From:	Amanda Bird
To:	Great North Road Solar
Subject:	F0E94AFBE plus video of blocked pipes
Date:	08 December 2025 15:03:51
Attachments:	image003.png 20180402_110847.mp4

Regarding Interest Party Reference number F0E94AFBE – Amanda Bird

Please see below the information from the Open Hearing for the GNR solar park.

I would like to question the number of homes that Elements Green state that they can supply as Cleve Hill Solar Park has over 550,000 solar panels yet can only supply up to 102,000 homes and on a sunny November day could only manage 20,000 homes. Kent is one of the sunniest places in the UK and receives a significant amount more sunshine than Nottinghamshire. Nottingham averages 1490 hours of sunshine compared with Kent which is 1846 hours a year.

Feature	Kent (Southeast England)	Nottinghamshire (East Midlands)
Sunshine	Drier, warmer, and sunnier climate.	Generally cooler and less sunny.
Rainfall	Lower average rainfall.	Abundant and more frequent rainfall.
Temperature	Milder winters and warmer summers.	Cooler winters and slightly larger temperature ranges.

My fear is that the reason they have positioned the solar panels this way is that after installation they will put a further application in for more development due to space on the grid. This is part of the reason that the boundary area is so large.

I would also like to comment on the last statement made prior to the adjournment before the opening hearing opportunity. The man from Elements Green stated that Climate change was the biggest risk to food security. I believe that solar and Lithium batteries are the biggest risk. There is a butterfly effect happening. We take agricultural land out of production, but that food still has to be produced so it comes from countries with less stringent food and as we know 3 million tonnes of Soy are exported from Brazil 90% of this is animal feed and as Wales are now realising is that this SOY that is fed to sheep is polluting waterways and soil and they are part of the deforestation issue so are looking at growing this themselves. This was discussed on the first day of COP30. Approximately 4.1 million hectares of rainforest are lost each year, some think this figure is a lot higher. We are contributing to the loss of forest so the more that we rely on others the more damage we are causing on Climate Change. The process of producing these solar panels, transporting etc will cause a great deal of CO2 and between a third and half will stay in the atmosphere for 1000's of years. The other half will be absorbed by trees and the ocean but this figure will decrease as we remove the ability for trees etc to absorb their portion of CO2. Planetary boundaries were established by the Stockholm Resilience Centre 2009 and updated 2015. They are also known as the doughnut economics, UN 2015 World conference ' A sustainable development. We have passed these boundaries in Biodiversity, Climate change and Land change (by a staggering 60% through deforestation, house building and renewable projects. The UN Sustainable Development 2015 set 17 goals, 1. Poverty, 2. Food Security 6. Water, 7th Modern Energy. We have major problems with droughts and several villages where mining of Lithium takes place are having water

shipped in as up to 65% of their water is being used for Lithium Mining, 500,000 gallons of water per one tonne of Lithium, 15 – 18 tonnes of CO2 released per tonne of lithium. 1 tonne of coal burnt produces 2 tonnes of CO2 it is the volume of coal used that was the problem, but Lithium has a greater environmental impact than coal such as pollution to the air and run off which will cause a disaster to soil, waterways and wildlife. See the disaster in Tibet. Lithium is becoming the new coal as renewables are no good without storage.
There are no British Standards with BESS sites or EV Charges. A CPD course in February regarding lessons learnt from Grenfell stated at the end of the webinar that we will have a similar disaster on our hands with these.

Solar is a back up not a reliable source of energy and the government itself state that hospitals and schools etc are saving money through rooftop solar. While our bills are going up and will continue to go up due to these schemes.
When the war in Ukraine started, I hear comments on the energy bills going up but my first thought was the empty shelves in the supermarkets. The energy prices didn't worry me as I can control what I use but the lack of food was a greater concern.
I live on [redacted], and my home is approximately 2 metres from the roadside. The house was built between 1800 and 1820; it has no foundations and is on clay. After a conversation at Phase 2 consultation, I was told that I had nothing to worry about and my house would be safer than most due to nowhere for the vibrations to go and therefore no Structural damage. 3 builders later and my house is 100 % at risk of structural damage. My insurers have advised that I need a structural survey prior to works starting to strengthen my case that it is not wear and tear. My house could more than likely become unmortgageable, and I will be in a predicament of not being able to afford to stay but also can not afford to leave. The HGV traffic will increase by over 1000%, traffic lights down the road meaning what may have taken 2 minutes to get down the road will now be between 10- 15 mins. I am going to have difficulty just leaving my house as I need to pull out into the road to see traffic coming from the right. We also run a business from home and delivery or collection of items in large lorries means other large vehicles struggle to get past, 2 HGV's going in opposite directions will not work. The passing places will also cause an increase in flooding due to debris collecting around the entrance to the duct where water will then overflow on to the road an into my garden because we sit in a dip. I would like Elements green to be required to reimburse any homeowner that has expenses that they wouldn't have paid if this project did not go ahead. I would also like Elements green to foot the bill for any damage etc caused by an increase in flooding that has directly come from the panels or works they have completed in order for this project to go ahead,

