuated and parts of the M1 motorway closed. There are more reservoir incidents in the UK than most people would expect. Ref DEFRA, EA Project: SC080046/R1, delivering benefits through evidence, Lessons from historical dam incidents.

Fig 3-25 page 44 of APP/095 The Logika FRA. The applicant states regarding reservoir failure “The mitigation incorporated in relation to fluvial flood risk would minimise any potential impact in this scenario” but fails to explain further how the infrastructure would be affected. The possibility is disregarded on the grounds of being low risk. Worst case scenario is what is expected to be accounted for. The applicant acknowledges that large areas of the site would experience flooding if the reservoir banks were breached, both if the river levels were normal and worse if the river was flooding too. There are no levels of flood water given if this was to occur but from the map it would appear to suggest the BESS and Substation would be affected on the west side and possibly on the east, depending on where that is finally situated. That would certainly put “safe for its lifetime” into question especially given the 60-yr timescale and the unpredictability of climate change.

As already submitted the mitigation efforts regarding the panels were found lacking late into the examination. There has only ever been speculation, until recently, as to where the numbers of inverters would be placed, with vague statements such as “some”, “where possible”. It is now known that 76 will be in flood zone 3, and 61 in the design flood event. That is more than a third of the total number of inverters. Compensation area is still not known and whether land raising will be decided upon. Inverters are highly susceptible to water damage, which can cause corrosion, electrical shorts, fires and even electrocution hazards, yet they are only afforded the same protection as panels. Even electrical sockets in new build houses must have 600mms freeboard.

Despite the EA at ISH2 saying there was no agreed standard tolerance level the applicant has referenced them on more than one occasion with apparently no denial from the EA. Ref the following remarks:

REP2-044 16th Jan 2025 points 2.2 “Results of the volume assessment indicate that the panel supports would displace approximately 620mcubed of floodwater, but that when compared to the design flood extent within the site, the increase in flood depth that could be experienced is less than 1mm. The applicant confirmed this is well within standard model tolerance of 5mms as previously discussed with the EA”.

Point 2.4 in the same meeting the applicant confirmed that “the floodplain extends beyond the Site boundary. Meaning that any increase in flood depth is likely to be less than that calculated”

In the same document under Fluvial Mitigation Measures the same reasoning is put forward again on page 31” The area of design flood extent within the order limits has been used to determine the potential change in flood level. The reality however is that the change in flood level would spread further than the order limits and would be less as a result”

The comments above would seem to indicate that there had been an earlier agreed “model tolerance” and because the extent of the floodplain goes beyond the site limits it would be acceptable for increases to be allowed to spread beyond the limits so as not to impact the site itself. There was no mention of compensation or of trying to achieve no increase. If the belief that there were 5mms to spare was acceptable and that it was not necessary to achieve no increase, then there was never going to be need for area of compensation if the increases remained under the 5 mm “model tolerance”.

The mitigation for the impact of the solar panels is misjudged, especially on this scale and vulnerability. A search for what specific scientific evidence the EN-3 para 2.10.84 that “since solar panels drain to existing ground, the impact of flooding will

not, in general, be significant” has been fruitless. The words “in general” are pertinent given the scale of this project and the search for the evidence that this is based on proved to be much the same as the search for “wider sustainable development objectives”, in that it quotes other planning policies in circularity, whilst noting it is not based on a particular piece of evidence. It cannot be Cook and McCuen since this was published in 2011 and Cook and McCuen was 2013 and there have been no updates to this para. The laws of physics governing water behaviour on hitting a solar panel are complex but include increased run off velocity from a concentrated drip edge, not the usual pattern for rain to hit the ground. As stated previously there is comprehensive evidence elsewhere for the underestimation of the effect of the panels on the water with the consequent lack of mitigation.

There has been prevarication over the determination of flood water routes with no explicit attempt to manage routes safely, other than to talk of maintenance and clean up after an event. While the 15cm mesh fence is intended to allow water and debris to flow through, the substantial debris volume of a major river in flood zone 3 will lead to debris accumulation and risk of structural failure. The EA Blockage management guide REF SC110005/R1 Nov 2019. “It should be noted that methods of assessing debris types and quantities are highly uncertain, and the sources and transport of debris along a watercourse can vary considerably over time. As a result, any mitigation measures should be designed with this uncertainty in mind”. “Furthermore, debris accumulations can change flow patterns, leading to scour and undermining of structures”. “Debris in the wrong place reduces flow capacity and raises water levels..... Blockages can also accumulate further debris and sediment.” Just examples of the unaccounted, unmitigated debris impact possible in times of flood.

In previous submissions I have addressed the issue of no/insufficient mitigation for emissions from a BESS fire contaminating the reservoir, (air and water), not sufficient regard for groundwater in a water protected area, remarked on the Sequential and Exception Test REP3-098 and REP4-069.

Q12.02 Policy Compliance.

1, Yes, in policy terms an increase in flood levels of any amount caused by the development, results in a higher flood risk. The policy is “ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere”. There is not an added footnote to explain or expand that no means any number other than 0. If it meant “no with an added tolerance” or “negligible below x” there would have been a footnote. It is an emphatic no. No is not the same as negligible. No is a complete absence. So even 1mm above 0 is an increase and contrary to the policy. The result being, in policy context, 2.2 and 3.5 mms indicate higher flood risk than no increase. Para 5.8.7. EN -1, “policy aims to make it safe for its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere” and Para 5.8.11 “the project will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere.” NPPF para 170 “Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.”

2, In order for there to have been an increase in flood level there must have been a loss in flood storage capacity. This change is because of the calculated volumetric assessment of the impact of the inverter and solar panel supports on floodplain storage capacity. Yes, there has been a net loss of floodplain storage which gives rise to the increase in flood level.

3, There has been no specific mention of ensuring deflection or constriction has been safely managed other than asserting the supports would be slender and allow water

to flow freely and maintenance clean ups. The same assumption is made for the voids. I have asked for details of modelling where this free flow is evidenced, rather than an assertion. The laws of physics (see below) regarding water flow around objects are complex and many but none result in no effect if water meets an obstacle.

