

From: [REDACTED]
To: [One Earth Solar](#)
Subject: Comments on Deadline 7 submissions
Date: 29 December 2025 20:28:09

To The Examination Authority

From Heather Fox IP [REDACTED] Deadline 8

Dear Sirs

Please accept this deadline 8 submission.

Comments on Deadline 7 submissions

Comments on Applicants Response to Deadline 6 Submissions APP/9.46

1.2 In reply to the applicant's response to the joint treatment of Mr Fox and Mrs Fox I would like to respond with the grievance of being treated as an adjunct to Mr Fox. I have not submitted jointly with Mr Fox and my approach to this examination has differed from Mr Fox. As an organisation with access to resources like HR I would have expected a different attitude from the applicant. As an IP living with flood risk all I have endeavoured to do is secure a "no increase in flood risk elsewhere" result for the local communities. As the statutory bodies involved in making the current flood risk assessments did not know where the flood water in the 2000 and 2024 flood events extended to, I think it reasonable to continue to question how they come to their conclusions and judgement, given this unprecedented situation and the existing vulnerability of the Trent valley.

I have not asserted that I am competent to determine the adequacy of flood risk, but I have continued to question the reasoning, and why was it only latterly (November 12th 2025) decided to have either side of the Trent treated independently when the combined increase in flood depth went over the 5mm tolerance. I had no answer as to why the initial lost volume assessment was a mere 618cubic metres compared to the 14,149 cubic metres volume for the same panel supports. That initial assessment left IPs thinking lost storage volume was not relevant. Then it surprisingly escalated with no comment from the applicant or the EA. It is a significant discrepancy never explained. I have a copy of the first Logika flood risk Flood Water Displacement Table 3-2 page 26 showing the 618cubic mtrs.

In the current Logika document page 33, the total flood volume lost is in excess of 18,000cubic mtrs, still with the remark that the "change in flood level would actually spread further than the Order limits and would be less as a result"! This remark continues to surprise and alarm, given the "no increase elsewhere" policy.

1.2.3" Even when the responses do not accord with the IPs preferred outcome". That is not the reason I continue to question. I am trying to ensure that the communities stay dry and if I think, as a person who has lived next to the Trent, that modelling in an office does not equate with lived experiences, I am at liberty to say so. There has never been any assurance from the applicant that their interest extends beyond keeping the infrastructure dry. Where has the applicant attempted to fulfil either EN-1 5.8.7 or EN-1 5.8.11 policy requirement of "and where possible, by reducing flood risk overall" for the community they seek to engulf, other than stating solar energy will help with climate change. The EAs attempts to enlist help with flood defence upkeep in the PEIR received negative response, and now surveys of the defences will

only be undertaken “if deemed necessary”.

This leaves me with doubt about calculation certainty and how this could change again so I have no option but to ask repeatedly if I do not get an answer at all, or an answer that I feel is not comprehensive. The applicant chose not to respond directly to my D6 submission so in anticipation that it will be the same for D7 I feel I have recourse to the ExA response to a question I asked at ISH2, EV6-011.

At 01.01.29 I asked about asking a question but not having a relevant answer and when the facility to have a question answered adequately would not be available. The following is the ExA reply at 01.02.15.

“Ultimately when we get to the end of the examination period there will be a cut off for comments that you can make and the applicant gets the final right of reply at the following deadline which will be just before the closure of the examination. I think if at the point you have your final submission to make you have questions that remain outstanding or you are not content with the answers given, if you can set out clearly the issues as you see it that remain outstanding that will help us in looking through the various documents to see what progress has been made in response to those but also hopefully it will help the applicant in setting out their final response . This obviously will help us in preparing the recommendation to the S o S to understand with clarity the differences on what matters remain outstanding between parties”.

The ExA will be aware of how often I have had to re submit questions. Following are just a couple of examples, in addition to the no reply about the volume assessment discrepancy above, that leave me with no confidence that the reality and unpredictability of a flood event have been taken on board. I would appreciate an answer.

The applicant has never responded to my question of how they intended to keep any increase in flood depth on site, despite my asking at D4, and at ISH3 when the applicant said they would respond in writing but did not. The applicant had stated at point 16.6.30 Chapter 16 Human Health APP/6.16.1 Health, that the ES Vol 2 Chapter 7 Hydrology and Hydrogeology APP/6.7 “considers flood risk and ensures there will be no increase off site”. The applicant’s answer was the development “will remain safe for its lifetime, and as such this part of the exception test is passed”.

