

Planning Inspectorate

Our ref: XA/2025/100500/01
Alt Ref: ENVPAC/1/NIT/00019
Your Ref: EN010159

[via Planning Inspectorate website &
oneearth solar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
]

Date: 16 December 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

ONE EARTH SOLAR FARM

RESPONSE TO DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT DEADLINE 6

Thank you for consulting us on the additional documents submitted by the applicant on the 03 December 2025. We have reviewed the submissions and have the following comments to make within appendix 1 (response to submitted documentation).

We are expecting submission from the applicant of an updated Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) at Deadline 7. We have been in consultation with the applicant to work through the outstanding items within the SoCG, the below comments have been previously sent to the applicant directly and we expect their Deadline 7 submissions to reflect these comments and a completed SoCG to be submitted which indicates our agreement with the applicant.

Please also see our comments within Appendix 2 which highlight the updated position on the FRA the applicant is looking to submit at deadline 7.

The Environment Agency can also confirm that we are satisfied with the alterations to the draft DCO and to requirement 22, the EA can also confirm we are satisfied with the disapplication of the relevant provisions within Article 6 of the dDCO.

Please also see a list of key issues as highlighted below in our Work Package Tracker, Appendix 3, we are satisfied these issues have now been agreed with the applicant.

We trust this advice is useful.

Yours sincerely


Planning Advisor - National Infrastructure Team

Appendix 1 – Response to documents submitted at deadline 6

Appendix 2 – Comments on FRA

Appendix 3 – Environment Agency Work Package Tracker

Cont/d..

Appendix 1

EAWQ – Watercourse Buffer Distances		
Chapter 5 Description of the Proposed Development Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	Issue:	Watercourse buffer distance is incorrect. In Table 3.5 of the CEMP, on page 42, it says “Watercourses will have a minimum buffer of 8m, ponds 10m, and a 16m buffer to the River Trent.”
	Impact:	If distances are not sufficiently away from the edge of the watercourse, then it can increase the risk of contamination in the event of a drilling fluid breakout.
	Solution:	Amend the distance to the 10m from top of bank of watercourses, in line with best practice and other documentation (i.e. Table 3.4 in the CEMP and C4 in Volume 7.0: Other Documents Commitments Register).
Additional comments:		

GWCL – Contaminated Substrate		
Appendix 7.4 – Stage 1 WFD Screening Assessment	Comments:	Section 4.1.3 now includes statement about removal and replacement of contaminated gravel. This section should also include text to confirm that any such works must be carried out such that this does not compromise the impermeable lining of the drainage system takes place, and that any damage to the lining would be immediately inspected and repaired.

GWCL – Contaminated Substrate		
Appendix 7.4 – Stage 1 WFD Screening Assessment	Comments:	Section 5.1.6 refers to piling hazards and the completion of Piling Risk Assessments. The Applicant should also ensure that foundation construction at the BESS and Substation developments would not compromise the sealed drainage infrastructure.

Appendix 2

Update of position of FRA to be submitted at Deadline 7

The applicant has undertaken hydraulic modelling using a storage reduction and flow constriction approach, to assess the loss of storage and flood flow conveyance impacts due to the development. We have reviewed the hydraulic modelling and consider the approach that the applicant has taken as reasonable. The outputs from this modelling are summarised in the most recent Flood Risk Assessment which will be submitted at Deadline 7. This modelling shows negligible impact from the solar panel support frames during the design flood event (1 in 100 year plus higher central climate change scenario (+39%). However, there are some localised increases of 1 to 3 millimetres (mm) in places but these changes are in areas of notable existing flood depth and are within the natural variability of floodplain behaviour. Additionally, the variation in levels are arguably beyond the precision limitations of the mathematical solver used within the hydraulic modelling software but are of a similar magnitude to the estimated change in flood level indicated from the volumetric assessment. The areas of change highlighted from the hydraulic modelling assessment are illustrated in figure 3-13 and 3.14 of the Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted at Deadline 7. There are no changes in water levels within the River Trent upstream or downstream of the proposed development. Furthermore, the applicant has undertaken an assessment on the impacts these changes have on flood hazard ratings on this area and have found that any changes either occur within the order limits of the site or on land which do not have receptors which could be affected.

Please see SoCG for full comment on the Environment Agency's position on flood risk matters as of Deadline 7. However, we can confirm all flood risk matters have now been agreed.

Appendix 3

Subject	Topics	Assessment	Impact	Solution	Agreed requirement/ or updated assessment	Note:
Ecology and Biodiversity	Biodiversity Net Gain	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Ecological Assessment	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Water Environment Report / WFD	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Flood Risk Assessment	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	

	Detailed Flood Modelling (Flood Risk Assessment)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
Geomorphology	Water Environment Report / WFD	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
Groundwater Protection & Contaminated Land	WFD Assessment	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Hydrogeology Sensitivities	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Surface water and Groundwater abstractions, pollutions incidents and discharge consents Report	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	

	Contaminated Land	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Piling Risk Assessment	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
Surface Water Quality	Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Modelling	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
Water Resources	Water Supply Strategy	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
	Water Resources Assessment	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
Permitting	Consents Strategy	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	EAGCC-01 - Delays to the delivery of the scheme where

						consents and agreements are insufficiently comprehensive, to ensure the EA can effectively deal with permit applications.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---