

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>1. General and cross-topic questions</b>		
Q1.1.1	The applicant	<p><b>Consultation on National Policy Statements</b></p> <p>The Government published on 24 April further consultation on each of the National Policy Statements (NPS) EN1, EN-3 and EN-5. The consultation period closed on 29 May 2025. Please advise if there are any areas of these documents that you consider the ExA should regard as important or relevant to the consideration of the proposed development.</p>
Q1.1.2	The applicant	<p><b>Assessment of environmental effects</b></p> <p>Noting the 40-year operational life of the proposed development, have its effects been assessed as temporary or permanent?</p>
Q1.1.3	The applicant	<p><b>Grid Connection</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">changes to the grid connection process</a> introduced by Great Britain's National Energy System Operator on 8 December 2025, mean that projects are prioritised where they are aligned to national energy targets and are ready-to-build, such as those with planning permission or land rights. As a result, energy generation projects have been informed of whether they are among the 283 GW of projects that will move forward now.</p> <p>The applicant is asked to confirm whether or not there has been any alteration to their position in relation to the grid connection via the 400kV National Grid Staythorpe substation.</p>
Q1.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Grid connection</b></p> <p>The Planning Statement [<a href="#">APP-317</a>] para 12, and the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 5 Development Description [<a href="#">APP-048</a>] para 5.4.1.7 set out that two alternative options are proposed to connect the 400 kV cable to the existing National Grid Staythorpe Substation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connect via the substation associated with a consented grid support battery energy storage system (BESS) on land immediately to the west of the existing National Grid Staythorpe Substation ('the Consented BESS') which was granted planning permission by Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC) (Planning Reference 22/01840/FULM) (Work No 7); or</li> <li>• Connect the 400 kV cable to connect directly to the National Grid Staythorpe Substation (Work No 6).</li> </ul> <p>The Planning Statement also sets out at para 13 that connecting via the Consented BESS substation would allow for a shared connection, which is resource efficient and cost effective. Alternatively, the 400kV cable could run directly to the same connection point at the existing National Grid Staythorpe Substation. The need for these alternative options results from the Consented BESS not having yet been fully constructed. Both of these options are assessed within the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) to allow for this flexibility.</p> <p>The applicant is asked to provide an update on the likely way forward for the connection. Also, noting that the dDCO makes provision for both options, the applicant is asked to confirm whether or not there is a continuing need for both options to be sought. If this remains the case, please explain how the dDCO is drafted to ensure that, if the BESS substation is constructed in time, it is the only option taken forward.</p>
Q1.1.5	The applicant	<p><b>The Rochdale envelope</b></p> <p>The ES Chapter 5 Description [<a href="#">APP-048</a>] para 10 sets out that in order to establish parameters within the Rochdale Envelope for assessment, the development description chapter follows a two-tier approach by establishing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parameter ranges that specify the limits for this development; and</li> <li>• Illustrative design – a realistic and buildable design for which each parameter is within the allowed range for that parameter.</li> </ul> <p>Does this mean that, for example, in relation to the solar photovoltaic (PV) modules referred to in table 5.3, the environmental effects have been assessed on the basis of the 3.5m maximum height referred to as the 'design limitation', rather than the 2.47m maximum height referred to as the 'illustrative design'?</p> <p>Similarly, the maximum measurements referred to as the design limitations for the intermediate substations (table 5.8) are much greater than used for the illustrative design.</p> <p>It is also noted that the design limitations are the measurements used in the Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [<a href="#">APP-329</a>], which is the control document for the detailed design of the proposed development.</p> <p>The applicant is asked to please clarify how the parameters have been applied.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.1.6	The applicant	<p><b>Defining the detailed design</b></p> <p>The ES Chapter 5 Description [APP-048] para 15 sets out that following consent and final detailed design, a final build plan will be submitted to NSDC for approval. What is this referring to? How would it be secured?</p>
Q1.1.7	The applicant	<p><b>Design details: intermediate substations</b></p> <p>There is limited information about the design parameters for the intermediate substations, other than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their dimensions, as set out in Chapter 5 Description [APP-048] Table 5.8</li> <li>• Fig 5.12 [APP-091] provides a compound elevation view</li> <li>• Fig 5.16 [APP-095] provides 132kV Substation elevations, though this relates to elevations of electrical equipment and a compound layout</li> <li>• Fig 5.18 [APP-097] 400kV and 132kV relay and control room</li> </ul> <p>Noting that the Design Approach Document [APP-322] section 6.2.4 sets out that outdoor electrical equipment would typically be painted grey or uncoated, indoor electrical equipment may be housed in metal or composite enclosures or within permanent buildings which would be designed to reflect local character, as would any ancillary buildings. It would be helpful if details and illustrative material could be provided in relation to such buildings.</p> <p>Also noting that Chapter 5 Description para 49 refers to there being 'up to four' intermediate substations, are they all likely to be required?</p>
Q1.1.8	The applicant	<p><b>Battery energy storage system</b></p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-317] Glossary sets out that the BESS is designed to provide peak generation and grid balancing services to the electricity grid. It will do this primarily by allowing excess electricity generated from the solar PV panels to be stored in batteries and dispatched when required. It may also import surplus energy from the electricity grid.</p> <p>Noting that Chapter 5 Description [APP-048] table 5.9 provides the BESS design parameters in terms of MWh per container, the applicant is asked to clarify the overall capacity of the BESS and to explain its balancing role?</p>
Q1.1.9	All parties	<p><b>Planning benefits</b></p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-317] para 306 sets out that, other than policy compliance benefits, including meeting the urgent need for such infrastructure, the development would deliver other benefits that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renewable energy</li> <li>• Biodiversity net gain</li> <li>• Economic, educational and sustainability benefits</li> <li>• Enhanced landscape and public access legacy</li> <li>• Community Benefit Fund (NG+)</li> </ul> <p>However, with regards to NG+, the applicant has confirmed [REP1-068] that NG+ measures are not part of the DCO proposals and are offered as an entirely separate community benefit.</p> <p>All parties are invited to comment on whether they agree that the proposed development would deliver such benefits.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> As NSDC are a statutory consultee to the process and not the decision maker, we do not consider our role is to weigh up the benefits of the project, as we see that as a matter for the ExA and the SoS. Notwithstanding this, we offer the following comments on the points mentioned above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renewable Energy – NSDC note and support the overarching principles of renewable energy generation, which should be viewed as a benefit, without prejudice to any separate observations we may make on the impacts of the proposed development and any associated mitigation, throughout the examination period.</li> <li>• Biodiversity Net Gain – NSDC agree that BNG is a potential benefit of the proposed development, but at this stage do not consider the Applicant has presented a clear position on what elements of biodiversity provision are necessary for mitigation and what parts are above and beyond that and can therefore be treated as a benefit.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic, educational and sustainability benefits – NSDC agree that these areas offer potential benefits, but our representations thus far have highlighted concerns around the delivery of these benefits, so that this can be considered in more detail during the examination stage, without placing an overreliance on the use of requirements within the Draft DCO.</li> <li>Enhanced landscape and public access legacy – On enhanced landscape, NSDC would refer to our response on BNG in respect of the clarity between enhancement and what is necessary mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>In respect of NG+, NSDC are aware of and would welcome any community benefits that would result, in the event that permission was forthcoming for the proposed development. However, the Applicant made it very clear at ISH1 that the NG+ scheme would not form part of the DCO and should not be taken into account as part of the decision making process. Accordingly, it bears no weight to the examination and therefore cannot be taken into account in the ExA's recommendation and the subsequent decision of the SoS. As such, we note that any financial contribution made by the Applicant to the community is done so on a voluntary basis, is subject to commercial forces and there is no formal mechanism in place that would bind the Applicant to this commitment. In light of this, any community benefit fund could be reduced, revised or withdrawn at any time.</p> <p>In light of the above, NSDC consider that the NG+ plus fund should not form part of any further consideration as part of the examination, or the subsequent decision making process.</p>
Q1.1.10	The applicant	<p><b>NG+ scheme and relation to EIA mitigation</b></p> <p>The ExA note the references to the NG+, with some of the proposed works requiring physical construction works within the Order limits, albeit requiring a separate planning permission as they are not within the scope of the DCO application.</p> <p>Can the applicant confirm whether it considers that any of the NG+ works are required specifically as mitigation measures for effects considered within the ES or any other relevant application documents, or whether the NG+ works are solely for beneficial measures compared to the current baseline conditions.</p>
Q1.1.11	The applicant	<p><b>Response to the scoping opinion</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that each ES chapter provides a tabulated response to consultation including the Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion <a href="#">[APP-198]</a>. However, no response appears to have been provided to the comments raised in sections 2.1 (proposed development description) and 2.2 (EIA methodology) of the scoping opinion, or any relevant consultee comments on these matters. Can the applicant either signpost to these responses if provided, or detail how these matters have been considered in the ES.</p>
Q1.1.12	The applicant	<p><b>Use of the Staythorpe Power Station Wharf</b></p> <p>Within document <a href="#">[APP-314]</a> (section 42 consultation feedback responses), there is an entry which states “the applicant has established that it does not need development consent for any works for the purposes of using the wharf at Staythorpe Power Station to transport and unload construction equipment and material via the river. This land has therefore been removed from the order limits. The applicant is in advanced discussions with RWE for a commercial agreement to use the wharf for these purposes”. This appears to be the only mention of the use of this wharf that the ExA can find within any application document, and as such the ExA is unclear as to the applicant's intention to use this wharf or how it considers permission would be granted for the use of this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant is requested to provide clarity on this matter.</li> <li>Specifically in relation to the ES and other relevant assessments, can the applicant confirm how the current ES and any other relevant assessments assesses the use of this wharf, as there does not appear to be any reference to relevant environmental matters included but not limited to use of the river for transport of materials to the wharf and the movement of materials and equipment from the wharf to the proposed development. The use of this wharf did not form a part of the Scoping Report on which the Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion was based.</li> </ol>
Q1.1.13	The applicant	<p><b>Material assets</b></p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that the EIA regulations typically refer to material assets as those that are required for construction and operation of the proposed development, such as concrete, steel, timber etc. The ES does not appear to include any information of the anticipated quantity of materials required to construct the proposed development. Whilst the ExA notes that a list of anticipated GHG emissions from the materials used is provided in ES Chapter 15 <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> and waste generation in chapter 16 <a href="#">[APP-058]</a>, can the applicant confirm if it has provided, or is able to provide, an estimate of the materials required for the construction and operation of the proposed development.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>2. Development consent order</b>		
Q2.1.1	The applicant	<p><b>Recitals at the beginning of the dDCO</b></p> <p>The dDCO <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> page 4 sets out that ‘The Secretary of State has considered the report and recommendation of the Examining Authority, has taken into account the environmental information in accordance with regulation 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017(e) and has had regard to the documents and matters referred to in section 105(2)(f) of the 2008 Act.’ The correct reference should be to section 104(2) of the 2008 Act.</p>
<b>Articles</b>		
Q2.1.2	The applicant	<p><b>Article 2 (Interpretation)</b></p> <p>“authorised development” It is considered that the current definition which includes the development described in Schedule 1 “and any other development within the meaning of section 32 of the 2008 Act” is too broadly based. It is unclear as to whether this would enable both the section 32 general powers and the Schedule 1 provisions. The applicant is asked to consider the following alternative “authorised development” means the development and associated development described in Schedule 1 (authorised development) which is development within the meaning of section 32 of the 2008 Act’.</p>
Q2.1.3	The applicant	<p><b>Article 2 (Interpretation)</b></p> <p>“Order land” refers simply to the land shown on land plans which is within the limits of land to be acquired or used and described in the book of reference. The applicant is asked to amend this to be more precisely defined to align with the approach used in other made solar DCOs, such as by reference to the different colouring on the Land Plans.</p>
Q2.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Article 10 (Street works)</b></p> <p>Article 10 (4) to (7) refer to the application of the Nottinghamshire Country Council Permit Scheme Order 2020. It would be clearer to separate this out as a separate article, as is the case in other DCOs.</p>
Q2.1.5	The applicant	<p><b>Article 14 (Permanent closure of public rights of way)</b></p> <p>Article 14 would allow the undertaker to permanently close public rights of way as set out in Schedule 5, though this cannot occur unless a substitute public right of way has been completed to the satisfaction of the street authority, or a temporary alternative route is first provided and maintained until the permanent substitute public right of way is provided, again to the satisfaction of the street authority. The applicant is asked to address the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14(2) Should this refer specifically to Schedule 5 part 3?</li> <li>14(2)(b) if a temporary alternative is to be provided, this should be ‘open for use’?</li> <li>14(3) In referring to the public right of way to be closed only, it is not clear that when rights are extinguished. It should be clear that this can only occur after the alternative provision is in place.</li> <li>14(3)(b) should the reference be to ‘the site of the public right of way’, rather than ‘the site of the street or private means of access’?</li> <li>14(4) and (5) refer to details being provided to the surveying authority of the modifications required. Should the details required be clarified?</li> </ol>
Q2.1.6	The applicant	<p><b>Article 14 (Permanent closure of public rights of way)</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding the applicant’s response to the above question (Q2.1.5) NCC in its relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-166]</a> and the Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers in their written representation <a href="#">[REP1-103]</a> have, with reference in the latter to made orders, raised concerns about the issues associated with permanent changes. Could the applicant review and amend its dDCO as appropriate, for example whether Article 13 could provide sufficient powers, given that the nature of the proposed development itself is temporary and justify any material differences that remain compared with previously made orders.</p>
Q2.1.7	The applicant	<p><b>Article 15 (Use of private roads for construction)</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Article 15(1) currently refers to 'any road' with the Order limits. Why does the applicant need this additional power, compared with made orders, given that it is seeking to acquire rights over all the land within the Order limits. Please either justify the need for the provision with reference to guidance or precedent or delete it.
