

I object to this scheme. I support solar generation in principle; I oppose its citing on productive arable land (despite this scheme's attempt to dishonestly categorise arable land in various ways to make it seem like this is not being sited on prime arable land which it absolutely is).1) Wrong location, wrong typology. 500 MW should be delivered on the UK's 250,000 hectares of residential commercial and industrial rooftops, not on Norfolk arable farming land.

2) Rooftop alternatives Dismissed on circular reasoning. Rejected for not developing 500 MW as one scheme, when the national target is aggregate capacity.

3) Loss of fertile land. contrary to NPS EN-3, in a period of declining UK food self-sufficiency.

4) Fire, BESS thermal runaway, and attack risk. Could deposit cadmium, lead and antimony across surrounding soils - Contaminating arable land for generations. If for some reason this site was attacked and set on fire The high temperatures would result in the units producing large quantities of contaminating materials, And with the increasing risk of global war this is increasingly likely. Sites such as the proposed solar farm at East, are not guarded in any way and could quite easily be attacked by bad actors.

5) The commercial package is [REDACTED]. the parent company of the developer is the same institution who asset stripped Thames Water. The Public has no confidence in this proposed scheme, or the developer, and amounts to governments selling the national interest to the global community to their own benefit and to the disadvantage of the Public.

6) The vast increase in the National Grid energy requirement is not driven by more people as UK population will only rise by 2.5% by 2034 (ONS), meaning these destructive solar farms are powering data centres and the like.