



Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Open Floor Hearing 1

Document Reference – EN010162/APP/8.18

Revision Number 1

December 2025

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at OFH1	3
2.1	Introduction.....	3
2.2	Benefits of the Development.....	3
2.3	Number of Homes Powered.....	3
2.4	Land Matters	4
2.5	Environmental Matters.....	4

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 This document contains Elements Green Trent Limited's ('the Applicant') summary of its oral submissions made at Open Floor Hearing 1 ('OFH1') which took place in a blended format at the Sir Goodwin Suite, Newark Showground and on Microsoft Teams on 27 November 2025.

1.1.2 OFH1 was attended by members of the Applicant team and the Applicant is grateful to all those Interested Parties ('IP') that participated and provided their comments.

1.1.3 A number of oral submissions were made at OFH1 by IPs and those are available in the Transcript [\[EV4-002\]](#) [\[EV4-004\]](#).

1.1.4 Miss Elena Sarieva for the Applicant acknowledged the points raised by the IPs which covered the following (non-exhaustive) list of topics:

- Benefits of the Development;
- Energisation date in 2028 in the context of Clean Power 2030;
- Calculation of homes powered equivalent;
- Clarification that the Development provides national benefits in terms of energy security as opposed to local;
- Clarification that land matters will be dealt with in another hearing;
- Clarification that the Environmental Statement contains information on all relevant environmental matters;
- Function of the Development and its parameters;
- Clarification that final design details and management plans are approved by the Local and County Authorities in consultation with statutory consultees;
- Clarifications on the following environmental matters:
 - Flooding
 - ALC and Socioeconomics
 - Traffic and transport, including construction traffic management and response to consultation
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Landscape and Masterplan and mechanism to secure the landscape mitigation and enhancement
 - Cumulative Effects
 - Decommissioning

1.1.5 The Applicant did not intend to cover these topics in detail in this submission. The concerns raised by the IPs relevant to the above topics were covered by the Applicant's already submitted evidence and/or will be dealt with in further written submissions and issue specific hearings as may be arranged by the ExA.

2 SUMMARY OF THE APPLICANT'S ORAL SUBMISSIONS AT OFH1

2.1 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1.1 Miss Sarieva responded to the oral submissions on behalf of the Applicant as follows:
- 2.1.2 She thanked everyone for speaking and raising representations. She noted that she would respond to some of the points now, with the remaining points being addressed in the written submissions for Deadline 1.

2.2 BENEFITS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

- 2.2.1 Miss Sarieva clarified that whilst the principle purpose of the Development is to deliver solar energy, there are other benefits which the Development will contribute to. These benefits mainly include the contribution to the UK's legally binding Net Zero commitments. The Development is anticipated to have a generation capacity of 800MW AC by 2028, which is critical for the Clean Power 2030¹ delivery. In order to reach the 2030 targets, six gigawatts per year for the next five years are required.
- 2.2.2 There is a provision for energy storage facility which will optimise the solar generation. The Development also brings significant biodiversity net gain, over 64,000 trees, over 30 hectares of woodland and 49 kilometres of hedgerow.
- 2.2.3 Other benefits are associated with enhanced public access to greenspace as well as permissive footpaths. There will also be temporary and permanent jobs created. These are all set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Socio-economics and Tourism [EN010162/APP/6.2.13]** [[APP-056](#)].
- 2.2.4 Miss Sarieva also noted that there had been a misunderstanding suggesting the Development would reduce local energy bills. She clarified that the Development would contribute to national energy security and low-carbon energy generation, which would benefit the country as a whole.

2.3 NUMBER OF HOMES POWERED

- 2.3.1 She explained that there had been several representations regarding the "homes powered" figure, and she wished to clarify how it had been calculated. The project had 800 MW of AC generation capacity, and the oversizing ratio of AC to DC had been 1.4, resulting in a DC capacity of 1,200 MW. They had then applied the project-specific P50 yield of 1,005 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt-peak per year.

¹ <https://www.neso.energy/publications/clean-power-2030>

2.3.2 This had produced an annual yield of 1,125.6 GWh. They had divided this by 2,700 Kilowatt-hours per year, representing the typical annual household electricity consumption according to Ofgem. This was how they had arrived at the figure of approximately 400,000 homes. The true figure had been slightly higher, but they had rounded down.

2.4 LAND MATTERS

2.4.1 She added that there had been several points raised relating to land matters, which would be addressed at a future hearing or through written submissions.

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

2.5.1 A number of representations had also been made about environmental matters. She emphasised that the submitted Environmental Statement dealt with these issues in detail, as discussed that day and as would be explored further in subsequent hearings.

2.5.2 She highlighted that **ES Volume 2, Chapter 5: Development Description [EN010162/APP/6.2.5] [APP-048]** sets out the project parameters and explained how the development would be delivered both at consent stage and pre-construction. Importantly, the County Council and District Council would have final sign-off on these details before development commenced, ensuring that the final design would be subject to scrutiny and approval. This applied to both the technical aspects and the landscape mitigation and enhancement measures.

Flood Risk

2.5.3 Regarding flooding, she acknowledged that this was a significant concern in the area. For this reason, one of the key design considerations had been to place all above-ground infrastructure associated with the solar farm and substations outside Flood Zones 2 and 3. She confirmed that the development would not create flood risk elsewhere and would remain safe for its operational lifetime.

Agricultural Land and Impact on Farming

2.5.4 She noted that agricultural land, impacts on farms, and socio-economic considerations had all been assessed in their respective chapters of the Environmental Statement. She also stated that the team would be happy to provide a written note on the impact from the Development on the sugar beet industry.

Traffic and Transport

2.5.5 Turning to traffic and transport, she reassured the public that a comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan would be in place. An outline version had already been submitted, as presented within **ES Volume 4, Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2A]** with the final plan to follow prior to construction. She explained that changes made in the north-east of the area had resulted from the statutory consultation. One of the key changes was the introduction of a haul road to route construction traffic within the Order Limits, helping to reduce traffic around Ossington.

Noise and Vibration

2.5.6 She confirmed that noise and vibration, including construction-related vibration, had been assessed within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010162/APP/6.2.12] [APP-055]**.

Landscape Masterplan

2.5.7 The landscape masterplan would secure the benefits of planting, both mitigation and enhancement. This is provided in **ES Volume 4, Appendix A5.1.1: oLEMP Appendix [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1.1A]**. Final sign-off would rest with the local authorities, and Natural England and other consultees would be involved prior to implementation.

Cumulative Effects

2.5.8 All cumulative effects had also been considered within the Environmental Statement.

Decommissioning

2.5.9 As discussed earlier, she concluded by noting that the decommissioning process had been clearly defined in a specific DCO requirement, which would also be subject to final approval by the relevant local authority.