Q2.1.8	The applicant	<p><b>Article 16 (Access to works)</b></p> <p>Should this article require the undertaker to restore any temporary access created to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority? Please also address the comments from Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) in their local impact report (LIR) <a href="#">[REP1-078]</a> that Article 16 refers to Part 1 (permanent access) and Part 2 (temporary access) of Schedule 6, but Schedule 6 appears to be a single entity with no parts.</p>
Q2.1.9	The applicant	<p><b>Article 17 (Agreement with street authorities)</b></p> <p>This Article authorises street authorities and the undertaker to enter into agreements relating to strengthening, improvement, repair or reconstruction of any streets, stopping up, prohibition, restriction, alteration or diversion of any street, works authorised under articles 10 (street works), 11 (power to alter layout, etc., of streets) and 12 (construction and maintenance of altered streets) of the Order and the adoption of works.</p> <p>Should the relevant provisions at Article 17(c) also refer to Article 16 (Access to works), which gives the undertaker powers to form new or to improve existing means of access for the purposes of the authorised development, as set out in Schedule 6 to the Order?</p> <p>Please also address the comments from NCC in their LIR <a href="#">[REP1-078]</a> relating to the procedure for consultation and approval of any Temporary Traffic Regulation Order.</p>
Q2.1.10	The applicant	<p><b>Article 18 (Traffic Regulation Measures)</b></p> <p>Article 19 (1) includes a power that would authorise temporary traffic regulation measures, for the purposes of the construction, operation maintenance and decommissioning of the development on roads specified in Schedule 7. Additionally, Paragraph (2) includes a general power, following consultation with the chief officer of police and subject to obtaining the written consent of the traffic authority, to make temporary provision for traffic regulation the purposes of the authorised development. Article 18(5) sets out that the undertaker must not exercise these powers without giving 4 weeks notice to the chief of police and traffic authority and published details of the provision in the relevant newspaper.</p> <p>Would it also be appropriate to include a site notice as a means of informing the local community?</p>
Q2.1.11	The applicant	<p><b>Article 22: (Compulsory acquisition of land)</b></p> <p>This Article provides for the compulsory acquisition of such land as is required for the development, or to facilitate, or is incidental to it. Article 22(2) makes clear that the powers in this Article are subject to the powers and restrictions in Article 23 (Time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily or to take land temporarily), paragraph (2) of Article 24 (compulsory acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictive covenants), Article 27 (acquisition of subsoil or airspace only), Article 31 (temporary use of land for constructing the authorised development), Article 33 (statutory undertakers) and article 50 (Crown rights).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should this Article also be subject to Article 25 (private rights over land) and Article 28 (power to override easements and other rights)?</li> <li>Is it relevant to refer to Article 50 (Crown rights)?</li> </ol>
Q2.1.12	The applicant	<p><b>Article 26 (Application of the 1981 Act)</b></p> <p>This Article applies the general vesting procedures in the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 to the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers pursuant to the Order. The quotations given in Article 26(5) do not appear to be complete.</p>
Q2.1.13	The applicant	<p><b>Articles 31 and 32 (Temporary use)</b></p> <p>These Articles allow land subject to compulsory acquisition powers to be temporarily used for constructing and maintaining the development.</p> <p>Article 31(1)(a) and Article 32(1)(a) extend the power to take temporary possession to any of the Order land. Please can the applicant explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the steps that have been taken to alert all landowners/occupiers of land within the Order limits of this possibility.</li> <li>why it considers only 28 days' notice should be required before entering on and taking possession of land under Article 31(4) and Article 32(3).</li> <li>In relation to Article 31(1)(b), what is the justification for the inclusion of the power to remove buildings and drainage on land temporarily used to construct the authorised development?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.1.14	The applicant	<p><b>Article 50 (Crown rights)</b> As no Crown land has been identified within the Order land, the applicant is asked to provide further justification as to why this Article is required.</p>
<b>Schedule 1 – Authorised Development</b>		
Q2.1.15	The applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – Authorised development</b> a. In the unnumbered paragraph immediately before the list of Works, for greater clarity could the applicant insert ‘alternating current’ after 50 megawatts?’ b. Should these two paragraphs, immediately before the list of Works be numbered as they do not appear to belong under para 1?</p>
<b>Schedule 2 – Requirements</b>		
Q2.1.16	The applicant, NCC and NSDC	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirements</b> Proposals are being developed to reorganise local government in Nottinghamshire which, if implemented, would result in a single tier of local government. It is therefore necessary that the dDCO should enable any of the requirements in Schedule 2 to be discharged by a superseding local authority? If so, how could this be accommodated?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> On this issue, NSDC note that Part 1 – Preliminary of the Draft DCO – Interpretation 2. (7) states the following:</p> <p>‘(7) In this Order, references to any statutory body include that body’s successor bodies.’</p> <p>In this regard, NSDC note that this provision allows on a general basis for successor bodies, in respect of the planned government reorganisation in Nottinghamshire. For clarity, NSDC would suggest that consideration be given to an amendment to ‘Schedule 2 Requirements (Article 3) Interpretation 1 from the current wording which states:</p> <p>“planning authority” means Newark and Sherwood District Council being the planning authority for the authorised development.....to</p> <p>“planning authority” means Newark and Sherwood District Council, being the planning authority (or any successor body) for the authorised development.</p>
Q2.1.17	The applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirements</b> The term ‘substantially in accordance with’ is used extensively in the requirements. The applicant is asked to consider whether alternative wording such as “which as a minimum must accord with” could be used so that improvements are permitted but deterioration is not.</p>
Q2.1.18	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 5: Approved details and amendments to them</b> Should approval be provided ‘in writing’ to provide clarity?</p>
Q2.1.19	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 - Landscape and ecological management</b> This requirement sets out that the ‘landscape and ecological management plan must include details of the extent to which the relevant phase contributes to ensuring that the authorised development overall achieves a minimum of 60% biodiversity net gain in area-based habitat units, a minimum of 26% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and a minimum of 11% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units during its operational lifetime’. On this phased basis, how can there be certainty that the overall commitment to this level of biodiversity net gain will be achieved? Should there be a requirement seeking to secure BNG, rather than this being embedded as an element of the landscape and ecological management plan requirement?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.1.20	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 9 - Fencing and other means of enclosure</b></p> <p>Does the reference at 9(1) to 'commence' include or exclude any permitted preliminary works?</p>
Q2.1.21	The applicant, NCC and Historic England	<p><b>Requirement 11: Archaeology</b></p> <p>The applicant, and other parties as relevant, are asked to address the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the reference at 11(1) to 'commence' include or exclude any permitted preliminary works?</li> <li>Is it acceptable that this be approved by the 'county authority', noted as being Nottinghamshire County Council?</li> <li>Is sufficient provision made for unexpected archaeological discoveries, areas with no known archaeology and the need for an archaeological watching brief?</li> <li>The Outline Archaeology Mitigation Strategy, section A11.8.6 sets out that following consent to proceed, the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the Stage 2 investigations will be submitted to the discharging authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) for approval. It also sets out that the Stage 3 Mitigation Measures WSI(s), would also be submitted to the discharging authority for approval. How would these provisions be secured through the dDCO?</li> </ol> <p>In addressing their points, the parties are invited to suggest alternative wording which would address any concerns raised.</p>
Q2.1.22	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 12: Construction environmental management plan (CEMP)</b></p> <p>This relies upon the outline CEMP (oCEMP) which is in places informative in nature rather than prescriptive.</p> <p>Could the applicant provide more project specific detail under this requirement regarding which environmental risks must be addressed in the CEMP to the satisfaction of the planning authority, in consultation with others, for example the Environment Agency, including those associated with the use of horizontal directional drilling to lay cables apparent from the oCEMP <a href="#">[APP-204]</a>.</p>
Q2.1.23	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 15: Operational noise</b></p> <p>Could the applicant review this against the corresponding requirement 23 in the made Order for The Helios Renewable Energy Project <a href="#">Helios - Development Consent Order [R]</a> which came into effect on 3 December 2025, amend as appropriate and justify any material differences with reference to guidance or precedent?</p>
Q2.1.24	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 21 Community liaison group</b></p> <p>This requirement provides that no phase of the authorised development may commence until a community liaison management plan has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. It also sets out that the community liaison management plan must be implemented as approved.</p> <p>Does there need to be a mechanism to ensure that this group is established prior to the implementation of the development?</p>
Q2.1.25	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 22 (1) and (2) Glint and Glare</b></p> <p>This requirement sets out the need for a glint and glare assessment containing details of how the design of the development has incorporated mitigation to ensure the glint and glare levels are below the assessment criteria as set out in the glint and glare assessment contained in the environmental statement for that phase.</p> <p>Should there be any wording be included to ensure that the post-consent assessment/levels do not exceed the assessment provided in the ES glint and glare assessment <a href="#">[APP-286]</a>?</p>
Q2.1.26	The applicant	<p><b>Requirement 23: Long term flood risk mitigation</b></p> <p>It does not appear to be specified either in the dDCO <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> or accompanying explanatory memorandum <a href="#">[APP-009]</a> why the requirement 23 has been included to provide an updated flood risk assessment (FRA) only if the solar PV panels are still in operation in the year 2069 (due to delays to construction resulting in a later commencement date for power export than 2029), rather than all relevant environmental assessments. Can the applicant confirm why this requirement is limited to flood risk only, when all effects in the ES and accompanying documents have been assessed up to the currently planned operational end date only and not beyond?</p>
<b>Schedule 14 - Procedure for the discharge of requirements</b>		

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.1.27	The applicant	<p><b>Schedule 14: Procedure for the discharge of requirements</b></p> <p>Within this schedule, references to either 'business days' or 'days' should be consistent.</p> <p>Please remove the word 'forthwith' from 4(2)(c).</p>
<p><b>3. Agriculture and land use</b></p>		
Q3.1.1	Natural England (NE) and the applicant	<p><b>BMV land during construction</b></p> <p>In your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-154]</a> (NE14) and statement of common ground (SoCG) with the applicant <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a>, you state that you consider that the total area of best and most versatile agricultural (BMV) land disturbed during the construction of the proposed development would be considerably greater than the 19.4ha assessed by the applicant in Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement (ES) <a href="#">[APP-060]</a>. Please could you confirm the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you consider that there would be any significant effects arising from this greater area during the construction phase that have not been assessed in the ES.</li> <li>If any further mitigations would be required were this greater area to be taken into consideration.</li> <li>If you consider that this would also apply during the decommissioning phase of the proposed development.</li> </ol> <p>To the applicant – please respond to the points raised by NE in paragraph 2.5.2 (NE14) of the SoCG <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a> in respect of the area of BMV land disturbed during construction of the proposed development, and/or provide an update as the status of discussions on the provision of the relevant information requested by NE.</p>
