

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

East Pye Solar - Planning Inspectorate Reference EN0110014

To: The Examining Authority, The Planning Inspectorate

Submitted by: Rev Dr David Lloyd & Mrs Anna Lloyd – Interested Parties

Property: [REDACTED]

Date: 11 September 2026

1. Introduction

1.1 This Written Representation is submitted on behalf of the owners and occupiers of [REDACTED] (“the Property”). It expands upon our concerns regarding the proposed East Pye Solar development.

1.2 The Property is a **Grade II listed residential barn conversion situated within the Shotesham Conservation Area** in South Norfolk. It occupies a prominent and elevated position within the historic Hawes Green group of buildings, with an important visual relationship to the surrounding agricultural landscape.

The principal outlook from our home is from the **Garden Room and front porch**, which enjoy an elevated view across Hawes Green and the valley beyond. This view is particularly distinctive because it looks out **between the two historic churches of St Mary and St Martin**, across the rural landscape towards the area in which Sites 7 and 8 are proposed.

These are the **primary windows and principal outlook of our home**. Other aspects of the Property are much more enclosed by neighbouring buildings within the historic Hawes Green cluster. The open valley view from the Garden Room therefore has a particular importance to both the character of the Property and our residential amenity.

It is in this direction that **Sub-Sites 7I, 7J, 7K and 7L (forming part of Site 7), together with Sub-Sites 8A and 8B (Site 8)**, are located.

1.3 [REDACTED] forms part of a particularly significant and tightly grouped historic cluster at Hawes Green. This includes the Grade II listed residential buildings [REDACTED], **Old Hall Barn and Old Hall Farm**, together with **Watendlath**, and, most significantly, the **Grade II* listed Church of St Mary** (Historic England List Entry 1050642). The Grade II listed medieval **Remains of the Church of St Martin** (List Entry 1152468) lie approximately 100 metres from St Mary's.

The significance of [REDACTED] therefore derives not simply from the building in isolation, but also from its relationship with this historic group and with the open rural landscape surrounding it.

1.4 We object to the Scheme as proposed. We do not object to renewable energy in principle and recognise the national importance of the transition to renewable energy. Our concern is specifically with the scale, siting and assessment of this Scheme in this particular landscape.

We submit that the Scheme as currently assessed and designed would cause significant and inadequately mitigated harm to the **visual amenity, residential amenity and**

heritage setting of [REDACTED] and the wider Hawes Green heritage cluster, and that this harm has not been properly evaluated within the Environmental Statement.

2. Visual Impact — Inadequate Assessment of [REDACTED] and the Hawes Green Heritage Cluster

Site 8 is the Highest Sensitivity Landscape Site in the Scheme

2.1 Table 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 (APP/6.1.7, Revision 1, March 2026) confirms that **Site 8 is assessed as High value, High susceptibility and High sensitivity** — the only solar site within the approximately 1,100-hectare Scheme to receive this rating. All other solar sites are rated as having medium sensitivity.

2.2 Table 7.5 of ES Chapter 7 further confirms that during construction, Site 8 is assessed as having a **Moderate magnitude of effect resulting in a Major level of significance and a Significant adverse effect on landscape character** — the highest construction-phase landscape impact rating of any solar site within the Scheme.

2.3 Despite Site 8 receiving the highest landscape sensitivity rating in the Scheme, and despite the Applicant identifying a Major Significant adverse construction effect, **no viewpoint has been assessed from [REDACTED] from Hawes Green, from St Mary's Church (Grade II*) or from St Martin's Church (Grade II).**

We submit that this is a material omission.

This omission is particularly significant in relation to [REDACTED] because the Property has an **elevated principal outlook from its Garden Room and front porch across Hawes Green and the valley towards Sites 7 and 8**. This is not an incidental or secondary view from the Property: it is the principal open outlook from our main set of windows.

