



# One Earth Solar Farm

**Draft** **Final** Statement of Common Ground with West Lindsey District Council

**EN010159/APP/8.4.54**

December 2025

One Earth Solar Farm Ltd

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Overview	2
1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.3 Purpose of this document	2
1.4 Terminology	3
<b>2. Description of the Proposed Development</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Record of Engagement</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Summary of Consultation	6
<b>4. Current Position</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1 Position of the Applicant and West Lindsey District Council	13

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Overview

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) has been prepared in respect of the application for the Proposed One Earth Solar Farm Development Consent Order (the “Application”) made by One Earth Solar Farm Ltd (the ‘Applicant’) to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“PA 2008”).

1.1.2 The DCO Application is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) for the installation, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and associated grid connection infrastructure which will allow for the generation and export of electricity to the High Marnham substation (hereafter ‘the Proposed Development’).

1.1.3 The SoCG is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed draft between both parties involved. It will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.

### 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and West Lindsey District Council.

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

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

### 1.3 Purpose of this document

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

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

1.3.3 Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 1.4 Terminology

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

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

---

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

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

## 2. Description of the Proposed Development

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

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

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

## 3. Record of Engagement

### 3.1 Summary of Consultation

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

<b>General Catch Ups</b>		
Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
20th July 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Initial introductions to the Project
20 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 – Ongoing	Correspondence (Email)	Ongoing email correspondence between the Applicant and West Lindsey District Council
31st August 2023	Meeting (Virtual)	Follow up introduction to the project
11 <sup>th</sup> March 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project overview</li><li>• Ecology Survey programme overview</li><li>• Summary of habitat information</li><li>• Summary of bat surveys</li><li>• Summary of bird surveys (breeding and wintering)</li><li>• Summary of badger, otter and water vole surveys</li><li>• Summary of great crested newt surveys</li></ul>

- Identifying local conservation priorities (to include within landscape design)
- Approach to BNG, incorporating local priority species

19 <sup>th</sup> April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around Jobs and Skills associated with the Proposed Development
8 <sup>th</sup> May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around socio-economic impacts
14 <sup>th</sup> May 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Consultation briefing including an update on EIA, the masterplan and consultation programme
12 <sup>th</sup> July 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Open questions from LPA officers to OESF team;</li><li>• Discussion around the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone briefing</li></ul>
9 <sup>th</sup> October 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Masterplan and programme update</li><li>• Adequacy of Consultation Milestone</li><li>• Statement of Common Ground</li></ul>
1 <sup>st</sup> May 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Post-submission de-brief and discussion of the next steps

15 <sup>th</sup> August 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	General discussion on the progression of the SoCGs and covering off topics of relevance.
------------------------------	-------------------	--

9 <sup>th</sup> September 2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion around the Statement of Common Ground and action points raised during the 2nd round of hearings.  Focused on the topics of landscape, design and cumulatives
--------------------------------	-------------------	---

04/11/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on the Statement of Common Ground focusing on landscape.
------------	-------------------	---

10/11/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on the Statement of Common Ground focusing on landscape and sequential test elements
------------	-------------------	---

27/11/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion on final elements of the Statement of Common Ground, including
------------	-------------------	---

## Cultural Heritage

29th- 30th April 2024	Meeting (Virtual)	Presentation on scope of cultural heritage assessment and discussion of proposed scope of heritage photomontages.
-----------------------	-------------------	---

19th November 2024      Meeting (Virtual)

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

## Ground Conditions

27 November 2024      Email

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

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

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

10 December 2024      Email

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

16 June 2025	Email	The Applicant requested information held by the local authority relating to private water abstraction locations (licensed or unlicensed) in response to consultation comments that the original dataset may not have been complete. Response awaited as to whether any information is available from West Lindsey District Council.
26 June 2025	Email	Response received from West Lindsey District Council to indicate that they do not hold any data relating to private water abstractions.

## Landscape and Visual

22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2024	Virtual meeting	<b>Key Topics:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LVIA methodology</li><li>• LVIA Study Area</li><li>• Landscape receptors</li><li>• Visual receptors</li><li>• Representative viewpoints</li><li>• Photomontages</li></ul> <b>Key Outcomes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Request for LVIA study area refinement to be detailed in the LVIA</li><li>• Suggestion of ZTV approach and agreement to share drafts for comment</li></ul>
-----------------------------	-----------------	---

Comments on consultation note to be provided in writing Follow-up meeting to be scheduled following publication of the PEIR

18 <sup>th</sup> October 2024	Virtual meeting	<p><b>Key Topics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LVIA Study Area</li><li>• Scope of cumulative assessment</li><li>• Scope of photomontages</li></ul> <p><b>Key Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agreed that 2km LVIA Study Area was appropriate</li></ul> <p>Justification on photomontage scope to be provided in the LVIA</p>
15th August 2025	Virtual Meeting	<p><b>Key Topics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Outstanding LVIA matters</li><li>- Visual impacts on users of A1133</li><li>- Design of BESS and substation</li><li>- Glint and Glare mitigation fencing</li></ul> <p><b>Key Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- WLDC to review and update position on LVIA matters</li><li>- Applicant to clarify how the height of the substation and BESS will be distributed across the Work Areas.</li><li>- Applicant to clarify full extent of fencing and anticipated timescales</li></ul>
9th September 2025	Virtual Meeting	<p><b>Key Topics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Location of substation</li><li>- Extent of Glint and Glare mitigation fencing</li><li>- Other miscellaneous outstanding LVIA matters</li></ul>

**Key Outcomes:**

- Applicant to provide clarification with supporting drawings on location of the substation
- Applicant to provide further clarification on glint and glare fencing
- Applicant to provide clarification with regard to any conflict between proposed access gate G and vegetation removal plan
- Applicant to provide additional baseline photograph from A1133 lay-by to supplementary existing assessment of motorists along the A1133