Q3.1.2	Natural England (NE)	<p><b>BMV land and woodland planting</b></p> <p>In your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-156]</a> (NE15) and SoCG with the applicant <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a> concerning the amount of BMV land that could be lost due to woodland planting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could you explain if the addition of any BMV land lost to woodland planting to the total already assessed by the applicant would, in your opinion, change the conclusions of the applicant's assessment undertaken in <a href="#">[APP-060]</a>?</li> <li>Could any additional mitigations reduce this potential loss?</li> </ol> <p><b>Economic impacts</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you have any comments regarding the economic impacts of the BMV land that would be temporarily or permanently lost as a result of the proposed development?</li> </ol>
Q3.1.3	The applicant	<p><b>BMV land and woodland planting</b></p> <p>Please provide an update with regards to the points raised by NE in paragraph 2.5.3 (NE15) of the SoCG <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a> concerning the total area of BMV land that could be permanently lost due to woodland planting.</p>
Q3.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Updates to the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP)</b></p> <p>Please provide an update with regards to the points raised by NE in paragraphs 2.5.6 and 2.5.7 (NE18 and NE19) of the SoCG <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a> in respect of NE's suggested amendments to the oSMP.</p>
Q3.1.5	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p><b>Sheep grazing and livestock regime</b></p> <p>In your SoCG with the applicant <a href="#">[REP1-060]</a>, with regards to livestock grazing (page 13) you state that you would like to see details of the proposed grazing regime included within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could you provide further explanation as to what details you would like to be included within the LEMP regarding the grazing regime?</li> <li>Would you consider Requirement 8 of the dDCO to be sufficient to secure the details of any grazing regime?</li> </ol>
Q3.1.6	The applicant	<p><b>Grazing regime</b></p> <p>Could the applicant state its position on Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust's suggestion to include details of the proposed grazing regime within the LEMP? Could the applicant provide an update with regards to progress on the drafting of any grazing regime details that would be included within the LEMP?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q3.1.7	NSDC	<p><b>BMV assessment considerations</b></p> <p>In respect of your comments made in Chapter 13 of your Local Impact Report (LIR) <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> and section 2.11 of your SoCG with the applicant <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a>, could you confirm the following:</p> <p>a. If you have any further comments on the methodology and conclusions of the assessment undertaken by the applicant in Chapter 17 of the ES <a href="#">[APP-060]</a>, including the effects of the proposed development and their significance.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC do not have any specific comments on the methodology, but as we have already set out in various written and verbal submissions to date, we remain concerned on the effects of the proposed development on BMV land and do not agree as a matter of general principle regarding the significance of the effects as assessed. NSDC maintain that at a local level, the impacts of the proposed development are ‘significant’ from the perspective of the proposed development and also with regard to cumulative effects. As noted below, NSDC also consider that the Applicant has failed to rule out that alternative areas of lower value BMV land that could have been utilised, as discussed during ISH1. NSDC also note that during ISH1 errors were identified in BMV calculations and cumulative schemes assessed and therefore we look forward to reviewing the Applicant’s D2 submissions in due course.</p> <p>b. If you consider the mitigations proposed in the ES and their inclusion within the assessment to be suitable, and to have followed the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Given that the proposed development involves the loss of a high proportion of BMV land, over a long term period, there is no suitable mitigation that can be provided from a land use perspective, which will mitigate for the extent of this loss of BMV from active agricultural use, for the operational period of the proposed development. As discussed during ISH1, NSDC consider that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that it has appropriately applied the mitigation hierarchy, with particular regard to the first step of ‘avoidance’ as detailed within Paragraph 4.1.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1).<sup>1</sup></p> <p>c. If you have any comments on the economic value of the BMV land that would be lost temporarily and permanently as a result of the proposed development.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> The economic value would comprise of the loss of cereals and other crops grown set against any income/value achieved from sheep grazing, if any. The proposed development consists of a significant area of BMV land to be lost for 60 years. Once the panels are in place it would be difficult and expensive to remove them to return the land to agricultural use at short notice, effectively locking flexible land out of cropping for the duration. Grassland in the UK is plentiful (there is an excess) and other climate change measures suggest that consumers should reduce their red meat consumption. Low intensity ecological based sheep grazing is therefore no substitute for the lost BMV and other land. The BMV land is the most flexible and therefore the effects of this loss would be felt most significantly in this respect.</p> <p>d. If you have any further comment on the oSMP and if you consider it be adequately secured.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> For the oSMP to be effective it would need to be informed by a suitable baseline survey of the site, in accordance with industry standards, partly as set out in the Defra Code, but also in line with soil health standards, e.g. as in AHDB guidance, which we attach as additional information in response to this question.</p>
Q3.1.8	The applicant	<p><b>NSDC LIR</b></p> <p>With regards to comments raised by NSDC in Chapter 13 of the LIR <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> and paragraph 2.11.4 of the SoCG <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a> concerning how improvements in solar panel technology could enable some land within the order limits to be returned to agricultural land use:</p> <p>a. Would this be viable should the development of solar panel technology enable it?</p> <p>b. Were there to be a reduction in the output of the proposed development due to operational or other reasons, would return to some of the land within the order limits to agricultural use be a possibility?</p> <p>c. Do you have any further comments?</p> <p>Concerning paragraph 13.2 of the LIR and the grazing of sheep under the solar panels:</p> <p>d. Can the applicant provide the acreage of land as requested by NDSC?</p> <p>e. Could this be included as part of any grazing regime as suggested in Q3.1.5 and Q3.1.6?</p>

<sup>1</sup> [Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy \(EN-1\) – December 2025](#)

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>4. Biodiversity, ecology and the natural environment</b>		
Q4.1.1	The applicant	<p><b>Mitigation and Enhancement</b></p> <p>NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.6.10 states in part that “<i>Biodiversity net gain should be applied after compliance with the mitigation hierarchy and does not change or replace existing environmental obligations</i>”.</p> <p>a. Can you explain how the inclusion of the oLEMP within the embedded mitigation measures as described in para. 8.6.8.7 of Chapter 8 of the ES <a href="#">[APP-051]</a> is consistent with this policy?</p> <p>b. Can you explain how the assumptions, methodology and conclusions of the BNG assessment in Appendix 8.13 <a href="#">[APP-226]</a> are consistent with this policy?</p>
Q4.1.2	NSDC and the applicant	<p><b>Environmental Impact Assessment</b></p> <p>In your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-156]</a>, paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of the LIR <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a>, and the SoCG with the applicant <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a>, you outline concerns related to the methodology used in the Environmental Impact Assessment for ecological receptors, including the transparency of the assessment process, the aggregation of habitats within the assessment, and the baseline survey data used.</p> <p>a. Do you consider that these concerns could lead to different conclusions in terms of the magnitude of impact and significance of effects assessed, and therefore under-reporting of these effects?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Yes, NSDC consider that these could lead to different conclusions for some ecological receptors and potential under-reporting of these effects. For example, if a reassessment were to identify an increased magnitude or significance of impact on a particular receptor, this could elevate the residual effect and therefore indicate that effects have previously been underestimated. Furthermore, the limited survey effort within habitats of higher ecological value—particularly Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat, semi-improved neutral grassland, and ditches—means there is potential for the baseline conditions to have been undervalued. If these habitats were subsequently found to have greater biodiversity value, this could reduce the achievable biodiversity net gain and further contribute to an under-reporting of ecological effects.</p> <p>b. Should the aggregated habitats (broadleaved woodland, native hedgerows, rivers and streams and ponds) have been assessed separately in your view?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Yes, NSDC consider that these habitats should have been assessed separately. Aggregating broadleaved woodland, native hedgerows, rivers and streams, and ponds fails to account for the variation in sensitivity, intrinsic ecological value, and the nature and magnitude of potential effects associated with each habitat type. Assessing them individually would allow impacts to be more accurately characterised and ensure that any embedded or additional mitigation measures specific to each habitat are clearly identified. Furthermore, presenting these habitats as separate entries within Table 8.12 would improve transparency and provide a more robust and defensible evaluation of ecological effects.</p> <p>c. Do you consider the applicant’s fundamental approach and methodology to the assessment of effects on ecological receptors to be robust?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Not as currently presented for the reasons outlined in our Relevant Reps and Local Impact Report.</p> <p>To the applicant:</p> <p>d. In response to paragraph 9.4 of the LIR with NSDC <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a>, can you provide any further information in relation to the points raised?</p> <p>e. Could you respond to the points raised concerning information on mature trees in paragraph 9.20 of the LIR with NSDC <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a>, and to the points raised in respect of great crested newts in paragraph 9.21 of the LIR with NSDC.</p>
Q4.1.3	NSDC and the applicant	<p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment</b></p> <p>In paragraph 9.17 of your LIR <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a>, you raise concerns around the baseline habitat surveys and therefore data used for the applicant’s BNG assessment <a href="#">[APP-226]</a>, particularly in regards to the sampling of features of higher ecological importance. Do you consider that were further baseline sampling data to be provided and used in the BNG assessment, that this would mean that its conclusions could be considerably different to the present conclusions?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Yes if the baseline values of habitats changes this could result in a different outcome of the BNG assessment but it is difficult to confirm the magnitude of change at this stage. If the baseline value of any of the habitats increased this would result in a reduced uplift of biodiversity units.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		To the applicant - in response to paragraph 9.37 of the LIR with NSDC <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> , have you considered the potential opportunities as suggested by NSDC?