Why are we not following other countries:
France- mandating solar on roofs and car parks and are trialling Agrivoltaics with success.
Solar for summer and Wind turbines for winter

South Korea – Car parks
Taiwan – Solar not on SSSI, agricultural land or Tourist areas
India – Roofs, 23km of cycle paths, Street Lights so no cabling from light to light.

Please look at the following

https://greentogrey.eu The Grey to green project

https://share.google/hLs4dJSWsUMbZ2dmp - reality of food security
https://search.app/hr9q5 - this discusses the fact we have far more renewable projects than we

require for the 2030 deadline

I have attached some photos of the flooding that occurs due to blocked pipes. We have done everything that we can to save our home from flooding but this will push us over the edge. We don't need a storm for this to happen just a wet week will affect us. Clay when reaches a saturation point water just runs over the grass, soil etc like a river.

Kind Regards
Amanda Bird Tech IOSH
Finance Director

[redacted]
www.garrisonsitemanagement.com

GARRISON SITE MANAGEMENT LTD
Partridge Farm
Moorhouse Road
Egmanton
Newark
Notts
NG22 0HH

While the UK needs to accelerate its energy transition, targets are being missed, projects run into delays, and the public wonders why progress feels so slow. The temptation is to blame politics, funding or technology. Yet there is a deeper reason the road to net zero keeps stalling.
Everything in our modern life, from our roads to our factories, have been built around readily available fossil fuels. As a result, we expect things to happen quickly, to last indefinitely and to disappear without consequence.

Why this expectation? Burning coal, oil and gas taps carbon and sunlight that were locked away over millions of years and releases that energy in a matter of decades. That compression of deep time (the vast geological timescales of Earth's history) into human time gives the impression that highways, buildings and plastics can be produced at speed and endure without limits. Through burning fossil fuels, millions of years worth of stored sunlight and energy can be transformed into concrete, plastics and electricity in a matter of hours.

When we talk about decarbonisation, we are not just changing fuels. We are being asked to change this entire pace of living.

Fossil fuels made energy cheap and abundant, and so our economies were organised around speed. We learned to pour concrete and we assumed it would stand for decades. We built factories that ran day and night and supply chains that delivered instantly. Convenience became normal.

In this context, it makes sense that governments promise to "accelerate" the green transition. The problem is that the very systems we are trying to fix still run on the rhythms of the fossil era. They are not designed to slow down or pivot quickly.

Read more: ***Five ways to improve net zero action – our new research highlights lessons from the past***

The North Sea's recent "tieback" oil licences help show what is really happening.

The UK government's new North Sea strategy is a case in point. The introduction of "transitional energy certificates" or "tiebacks" allow new drilling on or near existing fields. So while the UK has committed to banning all new oil and gas licences, some new fossil fuel extraction is still permitted.

Instead of marking a clean break from fossil fuels, they extend existing infrastructure by linking smaller oil fields to older platforms. This approach is faster and cheaper than starting new projects. On the surface, it looks like progress. But it keeps the old system going rather than rethinking it.

This logic shows up in how we build, too. Concrete is a telling example. In 2025 the UK announced its first carbon capture retrofit for a cement plant in Padeswood, North Wales. This so-called "net zero" cement factory will trap around 800,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide each year and start producing low-carbon cement in 2029.

This is a major technical step forward. Yet the retrofit does not change how cement is made. It simply adds a filter to an existing process that heats ancient limestone to very high temperatures. It still relies on the idea that we can turn geological time into buildings in hours and have them endure for centuries.

The four-year retrofit shows how slow it is to adapt a single plant, but the real lesson is that governments, industries and societies are investing heavily to keep the same rapid tempo of construction, rather than imagining different materials or building practices.

Decarbonising the cement industry will be a slow process. [redacted]/Shutterstock

The electricity grid reveals a similar mismatch. For years Britain's electricity network connected projects on a first come, first served basis. This model assumed a steady trickle of large fossil fuel plants. The surge of renewables has overwhelmed it.