**Noise**

01/10/2025	Meeting (Virtual)	Discussion of noise related elements of the Statement of Common Ground following hearings round 2.
------------	-------------------	--

Table 01 – Record of Engagement

## 4. Current Position

### 4.1 Position of the Applicant and West Lindsey District Council

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

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

Table 02 – Cultural / Built Heritage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
02-01	Scope of Assessment	Scope of Assessment around Kettlethorpe and Dunham. Further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Concerns addressed, further detail can be found in Table 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage [APP-039].	Agreed
02-02	Impact to Roman Vexillation Fortress, and a Royal Observer Corps	Any adverse impact must be given due negative weight.  WLDC to defer to Historic England on their stance on this point and seconded their request	As detailed within paragraphs 10.6.81 – 10.6.85 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039], the Proposed Development are at a distance of c.880 metres from the asset at its southern boundary and no permanent, long term-adverse effects have been found during operation and therefore no 'negative	Not agreed

	<p>Monitoring Post (Scheduled Monument)</p>	<p>for an additional view from the Scheduled Monument to support the assessment.</p> <p>We note the advice of Historic England and we note that harm has been identified by the government's heritage advisor. On that basis we consider that the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State will need to have due regard to Regulation 3(3) of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010:</p> <p>"(3) When deciding an application for development consent which affects or is likely to affect a scheduled monument or its setting, the decision-maker must have regard to the desirability of preserving the scheduled monument or its setting".</p>	<p>'weight' within the balance. The additional view requested has been provided within the Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-075, p.635] demonstrating there would be no impact to the Scheduled Monument.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

Table 03 – Noise and Vibration

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Comment	Status
03-01	Noise and Vibration Effects – construction noise	<p>WLDC disagree with the construction noise thresholds for significance that have been set in this ES. These are however matters that WLDC <a href="#">is seeking to have progressed</a> with the applicant through the Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>(1) The list of BPM shown in Table 3.7 of the Outline CEMP appears to be comprehensive, although it may not completely reflect the mitigation described in para A.15.3.26 in Appendix 15.3 or potential restrictions on piling methods.</p> <p>(2) Where impacts are shown to be minor, the measures outlined should be adequate to control noise and vibration. However, if the assessment were more in line with BS5228 there is potential for significant noise impacts, requiring specific mitigation for some works near to some receptors.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is that the criteria used for evaluating the magnitude of construction noise impacts, and hence significance of construction noise effects, are consistent with those set out in BS 5228: 2009 +A1: 2014, however further clarification will be provided to WLDC to confirm the effect of changing significance criteria thresholds on the outcome of the construction noise assessment. It is expected that this change will not materially change the assessment outcome as confirmed to WLDC.</p> <p>The Applicant's position is that the CEMP(s) will be the most appropriate form of controlling construction noise, which are required to be submitted to and approved by the LPAs under Requirement 13 of the draft DCO [REP2-009]. The CEMP(s) will therefore include the details of noise mitigation that are relevant to the precise works activities, construction plant and</p>	Agreed

		<u>This matter has been resolved to the satisfaction of WLDC.</u>	equipment, etc., which will be known in more detail at the time that the CEMP(s) are produced.	
03-02	Baseline noise survey locations	Agree with the baseline noise survey locations.	The baseline noise survey was carried out at locations that were agreed as being appropriate (as shown in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [APP-044] and Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	<b>Agreed</b>
03-03	Baseline noise survey results	Agree that sufficient data was gathered at each of the baseline noise monitoring locations.	Sufficient data was gathered at each of the baseline noise monitoring locations to form an appropriate basis for the noise assessment (see Appendix 15.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140]).	<b>Agreed</b>
03-04	Study areas	Agree with the Applicant's choice of study areas.	The respective study areas and the associated sensitive receptors identified are appropriate for the basis of the following assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction traffic noise and vibration;</li> <li>• On-site construction noise and vibration;</li> <li>• Operational noise.</li> </ul>	<b>Agreed</b>
03-05	Standards and guidance	Agree that the Applicant has followed the appropriate standards and guidance.	The appropriate standards and guidance have been referenced for the following aspects of the assessment:	<b>Agreed</b>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction traffic noise and vibration;</li> <li>• On-site construction noise and vibration;</li> <li>• Operational noise.</li> </ul>	
03-06	Significance criteria	Agree that appropriate significance criteria have been adopted.	<p>Appropriate significance criteria have been adopted for the assessment of the significance of effects associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction traffic noise and vibration;</li> <li>• On-site construction noise and vibration;</li> <li>• Operational noise.</li> </ul>	<b>Agreed</b>
03-07	Control of noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic	Agree that the control of construction traffic noise and vibration will be adequately controlled by the CTMP.	Potential noise and vibration impacts associated with construction traffic can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). An outline CTMP has been included as part of the application documents [REP1-005], for further discussion and agreement.	<b>Agreed</b>
03-08	Control of on-site construction noise and vibration	Agree that on-site construction noise and vibration potential impacts can be controlled by the use of a CEMP.	Potential impacts of on-site construction noise and vibration can be adequately controlled by the use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). An outline CEMP has been included as part of the application documents [REP2-049], for further discussion and agreement.	<b>Agreed</b>

03-09	Control of operational noise	Agree with the noise requirement for operational noise control.	Potential impacts of operational noise can be controlled by requirement. A noise requirement, based on appropriate standards and guidance, has been proposed.  Please refer to Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003].	Agreed
-------	------------------------------	---	--	--------