Q4.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP)</b></p> <p>The oLEMP <a href="#">[APP-201]</a> states that it is considered to be in part, the Biodiversity Management Strategy as set out in NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.4.36, which also cites training as an example of the type of subject covered within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this something applicant could envisage including within its strategy and would it be useful to provide a separate document from the oLEMP?</li> <li>Is the applicant confident that this resourcing can be secured long-term, for the 40-year life of the proposed development? In any scenario where the operation of the proposed development was no longer viable or early decommissioning of solar panels was required; would maintenance of the biodiversity elements still be required and feasible?</li> </ol>
Q4.1.5	Forestry commission and the applicant	<p><b>Ancient woodland</b></p> <p>Noting the comments about buffer zone distances made by the Forestry Commission in their relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-056]</a> – as well as the applicant’s response in section 3.11 of <a href="#">[REP1-065]</a>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To the applicant – do you consider the 15m distance to be sufficient? Would a potentially larger distance be appropriate as suggested by the Forestry Commission?</li> <li>To the Forestry Commission – can you provide further detail on the deterioration of ancient woodland that you consider could still occur as a result of the proposed development? Could this deterioration be assessed as a significant effect (in EIA terms) in your view?</li> </ol>
Q4.1.6	The applicant	<p><b>Woodland planting</b></p> <p>In its relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-154]</a>, NE15, Natural England have expressed concerns over the potential for woodland and biodiversity planting to sterilise or affect the baseline agricultural grade or quality of BMV land. Can the applicant comment on this?</p>
Q4.1.7	The applicant	<p><b>Decommissioning</b></p> <p>The outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan <a href="#">[APP-207]</a>, paragraph A.5.6.2.3, explains that the site vegetation would remain in place during the decommissioning of the solar panels, as well as the cables for certain areas of sensitive vegetation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the applicant confirm and/or explain further what is envisaged for the cables (Works No 2)? Are they to be fully left in situ or removed?</li> <li>If the cables are left in situ, would there be any particular management requirements over the long term to account for any effects from their degradation?</li> <li>After decommissioning, can the applicant confirm that the arable land that has been converted to grassland and grazed by sheep during operation of the proposed development could be returned to arable land?</li> </ol>
Q4.1.8	The applicant	<p><b>Protected species license</b></p> <p>With regards to Natural England’s comments in its relevant representation (issue NE12) <a href="#">[RR-154]</a> and its position outlined in ref. 2.3.2 of the SoCG <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a>, can the applicant provide an update as to whether draft licence applications will be submitted during the examination?</p>
Q4.1.9	Natural England	<p><b>Other qualifying features of the Humber Estuary sites</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the assessment of the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar site is limited to the lamprey features and excludes any other feature of these sites such as habitats, bird species/ assemblages and onshore species. The applicant has justified this due to the distance to the sites from the proposed development.</p> <p>Can you confirm whether you are in agreement with this approach, and whether the HRA <a href="#">[AS-020]</a> is required to be updated to include all qualifying features of the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar, and whether there is any requirement to include the overlapping Humber Estuary SPA.</p>
Q4.1.10	Natural England and	<p><b>Consideration of mitigation measures</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	interested parties	The ExA notes that the screening assessment is specified to consider project wide / design related mitigation measures only, rather than any specific mitigation for impacts to European sites (as required by the Sweetman judgement). Can you (or any other IPs) confirm that you are in agreement that specific mitigation has not been considered at the stage 1 screening [ <a href="#">AS-020</a> ]?
Q4.1.11	The applicant	<b>Relevancy of case law:</b> The ExA also notes the referral [ <a href="#">AS-020</a> ] to the Eco Advocacy judgement from 2023 which provides further clarification of the Sweetman judgement. As this judgement post dates the UK withdrawal from the European Union, the applicant is requested to provide further detail on its relevance and use within the applicant's methodology for the HRA report.
Q4.1.12	Buglife – The Invertebrate Conservation Trust	<b>Effects of polarised light on aquatic invertebrates</b> With regards to the comments outlined in your relevant representation [ <a href="#">RR-023</a> ] and noting the applicant's response in section 3.24 of [ <a href="#">REP1-065</a> ], can you provide any evidence of the phenomena that you describe with regards to the effects of polarised light on aquatic invertebrates as having occurred at solar farms in the United Kingdom? Have any previous solar farm projects adopted the mitigation measures that you propose? How were these secured?
<b>5. Climate change and sustainability</b>		
Q5.1.1	The applicant	<b>Greenhouse gas reduction strategy</b> NPS EN-1, paragraph 5.3.7 states that a greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy which sets out the steps taken to minimise and offset emissions should be provided and secured under the dDCO. Can the Applicant provide this?
<b>6. Community and human health</b>		
Q6.1.1	The applicant	<b>Inclusive design/health outcomes</b> EN-1 includes good design expectations (4.7) and health considerations (4.4; Part 5 social impacts). The applicant notes surfacing, gates and means of access would be set out later in the Recreational Routes Management Plan (RRMP) based on the Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan [ <a href="#">APP-295</a> ] (oRRMP) in its response to PEIR consultation [ <a href="#">APP-061</a> ] The applicant does not appear to commit to compliance with accessibility standards (e.g., widths, gradients, surfaces, BS 5709 gaps/gates/stiles). Can this commitment be made in the oRRMP, or is it made elsewhere in the application documents, if so, where? If the applicant disagrees to making such a commitment at this stage, please explain how this can be considered consistent with EN-1 policy.
<b>7. Construction effects</b>		
Q7.1.1	The applicant	<b>Traffic and transport</b> In its ES chapter [ <a href="#">APP-057</a> ] the applicant says that using percentage change, some of which are over 5000% for example HGVs on Ossington Lane would not be an appropriate approach for the assessment of: Non-motorised User Amenity, Severance of Communities, Driver Stress and Delay, and Road User and Pedestrian Safety a. Is the applicant relying upon additional guidance to justify its approach, if so, what? b. Is the applicant relying upon made DCOs for comparator projects to justify its approach, if so, which? c. Does the applicant accept that adverse effects caused by construction traffic would be likely despite the implementation of all the measures described in its ES and secured through the dDCO requirements and management plans?
Q7.1.2	The applicant	<b>Traffic and transport</b> The ExA notes the concerns of NCC in its LIR [ <a href="#">REP1-078</a> ] and NH in your draft SoCG with it [ <a href="#">REP1-053</a> ]. Which, if any, of their requests does the applicant consider it will not be able to comply with? Please provide your reasoning.
Q7.1.3	The applicant	<b>Cable crossings</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The ExA notes the concerns of the Environment Agency in its relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-054]</a> (EA020 and Appendix B) that remain in your draft SoCG with it <a href="#">[REP1-052]</a> with regard to the hazards associated with horizontal directional drilling close to groundwater receptors. In principle, could this hazard be eliminated and if so, how?
Q7.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Whilst the applicant concludes at 12.11 statement of significance of its ES chapter 12 Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment <a href="#">[APP-055]</a> that no significant construction noise effects are likely in EIA terms, can it confirm that in policy terms (EN-1 paragraph 5.12.17):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant construction noise effects would be avoided?</li> <li>Residual adverse construction noise effects, including traffic related, would likely remain despite reasonable steps being taken to mitigate and minimise these, as detailed elsewhere in the application?</li> </ol>
Q7.1.5	The applicant	<p><b>Ground conditions and land contamination:</b></p> <p>The applicant's ES chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> includes six occurrences of 'Error! Reference source not found' Please could these be corrected and an updated version provided?</p>
<b>8. Cultural heritage and archaeology</b>		
Q8.1.1	The applicant	<p><b>Baseline archaeological assessments</b></p> <p>Some explanation for the baseline archaeological assessments is set out in the outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy <a href="#">[APP-269]</a>. However, overall, the coordination of, and rationale for, the archaeological desk-based assessments and the geoarchaeological desk-based assessments, alongside the various geophysical surveys that have been undertaken (including Wessex Archaeology 2024; Magnitude Surveys 2024; York Archaeology 2025) is not clear.</p> <p>The applicant is asked to please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set out the basis on which this work has been managed.</li> <li>Clarify how have the results of the desk-based assessments informed the subsequent geophysical and trial trenching work.</li> <li>Provide clarity on the outcomes in terms of the total area covered by geophysics and trail trenching.</li> </ol>
Q8.1.2	Historic England/ NCC/ NSDC	<p><b>Archaeological Desk-Based assessment</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 11 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology <a href="#">[APP-054]</a> section 11.5.1 (para 48) sets out that the conclusions of the Archaeological Desk-Based assessment <a href="#">[APP-251 - APP-256]</a> are predicative and probabilistic and the results of the geophysical surveys have not been ground-truthed in their entirety. As such, there are some cases where the potential presence of heritage assets or their significance are based upon professional judgement. Even so, it is suggested that precautionary approach, assuming a reasonable worst case scenario (that is, any archaeological remains currently present this will likely be damaged or destroyed by construction related activities such as groundworks and earthmoving which could take place anywhere within the Order Limits) is reasonable. It is suggested that this is sufficient for the identification and assessment of likely significant effects.</p> <p>The parties are invited to comment on whether this approach is reflected in the assessment overall, that is, is professional judgment reasonably and appropriately applied?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> As confirmed in our Relevant Representations response and Local Impact Report, Nottinghamshire County Council are leading in relation to archaeology and therefore NSDC have nothing further to add in this regard.</p>
Q8.1.3	Historic England/ NCC/ NSDC	<p><b>Approach to further archaeological assessment</b></p> <p>Overall the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment <a href="#">[APP-251]</a> concludes at A11.1.5 that there is the potential for buried archaeological remains of high heritage significance within the Order limits, with the highest potential for possible archaeological remains from the Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, the Romano British and the medieval periods. The need for, scale, scope, and nature of any further assessment and/or archaeological works following grant of the DCO would be approved following consultation with the local planning authority based on the outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) which sets out the proposed approach to further evaluation and subsequent mitigation.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 para 5.9.11 sets out that where a site on which development is proposed includes, or the available evidence suggests it has the potential to include, heritage assets with an archaeological interest, the applicant should carry out appropriate desk-based assessment and, where such desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation. Noting this provision, the parties are invited to comment on whether the applicant has presented an adequate approach to assessment and mitigation.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<b>NSDC Response:</b> As confirmed in our Relevant Representations response and Local Impact Report, Nottinghamshire County Council are leading in relation to archaeology and therefore NSDC have nothing further to add in this regard.
