

As a local living in Pulham Market I'd like to thank the Inspectorate for a clear summary letter and annexes.

Summary:

Four sections:

First: Safety, which should be a separate, discrete section

Second: Site selection, alternatives and design...
selection and alternatives go beyond the scheme's sixteen parishes

Third: Landscape – beyond the visual

Fourth: Consultation, wholly inadequate for Pulham Market parish

Safety

The Inspectorate may take a view to consider within Annex C 'Community, health and well being' that '*Battery energy storage system (BESS) safety provisions and implications*' is better placed under a separate section 'Safety.'

These implications are universal. They apply to all such schemes, be they in Great Moulton parish, South Molton, Devon; Moulton, Texas or anywhere else in the world, including the EDF BESS station directly opposite Dunston Hall. 'Community, health and well-being' refers just to the South Norfolk Claylands. The safety issues are at least UK wide.

There is also the danger that within the same basket of eggs, neither set of issues will be addressed adequately, or that one dominates the other. Furthermore, the experts involved in the safety or otherwise of battery energy storage systems are totally separate from the other issues in the community, health and well-being section.

To summarise: in the Inspectorate's eyes these safety issues must be serious enough to warrant inclusion, and since they are by no means specific to the Claylands, both merit and require a separate discrete section, never mind the fresh threat precipitated by the recent wildfire epidemic across southern England.

Site selection, alternatives and design

Presumably alternatives will go beyond the applicant's sixteen parishes – there are 540 in Norfolk and 479 in Suffolk, which means the applicant has only considered under 2% of the area's potential. This is a woefully insignificant figure for a Nationally Significant

Infrastructure Project, especially when there are kindred schemes a stone's throw away at Tasburgh plus between Diss and Eye down the A140 corridor elbowing each other over the planning jumps in the great NSIP Steeplechase.

The applicant does not even mention the EDF BESS station knocking on the door of the scheme opposite Dunston Hall. It's ready to go on line and capable of feeding current directly into Norwich without recourse to the National Grid. To deny opportunity to discuss these local yet national ventures is, to use a highly technical term, nuts.

Landscape – beyond the visual

Though it's good to see landscape appear as a concept, a Constable or Turner would not deem it simply visual. Human settings and ecological factors occur within and therefore predicate a landscape, so these three subject zones should each be viewed as landscape-based. As previously indicated this accords with Natural and Historic Englands' deployment of landscape characterisation as a tool of analysis, being particularly suited for large-scale studies and applications. To assist understanding and synthesis, the trio of cultural heritage, ecology and visual may be placed under a landscape umbrella.

Consultation

This session is to cover how things are to be treated, not the things themselves. This should also cover how things were treated.

In February 2023 South Norfolk District Council brought to notice that two of the sixteen parishes, Framingham Earl and Pulham Market had hardly been consulted.

In March 2026 the applicant submitted a Statement of Compliance including Adequacy of Consultation Milestone Documents.

In between these dates Regener8 distributed leaflets with meeting invites to all the letter-boxes in Pulham Market. It was for a solar scheme:-

- outside the parish boundary
- as far away as the Great Moulton BESS complex - with its associated dangers
- thirty-three times smaller than East Pye Solar

During these three years to the best of our knowledge East Pye Solar provided virtually zilch – no letter box leaflets, notices, open meetings, nothing. In short consultation in Pulham Market wasn't simply inadequate, there wasn't any.

This is wrong. In a country governed by democracy and enshrined in the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act it is the applicant's obligation and the Planning Inspectorate's duty to ensure all relevant parties are informed and have their say. Pulham Market hasn't. It is the Inspectorate's duty to ensure this happens, regardless of all else.

The whys and wherefores during this three year gap is history. We're at the stage of the draft examination timetable. What needs to happen now is to engage with Pulham Market. If it causes delay so be it. East Pye Solar ought to have done things properly.

Finally, on a personal note, in May my wife happened to pick things up on local facebook, long after the planning application was delivered with Pulham ignored. It left her in tears. It leaves me fuming....

..... we're downwind and downstream from any fall-out from any fire at the Great Moulton BESS power station, and it still seems uncertain the applicant and the Inspectorate together will face up to their responsibilities.