Table 04 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
04-01	LVIA methodology	No comments or concerns on the LVIA methodology have been raised to date.	The applicant proposes that the LVIA methodology is agreed and is considered to be in accordance with Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition, and the associated clarification note (LITGN-2024-01).	Agreed
04-02	LVIA Study Area	West Lindsey District Council requested that further justification should be provided for the proposed 2km LVIA Study Area. In response, photographs from 8 locations were provided by the applicant to test the judgement of no significant visibility beyond 2km.  West Lindsey District Council welcomed this additional information and considered the 2km Study Area to be sufficient.	The LVIA 2km Study Area is agreed as being appropriate.	Agreed

04-03	Scope of landscape receptors	No comments or concerns on the scope of landscape receptors have been raised to date.	The scope of landscape receptors is agreed.	Agreed
04-04	Scope of visual receptors	No comments or concerns on the scope of visual receptors have been raised to date.	The scope of visual receptors is agreed.	Agreed
04-05	Scope of representative viewpoints	<p>West Lindsey District Council would request that a representative viewpoint is included from the layby on the A1133 (53°14'36.0"N 0°45'37.5"W) (What3Words Monkeys.stunner.newlywed). We agree this will be supplementary to the existing assessment.</p> <p>WLDC welcome the production of a verified view which was tabled at a meeting regarding this SoCG.</p> <p>WLDC consider that this verified view should be submitted into examination as it provides a helpful context to understanding the potential visual impacts associated with each of the two substation options the applicant has identified. In particular the verified view demonstrates the horizon line</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a baseline photograph from the suggested location at Deadline 5.</p> <p>This was agreed to be supplementary to the existing assessment of motorists along the A1133, rather than requiring further assessment.</p> <p>The locations and number of viewpoints was agreed during the pre-application process. Subsequently an additional viewpoint photograph was requested from the A1133 which has now been provided.</p> <p>No response for an additional photomontage was received from WLDC until 01/12/2025. The photomontage showing the proposed development from viewpoint 4 [REP2-031] was prepared to show views from</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>below which the proposed substation would be less visible from the A1133.</p> <p>We note however that this verified view does not provide a visualisation of the proposed development which would assist the Examining Authority in understanding the proposals in context.</p> <p><a href="#"><u>WLDC only received the viewpoint photograph, which we consider is helpful in assisting the Examining Authority, on 27 November 2025, and we have submitted it into examination as part of our Closing Position Statement at deadline 7. However it is only upon reviewing this viewpoint photograph that it has become apparent that it would be further beneficial to the Examining Authority to provide a photomontage from this view.</u></a></p>	<p>the A1133 and therefore representative of people driving along this route.</p>	
04-06	Scope of photomontages	<p>West Lindsey District Council suggested an additional Type 4 photomontage from Viewpoint 8 along the A57 following review of the PEIR.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns on the scope of representative viewpoints have been raised to date.</p>	<p>Further discussion was had between the applicant and the District Councils during the preparation of the LVIA ES Chapter regarding the scope of photomontages resulting in agreement that any justification for the photomontage scope should be included within the LVIA.</p>	<b>Agreed</b>

			The photomontage scope is agreed.	
04-07	Assessment assumptions and limitations	No comments or concerns on the assumptions and limitations have been raised to date.	Noted	<b>Agreed</b>
04-08	Level of effect on landscape receptors	Subsequent meetings with the Applicant have clarified impact on landscape receptors and this is now agreed.	The level of effect on landscape receptors is agreed.	<b>Agreed</b>
04-09	Level of effect on visual receptors	West Lindsey District Council has raised concerns within the Local Impact Report about the visual impacts on users of the A1133, particularly with regard to the nearby substation. It was questioned whether this could be located on lower-lying land and during follow-up discussion, it was questioned whether the Work Area 2 and 3 could be refined to provide clarity on where the taller elements would be located.	This comment on level of effect on visual effects has been discussed in greater detail within Table entry 07-01 of this Statement of Common Ground.  Overall, it can be confirmed that the level of effect on visual receptors is agreed.	<b>Not Agreed</b>

	<p>Discussions are progressing to agree more specific siting parameters for the substation.</p> <p>WLDC are still concerned about the visual impact from the A1133, hence the request for the supplementary drawing as set out at item 04-05 above.</p> <p>We agree that there will be a high magnitude of change, and that the nature of the effect will be moderate and therefore significant.</p> <p>However the extent of the change being assessed needs to factor in the proposed substation location and fence screening.</p> <p>The level of harm within the assessed level of moderate will depend on the location of the substation within the Work 3 area.</p> <p>It remains WLDC view that locating the substation at the eastern end of the Work 3 area, as set out in our submission [REP4-061] will mitigate further effects of substation on visual receptors.</p>		
--	--	--	--

04-10	Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP)	<p>No comments or concerns on the oLEMP have been raised to date other than queries around the glint and glare mitigation proposed by the Applicant and the retention of vegetation at Gate G.</p> <p>WLDC await clarity on the proposed fencing mitigation which we understand will be submitted at deadline 4.</p> <p>WLDC request the glint and glare mitigation fencing is added to the mitigation plan in Appendix A of the OLEMP.</p>	<p>Discussions remain on-going regarding the glint and glare mitigation.</p> <p>The applicant provided clarification in its response to the related action point from ISH2 [REP3-065].</p> <p>The Applicant has agreed in the updated oLEMP at Deadline 5 to secure the retention of the hedgerow north of Gate G in the oLEMP. The following text is has been included in the updated oLEMP at Deadline 5 [REP5-038]-</p> <p><i>“Regarding the hedgerow extending east to west along the northern side of the existing access track located north of the Anglian Water reservoir, west of A1133, the existing hedgerow will be retained. Minor removal will be undertaken as shown on the vegetation removal plan to facilitate the widening of the bell-mouth junction with the A1133, but no wider removal of the hedge is proposed”.</i></p>	<b>Agreed</b>
-------	---	---	--	---------------

