

GMAG Cumulative-Impact Speech 15.09.2026

I speak today on behalf of the Great Moulton Action Group. Our community supports renewable energy, but we will not accept a proposal that forces multiple high-risk, high-impact infrastructures into one small rural village without proper assessment, justification, or transparency. What is being asked of Great Moulton is unreasonable, unsafe, and unjustifiable.

Let us be clear: this is not a solar farm. It is an industrial complex. **Multiple solar sites**, a Battery Energy Storage System, a project substation, a National Grid substation, a construction compound, and a cable corridor cutting directly through our village. No rural community anywhere in the country has been asked to absorb this level of industrialisation in such a confined area. Yet Great Moulton is being treated as if it is an empty space on a map.

Across the developer's documentation, the most serious failure is obvious: impacts have been deliberately separated to make them appear smaller. There is **no cumulative noise modelling** for three substations operating together. **No cumulative traffic modelling** for narrow rural roads with no footpaths. **No cumulative visual assessment** of tall buildings, fencing, lighting, battery units, and expanded pylons. **No cumulative heritage assessment**. **No cumulative safety assessment** for equestrians and pedestrians who rely on these lanes daily.

Residents will experience these impacts all at once. The developer has chosen to assess them one by one. That is not a technical gap — it is a structural omission that hides the true scale of harm.

It is also clear that Great Moulton was not chosen because it is suitable. It was chosen because landowners signed up. Other areas were considered first. Our community did not choose this. We did not influence the siting. And National Grid have not confirmed that this is the final location for their infrastructure. We are being positioned as the path of least resistance — not the right location.

The BESS is a major industrial hazard placed close to homes and public rights of way. Fire safety, noise, lighting, and long-term reliability are not minor details. They are fundamental to whether this facility can safely exist in a rural village. The developer has not provided the information needed to demonstrate that it can. That is unacceptable.

The National Grid substation is the most intrusive and permanent part of the entire scheme, yet it is also the least defined. No detailed plans. No visualisations. No safety information. No clarity on its long-term footprint. This level of uncertainty for infrastructure of national significance is extraordinary. It has caused widespread anxiety and it undermines any claim that this proposal is ready for examination.

The wider impacts are equally severe. Public Rights of Way would be cut or diverted, removing safe off-road access for walkers, riders, and families. Best and Most Versatile farmland would be permanently lost. Sensitive groundwater areas would be built over without clear safeguards. Heritage settings would be altered. Rural lanes would carry heavy construction traffic far beyond what they were designed for. These are not temporary inconveniences — they are permanent losses that will reshape our village for decades.

Individually, each of these impacts is serious. Together, they represent a complete and irreversible transformation of our landscape, our daily lives, and our sense of place. No amount of mitigation can disguise that.

Our community has engaged throughout this process. We have reviewed the BEPS report and support its findings. We have produced our own detailed objection, grounded in evidence and lived experience. We reject the idea that rural communities should carry a disproportionate burden for renewable energy, especially when the cumulative impacts have not been properly assessed and meaningful alternatives have not been explored.

Great Moulton does not consent to this level of industrialisation. We ask the Planning Inspectorate to recognise that cumulative harm is not hypothetical — it is real, measurable, and already evident in the gaps and omissions within the developer's own documentation. We urge you to consider the full picture and conclude that this scheme, in its current form, is not compatible with a fair, safe, or balanced approach to development.

Thank you.