By late 2025 there were more than 700 gigawatts of generation and demand projects waiting in the queue – over four times the capacity needed to meet the government's 2030 clean power target. Some developers have been waiting a decade for a

connection. The backlog exists not because there is a shortage of projects, but because the system was never designed to handle so many small, decentralised schemes.

Regulators are now reforming the queue to prioritise "shovel-ready" projects. That is a necessary fix, but it is also an admission that our assumptions of endless, rapid growth have outpaced the physical network we built.

These examples reveal a deeper pattern. We are not only managing emissions or upgrading technology. We are holding on to the pace and habits shaped by the fossil era. The green transition often involves making the old system more efficient, rather than asking what a truly different future would require.

Many also expect this transition to be as quick and frictionless as the fossil fuel era made everything seem. Yet decarbonising means reworking industries and infrastructure that took decades to build.

Cement plants last half a century. Power lines take years to plan and construct. Even the most optimistic timelines involve years of design, consultation and construction. This is not a failure; it is the reality of shifting away from a system designed for speed and permanence without patience.

Resetting the clock

Recognising this mismatch does not mean giving up on urgency. Climate change demands swift action. But urgency is not the same as haste. Instead of expecting every solution to scale overnight, we need to design policies and industries in a way that respects how long things take, and, indeed, whose timing counts.

For example, do policies align with corporate investment cycles, election calendars or the slower timelines of ecosystems and future generations? Whose timeframes shape action?

Building a low-carbon economy will not feel like the rapid transformations of the past. It will involve repairing, adapting and sometimes slowing down. But if we want to move beyond fossil fuels, we cannot keep living on fossil time. A successful transition will be one that aligns our policies, industries and daily

lives with the slower, more regenerative rhythms of the world we depend on.

This was written in The Conversatio and published on the 28th November 2025 at 6.37pm

It came from the website theconversation.com

If you walked into a supermarket during a supply hiccup, storm, fuel protest, or even the early days of the COVID pandemic, you will remember the sight of empty shelves. For most people in the UK, these moments are surprising, even unsettling, precisely because they are rare. We are a generation largely spared the

rationing, shortages and hunger our grandparents and great-grandparents once endured.

But that rarity is exactly why we must not become complacent. Food security (the reliable availability, access and affordability of food) should be recognised as a major national concern. That means placing it firmly on the UK's national risk register.

The national risk register is the UK government's openly available list of the most serious risks that could affect the country in the short to medium term. These risks range from flooding and heatwaves to threats such as cyberattacks and energy shortages.

Being listed on the register does not mean the event is likely to happen tomorrow (but it could). It means the government has assessed it as significant enough, based on impact and probability, to require planning and mitigation measures.

Think of the national risk register as the country's official "what could really go wrong?" list. If a threat is on the register, policymakers, emergency planners and critical industries take it seriously and plan accordingly. If it is not, the risk can drift into the background (even when it should not).

For all its importance, food security occupies a limited and somewhat indirect presence in the risk register. It only appears within broader categories such as supply-chain disruption, fuel shortages and animal disease. It's not mentioned as a clearly defined risk in its own right.

Placing food security on the national risk register as its own defined category would send a clear signal that safeguarding stable, affordable food is a national priority – on par with energy, health and security. My team's recent white paper for the government highlights this urgency.

Our modern food system is more complex, interconnected and vulnerable than many people realise. The UK imports around half of its food.

Some categories, such as fruit and vegetables, depend on imports for as much as 80–95% of supply. We rely on long, intricate supply chains involving overseas farming conditions, global shipping routes, international labour markets and constantly changing energy prices. When any of these are disrupted, our food system feels the shock.

In 2023, extremely bad weather in Spain and Morocco reduced crop yields, leaving UK supermarkets rationing tomatoes and peppers. The war in Ukraine has caused spikes in grain and sunflower oil prices. And the COVID pandemic and subsequent labour shortages have exposed how reliant farming and food distribution are on migrant workers.

An uncomfortable truth lies behind each of these disruptions: we are more dependent on global systems than the public think. Those systems are under pressure from climate change, geopolitical instability and resource competition.

Food systems also operate with tight margins. Fresh produce is harvested, shipped and sold quickly. Livestock feed supply needs to be constant. Fertiliser production depends heavily on natural gas for providing both the hydrogen feedstock and the energy required to make ammonia, the key ingredient in most nitrogen fertilisers. All of these dependencies create points of vulnerability. When several of those break at once, shortages can cascade.