Q12.03.

1, Flood risk elsewhere is increased because the increase is not contained within the order limits. In policy the term no increase is not qualified or quantified with a description or amount, just the words no increase. There has been volumetric calculation of lost storage space which has not been compensated for; this water must go somewhere if not stored on site. There is nowhere for it go but elsewhere.

2, As above, there have not been efforts to safely manage deflection/constriction beyond maintenance and slender supports.

Q12.0.4.

1, No, there cannot be confirmation that the development will not result in a net loss of floodplain storage. There has been a loss of floodplain storage on both sides of the site which has not been compensated for, and I maintain that the full amount of lost storage space has still not been accounted for.

2, As stated above the laws of physics govern water meeting obstacles in its path. Below is a selection of laws of physics that affect water behaviour when encountering an obstacle. None of which have no effect. The policy states “will not impede water flows”. It would be difficult to prove that the structures do not impede the water flow. The policy does not quantify the level to which the water is impeded.

The laws of Conservation of mass: This is for an incompressible fluid like water and states that the mass flow rate must remain constant throughout the flow, meaning that the speed of the water must increase in areas where the flow channel narrows, such as around an obstacle and decreases where it widens.

Conservation of Momentum (Newton’s Law of Motion). The water exerts a force on the obstacle and the obstacle in turn exerts an equal and opposite force on the water (Newton’s third Law). The net force on any part of the fluid equals its mass times its acceleration (Newtons second law) leading to changes in the water’s velocity and direction and creating forces such as drag and lift.

Conservation of Energy. This is summarised by Bernoulli’s principle which states that in a flowing fluid an increase in speed occurs simultaneously with a decrease in pressure or potential energy. This principle helps explain the pressure distribution around an obstacle, where high velocity regions have lower pressure and low velocity regions (like the stagnation point on the upstream side) have higher pressure.

Viscosity and The Reynolds Number. Real world water has viscosity (internal resistance to flow), which creates friction both within the water and at the surface of the obstacle. The Reynolds number is a key factor that determines whether the flow is smooth and orderly (laminar) or chaotic with swirling eddies and vortices (turbulent), Most large-scale water flows around obstacles are turbulent.

Gravity. Gravity plays a crucial role, influencing the water’s potential energy (as described in Bernoulli’s equation) and driving open channel flows like rivers and streams. The pressure in the water also increases with depth due to the weight of the fluid above (hydrostatic pressure).

To add in debris to the water flow complicates it further. Turbulence can keep debris

suspended or alter its path dramatically.

Deposition and scour. The reduced velocity immediately upstream of an obstacle causes heavier debris to deposit (sedimentation) while increased turbulence around the sides and downstream can increase erosion (scour).

3, No, policy has not been met. Obstacles in a flood plain impede water flow, especially at this scale and as detailed before, there has been a net loss of floodplain storage capacity.

Q12.0.5 There is no requirement for this energy type to be in a high flood risk area. It is still disputed that a site of lower flood risk does not exist. It would be facilitating a known flood risk increase on a disputed site. The Sequential Test and policy are dedicated to avoiding an increase. The decision maker must exercise caution in an already vulnerable area. Accepting the construction of major energy infrastructure in a highly sensitive flood risk area would mean putting life, property and services at risk. Restoration of the built infrastructure after an extreme event may be impossible. EN-1 5.8.15 “Consider the effects of a range of flooding events including extreme events on people, property, the natural and historic environment and river and coastal processes”.

The updated PPG in September 2025 confirmed the Sequential Test remains the core of flood risk planning policy. Flood risk safety is at the forefront, and all sources of flood risk are on an equal footing, removing any doubt that a river- only focus is sufficient. The decision over whether the risk has been mitigated to a “safe and acceptable level” is subjective, not defined, and endangers all efforts to avoid flood risk. It turns everything that has been discussed and determined into a balancing act between flood risk uncertainty and public safety, versus the schemes benefits.

Despite the degree of mitigation measures on the proposal, increases in flood depth are evidenced. Given the climate change uncertainty element, the certainty that the mitigation would be sufficient for the next 60 yrs. is not assured. It would move the burden of this risk onto future generations. EN-1 5.8.5 “Within the lifetime of energy projects, these factors will lead to increased flood risks in areas susceptible to flooding, and to an increase in some areas which are currently not thought of as being at risk. A robust approach to flood risk management is a vital element of climate change adaptation; the applicant and the Secretary of state should take account of the policy on climate change adaptation in Section 4.9.” particularly 4.9.2 “Climate change is already altering UK weather patterns and will continue to accelerate depending on global carbon emissions”.

Q12.0.6. The placement of inverter numbers has only been referred to until recently as “some” or “wherever possible”. Exact figures in flood zones have now been acknowledged with 76 in flood zone 3 and 61 in the design flood extent; that puts the avoid and reduce guidance in jeopardy. EN-1 5.8.36, “The sequential approach should be applied to the layout and design of the project. Vulnerable aspects of the development should be located on parts of the site at lower risk and residual risk of flooding”. Please also refer to comments above about policy ref EN-1 5.8.41 regarding surface water flood risk and the functional floodplain.

Q12.0.8. On the basis that the flood risk for this proposal has not compensated for all lost flood storage space then unless the flood risk results of other proposals are precisely known it is impossible to be certain of the cumulative impact; they could all come with uncompensated loss of storage capacity. It cannot be assumed that other schemes are without flood depth increases. Since the Trent Valley is hydrologically connected then the cumulative assessment requires comprehensive information about all schemes and rigorous assessment in order that the whole region is not put

at risk. The large number of solar farms along the Trent Valley necessitates careful, cumulative assessment to prevent potential synergistic issues including surface runoff and flood dynamics threatening regional flood resilience.