Q8.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment</b></p> <p>Technical Appendix A11.3:Geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment <a href="#">[APP-256]</a> provides and Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment and Geoarchaeological Landscape Characterisation . It is dated June 2025. Section A11.5.1.2 sets out that the Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment outlines the sub-surface superficial deposits underlying the proposed development and provides an assessment of their archaeological and geoarchaeological potential, providing a baseline for further work.</p> <p>Noting that this document was completed after most of the Stage 1 investigation (as referred to in the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy <a href="#">[APP-269]</a> para 44) how can this provide a baseline for further work?</p>
Q8.1.5	The applicant	<p><b>Phase 1 Geophysics Results</b></p> <p>The Technical Appendix A11.4: Phase 1 Geophysics Results <a href="#">APP-257</a> section 2.1 and section 5.2 set out that the survey area covers 542ha.</p> <p>However, the ES Chapter 11 <a href="#">[APP-054]</a> section 11.6.2.5 para 95 sets out that the phase 1 geophysical Survey covered approximately 1,837 ha and the Phase 2 Geophysical Survey covers 515 ha. Please clarify this discrepancy.</p>
Q8.1.6	The applicant	<p><b>Phase 1 Geophysics Results</b></p> <p>Section 9 of the Technical Appendix A11.4: Phase 1 Geophysics Results <a href="#">APP-257</a> sets out preliminary conclusions including reference to anomalies represent an extensive multi-period archaeological landscape, some of which are classified as ‘Unknown Features’ whose archaeological origins cannot be excluded. The outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy <a href="#">[APP-269]</a> para 35 also states that the results of these surveys were used to inform the design of the development.</p> <p>Could the applicant please clarify specifically how the design of the development has responded to the survey findings.</p>
Q8.1.7	The applicant	<p><b>Phase 2 Geophysics Results</b></p> <p>Section 1.1 of Technical Appendix A11.5: Phase 2 Geophysics Results <a href="#">[APP-258]</a> sets out that this is an interim report and that the geophysical survey commissioned was over an area of approximately 635ha, though the report covers an area of around 515ha.</p> <p>The survey area for this stage of the project consists of 78 previously unsurveyed land parcels measuring (c. 635ha) located north of Ossington, east of Kersall, west of Maplebeck and north of Averham (Figure 1-4).</p> <p>The applicant is asked to please clarify how these areas were identified? Why was the full 635ha not covered and, of this area, which areas were excluded?</p>
Q8.1.8	The applicant	<p><b>Phase 2 Geophysics Results</b></p> <p>The conclusions of the Phase 2 Geophysics Results <a href="#">[APP-258]</a> at section 8.0 set out a number of findings, including that the survey identified three main areas of archaeological activity within the survey area. These areas comprise anomalies indicative of probable cut features, containing anthropogenically enhanced fill. The features include ditched enclosures, ring ditches, former field systems, and discrete pits. These anomalies appear to form Iron Age/Roman/British enclosures with associated field systems. Other more-isolated anomalies have also been interpreted as possible/probable archaeological origin.</p> <p>What are the consequences/implications of these findings?</p>
Q8.1.9	The applicant	<p><b>Further geophysical survey</b></p> <p>The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy <a href="#">[APP-269]</a> Section A11.8.4.2 (para 48) sets out that further geophysical survey is required within areas of the Order limits that could not be surveyed at Stage 1. Could the applicant please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm that these areas are illustrated in Figure 11.8.2 as ‘Areas not subject to any Stage 1 investigation?’</li> <li>Explain the size of the area to be surveyed?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		c. Noting that this includes areas associated with Works No 2, works to lay electrical cables (for example east of Park Lidgett, Ossington), how has the danger that that these areas could be of archaeological sensitivity been taken into consideration?
Q8.1.10	The applicant	<p><b>Phase 1 Trial Trenching</b></p> <p>The Technical Appendix A11.3: Geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment [<a href="#">APP-256</a>] sets out at A11.5.4.3 (para 34) that for the phase 1 trial trenching, of a planned 444 trenches, 231 were excavated as part of this phase.</p> <p>The phase 1 trial trenching report [<a href="#">APP-263</a>] then sets out that trenching was focussed upon areas of archaeological interest that could not be avoided by design to assess and that characterise potential archaeological remains which may be subject to physical effects as part of the development. The conclusions at section 12, para 12.8 note that despite the results of the geophysical surveys being broadly accurate, several archaeological features were often found in apparently blank areas, making its use as a lone tool unreliable to assess the presence of archaeological remains.</p> <p>Please address the following queries arising from these documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why were the planned 444 trenches not completed?</li> <li>What are the implications and consequences of the finding set out at para 12.8 of Technical Appendix A11.3?</li> </ol>
Q8.1.11	The applicant	<p><b>The extent of archaeological survey</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 11 [<a href="#">APP-054</a>] Table 11.1 refers to the fact that at PEIR review stage NCC set out that the full Order limits should be subject to trial trench evaluation with a minimum 3% coverage where geophysics has been undertaken and 5% coverage where it has not. Any less would be insufficient to properly inform the EIA assessment and for the production of a fully informed archaeological mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Historic England in their relevant representation [<a href="#">RR-073</a>] have also queried whether the completeness of geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation is sufficient to assess the archaeological potential at this time.</p> <p>Can the applicant please confirm the extent of trial trenching undertaken and also comment on whether the extent of archaeological survey is adequate pre-consent.</p>
Q8.1.12	The applicant	<p><b>Archaeological Mitigation Strategy</b></p> <p>The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [<a href="#">APP-269</a>] Section A11.8.1.2.1, para 10 sets out that the detail of subsequent proposed works referred to in the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will be set out in detailed Written Schemes of Investigation. The written schemes of investigation are nested under the archaeological mitigation strategy process and are subordinate to it.</p> <p>Please provide clarity of the relationship between the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy, the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy referred to in the dDCO and the Written Schemes of Investigation.</p>
Q8.1.13	NCC	<p><b>Archaeological Mitigation Strategy</b></p> <p>The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [<a href="#">APP-269</a>] Section A11.8.1.3.4 refers to the role of the Archaeological Curator.</p> <p>Noting that this this relates to NCC, do NCC Archaeologists have any comments on the remit outlined for them here?</p>
Q8.1.14	Historic England/ NCC	<p><b>Mitigation through preservation by record</b></p> <p>The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [<a href="#">APP-269</a>] Section A11.8.5.4 sets out various methods for preservation by record, where this is “the practicable or feasible approach for archaeology”.</p> <p>Historic England and NCC are invited to comment on the suitability of the methods identified.</p>
Q8.1.15	The applicant/ NCC and NSDC	<p><b>Heritage engagement</b></p> <p>The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [<a href="#">APP-269</a>] Section A11.8.7.5.1 sets out that public benefit and engagement with the community could help to offset some of the physical effects of the development. A potential location for a community archaeological project has been identified at the site of the proposed community orchard south of Vicarage Lane, North Muskam. This would be subject to a written scheme of investigation under the archaeological mitigation strategy.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The applicant is asked to please provide further details. NCC and NSDC are invited to comment on the suitability of this provision.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> As confirmed in our Relevant Representations response and Local Impact Report, Nottinghamshire County Council are leading in relation to archaeology and therefore NSDC have nothing further to add in this regard.</p>
Q8.1.16	The applicant	<p><b>Heritage significance</b></p> <p>There are subtle but notable differences between ES Chapter 11 [APP-054] Table 11.2 Framework for Determining Value (Heritage Significance) of Receptors and Table A11.8.2 Heritage Significance set out in the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-269]. The applicant is asked to review and confirm that a consistent approach has been/ will be adopted.</p>
Q8.1.17	The applicant	<p><b>Siting of intermediate substations</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 11 [APP-054] section 11.8 para 190 refers to direct effects during the construction phase with reference to the siting of intermediate substations. Specifically, the areas identified as being potential locations for intermediate substations are generally larger than the actual substations will be. It sets out that, in the event that post-submission evaluation as set out in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy identifies archaeological remains on the Substation sites, below-ground activities associated with their construction have the potential to affect buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>How would this scenario be managed?</p>
Q8.1.18	Historic England, NCC and NSDC	<p><b>Significance of effects on heritage assets</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 11 [APP-054] section 11.5.4 sets out a framework for the assessment of the significance of effects on heritage assets. On the basis of Table 11.4 it is suggested that for assets, or receptors, of 'very high' or 'high' values, which could include a world heritage site or a Grade I listed building, a 'low' magnitude of effect, which could include a 'minor change in setting... (to) listed buildings, sites and other features which may lead to a small reduction in the contribution the setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset with an appreciable loss in the assets overall significance.', would have a 'minor' effect overall. According to para 72, this would then equate to 'less than substantial harm to heritage significance (lower end of scale)'. This would not be significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Historic England /NCC/NSDC are invited to comment on whether this basis for the assessment is reasonable.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Yes, NSDC consider the basis for assessment set out is reasonable.</p>
Q8.1.19	The applicant	<p><b>Effects on buried archaeological remains</b></p> <p>In the summary of likely significant effects at ES Chapter 11 [APP-054] section 11.11 (para 377) it is suggested that five instances of possible minor to moderate effects to buried archaeological remains, therefore potentially significant in EIA terms, have been identified, though mitigation measures would reduce the previously reported significant effects to minor adverse or negligible effects which are not significant in EIA terms. However, Table 11.6 identifies six instances of possible minor to moderate effects to buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>Please correct this point.</p>
Q8.1.20	The applicant/ Historic England/ NSDC/ NCC	<p><b>Settings Assessment</b></p> <p>The settings assessment scoping exercise [APP-255] set section A11.2.3 (para 20) sets out that due to the large number of assets within the study areas, those within conservation areas have been grouped within their conservation area. The heritage assets identified as potentially being impacted by development in their setting are identified on Figure 11.4 [APP-161] and listed in ES Chapter 11 [APP-054] para 166. This does not include those listed buildings identified as being located within those conservation areas that have been scoped into the settings assessment (for example Kelham and Maplebeck Conservation Areas). It is not, therefore, clear whether the effect of the development within the settings of these buildings, has been given specific consideration.</p> <p>The applicant is asked to please clarify this point.</p> <p>The other parties are invited to comment on whether this forms a robust basis for the settings assessment of all the identified designated heritage assets.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<b>NSDC Response:</b> As previously acknowledged, NSDC consider that the significance of Grade I and II* are higher than that of Grade II and Conservation Areas. However, in terms of a methodology for assessing the impact of the proposed development on such assets, NSDC are satisfied that grouping the two higher grades, together with the lower grades within individual Conservation Areas, can be agreed as acceptable approach for the settings assessment, but in full recognition that the Conservation Area will contain individual buildings of higher grade within them.
