

**Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park EN010162
Post Hearing Submission from Nottinghamshire County Council
18th February 2026 (Examination Deadline 3)**

Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) submits the following post hearing statement at Deadline 3. This statement is a written summary of the oral representations made by NCC at the hearings held during week commencing 2nd February 2026, supplemented with further clarification where necessary.

**Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Draft Development Consent Order
Tuesday 3rd February 2026**

Item 1 – Overview of the draft DCO

1. NCC confirmed that the period for discharging requirements set out in Schedule 14 (Procedure for Discharge) is not agreed. It was acknowledged that the proposed ten week period aligned with the Helios Order made on Dec 3 2025, however NCC maintained that this period is insufficient when considering the number of other solar orders that are being proposed within the county and expected to follow a similar delivery programme. NCC referred to the comments made in its Local Impact Report (p.26 REP1-078).

Item 2 – Parts and Schedules of the dDCO

2. NCC welcomed the inclusion of Article 11 (Application of the Permit Scheme) under Part 3 (Streets) which would ensure that any street works are subject to the County Council Permit Scheme Order.
3. NCC requested that any alterations to the layout of the adopted highway or creation of accesses within the adopted highway pursuant to Article 12 (power to alter streets) and Article 16 (access to works) of Part 3 (Streets) are subject to full technical approval from the Highway Authority (HA), with the costs to the HA to be covered by the developer. NCC raised concern that Articles 12 and 16 would grant power to the developer to perform works at the locations specified in Schedule 4 and 6 respectively, without the HA having the right to approve the detailed scheme. NCC confirmed that it would wish to see a specific requirement included at Schedule 2 which would ensure that the safety of the proposed works is demonstrated and approved by the HA prior to those works being undertaken. It was also requested that the Applicant reimburses the HA for the technical approval process at the time the applications are made, in line with costs for Section 278 Agreements made under the Highway Act.
4. It is acknowledged that the Applicant has updated the Outline CTMP to include specific wording which would require the developer to set out how it will obtain technical approvals for any works to the adopted highway. However, NCC

maintains that this should be detailed in a standalone requirement for greater transparency and certainty, given that Requirement 14 only requires the Applicant to submit a CTMP which is “*substantially in accordance with*” the Outline CTMP and therefore provides scope for this process to be diluted post consent when the CTMP is submitted to the HA for approval.

5. Following the hearing, NCC has drafted the following requirement for inclusion at Schedule 2:

(X) Detailed highway approval

(1) No construction works shall be undertaken in the adopted public highway until the detailed design of those works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the county authority including:

- a. A programme for the works, details of the construction method and traffic management requirements;*
- b. A detailed design pack of drawings and specifications detailing the works and any service / utility works that may need to be accommodated, informed by additional surveys including topographical surveys and additional speed survey data;*
- c. The necessary health and safety information required under the Construction, (Design & Management) Regulations, or their equivalent at the point of submission;*
- d. Details of the proposed contractor, including their insurance provisions;*
- e. If required by the county authority the appropriate stage Road Safety Audit (RSA)*
- f. Details of any necessary road signage and road markings; and*
- g. Details of any proposed remediation proposals should the works not be permanent.*

(2) The authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

6. If the above requirement is included at Schedule 2, NCC would recommend that Schedule 14 (Procedure for Discharge of Requirements) is also modified to include the **text in bold** below to ensure that an appropriate fee is applied to the discharge of the proposed requirement:

(1) Where an application is made to the relevant authority for consent, agreement or approval in respect of a requirement only, a fee is to be paid to that relevant authority for each application.

(2) The fee payable for each application under sub-paragraph (1) is as follows...

(a) a fee of £2,535 for the first application for the discharge of each of the requirements...

(b) a fee of £578 for each subsequent application for the discharge of each of the requirements listed in paragraph (a)...

(c) a fee of £145 for any application for the discharge of....

(d) a fee of £3000 or 10% of the cost of the highway works to be approved under any application for the discharge of requirement X (detailed highway approval) whichever is the highest

7. If the technical approval process is to be secured within the Outline CTMP rather than via the requirement suggested by NCC, then it is requested that the Outline CTMP is amended to include a commitment to reimburse the HA for the technical approval process at the time the applications are made, in line with costs for similar S278 or S184 applications made under the Highways Act.

Item 3 - Protective Provisions

8. NCC did not comment on this item.

Item 4 – Opportunity for any further comments

9. NCC did not comment on this item.

Item 5 – Any other Matters

10. NCC did not comment on this item.

Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Environmental Matters
Wednesday 4 February 2026

Item 1 – Landscape and Visual

11. NCC did not comment on this item and deferred to NSDC.

Item 2 – Ecology and Biodiversity

12. NCC confirmed that the issues raised in its Local Impact Report (LIR) have been discussed with the Applicant and the Applicant has agreed to update their assessment work and mitigation considering the feedback. NCC confirmed that it would expect the issues to be resolved through the updated submissions and progress will be reflected in the draft Statement of Common Ground (SOCG).