Yours faithfully

Heather fox

Study: The Impact of the One Earth Solar Farm on Mental Health

Appendices, Testimonies, and Evidence

Appendix 1: The Impact of the One Earth Solar Project on Mental Health (Dr S. Fletcher, July 2024)

‘Human Health – Likely significant positive effect’. This is a quote from the One Earth consultation booklet regarding how their solar industrialisation project will apparently impact human health. Does it take a doctor to highlight that human health incorporates mental health as well as physical health? As a doctor, I am faced with the spectrum of manifestations of mental health conditions on a daily basis. Therefore, when I first became aware of the One Earth Solar proposal, the impact on mental health came to mind immediately.

I would expect the majority of people to realise the importance of mental health, especially as there has been a general increase in the awareness of such over recent years. I am therefore astonished that mental health has not been given any consideration whatsoever relating to the One Earth Solar proposal.

Mental health incorporates everything relating to how one feels, encompassing psychological and emotional well-being. This influences how the individual acts and the choices they make. A few examples of some of the common emotions and disorders that fall under the mental health bracket include stress, worry, anger, anxiety, sleep disturbance, low mood and depression, which can unfortunately then lead to acts such as self-harm, substance misuse and suicide.

- One in four people will experience a mental health problem of some kind each year in England¹, with around one in six people reporting to experience a common mental health disorder, such as anxiety and depression².
- Mental health problems are very common.
- Mental health is very important.

So, what is the relevance of this in relation to the One Earth industrialisation proposals? I am certain that should this project proceed, it will have a significant negative effect on the mental health of many people in the immediate and surrounding areas. I can go further in saying I am certain mental health is already being damaged, even at this early stage, and included in this document is evidence to support this.

Even though the numbers affected may seem small, the percentage of the population exposed to the proposed installation (whether nearby or further afield) whose mental health will be affected negatively by the project will be very high. It is important to realise that new mental health problems have sadly already been and will be created going forward. There will also be a worrying compounding of existing mental health problems, increasing the risk of more serious conditions developing.

Most people who live or have chosen to move to a rural area have intentionally done so to benefit from the countryside experience. This may include a considered move to a rural area

from perhaps a more built-up environment, thus a contrast in views from buildings, for example, to open fields. There is the advantage of access to rights of way such as bridleways, byways and footpaths, benefiting those such as horse riders, walkers, cyclists and runners. These leisure pursuits are ways that people unwind from the stresses of everyday life and keep themselves physically and mentally healthy. The advantages of such cannot be overestimated.

‘Our economies, livelihoods and well-being all depend on our most precious asset: Nature.’
(Dasgupta Review, 2021)

Nature is life. It underpins everything we do. It provides us with clean air, food, water and shelter. It regulates our climate and controls disease. Beyond this, it is central to recreational, cultural, social and spiritual aspects of human life. It is fundamental to our health and wellbeing³.

Evidence for the Benefits of Nature

- Exposure to green space is associated with improved psychological well-being, physical activity and linked health outcomes.
- Exposure to nature increases activity levels among children and young people.
- There are psychological benefits of nature-based interventions, in particular reduced depression and improved mood.
- Blue space exposure is also beneficial for psychological wellbeing and physical activity.

Should this project proceed as proposed, there will be disruption of and damage to popular rights of way such as the Sustrans cycle track and many footpaths and bridleways, both during the construction and operational phases. Consequently, individuals will be unable to carry out their normal leisure pursuits as they would have done and the positive visual impact of a walk, run, ride or cycle through the beautiful countryside will be destroyed within a black desert. There will be some residents whose houses will sadly become swamped within a mass of industrial black PV panels, having previously been surrounded by open farmland. Coupled with this is the noise pollution that will unavoidably affect certain areas that were once quiet. Furthermore comes the inevitable fall in house prices and reduced saleability that will ensue, both during the construction and operational phases of the proposed project.

When deciding to move to the country to enjoy the peace and tranquillity of rural village life, this is not a situation such individuals could have ever envisaged. I challenge anybody to claim that in the same situation they wouldn't feel at very best, stressed, low or anxious. Realistically, however, I predict a far greater impact. Our body can be as fit and healthy as an Olympic athlete, but if we are not in a sound place mentally our quality of life is compromised.

The stress caused by the One Earth project has the capacity to massively reduce the quality of life of every inhabitant of the immediate and surrounding areas affected by it.

Mental Health Should Not Be Ignored

Shocking statistics stated by Dr Elaine Lockhart, Chair, Royal College of Psychiatrists' Child and Adolescent Faculty London, has stated there were nearly a million referrals to children and young people's mental health services in the past year, a rise of 143% compared with 2019-20. She went on to say, 'we need all political parties to prioritise the prevention of mental illness and the treatment of mental health conditions.'

Comments from Local Residents

Below is just a handful of the many, many comments from local residents concerning the impact that the One Earth solar project is already having on their mental health (note this is even at the early 'consultation' phase):

