

**Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park – Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3)**

**Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2026**

Summary of Verbal Representations from Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC)

The following comprises a summary of the verbal representations of NSDC at ISH3 on the 4th February 2026. It is supplemented by additional comments as appropriate, where NSDC had further points to raise, but insufficient time was available within the hearings.

Landscape and Visual (Items 1.2 – 1.6 of the agenda)

1. NSDC confirmed that they were broadly content with the methodology to assessing landscape and visual effects but did raise points in respect of how cumulative effects were considered. The first of these points relates to the movement of people through the landscape between the Great North Road and One Earth Solar Farm schemes.
2. In this respect, reference was made to the NatureScot guidance as referenced by the Applicant which states as follows:  
*'Sequential impacts occur when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see different developments. Sequential impacts should be assessed for travel along regularly-used routes like major roads, railway lines, ferry routes, popular paths, etc. The magnitude of sequential effects will be affected by speed of travel and distance between viewpoints.'*
3. As such NSDC confirmed that the route for considering such potential effects has been agreed, but the output of that sequential assessment has not yet been undertaken and the results are currently awaited.
4. NSDC then referred to the strategic level cumulative impact of the proposed development on the wider character area, noting that this was a point raised by NSDC in ISH1. This position was also set out in the One Earth Solar Examination with reference to Technical Memorandum 7 (AAH TM07).<sup>1</sup>
5. On the issue of cumulative effects, NSDC explained that outside of the technical landscape and visual points, they remain concerned on the consequences of two large NSIP scale solar

---

<sup>1</sup> [EN010159-001037-NSDC One Earth Solar TM07 ExA Action ISH3 12-11-25.pdf](#)

projects that segments a large part of the district from the north of Newark to the north eastern side of the district.

6. NSDC noted the significant change in the wider character of the district that would result from the proposed development, introducing significant 'industrial' style development from the current character in these areas which is largely characterised by open countryside areas.
7. NSDC confirmed their view around the experience of 'sequential' views as moving through the landscape, which would be dominated by solar arrays and associated infrastructure and the significant change in land use that would result when considering the combined effects of the Great North Road and One Earth Solar Farm projects.
8. NSDC confirmed their position that the Applicant had followed an appropriate approach in relation to the identification of possible cumulative effects in association with the relevant government guidance.<sup>2</sup> In this respect NSDC confirmed that they considered in detail the Applicant's approach and that the long list and short list of development was a matter that was 'agreed.' NSDC set out that whilst it considered the correct schemes had been considered for cumulative assessment, it did not necessarily agree with the findings of the cumulative assessment and that it would continue to make representations in this regard.
9. NSDC concluded by confirming that the strategic level cumulative impacts on landscape character need not be considered within the technical documents, but it is a matter that can be presented through a technical note. This TN accompanies the NSDC submissions for Deadline three.

#### Ecology and Biodiversity (Items 2.1 – 2.4 of the agenda)

10. NSDC confirmed their previous position in relation to concerns raised within the Local Impact Report (LIR) in relation to the methodology used to determine likely significant effects for ecological receptors. Following further discussions with the applicants lead ecologist and review of other written correspondence, NSDC agree with the approach taken which does not follow the matrix as outlined within Chapter 2 and follows CIEEM guidance. NSDC confirmed that their main concern with the assessment was in relation to the Summary of Likely Effects Table 8.12 included in Chapter 8 whereby some of the mitigation that was treated as 'embedded' within the assessment should be more accurately considered as additional mitigation. This was specifically in relation to farmland birds whereby our view was that whilst elements such as the retention of arable fields outside of the solar PV areas and establishment

---

<sup>2</sup> [Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment - GOV.UK](#)

of species-rich grassland could be treated as embedded, that the provision of skylark and lapwing plots should be treated as additional. We concluded that the current assessment does have the potential to underestimate the impacts and distort the significance effect prior to the implementation of additional mitigation but that we did not consider that it would change the overall outcome of the assessment and that the effects would remain to be not significant. We also confirmed that we did not consider that the residual significance would not change for any other ecological receptors and that we support the applicant's commitment to update Chapter 8, including Table 8.12 at Deadline 3.