Item 3 – Construction Effects

13. With regards to traffic, transport and access, NCC confirmed that all matters are still under discussion between NCC and the Applicant and this is reflected in the draft SOCG. The main issues were outlined.

14. NCC advised that there is inconsistency between the transport assessment and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and suggested that these are discussed with NCC and reconciled.

15. NCC advised that several of the proposed accesses which have been designated as temporary accesses should be made permanent because they would be the primary access point. In accordance with NCC's Highway Design Guide, where permanent access is required, NCC would expect their safety to be demonstrated through provision of adequate visibility splays supported by speed data and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit prior to consent being granted, to ensure that they are acceptable in principle before they become fixed by the DCO. Full technical detail should be submitted for approval post consent, as outlined at ISH2 (see above), but technical detail matters would not override the principal of the location of the accesses which must be demonstrated prior to the order being made.

16. NCC recommended that all passing places to be installed on the highway are permanent, rather than temporary as proposed. This is because they are a necessary feature of the operational phase (to facilitate HGV access for replacement of the solar panels) as well as the decommissioning phase.

17. NCC is concerned that the visibility splays which have been provided to date may fall outside of the order limits and/or highway and therefore it is unclear how these could be maintained either by the developer or by NCC. It is critical that visibility splays are provided for each permanent access and passing place, alongside the order limits, in order to demonstrate that they can be maintained and, if necessary, the order limits can be modified. It would be too late for these to be provided post consent as part of the detailed design.

18. NCC acknowledged that the Applicant submitted additional visibility splay drawings at Deadline 2 however it is advised that several splays are missing and some have been drawn incorrectly. NCC confirmed it would be willing to discuss this further with the Applicant to ensure this is resolved.
19. NCC would highlight that in terms of residual effects, these are usually considered minor or negligible as the major highway impact should only be experienced during construction with such developments and generally manifest as delay and inconvenience. However, any failure to address these important design safety issues will result in moderate and potentially significant issues as the outstanding matters are safety matters, which could result in conflicts and collisions.

Item 4 - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

20. NCC did not comment on parts 4.1-4.4 on this item and deferred to NSDC.
21. In relation to 4.5-4.7, NCC concurred that the applicant has undertaken large areas of trenching in locations that they have identified as high potential in the desk-based assessment and geophysics work to date; and in those areas they have sufficiently assessed the extent and the archaeological resource to inform significance and impact. However, this is by no means comprehensive and NCC expressed its continued concerns regarding potential risks to the archaeological resource and to overall delivery of the scheme in those areas of the site that have not yet been adequately evaluated or assessed.
22. NCC confirmed that an appropriate scheme of post-consent assessment work, implemented effectively, would resolve the deficiencies in the current assessment, however there will be an elevated risk in terms of post-consent discoveries that could impact delivery of the scheme. The current proposal for post consent work is not satisfactory, but NCC is working with the applicant to agree an appropriate scheme before the end of Examination and is currently confident this can be achieved.
23. In relation to 4.8., NCC acknowledged that the Applicant has redrafted Requirement 11 (Archaeology) in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 2. However, NCC confirmed that it had proposed its own wording for this article in response to ExQ1 at Deadline 2. NCC believes that the wording proposed by the Applicant is insufficient to accommodate the complexity of a scheme where the applicant proposes a post-consent phase of evaluation to inform an updated Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS), and multiple phases of work programmes. The wording supplied by NCC in response to ExQ1 is refined from the Heckington Fen Solar DCO while maintaining the requirements for a structured work programme.
24. In relation to 4.9, NCC explained that the Ossington Airfield is a former WW2 RAF Airfield which is recognised on the HER as a heritage asset but has only recently been investigated on site by the Council, though it has long been a valued asset to the local community. NCC does not feel that this asset has been given sufficient

consideration within the environmental assessment and has significant concerns regarding the direct impact upon the original runways and airfield which is proposed to be covered by solar panels. Officers from NCC have visited the site and found substantial sets of remains from the runway/barracks above ground as well as potential archaeological remains below ground. NCC confirmed that Ossington is likely the best non-designated WW2 airfield asset in the county. It is partly accessible to the public and has significant communal value. NCC is willing to work with the Applicant to find an appropriate solution to ensure it is protected. An accompanied site visit for the week of 16th February is planned with NCC officers and the applicant's consultant in attendance.

Item 5 – Water Environment

25. NCC confirmed that it is the LLFA for the site and that it is satisfied that surface water (pluvial) risk can be managed adequately based on the principles in the Flood Risk Assessment as updated at Deadline 2. Further detail on the drainage strategy will be confirmed through detailed design and NCC is engaging with the Applicant to ensure this is satisfactory and does not increase risk of surface water flooding. NCC is satisfied that the recommendations in its LIR have been considered by the Applicant and that there are no significant issues to be raised at this stage. This position will be reflected in the updated draft Statement of Common Ground which the Applicant will submit at Deadline 3.