Q8.1.21	The applicant	<p><b>Heritage viewpoints</b></p> <p>The document titled 'Heritage viewpoints' [APP-162] provides photographs and wireline diagrams relating to only one viewpoint at Staythorpe on the PRow to the NW of Manor Farm. However, other than a reference to Figure 11.5 within Table 11.1 in response to comments from NSDC [APP-054], this is not referred to in the ES. The applicant is asked to please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide further explanation of the analysis and implications of this document.</li> <li>provide an indication of the position of this viewpoint.</li> <li>explanation as to why other viewpoints have not been provided.</li> </ol>
Q8.1.22	The applicant	<p><b>Historic Landscape Context</b></p> <p>Historic England noted in their scoping opinion (noted in Tab 11.2 of Chapter 11 [APP-054]) that the particular distribution of arrays proposed may pose particular challenges in respect of how settlements sit and are experienced in their historic landscape context hence an approach to the consideration of setting issues will need to consider the kinetic experience of moving through the space in considerable detail.</p> <p>In response, the applicant suggested that visits to the historic settlements which surround the Order limits were undertaken as part of the settings assessment.</p> <p>However, it is not clear how this work, including the kinetic experience of moving through the space, has informed the assessment, noting that very few references to this wider historic landscape setting are made. The applicant is asked to please address this point and to provide further explanation of the work undertaken.</p>
Q8.1.23	The applicant and NSDC	<p><b>Effects on designated and non-designated heritage assets</b></p> <p>In their LIR [REP1-075] NSDC have set out that in addition to the 13 heritage assets identified as potentially sensitive the effects of the development, there are a further 11 additional designated and non-designated heritage assets where there is the potential for the proposal to impact their settings. NSDC sets out that clear and convincing justification for scoping out these assets has not been provided. Further, recommended mitigation is identified for a number of these.</p> <p>The parties are asked to review their respective positions as a basis for progressing their SoCG on this matter, providing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear explanation of why they should be/have been scoped into/out of the assessment.</li> </ol> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC have previously expressed a view on the additional 11 assets that may be impacted and have to date not received a response on this issue. It is the Applicant's responsibility to either undertake additional assessment or explain why this is not necessary. Until such time that the Applicant responds on this issue, we are unable to respond further.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regards to NSDCs suggestions for mitigation, clear explanation of what it suggested is required and the basis for this, that is, how this relates to the significance of the setting of the particular asset.</li> </ol> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC have followed a precautionary approach to the identification of possible mitigation. Once again, we have (to date) not had a further response from the Applicant and until a response is provided, we are unable to comment further at this stage.</p>
Q8.1.24	The applicant	<p><b>Points of clarification</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES Chapter 11 section 11.6.2.3 (para 90) refers to a deserted medieval village being identified at Willoughby. Presumably this is the Willoughby Deserted Medieval Village Scheduled Monument (1013884) referred to in para 277?</li> <li>The Planning and Legislative Framework at Appendix 2 of the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment [APP-251] does not include reference to the relevant provisions of the National Policy Statements. Please confirm that these have been considered and have informed the Desk Based Assessment.</li> <li>With reference to the Archaeological desk based assessment: Part 2 of 4 [APP-252], the first figure, that is Figure A11.1.3a: Site, Study Area and HER Data (Palaeolithic-Romano-British), which it appears would cover the north-western quarter, is missing. Please address.</li> <li>There are discrepancies between the list of designated heritage assets in the 2km and 2km-5km study areas set out in ES Chapter 11 section 11.6.1 and those set out in The Settings Assessment Scoping Exercise [APP-255] at section A11.2.3. Please address.</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>9. Cumulative effects</b>		
Q9.1.1	To applicant	<p><b>Cumulative effects of the NG+ flood alleviation works</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the applicant has only considered the future NG+ flood alleviation works within ES Chapter 9 [APP-052]. The justification for this throughout the ES appears to be that as these are future schemes at an early stage of planning, there is insufficient information available in order to undertake a wider assessment of cumulative impacts, and that it is only water environment receptors that would be affected. However, given that the applicant has considered that sufficient detail is available to include these schemes within ES Chapter 9, and the NG+ works may involve works such as excavations and above ground bunds, the ExA is unclear as to why this would not impact on receptors assessed in other ES chapters. The applicant is requested to provide a justification for excluding an assessment of cumulative effects with the NG+ works from other ES chapters.</p>
Q9.1.2	The applicant	<p><b>Interrelationships</b></p> <p>With reference to ES Vol 2 Chapter 19 Interrelationships, [APP-062] Table 19.2, this identifies a range of adverse non-negligible effects on local people during the construction phase. These include visual effects, noise and vibration, traffic and transport, health and recreation. However, it notes that as the construction phase is time limited, with some effects lasting for a few weeks at the most, the in-combination effects on local people would be a detectable but non-material change which is minor and therefore not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. Noting that the construction phase overall would span 24 months and that it is not clear how the duration of effects would be controlled or would combine, the applicant is asked to comment on whether this assessment has been based on a worst-case scenario.</p>
Q9.1.3	The applicant	<p><b>Interrelationships</b></p> <p>With reference to ES Vol 2 Chapter 19 Interrelationships, [APP-062] Table 19.2, it is suggested that the visual impacts have been derived from Tables 7.5 and 7.6 of ES Chapter 7, it is not clear that this is the case and inconsistent referencing has been used. Also, the viewpoints in Table 7.5 are not referenced. Please review and clarify.</p>
<b>10. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations</b>		
Q10.1.1	Affected Persons and Interested Parties	Do any Affected Persons (APs) have concerns that they have not yet raised about the legitimacy, proportionality or necessity of the compulsory acquisition (CA) or temporary possession (TP) powers sought by the Applicant that would affect land that they own or have an interest in?
Q10.1.2	Affected Persons and Interested Parties	Are any APs or Interested Persons (IPs) aware of any inaccuracies in the Statement of Reasons or Land Plans? If so, please set out what these are and provide details.
Q10.1.3	Affected Persons and Interested Parties	The Book of Reference (BoR) [REP1-013] identifies, on a plot-by-plot basis, all parties who own or occupy land and/or have an interest in or right over the land affected by the proposal, and/or who may be entitled to make a 'relevant claim' as defined in section 57 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). Are any APs or IPs aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR? If so, please set out what these are and provide details.
Q10.1.4	Drone Defence Services Ltd and the applicant	<p>Following the comments made in [RR-045], can Drone Defence Services Ltd. please confirm the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plots of land (as per the Land Plans) for which you have any land interests.</li> <li>If you are a category 2 or category 3 interest, and how these rights specifically would be affected by the proposed development.</li> </ol> <p>Can the applicant provide an update with regards to the status of any ongoing relevant discussions or negotiations concerning the comments made by Drone Defence Services Ltd.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q10.1.5	James Chase	In your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-077]</a> you state that you “do not believe that power of compulsory purchase should be granted”. a. Do you have any land interests which relate to the proposed development, and which have not been included by the applicant? b. Does your comment pertain to the compulsory acquisition of any specific land rights requested by the applicant in respect of the proposed development? c. Does your comment pertain to the compulsory acquisition of any specific plots of land as detailed in the BoR and the Land Plans? d. Do you have any further specific objections related to land rights?
Q10.1.6	Mick George Limited and the applicant	To Mick George Limited - in respect of comments made in relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-138]</a> , and noting the applicant’s response in section 3.18 of <a href="#">[REP1-065]</a> , please confirm the status of any ongoing negotiations with the applicant. Do you have any further comments in response?  To the applicant – please confirm your position with regards to the comments raised in respect of the compliance of the proposed development with the Nottinghamshire Mineral and Waste Local Plan.
Q10.1.7	National Grid and the applicant	With regards to the relevant category 2 land interests outlined in the BoR <a href="#">[REP1-013]</a> , can the applicant provide an update on the status of negotiations.
Q10.1.8	Pamela Gladwin and Paul Mitchell	With regards to your comments made in your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-169]</a> Do you have any specific objections or comments relating to the compulsory acquisition of land rights where you have a category 2 interest?
Q10.1.9	Richard Gill and the applicant	To Richard Gill - in respect of your comments in relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-181]</a> , please provide further detail as to the services which would be affected by the proposed development, and how these may affect the viability and use of your property.  To the applicant - please confirm the status of any ongoing negotiations with Richard Gill.
Q10.1.10	Robert Reeve and the applicant	To Robert Reeve - with regards to your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-186]</a> , please confirm the precise location of the lake and any specific concerns you have regarding the effects of the proposed development on it. To the applicant - in respect of relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-186]</a> , please confirm the following: a. The land rights interests that would be affected by compulsory acquisition. b. If there are any effects on the lake that would interfere with the land rights. c. The status of any relevant negotiations.
Q10.1.11	RWE Generation UK PLC and the applicant	To RWE Generation UK PLC - with regards to comments made in your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-190]</a> , please provide further detail as to your use of the rights related to plots 1/3, 1/9, 1/10, 1/11, 1/12, and 1/23 for access to its equipment, and how these would be affected by the proposed development. To the applicant: a. Please provide an update on the status of any relevant negotiations with RWE Generation UK PLC. b. Please confirm if the BoR has been updated to include RWE Generation UK PLC’s interests in plots 1/12 and 1/23. c. Please respond to the comments raised by RWE Generation UK PLC in respect of s138 of PA2008.
<b>11. Landscape and visual impacts</b>		
Q11.1.1	The applicant and NSDC	<b>Significant landscape effects</b> The SoCG between the applicant and NSDC <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a> sets out the interpretation of the ‘moderate adverse’ effects in EIA terms is a matter not agreed. NSDC refer to the nature and size of the application in suggesting that moderate effects should be judged as significant. In response, the applicant refers to the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) explicitly identifying that only “major and major/moderate effects are considered to be significant, thereby meeting the guidance provided in GLVIA paragraph 3.33”. The

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:																																											
		<p>applicant also refers to the use of professional judgement to ensure that the potential for significant effects arising has been thoroughly considered, and the fact that some other NSIP projects have also used major/moderate effects as the threshold for significant effects. However, the ExA notes that this is not universal.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.33 of GLVIA3 (Annex A of <a href="#">REP1-068</a>) sets out that “<i>The final overall judgement of the likely significance of the predicted landscape and visual effects is, however, often summarised in a series of categories of significance reflecting combinations of sensitivity and magnitude. These tend to vary from project to project but they should be appropriate to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and should as far as possible be consistent across the different topic areas in the EIA.</i>” (emphasis added).</p> <p>The parties are asked to provide further justification for their respective positions.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC agree with the quotations from the GLVIA3 paragraph 3.33 and note that the ‘significance’ is relevant to the nature, size and location and should be consistent across the different topics, where possible. We would, however, refer to the fact that the One Earth NSIP project, also located within the NSDC district is a directly comparable NSIP project. The One Earth LVIA methodology sets out at A.11.4.2 that moderate effects are considered to be significant in EIA terms, as stated below.</p> <div data-bbox="439 695 1279 1121" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="5">Magnitude of effect</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Very High</th> <th>High</th> <th>Medium</th> <th>Low</th> <th>Very Low</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th rowspan="5" style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Sensitivity</th> <th>Very High</th> <td style="background-color: #d62728;">Major</td> <td style="background-color: #d62728;">Major</td> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ffbb78;">Moderate</td> </tr> <tr> <th>High</th> <td style="background-color: #d62728;">Major</td> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ffbb78;">Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #bcbd22;">Moderate or Minor</td> </tr> <tr> <th>Medium</th> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ffbb78;">Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #bcbd22;">Moderate or Minor</td> <td style="background-color: #2ca02c;">Minor or Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <th>Low</th> <td style="background-color: #ff7f0e;">Major or Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #ffbb78;">Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #bcbd22;">Moderate or Minor</td> <td style="background-color: #2ca02c;">Minor or Negligible</td> <td style="background-color: #2ca02c;">Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <th>Very Low</th> <td style="background-color: #ffbb78;">Moderate</td> <td style="background-color: #bcbd22;">Moderate or Minor</td> <td style="background-color: #2ca02c;">Minor or Negligible</td> <td style="background-color: #2ca02c;">Negligible</td> <td style="background-color: #2ca02c;">Negligible</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 5px;">Notes: where the assessment concludes that there will be no impacts on a receptor, (e.g. not visible in the view) this will be reported as no effect.</p> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 5px;">A.11.4.2. Following identification of the level of effect, an assessment of significance is provided. Major and moderate effects are considered to be significant in EIA terms. Minor, negligible, and no effects are considered not significant.</p> </div>			Magnitude of effect					Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	Sensitivity	Very High	Major	Major	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	High	Major	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Medium	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Low	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible	Very Low	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
		Magnitude of effect																																											
		Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low																																							
Sensitivity	Very High	Major	Major	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate																																							
	High	Major	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor																																							
	Medium	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible																																							
	Low	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible																																							
	Very Low	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible	Negligible																																							
Q11.1.2	The applicant	<p><b>Viewpoint analysis</b></p> <p>In relation to ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[APP-050]</a>, Table 7.5: Viewpoint Analysis Summary – non-Negligible Scale effects, please address the following queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The nature of the non-negligible scale effects are very briefly described. Is there an analysis underpinning this summary? If not, can one be provided?</li> <li>b. This table describes the ‘scale and nature of change’ in identifying non-negligible effects. How does relate to the significance criteria set out in section 7.3?</li> <li>c. Some of the effects described in Table 7.5 are unclear. For example, for viewpoints 7, 33 and 46, it sets out that the change would be ‘Large, Adverse, reducing to Medium, Neutral’. How have such effects been identified?</li> <li>d. Some of the effects described in Table 7.5 appear to be significant, for example in relation to viewpoints 7, 33, 38, 46, 48 and 55. However, they do not appear in Tabel 7.6 which sets out the receptor for which significant effects are identified. Why not?</li> </ol>																																											
Q11.1.3	The applicant	<p><b>Effects on landscape character</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[APP-050]</a> section 7.7.9.3 refers to ‘Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands / Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands’, setting out that this is shown in Figure 7.3 <a href="#">[APP-100]</a> and that this character type forms most of the rural area between Hockerton and Tuxford. However, figure 7.3 refers to the Newark and Sherwood Landscape Character Types (LCT) ‘Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands’ and the Bassetlaw LCT ‘Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands’. It is therefore not clear what the area at section 7.7.9.3 relates to. Reference to ‘Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands – Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands’ is also made Table 7.2 and in Appendix 7.3 <a href="#">[APP-210]</a>. It is assumed that this reference is to the fact that the Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands LCT is within the wider Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands RCT. The applicant is asked to please clarify this point.</li> </ol>																																											

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b. Also in relation to the Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands / Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands LCT, with reference to the effects of the development during construction and early operation, there is some high level analysis setting out how the conclusion that the impact on the LCT would be large/medium magnitude and effects would be major/moderate, adverse and significant' in reached. However, notwithstanding the same conclusion being set out in Table 7.6 for the effects on this LCT during operation and decommissioning, the corresponding analysis is missing. Please clarify.