- "I've been in South Clifton for 16 years and I will never be able to take my horse out again if the solar farm goes ahead."
- "I can't sleep to be honest."
- "We're a couple who have lived in North Clifton almost all our lives. We are in total despair with what may happen with the solar farm. It just can't. Our lives will be ruined."
- "I'd consider moving, even though I've been here for 40 years."
- "I've woken up in the night restless and angry, and have to get up, make a drink, and calm down, finally going to sleep some hour or so later. It's just wrong."
- "As a resident of our village I own and ride horses who are kept at home and also walk our little dog. The reality is I will no longer be able to hack whilst the work is undertaken and am not sure if it will be safe to hack when completed. I work in a stressful job and without the riding it will absolutely impact on my health and wellbeing. Also I think walking our dog without the filter of the beautiful countryside will have a similar impact. Walking mindfully looking at solar panels doesn't have the same impact as flowers and countryside I am certain."
- "I live in North Clifton, this solar installation is the devil's work. We may not live in an AONB but this does not mean our countryside isn't beautiful. I despair for the wildlife, and this is destroying peace of mind for so many. I am also scared we will hear the battery storage, especially at night. It regularly reduces me to tears, it's nothing short of environmental vandalism. Very worried that the new government will just rubber stamp this."
- "It's adversely affecting my work and my family life. I can't eat. I can't sleep. I feel anxious. I'm drinking more to help numb the pain. I'm not sure where this will lead."
- "I live in Fledborough and have ridden round here for 20 years except for the last 5 - the ever-increasing traffic from pears factory including smalls tankers has made it literally impossible to access our one and only bridlepath as this has to be accessed via the main 60mph road and now with the proposed extra traffic with the solar fields it's too dangerous! I had hoped to maybe start riding out again that way but with the proposed increase of traffic during the solar fields construction it will make it nigh on impossible. I don't think anyone involved with the building of these projects understand how they have devastated our equestrian community, it saddens me and has made me contemplate giving up my horses altogether - I couldn't live with myself if anything happened on the road knowing full well the amount of HGVs that are on there 24/7, we can only hope they listen."
- "One Earth will cause and already has caused mental health problems. People are worried, upset and dismayed at the thought of our countryside being covered in ugly solar panels, BESS, inverters and sub-stations. Our leisure will be affected - walking, cycling and horse riding will be contained within fencing and with close views of panels etc. Homes will be surrounded by panels where before all they saw was green fields and trees. We are fighting to stop this abomination. If we fail a lot of people will be fed up and depressed by the major adverse effects this plan will bring."

- “I can’t sleep. I can’t function during the day. All I ever think about now is the solar farm. I am worrying about the knock-on effect it is having on my family.”
- “My wife and I retired to Thorney 3 years ago. One of the main attractions were the open fields and big skies. This monstrous solar farm will destroy this feeling of wellbeing and happiness in our retirement. Our visits to the Red Lion bar in South Clifton would never be the same. We wouldn’t see the panels from our lovely garden, but we will hear the hum of the inverters. We asked at the recent One Earth event at South Clifton about future expansion and disruption of our lanes caused by months of lorries and heavy machinery being moved about. They just looked sheepish and embarrassed. On expansion they said they would have to apply again, but admitted they could do. We understand the huge sub-station they plan to build will cater for expansion. We are very worried.”
- “I have high pressure with my day-to-day job but feel now I am being pushed to the limit. People have chosen to live in a rural environment for their own wellbeing, but this is now being stolen from them – inflicted by other people’s greed and lack of morals. I have worked hard all my life to get where I am, and it could all be for nothing.”
- “I have moments of mixed emotions with frustration, anger and despair when I think that piles of money and big foreign industry are hiding under ‘Greenwashed’ cloaks that’s stealing people’s lives and livelihoods, killing our farmland, chasing our indigenous wildlife away and creating a PV panel desert amidst our beautiful countryside. I detest greed. And greed under the guise of ‘For The Common Good’ is wallowing close to the top of the cess pit of ‘Legalised Criminal Activities’.”
- “I received a call from a close friend who lives nowhere near us, but saw the hideous industrial proposal. He said 'cut your losses and get out now while you still can.' I told him that this is our home, this is where we live and intend to live out our lives. He paused and replied 'Ok, I understand, but be prepared for what's coming at you and your friends. You're having a massive pile of monster s**t dumped on you. You may be in countryside and farmland now, it'll become worse than living in the middle of a city'. Could that have been some of the best advice of my life?”
- “Our daughter has formally been diagnosed with being highly [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (medicated), learning difficulties and difficulties processing and understanding language and does not interact with peers or anyone outside of her circle (family and a few family friends). We moved to South Clifton to give her a better lifestyle suited to her needs - peace and quiet, less people, lovely countryside. Horse riding has been a massive part of her life since moving here. It’s all she has. She is a novice horse rider who enjoys quiet riding around the tracks, bridleways and fields. If this proposal goes ahead, she will lose the one thing in her life she loves to do. It will be too dangerous to ride within these areas and beyond stressful. There are no other suitable riding areas locally. This is unthinkable and the effects on her mental health will be devastating. She is already in panic mode, not sleeping, worrying and is very unsettled. She will decline, inevitably. There will be a knock-on effect for our family and added pressure. This cannot be allowed to happen. It is too high a price to pay for this project to go ahead. In the past my daughter has self-harmed - an outlet for her [REDACTED]. Since moving here she has not [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This is genuine and witnessed by

her support staff where she attends a special school for youths with disabilities. If you ignore this, then shame on you.”

- “Although I am myself not local, I have family and friends in the area hence visit on a regular basis. I also horse ride in the local area and am familiar with many of the unspoilt paths and bridleways that allow for safe exploration of the area. This is a stunning part of the country; it is quiet, beautiful and enhanced by the vast variety of birds and wildlife. The thought of 3500 acres being blanketed in black panels is too shocking for words. When people often struggle obtaining planning permission for simple house extensions, how can the ruining of so much land surrounding quaint and historical village even be on the radar as a possibility? I am not against the development of renewable energy but this surely must be carefully balanced with the negative effects on the landscape, local people and wildlife. I can only envisage destruction if the plan is passed. Destruction of land; destruction of wildlife; destruction of family ties as people inevitably decide to flee the area; strain on and destruction of relationships as tensions build by either having to put up with/adapt to the variations or deal with the financial implications as house prices crash. I can already see the effect that this proposal is having on the mental health of friends and family members, even at this early consultation stage. The knock-on effect is that my own mental health is also starting to suffer. The proposal and the devastating effects that will follow if the plan is passed is at the forefront of my mind – and I am not local. I can only imagine the catastrophic effect on the mental health that is bound to ensue in relation to many directly affected.”
- “I have been subjected to numerous acts of [REDACTED] both at home and abroad. As such, it has been paramount that I mitigate the residual effects of this for my emotional wellbeing. It is not by accident that I therefore chose to live in the village of South Clifton. There is immediate access to go running, walking, cycling or painting. All these pastimes are key in attaining the correct equilibrium needed for my mental health. I feel a pending sense of doom with the application of the One Earth Solar Panel project, which will destroy the very reason for my living here. How ironic that this may lead to another act of terrorism. This time the victim will be the beautiful countryside.”
- “Erecting black panels over any area will stop the sun reaching the earth below, this will slow down the evaporation of surface water. We live in a HIGH RISK FLOOD AREA, the water needs to disperse/evaporate unhindered or the water table will rise quicker causing more devastation. Flooding will be another consequence. The prospect of this is already causing anxiety which is having an adverse effect of my daily life. When and how will this end?”
- “The threat of our lives being ruined clearly has a marked effect on our mental health. We have been married for a long time and together we have been experiencing matters of a similar nature. Starting with SLEEP or most notably the lack and quality of it. Nightmares are definitely on the increase, most are of a very dark nature and so vivid in their presentation that sometimes one wakes up actually wondering if the night horror just experienced is true! [REDACTED] ANGER, GLOOM and downright out of character outbursts of BAD TEMPER are all too common. We both worry about our future quality of life; the [REDACTED] of our beautiful countryside by mindless morons; values of our homes that we have saved for all our lives disappearing with nothing to pass onto our children. The open greed of just a few individuals who want to make a financial killing by giving their land to a gang of foreigners. Also there is the NOISE aspect to consider. We both have pretty low noise thresholds so to be exposed to unnatural noise from a solar farm would be purgatory. Has anyone given any thought to the fact that in