11. NSDC confirmed that during further discussions with the applicant and agreement had been reached regarding the baseline surveys and that our position will be confirmed within the SoCG. We stated that whilst the additional Figure A8.13.1 included within TA 8.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment did illustrate the areas that had been subject to detailed habitat condition assessments, that a lot of these areas now fall outside of the Order Limits. We consider that although there are several areas that were not subject to detailed assessment still, that proportionally these were a relatively small and that we are content with the requirement 8 of the draft DCO to update the baseline habitat surveys post-consent. We confirmed our view, which the applicant acknowledges, that while further detailed assessment at this stage would either increase or decrease the overall existing biodiversity of the site, and therefore would change the overall BNG score, the changes would not be significant in EcIA terms and the BNG assessment would still demonstrate over a 10% net gain.
12. NSDC had no further questions or comments following the Applicant's response to the question regarding the impacts of polarised light on aquatic invertebrates or impacts to ancient woodland.
13. NSDC confirmed that points raised within the LIR regarding breeding bird surveys had been agreed and that there had been a targeted nocturnal survey and although not a stand-alone survey that any nocturnal birds such as barn owl were noted during bat surveys across the site.
14. NSDC confirmed its position on some of the technical errors in relation to the BNG assessment and that through further discussions with the Applicant that some of these had been resolved thorough revised submissions at Deadline 2, but that discussions were ongoing to resolve the remaining issues and it was anticipated that further revisions would be received following Deadline 3. We confirmed our position that until review of further amended documents had taken place and all remaining issues are resolved this would remain under discussion within the SoCG.

15. In response to the ExA's question about the draft DCO and the amendment to Requirement 8, we stated that our understanding was that the introduction of the Biodiversity Design Strategy (BDS) element had been introduced to make it clearer how the Biodiversity Net Gain would be achieved. We explained that the way the requirement was worded it implied that there the BDS would be an overarching element rather than being phased which is how the post-consent LEMPs will be produced. We then explained that we had considered that given the proposed two year build-out program that perhaps the BNG assessment should be phased, with an overarching Biodiversity Net Gain strategy and then separate BNG assessments for each phase demonstrated how the overall net gain proposed within the draft DCO would be achieved. We acknowledged that the BNG assessment was voluntary and that in comparison to other DCO schemes the loss of habitat was much lower and that it unlikely there would be delays to habitat creation and therefore the approach as presented would be acceptable.
16. NSDC had no further questions or comments following the Applicant's explanation of how the document for Requirement 8 would be produced in two separate parts. Although not stated at the time we will review any additional draft documents provided and consider it important that this is provided as part of the examination process.
17. NSDC had no further questions or comments following the Applicant's response to the question regarding the effects of construction on adjacent woodlands.
18. During ISH3 NSDC had no further questions or comments following the Applicant's response to the question regarding the effects on the Humber Estuary SAC and need for an appropriate assessment.

Construction effects (Items 3.1-3.4 of the agenda)

19. NSDC confirmed their opinion that the applicant has used appropriate thresholds for noise, derived from appropriate standards. Receptors have been identified within areas where noise levels are above the threshold, however the modelling assumes a 'worse case' with all noise sources operating continually and simultaneously, with no screening or other attenuation. Details of measures to control noise are to be provided through submission of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and Noise Management Plan (NMP).

Cultural heritage and archaeology (Items 4.1 – 4.9 of the agenda)

20. NSDC agreed with the applicant regarding the heritage assets scoped in for further assessment and NSDC are happy that the potential impact would not likely harm the significance of heritage assets. Although, it was raised by NSDC that there are a number of

heritage assets that have been scoped out where the reasoning for being scoped out should be articulated in more detail, with clear and convincing justification. Following site visits, the list of heritage assets that NSDC would suggest require further justification has reduced to seven, since previous comments. NSDC are in discussion with the applicant regarding the heritage assets which require further justification for scoping out. NSDC are satisfied that this can be addressed during the examination period.

21. NSDC agreed with the points raised by the Applicant. NSDC are largely in agreement that the screening proposed to mitigate specific views and effects on heritage assets are appropriate and are in discussion to resolve concerns surrounding specific issues. One relating to Kersall Conservation Area and the other relating to what infrastructure will be within the proposed BESS between Kelham Conservation Area and Averham Park House, to determine the effect this will have and, therefore, what mitigation is required. Following recent discussions, the applicant has agreed to look into this and to hopefully provide an answer to resolve these concerns. NSDC are still in discussions with the applicant and are satisfied that these concerns can be addressed before the end of the examination period.
22. NSDC did not comment on 4.2 or 4.4 during ISH3. NSDC agree with 4.2 that reasonable assessment of the significance of effects on heritage assets has been adequate and reasonable. With regards to 4.4, NSDC refer to verbal comments made during the hearing under 4.1, as some unregistered park and gardens fall within the heritage assets which require further justification for scoping out.