Q11.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Landscape effects</b></p> <p>Some interested parties have raised concerns about whether the undulating topography of the area have been considered in the design of the proposed development (for example <a href="#">[RR-136]</a>). Noting the reference in NPS EN-3 para 2.10.95 to the suggestion that '<i>with effective screening and appropriate land topography, the area of a zone of visual influence could be appropriately minimised</i>', the applicant is asked to explain how such considerations have been accommodated.</p>
Q11.1.5	The applicant	<p><b>Visual effects</b></p> <p>With reference to ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[APP-050]</a> section 7.7.10, Visual Effects, please address the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 150 sets out that 'Groups' of visual receptors have been identified based around settlements or rural areas and representing effects on the community within public spaces including streets and local recreational routes in that place. Whilst these are illustrated in Figure 7.5 <a href="#">[APP-102]</a>, the area covered by each group, indicated as a brown/red line, is not clear. The applicant is asked to please address this point.</li> <li>Para 150 sets out the three types of visual receptors as being 'Group', 'Route' and 'Specific viewpoint' receptors. Table 7.2 refers to Eakring, Kersall and Maplebeck as separate visual receptors. Clarification is requested on exactly what these receptors relate to, noting also that that Kersall and Maplebeck are also within Group C.</li> <li>Para 151 refers to candidate specific viewpoints. What does this term mean?</li> <li>Para 151 sets out that the only candidate specific viewpoint in the study area is the Millenium viewpoint approximately 1 km southwest of Maplebeck. It suggests that the baseline visibility in that area (tall roadside hedgerows and restricted outward views) indicates that it is presently unlikely to be visited in order to enjoy the view and it is not therefore considered in the assessment. The applicant is asked to clarify whether this corresponds with viewpoint 4.</li> <li>Para 155 sets out that Figure 7.6 illustrates scale of change to views on completion and prior to growth of mitigation planting. Figure 7.7 illustrates scale of change to views after growth of mitigation planting, although the areas of visibility shown have not included modelling of the proposed planting and show the unmitigated extent of visibility, given that visibility above and through hedges would remain in some places in the longer term. Given that Figure 7.7 does not included modelling of the proposed planting and shows the unmitigated extent of visibility, how do Figures 7.6 and 7.7 differ?</li> </ol>
Q11.1.6	The applicant	<p><b>Visual receptor groups</b></p> <p>With reference to ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[APP-050]</a> section 7.7.10.5 Receptor Group C: Between Caunton, Eakring and Kneesall : The effects of the development during construction and early operation for both PRoW users and road users are identified as major/moderate, adverse and significant. PRoW users are generally recognised as being more sensitive to changes in the landscape as they tend to spend relatively more time experiencing the changes. Are the same conclusions on impact therefore appropriate?</p>
Q11.1.7	NSDC	<p><b>LVIA Visual assessment</b></p> <p>The LIR <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> notes slightly different conclusions compared to those set out in the ES Chapter 7 in relation to the effects on the grouped visual receptors for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group B – PRoW users: post-decommissioning NSDC considers effects to be major/moderate adverse rather than moderate adverse.</li> <li>Group B – Road users: during construction and early operation NSDC note same moderate adverse conclusion as applicant, but state this is significant.</li> <li>Group C PRoW users: during construction and early operation NSDC considers effects to be moderate significant rather than major/moderate.</li> <li>Group C Road users: during construction and early operation NSDC considers effects to be moderate significant rather than major/moderate.</li> </ol> <p>NSDC are asked to provide clarification and explanation of the reasons for the differences noted.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> Firstly, we note that the hyperlink above is incorrectly referenced, as it provides a link to the NCC LIR, rather than the NSDC one. Furthermore, we would clarify that NSDC have not undertaken a comparative assessment, but in any event, the information presented in a table at Section 8.24 of the LIR is a summary of the information contained at paragraph 7.7.10 of ES, Chapter 7 – Landscape and Visual and therefore this is simply an error in the translating the information from the ES chapter to the LIR.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q11.1.8	The applicant	<p><b>Carlton on Trent Parish Council</b></p> <p>With reference to the request from Carlton-on Trent Parish Council <a href="#">[RR-025]</a> that further visualisations be provided to inform and alleviate concerns of the Parish Council, the applicant has responded that assessment covers all visual receptors in the study area, including the receptors represented by the additional viewpoints requested <a href="#">[REP1-065]</a> p25]. The applicant is asked to provide specific clarification on how the requested viewpoints have been covered.</p>
Q11.1.9	The applicant	<p><b>Effects of residential visual amenity</b></p> <p>The Residential Visual Amenity (RVA) Assessment <a href="#">[APP-213]</a> sets out a four stage approach. Section A6.2.2.2 sets out that the final stage identifies amenity of individual properties identified as “having the greatest magnitude of change” (i.e. large magnitude within this assessment) and identifying whether the RVA threshold is reached. It states that where a magnitude of change is identified that is less than large, this final step is not required as the effects would not reach the RVA threshold. Section A7.6.2.2. refers to an assessment being made of “whether the predicted effects on visual amenity and views at the property are such that it has reached the RVA Threshold, therefore potentially becoming a matter of residential amenity”. The applicant is asked to please provide further explanation of and justification for the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the properties identified as receiving a large or medium magnitude of effect are considered meet the RVA threshold. However, for a number of these properties the effects are identified as high as “Magnitude: Large/medium, Level of Effect: Major, Adverse” (R27, R49 and R50). It is therefore not clear how the assessment of whether the RVA Threshold is met has been undertaken.</li> <li>Noting that this assessment is informed by desk study and field surveys from nearby publicly accessible locations and not by visits to impacted properties, it is not clear that an assessment of impacts can be accurately made.</li> </ol>
Q11.1.10	NSDC	<p><b>Landscape and visual impacts overall</b></p> <p>The LIR <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> notes at section 8.0 sets out that ‘landscape and visual impacts would be neutral to negative (depends on the landscape character area).’ However, the conclusions at para 16.2 note the ‘specific and direct negative impacts associated with the proposed development, including landscape and visual impacts leading to a marked change in the character of the area’.</p> <p>NSDC are asked to please provide further explanation and clarification of their position on this point.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> The proposed reference as referred to above is not contained within the Landscape section of the LIR (8.0) but rather is within the Summary and Conclusions section of the LIR at Paragraph 16.2. As such, Section 8.0 is a technical consideration of landscape as a topic area and Section 16 seeks to wrap up NSDC’s overall position. As such, Paragraph 16.2 does not relate to character areas from a technical landscape and visual perspective but seeks to identify the change in the character of the district as a whole in land use terms, from the proposed development and as a result of cumulative impacts from the One Earth solar farm and/or other development.</p>
Q11.1.11	The applicant	<p><b>Mitigation v. enhancement</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[APP-050]</a> section 7.6.4 refers to mitigation and enhancement measures. During the discussion in ISH1 reference was made to the distinction between landscape enhancement and mitigation measures with reference to published guidance on this matter, with the applicant providing further details in their written note <a href="#">[REP1-068]</a>. To assist further, the applicant is asked to please clarify how the distinction between the embedded mitigation measures set out in ES Chapter 7 Table 7.3, and the embedded enhancement measures set out in Table 7.4, has been drawn.</p>
Q11.1.12	The applicant, NSDC, NCC and interested parties	<p><b>Cumulative landscape and visual assessment</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the comments made in relation to cumulative landscape and visual assessment by the applicant [Appendix 3 of <a href="#">REP1-068</a>] and NSDC <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> and <a href="#">[REP1-076]</a>, and the comments of other parties (for example <a href="#">REP1-091</a> and <a href="#">[REP1-087]</a> and others eg <a href="#">[RR-194]</a>), as well as preliminary progress made in the SoCG <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a>. Specifically, concerns are raised about the landscape and visual impacts of the proliferation of large scale solar across Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, particularly associated with the River Trent corridor.</p> <p>To progress consideration of the issues raised, comments from all parties are invited in relation to the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant’s position is that other consented projects and the effects arising from them should be considered as part of the baseline, that is the landscape present now. This is based on the applicant’s assessment of the relevant regulations, policy and guidance relating to the principles and purposes of cumulative landscape and visual assessment (set out in Appendix 3 of <a href="#">REP1-068</a>). Views are sought on this interpretation of how other existing and, or approved development, including existing plans and projects that are ‘reasonably foreseeable’ but not yet consented should be treated.</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:																
		<p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC do not agree with the Applicant on this point. For consented and/or planned developments, there is still a level of uncertainty, because although permitted, all the assessment undertaken to inform decision making regarding the potential impacts and resulting effects is predicative only. As such, NSDC question how such developments can be considered part of the baseline, if they do not yet exist, the full extent of those impacts has not yet been experienced by the environment and therefore cannot be fully understood. The result of this interpretation is an assumption that everything consented currently exists and forms part of the context within which a new development will be accommodated and/or it will be constructed before the proposed development. NSDC has not seen any evidence behind this assertion. NSDC note and accept that cumulative assessment and how it is considered within respective discipline chapters of an ES can vary, but we remain particularly concerned on the potential cumulative effects from a landscape and visual perspective. NSDC consider it essential that a robust and ‘proper’ consideration of cumulative effects be undertaken in this regard. At the time of writing this response, NSDC are undertaking further discussions with the Applicant on cumulative effects and how they should be assessed as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>b. If, as is suggested, the applicant’s LVIA has not considered the potential impacts across the wider landscape character areas than that covered by the proposed development, how is it suggested that this should be addressed?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> We would make reference to part 7.21 of GLVIA3 and consider there are two possible ways to do this, with both options starting with a ZTV. This would also assist with the question below on sequential visual effects. Running a ZTV for all the relevant applications would show where there is overlap and would give an indication of where there are locations where visually more than one application can be visible. It would also identify the routes and the receptors which could experience these sequential views. This would then allow, when overlaid with the Landscape Character mapping, to see where these changes may affect landscape character. This could then lead to an overview of whether the landscape was so changed that new landscape descriptions or sub-types (based on a predicted change) would be required. This would determine if there were such a change in the landscape that the descriptions of landscape character would change. NSDC consider that a combination of the two methods referred to above, would provide a more developed understanding.</p> <p>c. Whilst the applicant and NSDC have agreed that the LVIA does consider sequential views at the site level, it is suggested that consideration has not been given to the movement of people across the wider landscape [LIR <a href="#">[REP1-075]</a> para 8.34]. This point is raised by other IPs (eg Norwell solar ISH1 summary <a href="#">[REP1-098]</a>). In this regard the GLVIA3 guidance sets out that sequential views can occur when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see the same or different developments [Annex A of <a href="#">[REP1-068]</a>]. These can be ‘frequent’ sequential, where features appear regularly, or ‘occasional’ sequential, where there are longer time lapses between occurrences due to distance or speed of travel. If, as is suggested, that such considerations have not been adequately addressed in the applicants LVIA, how should this be addressed?</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC would again make reference to part 7.35 of GLVIA3 which sets out that sequential views should be recorded along important linear routes in order to understand cumulative impact on visual receptors. This should be done in the context of reviewing combined and sequential, as indicated below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="430 1354 1083 1900"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3"><b>Combined</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Occurs where the observer is able to see two or more developments from one viewpoint.</td> <td>In combination</td> <td>Where two or more developments are or would be within the observer’s arc of vision at the same time without moving her/his head.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In succession</td> <td>Where the observer has to turn her/his head to see the various developments – actual and visualised.</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3"><b>Sequential</b></th> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Occurs when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see the same or different developments. Sequential effects may be assessed for travel along regularly used routes such as major roads or popular paths.</td> <td>Frequently sequential</td> <td>Where the features appear regularly and with short time lapses between instances depending on speed of travel and distance between the viewpoints.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Occasionally sequential</td> <td>Where longer time lapses between appearances would occur because the observer is moving very slowly and/or there are larger distances between the viewpoints.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>If such work was undertaken, NSDC would suggest that once the routes and locations have been identified by the Applicant, the locations be agreed with NSDC, with input from other interested parties as appropriate.</p>	<b>Combined</b>			Occurs where the observer is able to see two or more developments from one viewpoint.	In combination	Where two or more developments are or would be within the observer’s arc of vision at the same time without moving her/his head.	In succession	Where the observer has to turn her/his head to see the various developments – actual and visualised.	<b>Sequential</b>			Occurs when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see the same or different developments. Sequential effects may be assessed for travel along regularly used routes such as major roads or popular paths.	Frequently sequential	Where the features appear regularly and with short time lapses between instances depending on speed of travel and distance between the viewpoints.	Occasionally sequential	Where longer time lapses between appearances would occur because the observer is moving very slowly and/or there are larger distances between the viewpoints.