the next few years we and NATO allies are likely to be in armed conflict with a number of despot authoritarian states. The Notts/Lincs area will be producing the bulk of UK electricity therefore turning us into very real target for modern weapons. Furthermore, another reason for DEPRESSION - where are the millions of solar panels coming from? Yes, you guessed it Red China. What a mess.”

- “I’ve found the impact of the solar farm plans to be impacting most aspects of my life, home and work. I got to a point where I was crying daily especially when outside my home or driving by the areas that are potentially going to have panels on them and if I thought about the scheme for any period of time I would also end up in tears. I am normally very robust, but this has had such a detrimental impact on my life and ability to function normally I have had to seek help from my GP. I am waiting for talking therapy and have started medication to try and help me cope with the plans. I can’t see any end to the way I feel as the impact on our home and village life is immense. The only way I can see me feeling better eventually is if the plans were to not be approved. If they do go ahead then I’m not sure how I will function long term without us moving away or taking medication which I really don’t want to be taking for prolonged periods of time. The worry about the potential loss of value on our home and inability to sell in the future, has also created a lot of stress and anxiety as we could find ourselves in negative equity and trapped in our home with no other options but to live within the scheme! The worry of the unknowns such as the noise of the inverters is also concerning as until the scheme is in, I don’t believe anyone can truly say people won’t hear the noise from their homes.”

The nature of some of these comments is so incredibly concerning that I feel a professional and personal obligation to follow some of these people and families up to try to ensure that their mental health does not deteriorate further. I have already advised several of these individuals to consult their own General Practitioners to seek additional advice and support. I openly admit that I have experienced anxiety, low mood and sleep disturbance as a result of the One Earth proposals.

Being a horse rider in South Clifton who also walks, cycles with my husband and young son, and runs along many of the public rights of way, I am already concerned about the direct impact that industrialisation of this area will have on my family and I. I worry about our 4-year-old son and future generations. I worry about my neighbours and local communities. I can see the negative impact this is already having on those around me. I have seen emotions in individuals that I have never seen before including anger, despair, frustration, resentment and even contempt.

At this stage, purely through direct messages being received, the evidence is clear. There are countless negative voices coming from those who feel that they have no power or influence over what is being forced upon them – changes that will affect their lives on a permanent basis. Some of the messages indicate total despair, hopelessness and loss, akin to a bereavement reaction.

If the government ignore this and sign off the proposal to allow the erection of black panels so close to domestic areas, they are totally disregarding their moral obligation. A genuine concern I have is that the company, ‘One Earth,’ by way of their marketing campaigns are manipulating people’s perceptions to influence views and opinions about the project. Even the very name ‘One Earth’ is staggeringly misleading. ‘One Earth’ suggests a green agenda, protecting the world, uniting people even globally (a very bold statement). The unfortunate reality is very different.

One Earth have stated in their own literature that should the marketing/consultation stage of the project be passed, One Earth will no longer exist and the true company behind this project, 'Orsted' (a Danish government-owned business) will become the owner and operator. One Earth has clearly been used as a marketing tool, implying that this is an environmentally friendly proposal which will also benefit human health. At that transition phase, people would understandably feel confused and betrayed. There are better ways of supporting renewable energy – ways which don't impose such detrimental impact on human life, health and wellbeing. Ones which don't lead to a dramatic reduction in food security, irreparable destruction of farmland and incalculable harm to indigenous wildlife.

One Earth has demonstrated a disturbingly blinkered one-dimensional veneer vision regarding human health. Rather than being driven by genuine fact-finding, the mention of human health appears to be yet another tick-in-the-box exercise to push their project through. It has been used and passed off as evidence when clearly it is not. This astonishing and extremely concerning oversight of mental health needs addressing as a matter of urgency and to be given the priority status it demands.

These findings will constitute documentary evidence as part of an auditable process. It may be used in any future legal procedures regarding the adverse effects on a person's health. Should this document, with the evidence, be disregarded by any appropriate governance body for endorsement, they will be held culpable.

'Human Health – Definite significant negative effect'.

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Age:	
Gender:	
Area of residence:	

Please circle as appropriate:

Do you think your mental health has been negatively impacted because of the One Earth solar farm proposal (for example anxiety/altered mood/disturbed sleep)? Y / N

If yes, please give details:

Do you feel your mental health is likely to worsen should the One Earth solar farm be approved? Y / N

If yes, please give details:

Do you currently, or have you ever had, any of the following mental health problems? Please circle as appropriate:

- Anxiety
- Sleep problems
- Depression
- Low mood
- Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)
- Other (please specify)

Any further comments relating to your mental health/solar proposal (please include any concerns regarding worsening of current mental health conditions):

Please note all information will remain anonymous.