For many households, even small disturbances lead to real consequences: higher prices, reduced choice and increased stress about meeting weekly food bills. Families on tight budgets feel these effects most sharply.

While we are nowhere near the wartime rationing experienced by earlier generations, food banks across the UK are already serving record numbers, and food-price inflation has recently reached levels not seen in decades. Food insecurity is not a hypothetical risk for millions, it is a reality.

An expert explains the meaning of climate resilience.

Lessons from the past

Historically, Britain has faced food insecurity before. During the second world war, German U-boats targeted supply ships, leading to rationing that lasted until 1954. Earlier still, crop failures and poor harvests in the 19th century caused widespread hardship. Today we benefit from refrigeration, global trade, advanced agriculture and data-driven logistics, but those advantages can create an illusion of invulnerability that our supply chains are robust.

Food security, even in the UK, is more fragile than it might seem. Our shelves look full until suddenly they do not. A combination of climate-driven harvest failures, rising energy prices and trade disruptions could create national shortages or unaffordable prices much more quickly than many people may expect.

Including food security on the national risk register would prompt government departments to plan coordinated responses. It would drive investment in resilient agriculture, storage and domestic production while encouraging diversification of food imports to avoid overreliance on just a few regions.

Better risk planning would also support households through better safety nets and targeted interventions such as emergency rations and direct support to vulnerable households. Raising public awareness that food security is a shared national responsibility does not suggest panic – it means preparation.

This was on the conversation website and published on th 4th December 2025 at 12.29pm

Website theconversation.com

Revealed: Europe losing 600 football pitches of nature and crop land a day

This article is more than 2 months old

Investigation shows extent of green land lost across UK and mainland Europe to development from 2018 to 2023

•

Wed 1 Oct 2025 07.00 BST

Share

Europe is losing green space that once harboured wildlife, captured carbon and supplied food at the rate of 600 football pitches a day, an investigation by the Guardian and partners has revealed.

Analysis of satellite imagery across the UK and mainland Europe over a five-year period shows the speed and scale with which green land is turning grey, consumed by tarmac for roads, bricks and mortar for luxury golf courses and housing developments.

The loss of the Amazon rainforest has been measured for years using satellite imagery and on-the-ground monitoring, but until now the scale of green land lost in Europe had never been captured in the same way.

In the first investigation of its kind across Europe, the Green to Grey project, working with scientists from the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (Nina) to measure nature loss, reveals the scale of nature and farmland engulfed by human interventions.

The cross-border project by the Guardian, Arena for Journalism in Europe (Arena), Nina, the Norwegian broadcaster NRK and other news outlets in 11 countries found that Europe loses about 1,500 sq km (580 sq miles) a year to construction. About 9,000 sq km of land – an area the size of Cyprus – was turned green to grey between 2018 and 2023, according to the data. That is the equivalent of almost 30 sq km a week, or 600 football pitches a day.

Nature accounts for the majority of the losses, at about 900 sq km a year, but the research shows we are also building on agricultural land at a rate of about 600 sq km a year, with grave consequences for the continent's food security and health.

[redacted], a professor of wilderness at the University of Leeds, said: "Land lost to development is one of the primary drivers of wilderness loss and biodiversity decline. But we are also losing cropland and productive land as our cities expand into the green belt and on to agricultural land."

The most common developments, accounting for a quarter of all cases, were for housing and roads. But nature and farmland is also being destroyed to accommodate luxuries for the rich, tourism, consumerism and industry.

Arena reveals that in Portugal, almost 300 hectares (740 acres) of the protected sand dunes at Galé Beach near Melides, an hour south of Lisbon, have been lost to create a new golf course at the CostaTerra Golf and Ocean Club, where properties will sell for about £5.6m

The resort, which is still under construction, is a second home to [redacted] and her husband, [redacted], who works for the development. It is being built on Natura 2000 land, which is supposed to be protected under EU regulations.

Satellite imagery shows the areas of protected dune land lost to the CostaTerra Golf and Ocean Club in southern Portugal

The resort promises "the simple luxury of European living" on "the last untouched Atlantic coast in southern Europe". Its 75-hectare golf course is estimated to consume as much as 800,000 litres of water a day to maintain the greens.

Exceptions to development on Natura 2000 land can be granted if there is overriding public interest. The Portuguese authorities approved the resort, which is owned by the US property firm Discovery Land Company, on the grounds of economic benefit.

[redacted], a lawyer for ClientEarth, an environmental law NGO, said a golf course did not fulfil these requirements. "It is obviously not overriding public interest," he said. "The mere fact that you find economic benefits or some type of economic development from a project does not make it overriding public interest."