04-11	Vegetation Removal – Gate G	<p>Query around the potential conflicts between the commitments in the oLEMP and what was shown on the vegetation removal plan with regard to access gate G.</p> <p>WLDC await clarity on the interaction between vegetation retention and the use of the existing access north of the reservoir running westwards from Gate G.</p> <p>WLDC has a concern with the landscape effects rather than the transport effects.</p>	<p>The Applicant has agreed in the updated oLEMP at Deadline 5 to secure the retention of the hedgerow north of Gate G in the oLEMP. The following text is has been included in the updated oLEMP at Deadline 5 [REP5-038]-</p> <p><i>“Regarding the hedgerow extending east to west along the northern side of the existing access track located north of the Anglian Water reservoir, west of A1133, the existing hedgerow will be retained. Minor removal will be undertaken as shown on the vegetation removal plan to facilitate the widening of the bell-mouth junction with the A1133, but no wider removal of the hedge is proposed”.</i></p>	Agreed
04-12	Glint and Glare mitigation fencing – Viewpoint 4	<p>West Lindsey District Council questioned the close board fencing shown in Viewpoint 4. Further clarity was requested around the purpose of this fencing, its extent, and anticipated duration before the adjacent vegetation would be established such that the requirement for the fencing would be no longer required.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided clarification in its response to the related action point from ISH2 [REP3-065].</p> <p>The plan in Appendix A of the oLEMP shows extent of existing and proposed habitats, rather than fencing. The extent of mitigation fencing has been reduced to 240m along the A1133, as secured in the oLEMP [REP5-038].</p>	Not Agreed

		WLDC request the glint and glare mitigation fencing is added to the mitigation plan in Appendix A of the OLEMP.	Which references the glint and glare assessment which shows the location of these fences.	
--	--	---	---	--

Table 05 – Agricultural Land

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
05-01	Loss of BMV – Food Security	<p>The applicant's reliance on the loss of BMV land being 'temporary' is, in WLDCs view, flawed given the 60-year lifespan that the OESF seeks development consent for. This is a significant period of time, akin to permanent development, where land would not be available across the whole Scheme for the production of food. The total land and over 660ha of BMV land will be lost to the agricultural sector for the production of food for several generations. This is an impact that is significant and adverse.</p>	<p>The utilised agricultural area (UAA) is 16.8 million hectares in 2024 (Defra 2024), therefore the total agricultural land take from the Proposed Development accounts for less than 0.01% of the UAA. Therefore, the Proposed Development will not have a significant effect on National Food Production.</p> <p>In terms of the temporary nature of the Proposed Development, the Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects including consents granted for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass solar farms, which have all been granted 60-year consents. It's important to be clear that EN-3 para 2.10.65 states that "An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time periods of operation" and does not impose or suggest a 40-year limit is required.</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>In recent decisions the Secretary of State has confirmed that the 60- year consent lifespan is 'temporary and reversible for the majority of the land' (paragraph 4.167 of the Gate Burton decision) and it is the case for this Proposed Development as noted in paragraph 3.6.2 of the Planning Statement [ref. APP-168] that at the time of decommissioning the land will be reverted back to its original condition.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the decommissioning of the Proposed Development demonstrating that the Project is temporary with an end date of 60 years from first operation.</p>	
--	--	--	--

05-02	Loss of BMV	<p>WLDC disagrees with the justifications provided by the applicant. A significant amount of BMV land is purposed to be lost without sufficient justification as to way the design approach has not avoided its use as part of the scheme. To locate infrastructure such as the BESS on BMV land has not been adequately justified, especially where there are lower grades of land nearby that could accommodate these Scheme components.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.3.4 of REP4-050 states that BMV use in Lincolnshire across the cumulative projects is 6.54% or 6915.77ha. The same paragraph also states that "A change in land use in the range 0.05% to 5.0% is considered to be 'normal'", although this assertion is unsourced.</p> <p>However, if a change in land use of up to 5.0% is "normal" then the cumulative at county level of 6.54% is above the "normal" range, or 'abnormal'.</p> <p>It should also be noted that while the other NSIPs in Lincolnshire would result in a BMV loss of 257.64ha, One Earth Solar Farm on its own would result in a loss of BMV of 128ha BMV, which is half as much again as the NSIPs in Lincolnshire.</p>	<p>The Applicant has taken steps to avoid and minimise use of BMV land, however, there does still remain BMV land within the Site. The Applicant has set out its justification for this in the application documents. It is explained within Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-033] that other potential Order Limit locations were not of significantly better BMV profile in comparison to the Order Limits, resulting from detailed ALC survey. As the Order Limits have evolved, some land parcels of ALC Grade 2 have been removed in seeking to avoid and minimise impacts to BMV land.</p> <p>As noted within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [REP3-065], the Applicant set out the Breakdown of Agricultural Loss at a District Level in terms of both the Proposed Development and other NSIP applications in the area.</p>	<p><b>Under discussion</b> <b>Not Agreed</b></p>
-------	-------------	--	--	--