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

Appendix 3: Individual Comments Regarding How the One Earth Solar Project is Currently Negatively Impacting Mental Health

- Massively impacted every single day and night with anxiety, sleep disturbance, depression and low mood/palpitations;
- Anxiety, disturbed sleep;
- Anxiety, low mood, disturbed sleep, which also has a negative impact on my daughter who is autistic. I wake regularly with it on my mind. I'm anxious regularly;
- Anxiety/low mood/insomnia with a negative impact on my work/family/social life;
- A previous stressful experience from a solar farm proposal led me to have a stroke;
- Anxiety, anger, mood swings, disturbed sleep;
- Concerned for the future of our village and the impact on all the community;
- I am suffering from anxiety and I am unable to sleep;
- Feeling anxious most of the time and awakening me in the night;
- I believe it will negatively affect the value of our houses;
- I think the value of properties will decline;
- Worry! During all consultation, I do not feel anything will change – a 'tick-in-the-box' exercise. No answers given over specifics. Proposals massively over-sized. Landowners seemingly happy to be moving out of area leaving community to suffer once implemented;
- Anxiety due to not being able to walk/ride mindfully in the countryside;
- I am suffering from anxiety regarding the solar farm already. Just the thought of it is causing great stress;
- I am worried that we have ploughed a lot of money into renovating our house and now we risk losing a great deal should we ever have to sell;
- Worry about increased noise – including traffic during construction. Problems commuting to work from increased traffic. Long-term worries about loss of house value. Toxicity from panels, scared of potential fires;
- Change and uncertainty negatively impacting anxiety, mood and sleep – increasingly affected by age when change becomes more impactful;
- Sleep problems;
- Constantly on my mind all day, waking up at night and early morning, anxiety, sleep problems;
- This One Earth solar farm proposal has caused large amounts of anxiety along with lack of sleep. It has made a huge negative impact on the time I will never get back with my newborn baby;

- I am very worried about my future environment, of living in my property if I am to be surrounded by an industrial estate. I have had anxiety, sleep problems, depression and low mood since this proposal was announced, but never before then;
- I have had anxiety and sleep problems since this all started;
- The proposal is always on my mind;
- Disturbed sleep;
- The proposed plans by One Earth solar have clearly caused a divide within the community. This has had a knock-on effect as individuals who previously got along well, now longer know where they stand with each other. I for one now worry that the subject will come up in conversation and disagreements will begin;
- The One Earth proposal has been dumped on us at the same time as several other proposals. This will result in 30,000 acres of prime farmland in the Trent Valley being INVADED – yes it feels like a carefully choreographed invasion by a hostile force;
- Anxiety;
- Anxiety due to uncertainty of future. No agricultural land for food;
- Visual landscape ruined, farmland lost;
- We moved here when we retired for the beautiful countryside having horses and dogs and as an artist. The peace and quiet was also important. This is all going to be destroyed – no wonder we are sleepless and anxious;
- Anxiety;
- Much concern and distress;
- Depression;
- The hypocrisy of the proposal has made me angry. It is unjust to ask our community to be altruistic when their motive is money, with little/no regard for the undesirable impact on our surroundings and life enjoyment;
- Our hard-earned homes will be valueless. We will not be able to sell and move away; so therefore we are destined to be tortured for something we have not done and not deserve – this is causing anxiety, low mood, depression, sleep problems/bad dreams/irritability, gross unhappiness, fear of war with Russia – we will be a prime target for Putin's missiles;
- We moved to the countryside not to be surrounded by panels. It is stressful thinking about what we will lose, and this being 'Phase 1', worry whether 'Phase 2' will completely surround us;
- The stress and anxiety from this proposal is apparent in many. Fallings out, neighbourly upsets;
- Value of my property!! Overall look of the area I have lived in for over 30 years! This is causing sleep problems and low mood;
- It has caused a division in such a small community. Plus it has caused me to worry about local food production;
- Anxiety and disturbed sleep;
- Anxiety and sleep problems;
- I can't sleep at night knowing that the beautiful countryside will be destroyed;
- I already take antidepressants as I suffer from sleep problems and anxiety. As the peace and tranquillity of this area will be badly affected by the proposal I am already deeply concerned which has caused me sleepless nights. I am now having to take medication to help me sleep;

- We moved here a year ago to get away from the rat race, I already work in Nottingham and coming home gives me serenity;
- We came here in the recent past to escape the hustle and bustle of town life due to my acute anxiety. This has now made my condition worse! I am currently suffering from anxiety, sleep problems, depression and low mood;
- It will look so unnatural in the countryside;
- Stress, anxiety, disturbed sleep;
- I feel the loss of the countryside and the open space will have a negative impact on my health and wellbeing;
- I moved to live in the countryside;
- It's causing me a feeling of worry and unease;
- Stress and worry to all local residents;
- Stress, disturbed sleep;
- My mental health is already very negatively being affected. I have spent many years working on my property to make nice and improve value and this solar farm will completely destroy all my hard work;
- Anxiety, disturbed sleep, altered mood. Since the plans for the solar farm were made public the impact on my day-to-day life has been significant. Working from home there is little escape from facing the reality this solar farm is going to destroy the life you live;
- Disturbed mood/sleep, anxiety;
- Low mood, sleep problems, anxiety;
- Since the plans have been out I have been unable to sleep and function normally. I was crying every day (at least once) and have had to seek medical advice/support. I am now on medication and having therapy;
- My mental health has been negatively affected because I don't want to be living next to solar panels;
- We moved from an area that was under heavy development for the sake of my mental health which was in a poor state. Within two years of making a huge lifestyle change we learned that our haven of peace may be destroyed. I can't think about it without crying;
- It has made me angry and frustrated;
- Of course – we choose to live in this area for its natural beauty which will be seriously impaired by this project!;
- How can you not realise what you are doing to the communities causing anxiety due to noise, wildlife destruction, constant traffic, loss of views;
- Moved to the area for my love of the countryside and wildlife. Pains me to see how much roadkill there is of all our precious wildlife, deer, foxes, badgers and others;
- Sad to think this could be built in our area. When we moved here we were at peace and happy to move to such a peaceful, green and calm village;
- Emergency services shift worker. The area is a lot quieter than Lincoln/Newark. Additional noise pollution will impact me further;
- Worry, disturbed sleep, anxiety;
- Anxiety due to potential impact on house sale/price;
- Anxiety about the future. Anxiety linked to comments made by other people whose opinions differ to my own;
- Concerned about noise pollution;
- Worried about house prices falling as we've just moved here;

