

One Earth Solar Project will affect Water Resilience for our Communities.

This solar project will change the resilience supplies of water from the proposed flood areas and drinking water protected area (GB104028058480) affecting the supply for up to 20 million litres every day from the Hall Water Treatment works to Lincolnshire, plus it's confirmed the new Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire reservoirs will supply around 750,000 homes with drinking water, water abstracted from the River Trent; this is a critical supply for that sector.

The One Earth Solar project contradicts the Environment Act 2021 (S78) which introduced changes to the Water Industry Act 1991 (new S39E) to enable the Secretary of State to direct water undertakers to prepare and publish joint proposals for the purpose of improving the management and development of water resources.

Our UK National Framework for Water Resources (WRMP's) 2025 was implemented to prevent such tragedies from this proposal by enhancing depleting water management plans. This project undermines these key principles, we must consider the catchment-based approach which is crucial to managing pressures on water resources and supplies, we should not introduce a reduction of water for the river nor add contaminants from the construction and operational phases from this proposed project.

Protecting our water environment should be of the upmost importance, and until we have additional infrastructure in place which reduces the direct need for drinking water from rivers and aquifers, we must protect our current systems.

I strongly feel the local Environmental Agency has overlooked these key objectives for this project.

I'm personally for solar systems in the right environment; however, this project will change the River Trent's resilience to fulfil its requirements by contaminating the water drainage feeding the river. Should the unfortunate fire situation occur to a PCU/inverter stations, I've not seen anything which accounts for the containment of fire services high-pressure hoses containment, where contaminants will spread several meters from the point of hose impact, especially when the PCU/inverter stations are at 6-metres high. Should this event happen during a flood occurrence, I don't see the applicant has provided a containment action for this eventuality. Generally speaking, for any designed specification the worst-case scenario is used for compliance.

The Environment Agency is legally required to exercise a general supervision over all matters relating to flood and coastal erosion risk management in accordance with Part 1 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and I feel the Environment Agency should be focused on the potential for misrepresentation when allowing One Earth Solar Farm to have full control for sampling, collecting samples and reporting river water contamination, there is a conflict of interest. Furthermore, how can the Environment Agency agree to "We acknowledge that details of the sampling methodology, locations and analytical parameters will be determined post-consent"?

The view of our Environment Agency to state 'The Environment Agency does not consider there to have been a failure to provide a WFD specialist' to review or challenged the applicants submissions is a mockery to justification and clarification.

██████████, Chair, Environment Agency has expressed "huge pressure already exists on the nation's water resources and, with population growth and climate change, that pressure is set to continue and steadily increase".

With the population increasing by 10.29% for East Lincolnshire and 13.44% for Lincolnshire Retford and Gainsborough (population increase was forecast within England using water company water resources zones) highlights the significant increase demonstrating water requirements out ways the need for this solar project on a protected water catchment area. Estimates suggest that without continued action, we could have a 5-billion litres a day shortfall by 2055 for public water supplies alone.

██████████, Independent Chair of the National Framework also concluded in an executive summary.

"Water is fundamental for public health, food, energy supply, a strong and growing economy and a thriving natural environment. We are on the cusp of huge change in how society operates as Artificial Intelligence develops, and we move to clean energy production. Yet all of these depend upon a sustainable, resilient supply of water. Climate change is also likely to change the distribution and timing of rainfall, with warmer, wetter winters and hotter, drier summers. Together, the impact of all these pressures on water resources is unprecedented".

I truly see no valid justification why this project should be given the go-ahead while it's situated on a protected drinking water catchment area and also known flood plain which would transport contamination in the event of a flood, which is highly likely.

Resources:

- National Framework for Water Resources 2025 planning of resilient water supplies in England to 2050 and beyond
- Environment Act 2021 (S78) Environment Act 2021
- Water Industry Act 1991 (new S39E) Water Industry Act 1991
- Five regional groups coworking across water company boundaries and sectors for planning water resources. planning of resilient water supplies in England to 2050 and beyond
- Building water resources capabilities in Catchment Based Approach (CaBA) Catchment Partnerships in collaboration with the Environment Agency Current and future pressures on water resources: an overview
- Household population percentage increase from 2025 to 2055 from WRMP24 forecasts (based on ONS data)