Table 06 – Principle of Development / Site Selection

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
06-01	Lifetime of the Proposed Development	<p>WLDC notes that the applicant considers the Scheme to constitute a 'temporary' development and have treated it as such in their EIA. This has resulted in the assessed impact being derived on the basis that the impacts will be 'temporary'.</p> <p>WLDC consider a 60-year timescale to have the effect of permanent impacts. Whilst the infrastructure can be removed at the end of the consent lifespan, this period is significant and will be experienced over several generations.</p> <p>To reduce or downgrade impacts on the basis that 60 years is 'temporary' is considered to be an unrealistic approach. All assessments should have been carried out on the basis that the impacts would be permanent to reflect the time period over which they would be experienced. This would potentially be beyond the year 2090 based on the lifespan of development consents being granted.</p>	<p>The Applicant is seeking a 60-year consent, which is consistent with other similarly sized solar projects including consents granted for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass solar farms, which have all been granted 60-year consents. It's important to be clear that EN-3 para 2.10.65 states that "An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time periods of operation" and does not impose or suggest a 40-year limit is required.</p> <p>In recent decisions the Secretary of State has confirmed that the 60- year consent lifespan is 'temporary and reversible for the majority of the land' (paragraph 4.167 of the Gate Burton decision) and it is the case for this Proposed Development as noted in paragraph 3.6.2 of the Planning Statement [ref. APP-168] that at the time of decommissioning the land will be reverted back to its original condition.</p>	Not Agreed

			<p>The Applicant has assessed the decommissioning of the Proposed Development demonstrating that the Project is temporary with an end date of 60 years from first operation.</p>	
06-02	Sequential Test / Site Selection search radius	<p>The applicant has undertaken a search within a 10km radius of High Marnham, which according to paragraph 10.1.15 of the Planning Statement [APP-168]. However, this is not justified beyond “the desire to be as close to the point of connection as possible”. It is not clear why other radii, such as 12km or 15km did not also fulfil that requirement, nor whether such a search would have identified sites outwith Flood Zone 3. It is also the case that, given the compulsory purchase powers available with a DCO, WLDC do not consider that the sequential test needs to be restricted by sites which are “reasonable available”.</p> <p>WLDC do not consider that the applicant has demonstrated adequately that it has met the requirements of the sequential test. This view has been underlined by the update to Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk and Coastal Change paragraph 27a. In particular the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that an adequate review of whether the scheme can</p>	<p>The Applicant prepared further evidence to demonstrate how the Sequential Test was applied and satisfied as part of the Deadline 2 Submissions [REP2-080]. The Assessment also provides further evidence to justify the 10km search area, and a sensitivity test has also been undertaken to extend this search area to 15km to address comments raised during ISH1.</p> <p>Following discussions within the Issue Specific Hearing 2, the Applicant further developed their Sequential Test through an addendum which was submitted at deadline 3 [REP3-069].</p> <p>The Applicant has developed the Sequential Test following the requests from the ExA.</p> <p><i>WLDC and the Applicant continue discussions on this point, and will finalise stances following the Applicants Deadline 6 submissions.</i></p>	<p><b>Under discussion Not Agreed</b></p>

	<p>be split across a number of alternative sites, as was the case with the Cottam NSIP scheme.</p> <p>As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance on flood risk and coastal change, the aim of the sequential test “is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk” (Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 7-023-20220825).</p> <p>The applicant says 46% of site is FZ1, therefore “reasonably available” alternatives are only required for the remaining 54% of the site.</p> <p>In the Sequential Test Addendum [REP3-069] AP16 has been identified as “predominantly within Flood Zones 2 and 3” (paragraph 4.2.4) whereas the plans in Appendix B would appear to indicate only around half of the site area is in such zones. Likewise in Appendix A, site Alternative AP17 is identified as being “wholly within Flood Zones 1”, when the accompanying mapping would appear to indicate the site is partially within flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>We note that at ISH3 the Examining Authority asked the Applicant to provide further information about AP16. However, WLDC still consider that for the sake of clarity the Applicant should provide a table setting out, for each of the AP sites considered, the area (in hectares)</p>	<p><u>At ExAWQ2 Q12.0.9 the Applicant offered a table of ALC for each of the AP sites, following a request from WLDC. This has been provided below, and as stated in ExAWQ2 Q12.0.9, the Applicant confirms that all of the sites (with the exception of AP14) are located predominantly within Grade 3 ALC so are comparable to the Order Limits, and the grade of ALC has not been used to discount these sites, so whilst a table has been provided above, it does not feel relevant to the discussions being had with WLDC on the sequential test approach. The Applicant confirms that AP14 is located predominately within Grade 2 land, which has been taken into consideration when assessing this site for suitability for solar development.</u></p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th><u>Site Reference</u></th><th><u>Approx. Site Size</u></th><th><u>ALC Grades / %</u></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td><u>AP1</u></td><td><u>985ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 98.18%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 1.82%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP2</u></td><td><u>985ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP3</u></td><td><u>985ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 91.35%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 8.65%</u></td></tr></tbody></table>	<u>Site Reference</u>	<u>Approx. Site Size</u>	<u>ALC Grades / %</u>	<u>AP1</u>	<u>985ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 98.18%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 1.82%</u>	<u>AP2</u>	<u>985ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>	<u>AP3</u>	<u>985ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 91.35%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 8.65%</u>	
<u>Site Reference</u>	<u>Approx. Site Size</u>	<u>ALC Grades / %</u>													
<u>AP1</u>	<u>985ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 98.18%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 1.82%</u>													
<u>AP2</u>	<u>985ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>													
<u>AP3</u>	<u>985ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 91.35%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 8.65%</u>													