- Anxiety because of local walking areas being ruined!;
- We have only just bought in the area and did so to get away from city life and have seen the impact on neighbouring areas on value of the house and my children's mental health;
- Altered mood, worrying about the noise levels;
- I am concerned as when I come back from uni I like the views as this is a coping mechanism and helps me feel better when I go back;
- Worried over the impact it will have on the area – noise/light pollution, restricted walkways;
- No worries yet but will in the future;
- Altered mood/anxiety/sleep problems and frustration and anger. I didn't move here to be surrounded by a metal jungle and solar panels. House prices will decrease. This solar farm is about profit only;
- Anxious about how it will impact our lives – mainly from the noise and appearance.

Appendix 4: Individual Comments Regarding How Mental Health is Likely to Worsen Should the One Earth Solar Proposal Be Approved

- Concern over increased flood risk and noise;
- This is causing anxiety;
- Yes, I do not want to live in such a grotesque environment and will feel trapped, as even trying to sell up will lose tens of thousands of pounds even finding a buyer! A living nightmare;
- Altered mood and anxiety;
- Two years of heavy construction and disruption will be stressful;
- I feel overwhelmed by the idea of such destruction of our countryside;
- I will get an increase in anxiety, my mood and sleep will worsen;
- Fencing alarms me;
- Views ruined, noise pollution;
- Currently no mental health issues, but as a villager for 50 years plus a scheme on this scale is bound to have an adverse effect on me. This village is surrounded by agricultural land/pleasant countryside views so the last thing we need are solar panels and the infrastructure that comes with them;
- Being anxious about how we will all be affected;
- Extremely worried about the loss of value and reduced saleability of house prices;
- We moved to the area to enjoy the tranquillity of the countryside – not an industrial area;
- The loss of the countryside views, which helps with any stress, will be gone. I will not be able to wind down after a tough day at work;
- I personally moved to this area for the countryside aspect. I am perturbed to think I may soon have a very different aspect;
- Change from green environment to industrial environment – proven studies are available to show psychological impact from lack of plants etc in surroundings at work and home having significant negative impact;
- Environmental issues, noise pollution, congestion causing anxiety/low mood;

- No escape from the views of this industrialisation on my doorstep (close);
- Destroying our beautiful landscape, house price deterioration – who wouldn't this impact when your whole life's work is destroyed;
- I will be even more unhappy if this is approved as I will be unable to sell my property and move elsewhere;
- My mental health will worsen due to my future living here;
- We want to live in the countryside not an industrial estate;
- The community divide will increase. Plus the increased traffic/noise will negatively impact my life and cause great concern for me. Having a small child, we regularly walk/bike ride around the village, there will be a greater risk of traffic;
- The prospect of being surrounded by mega monster solar panels is totally depressing and the fact that this will be for 60 years will last until my 3-year-old grandson will be old;
- Increased anxiety;
- Property value, noise, visual landscape ruined;
- Anxiety - unknown future;
- I don't tolerate noise well and the constant traffic when the solar 'farm' is being installed is a worry, as is the buzz from the battery storage systems. We also like to buy fresh local produce which is healthy – that will go and I worry about it;
- Concern over decrease in house prices and relationship with neighbours being affected;
- Depression may become extreme;
- Depression, daily environmental experience being permanently changed by the destruction of the local environment;
- This is an ongoing situation, akin to the feudal where landed gentry dictated to the underlings. Research indicates the habituation does not lead to acceptance or change of opinion – so I won't have any relief from the anger, upset and altered landscape.
- The noise/glare from the panels, heavy traffic on our single track roads, loss of valuable wildlife, loss of money invested in our homes;
- Who wants to look out over a sea of silicone. I live in the countryside for a reason. House pricing will also cause anxiety;
- The overall look and disturbance to natural habitats;
- It will look absolutely dreadful and will 100% affect the wildlife and the look of where I live;
- It will be a HUGE blight on the countryside. The money-greedy companies need stopping!;
- Anxiety and disturbed sleep;
- Stress, anxiety, disturbed sleep;
- I feel my mental health will worsen because I love the beauty of my area;
- I love the beautiful scenery so I expect my mental health to worsen;
- My mental health is likely to worsen because of the thought of having to see this every day;
- As I moved here for open views, I feel this will be lost and will have a negative impact on my mental health;
- I work hard to be able to have my home which I love as a family space but feel it won't be worth it if the plan goes ahead, I may move;
- Disruption whilst being constructed causing worry and anxiety;
- Ongoing noise, people around more, destroying landscape;