Discovery Land Company said in a statement: "We are developing CostaTerra to be a model for environmental stewardship and sustainability in the region.

"Every aspect of the property – from the design of the golf course, to rainwater and waste management practices, to the development and preservation of wildlife habitat and corridors – was designed to meet or exceed EU standards, including the Natura 2000 framework.

"We'll continue to innovate and find solutions to make CostaTerra the most responsible property of its kind."

Brooksbank was approached by the Guardian but did not comment.

In Turkey, the Çaltılıdere wetland in the İzmir province on the Aegean coast has been buried beneath more than a square kilometre of concrete foundations for a marina to repair and build luxury yachts, the investigation shows.

Officially designated as a wetland by Turkey, Çaltılıdere was home to flamingos, pelicans, cormorants, sea bream and sea bass. It also served as a vital carbon store and natural flood defence.

But local authorities overturned its protected status in 2017 after a tense and controversial local commission meeting. Satellite images show how the vital stopping point for migratory birds has been consumed by concrete foundations.

Satellite imagery shows the wetland lost to the marina development at Çaltılıdere in Turkey

Yatek, the industry cooperative developing the marina project, says it will bring huge economic growth and thousands of jobs to the area. “The richest people in Turkey and in the world will bring their big yachts here and repair them or have them built,” Yatek’s former director said in an interview in 2021. The cooperative foresees manufacturing as many as 132 luxury yachts a year.

Yatek said in a statement that its project was “a fully compliant initiative that strictly follows all legal procedures, including the acquisition of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) report”, a document detailing a project’s effects for permission to be granted under EU law.

“The environmental impacts and other ecological aspects of the project have been thoroughly assessed by the competent authorities of our country, which have granted a positive EIA decision. Accordingly, the entire project process continues lawfully and in line with the relevant legislation,” the statement said.

Turkey, the largest country in the analysis, ranked highest for the amount of green land lost between 2018 and 2023. It built on 1,860 sq km of nature and crop land, accounting for more than a fifth of the total loss in Europe.

But the developments are across Europe. In the Vermio mountains in northern Greece, defined as a roadless area of wilderness in Greek law, a large windfarm is being developed across the western and central Macedonia regions.

According to the Dublin-based Aer Soléir, the ultimate owner of the Vermio windfarms, the plans are fully aligned with applicable Greek and EU

regulatory frameworks. It said the development had “secured, during a lengthy demanding design and licensing process, all required permits and approvals”, and added: “The project was reviewed twice by the supreme administrative court. In both cases, the relevant annulment actions were rejected, and the court confirmed full compliance of the project with the environmental and regulatory framework.”

The company also said a series of reforestation works were being undertaken in parallel with construction.

In Germany, half a million trees were felled near Berlin to build a Tesla gigafactory after the government approved a plan to expand the plant to double production to 1m cars a year. Tesla has been approached for comment.

Woodland cleared to make way for the Tesla factory.500,000 trees removed

The methodology used in the Green to Grey investigation is different from the official method used by the European Environment Agency (EEA), which excludes areas smaller than 50,000 sq metres, the equivalent of about five football pitches. The investigation identified small, piecemeal nature losses as well as construction in urban green spaces, resulting in estimates 1.5 times larger than the EEA’s calculations and showing the total impact of cumulative small-scale losses.

“It’s a slow-burning issue,” said [redacted] of the EEA. “It just accumulates over time.”

The Green MEP [redacted] said: “For years, the EU has promised to lead on climate and nature protection, but what this investigation shows is that we are literally cementing over our own future.

“Every forest, fertile field and biodiversity hotspot destroyed for short-term profit is a betrayal of the promises we made to young people.”

The construction site for Tesla’s gigafactory near Berlin pictured in September 2020. Photograph: Odd Andersen/AFP/Getty Images

She said that if nature continued to be treated as expendable, Europe would lose not only its climate goals, but also its food security, its health and the very places that made the continent worth living in.

The analysis covered 30 countries, covering 96% of the EEA’s 39-country area. Every country examined is losing natural and agricultural areas, but some fare worse than others. The five countries with the highest green losses were Turkey, with more than 1800 sq km of nature and crop land lost

between 2018 and 2023, Poland (more than 1,000 sq km), France (950 sq km), Germany (720 sq km) and the UK (604 sq km).

This was published in The Guardian on the 1st October 2025

Website theguardian.com/environment

The complete green to grey project can be found on greentogrey.eu