	<p>located within each of flood zones 1, 2 and 3. This would then allow the decision maker to see a fair comparison as to the extent of land at a lower risk of flooding within the other sites considered.</p> <p><u>WLDC appreciates the provision of further information on agricultural land classification for the alternative sites considered. WLDC has considered this further in the closing position statement submitted at deadline 7.</u></p> <p><u>WLDC note that 19.7% of the One Earth Solar Farm, or 277.6ha is located within Grade 2 agricultural land. WLDC's view is that this area of OESF within the Grade 2 agricultural land could be eliminated and replaced with the area of another AP within that is in lower grade land. For example, the assessment for AP1 in [REP2-080] is that "The Site is situated entirely within Grade 3 and Grade 4 land".</u></p> <p><u>The assessment in [REP2-080] also states "When compared against the current site location for the One Earth Solar Farm, which is Grade 3, AP3 [sic – WLDC assume this should be a reference to AP1] is of a similar grade from a review of publicly available information."</u></p> <p><u>However, the applicant's figures indicate that less than 2% of AP1 is in Grade 2 agricultural</u></p>	<p><u>AP4</u></p> <p><u>AP5</u></p> <p><u>AP6</u></p> <p><u>AP7</u></p> <p><u>AP8</u></p> <p><u>AP9</u></p> <p><u>AP10</u></p> <p><u>AP11</u></p> <p><u>AP12</u></p> <p><u>AP13</u></p> <p><u>AP14</u></p>	<p><u>985ha</u></p> <p><u>985ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>490ha</u></p> <p><u>250ha</u></p>	<p><u>Grade 3 – 83.64%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 4 – 16.36%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 2 – 19.18%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 80.82%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 95%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 4 – 5%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 95.28%</u></p> <p><u>Non-Agri – 4.71%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 84.62%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 4 – 15.38%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></p> <p><u>Grade 2 – 72.6%</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

		<p><u>land whereas nearly 20% of the OESF site is within Grade 2 land.</u></p> <p><u>It should be noted that, in the WLDC area, the OESF Order limits either encompass BMV or Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 land. There is very little, if any, land which isn't in either of these categories</u></p>		<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 27.4%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP15</u></td><td><u>250ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP16</u></td><td><u>250ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP17</u></td><td><u>250ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 2 – 27.72%</u> <u>Grade 3 – 65.32%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 6.96%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP18</u></td><td><u>250ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 100%</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>AP19</u></td><td><u>250ha</u></td><td><u>Grade 3 – 97.2%</u> <u>Non-Agri – 2.8%</u></td></tr></table>			<u>Grade 3 – 27.4%</u>	<u>AP15</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>	<u>AP16</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>	<u>AP17</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 2 – 27.72%</u> <u>Grade 3 – 65.32%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 6.96%</u>	<u>AP18</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>	<u>AP19</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 97.2%</u> <u>Non-Agri – 2.8%</u>	
		<u>Grade 3 – 27.4%</u>																					
<u>AP15</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>																					
<u>AP16</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>																					
<u>AP17</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 2 – 27.72%</u> <u>Grade 3 – 65.32%</u> <u>Grade 4 – 6.96%</u>																					
<u>AP18</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 100%</u>																					
<u>AP19</u>	<u>250ha</u>	<u>Grade 3 – 97.2%</u> <u>Non-Agri – 2.8%</u>																					

06-03	BESS Capacity	WLDC queries the total capacity of BESS as part of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant confirms that, at this stage of the application, the Western Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) is proposed to provide a capacity of 500 MW with a discharge duration of four hours, while the Eastern BESS is proposed to provide a capacity of 370 MW with a discharge duration of four hours. In the event that both BESS schemes are progressed to the detailed design and implementation stage, each installation would be configured to provide a capacity of 370 MW with a four-hour discharge duration.	<b>Agreed</b>
-------	---------------	--	---	---------------

Table 07 – Design

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
07-01	Design Approach	<p>Whilst recognising the general locations and site characteristics favoured by solar farm development, WLDCs view is that policy requires applicants to minimise impacts as far as possible. The design approach adopted by the OESF project has, however, resulted in solar panels being sited up to field boundaries in highly visible locations. Additionally, associated development such as the BESS and substation, up to 13.5m high, according to the height parameter plans [APP-016], has also been located in a location is highly visible with open views into the site from area within West Lindsey and adjacent to the south from within Newark and Sherwood District Council administrative area.</p> <p>The location of panels, BESS and substation in the large open field to the east of the A1133 represents a highly visible and conspicuous part of the OESF project and WLDC does not understand from the application how, integrating policy requirements on 'good design' has resulted in a methodology that has resulted in this area being selected as the optimal location</p>	<p>The Applicant has been shown draft supplementary drawings to WLDC to support the reason for the proposed location of the substation. The Applicant is continuing to hold flexibility in the location of the substation within the parameter, but WLDC will continue to have an influence on the detailed design under Requirement 5 of the DCO.</p> <p>WLDC requested that a plan is created and provided to include neighbouring applications for Anglian Water to demonstrate the relationship between the proposed substation. The Applicant has now produced this plan and it has been submitted at Deadline 5 following ISH3 <a href="#">[REP5-071]</a>.</p>	Not Agreed

		for this type of development. The applicant has shown WLDC draft drawings showing indicative locations for the eastern substation. WLDC wish to see tighter parameters drafted in respect of the location of the eastern substation, narrowing its potential location, for visual impact reasons, to the eastern half of the area identified for Work number 3 on works plans sheets 14 and 15 (revision 2) [REP2-007].		
--	--	---	--	--