- Living in the middle of this solar farm, I feel I will no longer want to live in my once idyllic home and will suffer a massive financial loss doing so, which is also causing stress;
- Nice view outside my residence at the moment, do not wish to be seeing solar panels on my doorstep;
- I am struggling to imagine how life will be living within a solar scheme. The joy of countryside living will be gone and my happy home life won't be the same. I worry about the views and the noise there will be;
- At the moment I have a lovely view of countryside outside my windows. I don't want to be looking at solar panels;
- Without a doubt my mental health will worsen. Everything here that has dragged me from depression – the peace and quiet, the wildlife, the beautiful walking routes – will be negatively affected, and I honestly don't know how I will cope. I am dreading it;
- There will be concerns regarding the effect it will have on our health and also financial security with all our money being tied to our property;
- Value of house will diminish;
- It will probably worsen due to the increased noise and battery safety;
- Mental health will worsen due to environment changing – moved to the country for the landscape and sounds;
- Importantly the devaluation of my house is a major factor;
- I need to walk in the countryside every day to help keep my mental health stable;
- We retired here – it's quiet. You are ripping communities apart, covering farms with panels. Really wish we were somewhere else;
- I believe with large areas of countryside fenced off it will leave little space and wildlife will be concentrated towards roads;
- Constant noise, unable to walk around the countryside with restricted views and access;
- Impact on sleep in daytime (emergency services shift worker) with construction and inverters;
- The friction the proposed project has caused in the community has caused increased levels of stress and anxiety when attending community events;
- If the solar farm is approved I am concerned I will have further anxiety/guilt in relation to the impact on local wildlife and ethical implications arising from Chinese production and labour;
- I often work nights and have disturbed sleep. The noise will keep me awake leading to other issues with my health;
- Moved here for the tranquillity of a small village, will be worried about the panels causing health problems;
- Anxiety will worsen as more stress comes because of noise, nowhere to walk etc!;
- Worrying about my children's health, investment in the local area and also my own sleep patterns. I have stayed in other areas close to solar farms and the noise of the panels affects my sleep;
- Won't be anywhere local to ride my bike that's quiet;
- A coping strategy would have been removed and will feel like I am just surrounded by plastic/metal instead of away from anyone else;
- My feelings about this going ahead are bad enough. I fear the long-term impact this will have on my family and I;

- We need to move house at some point in the next few years. If this goes ahead then there will be significant worry around house prices and whether we can afford to move;
- Noise! Ruins our beautiful countryside as well!

Appendix 5: Further Individual Comments Regarding Mental Health and the One Earth Solar Proposal

- The accumulative impact of the vast range of solar farm developments in one area has basically made this part of the midlands area a gargantuan industrial scale solar plant. To call them solar 'farms' completely misrepresents the situation from when district to district, county to county across Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire we are becoming completely swamped. The utter rage, frustration, and desperation residents feel is immeasurable. This adds significantly to our daily mental load. We feel put on and disregarded. The impact this has on all our mental health is hugely significant. Having recently moved to this area specifically to be in the natural surroundings of the countryside, so we can enjoy views, quiet sounds of nature, after having worked hard all our lives, to now have to face this mass scale industrial development leaves us depressed, sleepless, and worried about the future;
- Many as yet unknown factors, but a solar farm of this scale will disrupt many leisure activities – walking, cycling and horse riding - all good activities to improve mental health;
- I find that as time passes I become more anxious – feelings I've never experienced before;
- I already take anxiety medication (fluoxetine). I was stable and doing really well but I have had to increase the dose solely because of the solar farm proposal;
- My mental health will only deteriorate due to the One Earth solar project;
- This proposal is a money-generating project only!!;
- Please, please leave our countryside as it is;
- I am deeply saddened about the proposals. I moved to the countryside for its views, relaxation and tranquillity. This will be all gone if the proposals go ahead;
- I feel this would cause unnecessary stress;
- Moved to the countryside from urban environment to improve physical and mental health. Now feel that moving again would be the best option, however may not be possible if house value has dropped – increasing stress levels, anxiety and depression which in turn is having a knock-on effect on a long-term condition I have leading to more pain. It is bad enough whilst we are in limbo awaiting the outcome – if it goes ahead I am afraid about how much worse it will get;
- The sheer amount of stress this causes, flare-up's of my vertigo episodes;
- Didn't need any additional stress, no warning;
- Concerned how it will affect my mental health in the long-run;
- We thought we had found the ideal place to retire – now it is going to be destroyed. We cannot sell and move always our property is being devalued – money we thought our kids would inherit. The most distressing and heart-breaking element in all this is that it is not necessary, but it is out of our control. Even our MP cannot help us against 'green at all costs' mania;

- There are many other ways of generating cheap electricity without resorting to solar panels. With that said why not cover the roofs of Nottingham City and Mansfield with solar panels and leave us country folk alone. We fear for our children and grandchildren. Why do organisations trade with rogue states such as China for solar panels;
- For several years I struggled with leaving the house. Moving to a more rural area has helped tremendously – I walk regularly in the beautiful countryside and have started getting involved in the local community. I am genuinely worried that I may go back downhill if all I see when I leave my house is a sea of monstrous solar panels;
- The positive effect of living in a beautiful, rural environment should not be underestimated. There is escape and peace in the open countryside that cannot be found in industrial settings;
- This is a nightmare and NO-ONE cares about us – we are just collateral damage. Shame on you and your shareholders – it's all about money;
- Worried about our futures, house prices and desirability of the area;
- Although it will not severely impact my mental health, wellbeing is important and physical health also with noise pollution initially and unaware of long-term issues with lithium batteries/solar panel parts needs to be considered when in close proximity to houses with families and pets. Use of green space which supplies oxygen through trees and pollens for bees and insects which are all vital for our health and part of the nature and nurture;
- Increased stress due to worries over construction traffic and noise, operating noise, lack of good agricultural land and UK food production, and loss of property values;
- I feel if the solar installation was to go ahead, it would lead to further community tension and give a general feeling of loss in relation to the landscape around our homes as well as uncertainty about the long-term implications on employment and house prices;
- I am concerned that the construction and installed inverters will cause noise pollution leading to sleep deprivation which in turn will negatively impact mental health. I am also concerned that access to nature and the countryside will be impacted and restricted and will again negatively impact mental health.

1 McManus, S et al (2009). Adult psychiatric morbidity in England, 2007: results of a household survey.

2 McManus S, Bebbington P, Jenkins R, Brugha T. (eds.) (2016). Mental health and wellbeing in England: Adult psychiatric morbidity survey 2014.

3 Lamont R, Hinson C (March 2024). NEER030: A narrative review of reviews of nature exposure and human health and wellbeing in the UK.