The applicant has maintained on more than one occasion that “the area of design flood extent within the order limits has been used to determine the potential change in flood level. The reality is that that the change in flood level would actually spread further than the Order Limits and would be less as a result”, Vol 6 ES APP/[6.21.2](#). How does this not constitute an “increase in flood risk elsewhere”? There has been no strategy to keep the acknowledged increases on site.

I am perplexed as to how a commitment to undertake surveys of the flood defences has now become “if deemed necessary” and the previous depth increase levels have been dropped, stipulating only < 5mms. This leads to mistrust, as has not answered questions. I also continue to question the EA agreeing early in the application a “model tolerance” of 5mms and a freeboard of 300mms when the placement of such large numbers of inverters with “last resort voids” in flood zone 3 was not apparent. In short, I have questioned most of the flood risk strategy, when adherence to policy alone should have avoided using so much mitigation. Now even the proposed “removal” of panels has been manipulated.

Ultimately, I cannot accept that introducing such a large volume of solid structures onto a floodplain, will not affect the flood water levels or behaviour, especially as hydrologically connected compensation areas have not been included, and the full

amount of lost storage space has not been accounted for. The laws of physics which I have previously listed simply do not accord with the notion of no effect. I have yet to see if the applicant or the EA can shed light on the scientific derivation of EN –3 para 2.10.84 “that since solar panels drain to existing ground, the impact of flooding will not, in general, be significant”. It cannot be blindly accepted in the face of more recent scientific results.

D6R13/14 South Clifton parish Council remark on the absence of a catchment wide cumulative assessment risk given the number of other consented proposals. The EA reasoning for not undertaking one appears to be more of a concern about how technically challenging and time consuming it would be and introducing new uncertainties, rather than what it may reveal. In these circumstances of climate change and scale of consented proposals was there ever more justification for undertaking one than now?

D6R29 NSDC. BESS unplanned emissions. The reason impacts on poultry and reservoirs should be considered sensitive receptors is because reservoir and poultry sensitivity would affect human health, which is covered by policy and guidance. To list everything that would affect human health and safety would be an exhaustive list.

Comments on the SoCG EA APP/8.11 .5

02-02 Development layout. Applicant to set out the development such that sensitive equipment is located outside the design flood extent. Response.” A sequential approach to the development layout has been taken with sensitive infrastructure (BESS and Sub stations located outside of the design flood extent”. When did Inverters become not sensitive infrastructure and why is the EA so accepting that they are not treated as such?

02-13 Cumulative effects. Response. “No cumulative flood risk effects are anticipated” Assumptions are not acceptable in these circumstances.

Comments on Logika Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy APP/6.21.5

Point 3.3 of the Aegaea report “a better representation of fine scale floodplain features such as photovoltaic supports could be achieved through a reduced grid cell size. However, given the size of the existing Tidal Trent model and the need to balance computational efficiency with accuracy, in combination with the aim of the hydraulic modelling study for comparison purposes only, the relatively coarse grid cell size of 25m has been accepted as a limitation”

3.9 “It should be noted that the representation of ground levels and 2D domain features throughout the model domain and at the site is quite coarse, with a grid cell size of 25m. Grid cell size is a fundamental model parameter that can have wide ranging effects on model performance, stability and outputs”

The above just confirm that modelling is not surety.

Comments on WLDC Closing Position Statement

Regarding the statements below made by WLDC they have succinctly expressed views held by this IP.

2.7 “This amount of solar development within a close geographical area is

unprecedented and gives rise to substantial adverse impacts that have not been experienced on a cumulative basis in England”

2.46 “With regard to flood risk in particular WLDC does not consider that the applicant has demonstrated fully compliance with the mitigation hierarchy, particularly with regards to avoid and reduce, and thus the scheme cannot be considered CNP”.

2.47” WLDC emphasises that this situation is unprecedented, with no other DCO decision having to consider such extensive cumulative impacts”

2.92” WLDC closing view therefore is that the applicant has not fully satisfied the mitigation hierarchy and therefore cannot progress to Secretary of state decision as CNP”

2.103 “NESO has confirmed that there is an oversupply of capacity from solar schemes in the East MidlandsThis begs the question whether OESF is required at all “

Yours faithfully

Heather Fox.