Table 089 – Cumulatives

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
089-01	Cumulative Assessment in regards to landscape and visual	<p>WLDC notes that Landscape and Visual assessment in the ES does not carry out a cumulative assessment against the projects including Gate Burton, Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge Solar.</p> <p>This is due to a 2km study area buffer being applied, which excludes the other projects. Whilst this approach may reflect typical methodology, it results in there being no assessment of the total impact of all of the projects on the landscape character of West Lindsey and the significant magnitude of change that its character will endure as a consequence of solar farm development cumulatively.</p>	<p>As explained during Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) and detailed within the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the ISH1 [REP1-077], the Applicant's approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects is consistent with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance on cumulative effects.</p> <p>With regard to cumulative impacts with other NSIP solar projects, the Applicant also explained that this has been considered within the DCO examinations for Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Tillbridge, which all found there to be no potential for significant cumulative effects with One Earth Solar Farm.</p> <p>Further information on this can be found within the Joint Interrelationship Report [REP2-074].</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>WLDC expressed the view that the cumulative assessment set out in the Inter-project Effects with other NSIP and Major Development Schemes (Rev 1) report [REP4-050] doesn't address sequential views for motorists on the A1133 and the A156. A motorist or passenger may not dwell long on a particular element as it passes, but on most routes to and from the main towns in the district, such as Gainsborough, much of a journey will be made up in passing NSIP solar schemes. These will be there for decades to come.</p>		
089 -02	Cumulative Assessment in regards to Traffic	<p>The OESF Transport Assessment states that the Cottam Solar project has not been included in the cumulative assessment as it would not coincide with the OESF construction period. It also omits the Tillbridge Solar Project from the assessment for the same reasons.</p>	<p>Cumulative traffic matters have been considered and the assessment is based upon the published dates of construction, as per standard transport planning guidance. As such, no further assessment is considered reasonable or necessary.</p> <p>The approach adopted in the assessment of cumulative traffic is standard and compliant.</p>	<b>Not Agreed</b>

	<p>WLDC contends that this is an incorrect assumption to make as the Cottam project has a 5-year consent lifespan, which has yet to commence development (or submit details to discharge DCO 'requirements'). There is therefore a strong likelihood that construction activity and associated travel movement could occur at the same time using the same roads for five solar NSIP projects concurrently.</p> <p>WLDC considers that, as all the traffic data for each project is in the public domain, the OESF should assess the likely cumulative construction traffic impacts.</p> <p>It is also noted by WLDC that the OESF project has not engaged collaboratively with other cumulative projects with regard to traffic management. The other solar NSIP project of Gate Burton, Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge have all worked together to produce a 'Joint Report on Interrelationships', which brings together the key cumulative impacts of the projects and identifies areas where impacts could be minimised/mitigated. This report was produced and submitted as part of the respective applications and was updated as required during examination phases.</p>	<p>A Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] was submitted at Deadline 1 which considers the cumulative effects of the nearest NSIP solar schemes located within 16km of the Proposed Development. In addition, an update to the Transport Assessment [REP1-045] was submitted at Deadline 1 incorporating committed developments. The findings from both these assessments confirm there are no inter-project cumulative significant effects on any environmental aspect.</p> <p>The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP5-040] and the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP5-032] sets out details on how the Applicant will work with other projects to reduce potential cumulative impacts.</p>	
--	---	---	--

		WLDC notes that when considering the worst case construction timelines as set out in Figure 3 in REP4-050, it would appear from a review of the other solar NSIP project transport assessments and chapters that they will all be using parts of the A57 and undertaking works on other roads in the area, potentially at the same or similar, consecutive, times, prolonging effects on travellers.		
--	--	--	--	--

089-03	Schemes in the district	<p>WLDC notes that the applicant has provided a drawing that identified the approximate location of other projects through numbered circles (Figure 18.9 / Drawing Number EN10159/APP/6.20/18.9). Whilst serving as a useful reference, WLDC wishes to see a drawing that shows the true extent of solar farm area coverage in the District and surrounds, including solar NSIPs and any large scale (49.9MW) schemes consented or proposed to be consented under the Town and Country Planning Act. Were such a drawing produced with, for example, the Order Limits/red-line boundaries of other projects shown, the extend of land lost to solar farm development and the proximity to each other would be revealed. WLDC considers that this exercise is required in order for the cumulative impacts of the OESF project to be properly considered. WLDC request that proposed large vehicle and AIL routes are included in this drawing or set of drawings, along with context background mapping showing flood risk zones and agricultural land classification.</p>	<p>The Applicant submitted a Joint Interrelationship Report [REP1-074] at Deadline 1 demonstrating this interrelationship of cumulative schemes in the area. From this report, it is clear in figure 2 that there are no other NSIP schemes that cross into the One Earth Solar Farm Order Limits other than the North Humber to High Marnham application.</p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant demonstrates that there is no relationship between the One Earth Solar Farm and other large-scale applications within the district.</p>	Agreed
--------	-------------------------	--	--	--------

089-04	Accommodation impacts	<p>If the cumulative impacts result in much of the accommodation available within West Lindsey being used to accommodate construction workers, WLDC has concerns that this would have an adverse impact upon the tourism sector. Should there be a significant reduction in the availability of accommodation for tourists, it can be assumed that visitors will look elsewhere beyond the District. Due to the potential lengthy cumulative construction period of a number of years, the ability for tourist accommodation businesses to recover once construction is complete is unknown and it is feared it would take significant time to do so. The tourist industry is already seeking to re-establish growth post-COVID, and eliminating accommodation for visitors could prolong this recovery.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 17 – Socio-Economics [APP-046], includes data on existing labour supply, to provide some further context on the likelihood of construction workers being required from further afield and hence increasing demand for accommodation.</p> <p>Whilst the new construction jobs will likely be required at a range of skills levels (including some specialist skills), the data suggests- in quantitative terms – a relatively large pool of potential workers are local.</p>	Not Agreed
089-05	Shortlist Approach	<p>Comment taken from the Issue Specific Hearing 2 around the approach taken to creating the shortlist associated with the Cumulative Assessment for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>WLDC in agreement with the cumulative longlist and open to continuing to engage with the Applicant around the further cumulative assessment.</p>	<p>The Applicant produced a technical note at Deadline 4 [REP4-050] setting out the approach that has been taken to assessing the cumulative applications to create the short-list taken forward within the Environmental Statement for the Proposed Development.</p>	Agreed

