

The following represents a rejoinder to the Applicant Response to Stop Greenhill Solar Written Transport Response (**EX6/GH8.2.20, March 2026**). Plus: **Addendum** on proposed A43 major road works.

Issues raised-

1.1.3 - The issues raised were based on the forecasts provided by the applicant. It is easy to say that this is a common misinterpretation; the traffic flow forecasts do not ring true. This is a construction project. The construction industry carries out these assessments for all construction projects. These should be carried out by professionals and it is expected that written representations are factual and based on reliable data.

1.2.1 - Of course the number of construction vehicles will fluctuate, but as experts in this field, working to a design plan and construction programme, it should be able to assess those fluctuating requirements.

1.2.4- The applicant confirms that figures have been taken from the Cottam Solar project. (Which is smaller than Greenhill) This confirms a gross underestimate of the number of HGV's, so as not to cause concern to the locals, the anti-campaigners and environmentalists, but which in turn will cause a significant rise in harm to the environment, disruption to the locals and an increase in pollution.

1.2.5 - Interestingly in this paragraph, the applicant agrees that the assessment is typically underestimated?

1.2.6 - Any agreement with the authorities is a nebulous statement as they have nothing to compare with, and are unlikely to have sufficient information to provide a measured response.

2.1.3 – The applicant agrees that a complete construction programme is not yet known. How, therefore, is it possible to design and predict forecasts with no complete programme? Also it would appear that the applicants do not know where construction workers are to be located, and yet refer to a similar scheme at Cottam!

2.1.5 - This frankly is an admission that the figures are from Cottam, a much smaller site.

2.2.2 - This assessment looks at the capacity of the road network, to accommodate additional construction vehicles, associated with the scheme on a daily basis. Given that no up to date traffic figures are quoted anywhere on this scheme and reliance is placed on random traffic count information that is out of date, how is it possible to know the available capacity on the road network?

Conclusion,

We regard this response as very poor, given the gravity of the implications of a significant increase in HGV traffic on this proposed scheme. The “dumbing down” of the effects of traffic is unacceptable and demonstrates a clear example of data manipulation in an effort to win an application.

Addendum: Proposed road development works on A43 in 2028

Construction Compound 1 is positioned on the southbound carriageway of A43, north of the Sywell roundabout. As discussed in ISH 5, the road is too busy most of the time for construction traffic heading to sites A and A2, to turn right across the traffic flows. The vehicles would need to turn left southwards down to the Sywell roundabout, do a 360-degree turn and head back northwards. All traffic to and from Site B would also be using this roundabout. The GHS representative present at the meeting, in his response at the time, confirmed that the construction vehicles would be instructed to only turn left out of CC1 and then turn round at the roundabout.

However, information from West Northants Council indicates that it is likely that **significant roadworks** will commence in 2028 and finish in 2029 to dual the A43 up to this roundabout, which will likely cause considerable disruption to the busy A43, exactly at the same time as the extra Green Hill Solar construction vehicle traffic would be added.