<b>Combined</b>																		
Occurs where the observer is able to see two or more developments from one viewpoint.	In combination	Where two or more developments are or would be within the observer’s arc of vision at the same time without moving her/his head.																
	In succession	Where the observer has to turn her/his head to see the various developments – actual and visualised.																
<b>Sequential</b>																		
Occurs when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see the same or different developments. Sequential effects may be assessed for travel along regularly used routes such as major roads or popular paths.	Frequently sequential	Where the features appear regularly and with short time lapses between instances depending on speed of travel and distance between the viewpoints.																
	Occasionally sequential	Where longer time lapses between appearances would occur because the observer is moving very slowly and/or there are larger distances between the viewpoints.																

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q11.1.13	The applicant, NSDC, NCC and interested parties	<p><b>Cumulative landscape and visual effects: Kelham Solar Farm</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 [APP-050] section 7.9.2.1 sets out that in terms of the effects on landscape character, if the now proposed [and now consented] Kelham solar farm were present there would be a reduction in the extent of changes to landscape character, with the effects of the proposed development being slightly reduced.</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> In relation to the reduction of effects on landscape character, NSDC would accept that when built the Kelham Hall solar array would have a larger impact on landscape character, but the reality it is not built yet, or in situ. The proposed development still increases the footprint of developed land and increases the extent of industrial features within the wider landscape.</p> <p>Similarly at section 7.9.2.2 it is suggested that at viewpoint 45 on the A617/Trent Valley Way, the scale of change arising from the development would be negligible as the foreground of this view would be occupied by this Kelham solar farm. A similar scenario is set out on the appellant's Cumulative landscape and visual technical note [Appendix 3, para 4.10 of REP1-068].</p> <p><b>NSDC Response:</b> NSDC would estimate this change as being low to negligible. As noted above, a large change has occurred in this scenario as a result of the Kelham solar array, but we consider the BESS will still be visible and will appear as an additional element in those views.</p> <p>All parties are asked to comment on the implications of these conclusions.</p>
Q11.1.14	The applicant	<p><b>Points of clarification</b></p> <p>The applicant is asked to please address the following points with reference to ES Chapter 7 – Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-050]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to Section 7.3.6 Visualisations Para 46: Should the reference to photomontages for viewpoints 27, 38 and 47 be amended to 27, 38 and <b>48</b>?</li> <li>With reference section 7.7.10.8 Receptor Group F PRow users: the effects after decommissioning area noted as being major/ moderate, adverse and significant – this should therefore be noted in bold in Table 7.6.</li> <li>For all viewpoints provided as part of AS-036, it would be helpful if the direction of the photographs/wirelines/photomontages (N, E, S, W, NE, NW, SW etc) could be provided.</li> <li>Within AS-036, for viewpoint 4, the cumulative Wireline for this viewpoint appears to indicate inter-visibility with One Earth Solar Farm, which is highly unlikely. There is also a suggestion of visibility of a substation to the north, though the plans indicate this would be to the east. Please review.</li> <li>Within AS-037, for viewpoint 15, whilst there is an acknowledgment of cumulative effects with One Earth Solar in Figure 7.8, [APP-105] this is not represented in the directions considered relating to viewpoint 15. Please review.</li> <li>Within AS-037, for viewpoint 27, please indicate what the area coloured green on the cumulative wireframe for 27(A) relates to.</li> <li>Within AS-038, for viewpoint 46, please indicate what the area coloured green on the cumulative wireframe for 46(C) and 46(D) relates to (assume this represents woodland).</li> </ol>
<b>12. Need, site selection and alternatives</b>		
Q12.1.1	The applicant	<p><b>Site selection criteria</b></p> <p>NPS EN-3 at section 2.10 refers specifically to Solar PV Generation, setting out the factors influencing site selection and design (para 2.10.18 to 2.10.48). The first of these factors is irradiance and site topography. Noting that these factors are not referred to in either ES Vol 2 Chapter 4 Alternatives [APP-047] or the Design Approach Document (APP-319 to APP-322), the applicant is asked confirm whether and how these factors have been taken into account.</p>
<b>13. Water environment and flood risks</b>		
Q13.1.1	Environment Agency	<p><b>Surface Water Runoff</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you agree with the applicant's assessment of effects of the potential increase in surface water runoff from the solar panels as set out in section 9.6.2.5, Chapter 9 [APP-051] of the ES?</li> <li>Do you agree that the establishment of vegetation and grassland cover within the vicinity of the panels would lead to reduced surface runoff into surrounding watercourses?</li> <li>Could the presence of panels on slopes change the conclusions?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		d. Given the extent of local concerns raised on this issue, do you have any further comments?
Q13.1.2	Environment Agency	<p><b>Flood Risk Assessment</b></p> <p>With regards to the flooding-related issues set out in your SoCG with the applicant [REP1-052], and your relevant representation [RR-054], EA007 to EA011 and EA025 to EA029:</p> <p>a. Are there any aspects of the FRA undertaken by the applicant which you would consider to under-report the risk of flooding as a result of the proposed development, or the impacts and effects on flooding?</p> <p>b. Can you comment on if you consider the FRA undertaken to be compliant with planning policy (EN-1, EN-3, EN-5, NPPF and local planning policy)?</p>
Q13.1.3	The applicant	<p><b>Water Framework Directive, mitigations and monitoring</b></p> <p>With respect to the issues raised by the Environment Agency in [RR-054], EA014 to EA024, please can you respond to these recommendations or provide or signpost to an update regarding the progress of any relevant discussions related to these matters.</p>
Q13.1.4	NCC	<p><b>Local Impact Report</b></p> <p>In section 5.3 and appendix 2 of your LIR [REP1-078] you provide a number of comments and recommendations with regards to the flood risk assessment (FRA) undertaken by the applicant in Appendix A9.1 of the ES [APP-228].</p> <p>a. Are any of your comments in conflict with the conclusions set out in A9.1.7 of the applicant's FRA?</p> <p>b. Do you consider the applicant's conclusions to be robust?</p> <p>In paragraph 5.3.5 of your LIR, you state that "<i>the Flood Risk Assessment and associated Drainage Strategy is presently inadequate</i>" and that "<i>the project has the potential to have a negative impact if further assessment work and mitigation is not addressed</i>".</p> <p>c. Could you briefly summarise what the negative impacts would be, and if you consider that the proposed development would be in conflict with planning policy (EN-1, EN-3, EN-5, NPPF and local planning policy)?</p>
Q13.1.5	The applicant	<p><b>BESS fire during a flood event:</b></p> <p>At A9.1.4 of the FRA [APP-228], the applicant refers to the design of detention basins in the BESS area to be whichever is larger out of the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability + 40% climate change allowance event, or 228m<sup>3</sup> (maximum fire suppressant volume).</p> <p>Can the applicant confirm whether the basins have been designed to accommodate a scenario of the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability event and the requirement for fire suppression to occur simultaneously?</p>
Q13.1.6	The applicant and all Interested Parties	<p><b>Sustainable drainage system design:</b></p> <p>The ExA notes within the FRA [APP-228] that a specific sustainable drainage system strategy is not included for works 2 (as this is underground cables only), 3 (as this is for soft landscaping/ ecological enhancement only with no above ground infrastructure), 6 (as this is the existing National Grid substation), 7 (as this has not yet been constructed) or 8 (access improvements).</p> <p>a. To all IPs - Can you provide any concerns over the omissions of sustainable drainage system features from these works areas?</p> <p>b. To the applicant - On the basis that the applicant proposes to utilise the existing sustainable drainage system features in work area 6, or future in work area 7, can the applicant confirm how the design of these sustainable drainage system features has considered the proposed development, and how the proposed development will integrate with these?</p>
Q13.1.7	The applicant	<p><b>Provision of a surface water drainage strategy:</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that requirement 10 of the dDCO [REP1-006] requires the submission and approval of a surface water drainage strategy. The applicant does not appear to have submitted a standalone version of this to the examination.</p> <p>Can the applicant confirm if they are intending to provide an outline surface water drainage strategy to the examination, and if not, why not (given that other outline management plans have been provided due to be secured by dDCO requirements)?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q13.1.8	The applicant	<b>Climate change allowances:</b> Can the applicant confirm that the climate change allowances used in the FRA <a href="#">[APP-228]</a> for fluvial flood risk relate to peak river flow, as this is not specified in the FRA?
<b>14. Any other matters</b>		
Q14.1.1	The applicant	<b>Design Approach Document</b> The ExA considers that the Design Approach Document <a href="#">[APP-319 to APP-322]</a> is difficult to interpret because of its format, in particular the fact that illustrations are split across non-adjointing pages. The ExA therefore requests that it be reformatted to address this point with specific reference to Figures 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,12, 13, 14 and 15.