Table [10-09](#) – Traffic and Transport

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
<a href="#">1009-01</a>	Construction Routes	<p>The OESF assesses and proposes two construction traffic route options. As both options have been demonstrated to be viable by the applicant, WLDC considers that there is no compelling reason to propose both routes, and that the 'Proposed Access Route 2', using the M18 to access the site from the west, should be the only option used. This would avoid potential significant cumulative construction traffic impacts along the A15, the A46 Lincoln bypass and the A57 from Lincoln to the site.</p> <p>The avoidance of 'Proposed Access Route 1' would minimise the impacts upon communities in terms of disruption, noise and air quality impacts, and additional traffic management that could extend for a period of 5-10 years should all five NSIP projects overlap/stagger their construction phases.</p>	<p>The construction access routes are described in the Transport Assessment [REP5-030]. This indicates access primarily from the south and east, with no access proposed from the A15.</p> <p>Cumulative traffic matters have been considered and the assessment is based upon the published dates of construction, as per standard transport planning guidance. As such, no further assessment is considered reasonable or necessary.</p> <p>The approach adopted in the assessment of cumulative traffic is standard and compliant.</p>	Agreed

1009-02	Construction Access – road safety	<p>Queries raised as to why the Scheme appears to propose on the Indicative Layout (EN010159/APP/2.9 rev 1) two construction access points in close proximity to each other from the A1133 into the eastern part of the site. There does not appear to be a compelling reason to remove hedgerows forming the field boundary to create this access. The use of a single access would minimise the environmental harm caused and WLDC would welcome such an amendment to the OESF project. The Transport Assessment (Appendix 12.2 EN010159-000179-6.21) identifies the northernmost access as “Gate F”, but the access immediately adjacent the Anglian Water Works is not shown. WLDC considers this needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>The southern access junction is for emergency access and would not be used for construction access. Further details of this access are provided in Transport Assessment [REP5-030].</p>	Agreed
1009-03	Construction Access – impacts on hedgerows	<p>The Gate G access is directly opposite the existing access for the Anglian Water Hall Water Treatment Works. Given a maximum 6 metre width without removing the field boundary hedgerow there does not appear to be enough width for two large goods vehicles to pass each other on the access road. This has the potential, if a large goods vehicle is leaving the site, for the need to an incoming vehicle to need to wait on the carriageway of the single carriageway A class road with a 60 miles per hour national speed limit for the vehicle to exit.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by West Lindsey District Council. The Applicant can confirm that existing hedgerow north of the access track at Gate G will be retained. Minor removal will be undertaken as shown on the vegetation removal plan [REP4-024] to facilitate the widening of the bell-mouth junction with the A1133. This is secured within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-038].</p>	Agreed

Table [11-10](#) – Community Benefits

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
<a href="#">1110-</a> 01	Lack of information around community benefits	<p>WLDC is concerned that there appears to be scant information on the developer website or within their documents which allude to any direct community benefits. In this context WLDC wishes to ensure that a community benefit fund is established for the OESF, and that the fund is distributed proportionally between the relevant communities, with particular regard to the cumulative effects of the OESF and other solar NSIP projects in the WLDC area.</p> <p>WLDC welcome the commitment to the One Earth Community Fund but wishes to see more detail of the extent of the fund and its proposed distribution. While this matter may not be a planning consideration in determining the NSIP, this proposal will have a lasting impact across communities for many decades and WLDC are concerned about the lack of detail to date.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to a community benefit fund to support local priorities and initiatives, and continues to consult on the best structure and approach to this fund with the community and other stakeholders if the project is consented.</p> <p>It is an established legal principle that a community benefit fund must not be a material consideration in the planning balance. The case law spans decades and was most recently confirmed by the UK Supreme Court in <i>R (Wright) v Resilient Energy Severndale Ltd &amp; Forest of Dean DC [2019] UKSC 53</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant is therefore not permitted to rely on community benefit fund provision within its planning application, and the Examining Authority and Secretary of State are not permitted to place any</p>	<b>Not Agreed</b>

		<p>reliance on the provision of a fund in their recommendation or decision.</p> <p>Voluntary funds do operate, and the Government has recently consulted on consolidating and making consistent the operation of these funds across renewable energy schemes. The Government is not proposing to change the law regarding the interaction of community benefit funds and the planning system, meaning the legal prohibition on considering these funds within the planning process will remain.</p> <p>The Applicant has already established the One Earth Community Fund but does not seek to rely upon it in its DCO application.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Table 12-11 – DCO Requirements

Ref.	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
1211-01	Discharge of Requirements	<p>The Local Planning Authority request that in the event of a DCO consent, a period of at least 13 weeks is given to consider all applications to discharge conditions.</p> <p>At paragraph 4.110 of his decision letter on the Cottam Solar Project, the Secretary of State concluded, after careful consideration, that a discharge period of 13 weeks would be most appropriate to account for the number of applications coming forward in Lincolnshire, whilst seeking to avoid delays to the progress of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>WLDC wish to see the same 13 week period applied for the One Earth Solar Farm project.</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciates the points raised by the Council and at Deadline 2 has extended the time from ten to twelve weeks. The Applicant does not agree that the time allowed should be any longer than this, for the reasons previously set out in support of the ten week period. The Applicant has also made consequential amendments to the time periods in Article 45 and Requirement 20 (Decommissioning and restoration).</p>	Not Agreed

<u>4211</u> -02	Requirement Fees	WLDC welcome the commitment in Schedule 15 to pay a fee of £2,578 for the first application for the discharge of each of the requirements in Schedule 2.	At Deadline 5, the Applicant agreed to increase the fee associated with all requirements (1 to 22) to 2,578 for the first application for the discharge.  The Applicant notes WLDC's agreement with this.	Agreed
-----------------	------------------	--	---	--------

## Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of West Lindsey District Council

Name: Russell Clarkson BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI



Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 19/12/2025



On behalf of the Applicant

Name: Daniel Boyd



Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 22/12/2025



**one earth**

solar farm