

**Great North Road Solar Development**  
**Open Floor Hearing – 27<sup>th</sup> November 2025**  
**Text of oral submission by Janet Carr**

Good afternoon. My name is Janet Carr and I am speaking on behalf of myself and Ossington Solar Concerns Group.

Speaking as an individual, I wish first to state that I am firmly against the proposed Great North Road Solar development for many reasons, not least of which is the cumulative impact that potentially one of the largest solar developments in the country will have over a huge swathe of extremely rural countryside.

Others have and will cover many of the concerning aspects of the application. I wish to bring the inspectors' attention to the situation of tenant farmers affected by this potential development. Not enough weight has been given to this aspect. My family farm land in the parish of Ossington, which is a very traditional estate village, unlike any other of the 18 or so villages affected. Virtually all the land in the parish, and most of the houses, are tenanted, with the estate owner resident within the village. Whilst many residents disagree strongly with the application, they are unwilling to voice their opinions publicly for fear of upsetting their tenancy arrangements.

Our farmland is held under a Farm Business Tenancy or FBT. Previously it was a pre-1986 inherited Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy which may have attracted some compensation for the loss of land in such circumstances. FBTs do not have the same status and consequently there is no statutory right to compensation for loss of land and therefore income. There are other tenants losing a greater amount of land, but in our case the land to be taken for solar panels and a substation amounts to 34 acres – 13% of the current area of the farm. It is Grade 3 land – officially classified as Best and Most Versatile (BMV) – which will be lost to food production for at least 40 years. Nationally the Tenant Farmers Association has petitioned government and the Prime Minister with regard to greater protection for tenants in the face of solar developments.

I am asking the inspectors therefore – how would you feel to be told with no warning that have to arbitrarily accept a 13% pay cut through no fault of your own? This, coming on top of the potential disruption, noise damage to roads and the environment, is a very hard pill to swallow.

Moving on, the other subject I would like to address on behalf of Ossington solar concerns group is the extremely detrimental effect on the village, the landscape and the wider community if the former airfield site of RAF Ossington is taken for solar development. This should not be allowed to happen.

Ossington village was radically changed during World War 2 when it was decided to build an airfield covering a large part of the parish. Roads were closed, and two farms and the village school were demolished to make way for the airfield. It operated from 1942 to 1946 primarily as a training airfield for RAF and Royal Canadian Air Force bomber pilots and crew. After the war, the land was eventually mostly returned to agriculture, albeit with the concrete runways, buildings, and associated structures still largely in place.

Ossington is a small village of approximately 100 inhabitants, with only a former World War 1 military hut serving as the village hall and no designated public open spaces at all (i.e. no play area,

park etc) Over the years, due to the relaxed attitude of the estate, the former airfield has become an unofficial open space enjoyed by local residents for leisure and recreation, using the runways for access. Farming takes place across the airfield site with the public respectfully accessing the area for walking, running, dog walking, bird watching, painting, meditation – the list goes on. There has never been any formal recognition of all this activity, which is probably why Elements Green considered it to be merely a ‘brownfield site’.

At the same time, the fact that there were and still are areas where nature has taken over (chiefly the former sites of buildings and other structures) has meant that wildlife has flourished. Raptors such as buzzard, red kite, kestrel and sparrow hawk all hunt for prey there, and barn owls can regularly be seen quartering the extensive area (and indeed they breed on the airfield). In particular ground nesting birds such as lapwing and skylark, both acknowledged officially at risk nationally, make the airfield their home and breed there. Deer fox, badger and hare are regularly seen, and bats thrive in the adjacent woodland, whilst foraging over the airfield and the nearby lake. In particular, the nationally extremely rare Barbastelle bat has been discovered as a result of surveys carried out by Elements Green – the airfield and adjoining landscape obviously suit its special requirements. In fact, most of the species mentioned will struggle to retain a foothold as the installation of solar panels will obliterate the precise environmental conditions that they need.

The former airfield site is unique in the area because of its vast open vistas, peace and solitude. Lincoln Cathedral and, poignantly, the newly constructed bomber memorial ‘On Freedom’s Wings’ near Norton Disney can both be seen from the highest point of the airfield, which will be covered in solar panels and inaccessible to the public if the scheme goes ahead in its current form. A suggested public access way alongside the security fencing, surveillance cameras and solar panels will be no compensation whatsoever. Local residents, and those ‘in the know’ from further afield, use this area as a valuable ‘green lung’. It helps people with both their physical and mental health, and gives a sense of freedom unavailable elsewhere. It is also very safe for dog walkers.

So much will be lost here if the scheme goes ahead – farmland (and with it a further decline in food security), wildlife (including several nationally ‘at risk’ species), open access, views, peace, tranquillity and a sense of place. All this is irreplaceable. I make no apology for this being an emotional appeal rather than an academic one. This is how much of the public at large views the threats to the airfield from the scheme. Residents and users are passionate about this place. Please listen and take on board our very real concerns.

Thank you.