Hawes Green is Absent from the Visual Assessment

2.4 Table 7.4 of ES Chapter 7 lists 21 separate viewpoints assessed for Sites 7 and 8 combined. **Hawes Green does not appear as a named receptor or viewpoint location anywhere within that assessment.**

2.5 The only assessed viewpoint in the vicinity is Site 7 VL11, described as **PRoW Shotesham FP21**, and rated medium value, medium susceptibility and medium overall sensitivity.

This is an assessment of a public footpath receptor. It is not an assessment of the effect upon a permanent residential receptor or upon the setting and principal outlook of a Grade II listed dwelling within the Conservation Area.

In particular, it cannot substitute for assessment of the **elevated view from Church View Barn's principal living space**, experienced repeatedly and throughout the year by the occupiers of the Property.

2.6 ES Chapter 7 paragraph 7.5.22 explicitly states that potential visual effects are likely to be experienced from the **"settlement edges of... Shotesham"** and from PRoWs around Shotesham.

Having expressly identified Shotesham as a settlement from which visual effects are likely, the Applicant has nevertheless failed to assess a residential receptor viewpoint within **Shotesham St Mary or Hawes Green**.

We submit that this represents an important internal inconsistency in the assessment.

2.7 ES Chapter 7 paragraph 7.7.14 further confirms that solar PV panel development within Sub-Sites 8A and 8B has been excluded in proximity to residential properties on Market Lane, Wash Lane **“and from Shotesham.”**

The Applicant therefore appears expressly to recognise Shotesham as a sensitive residential receptor. That makes the absence of a representative residential viewpoint from Hawes Green particularly difficult to understand.

St Mary’s Church (Grade II*) and St Martin’s Church (Grade II)

2.8 The **Church of St Mary, Shotesham St Mary**, is a Grade II* listed building (Historic England List Entry 1050642). The **Remains of the Church of St Martin** (List Entry 1152468) comprise a Grade II listed medieval ruin approximately 100 metres from St Mary’s.

Both form part of the immediate historic context of [REDACTED] and the Hawes Green cluster. Neither appears as a named viewpoint receptor within the visual assessment.

2.9 ES Chapter 7 paragraph 7.3 and the Scoping Opinion response table confirm that impacts on Conservation Areas are to be assessed and cross-referenced between the LVIA and ES Chapter 10.

Nevertheless, the **Shotesham Conservation Area**, including this particularly sensitive group of designated heritage assets, is not represented by an assessed viewpoint looking towards Sites 7 and 8.

2.10 An independent Landscape Architect commissioned by objectors has assessed the impact of Site 8 upon the Shotesham Conservation Area and concluded that this is a valued landscape and that the harm caused by the Scheme would be significant.

We request that the Examining Authority gives appropriate weight to this independent professional assessment.

The 2km Study Area

2.11 ES Chapter 7 paragraph 7.5.6 defines the Study Area as extending **2km from the boundary of Sites 1 to 10**. [REDACTED] and the Hawes Green heritage cluster are within the area in which detailed consideration of potentially significant effects should therefore be expected.

2.12 The Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion, noted in Table 7.1 of ES Chapter 7, specifically directed the Applicant that the ES should assess potential effects on views and visual amenity within the ZTV where significant effects are likely.

We therefore request that the Applicant be required to confirm whether **Church View Barn falls within the ZTV for Site 8 (Figure 7.5.4) and Site 7 (Figure 7.5.5)** and, if so, to explain why it has not been assessed as a named or representative residential receptor.

2.13 We submit that the LVIA therefore contains a number of material gaps relevant to [REDACTED] and the Hawes Green heritage cluster:

- no viewpoint assessment from Hawes Green or [REDACTED], despite Shotesham being identified in paragraph 7.5.22 as a settlement from which visual effects are likely;
- no assessment of the elevated principal outlook from [REDACTED] Garden Room and front porch across the valley towards Sites 7 and 8;
- no representative residential receptor assessment from within this part of the Shotesham Conservation Area looking towards Sites 7 and 8;
- no viewpoint assessment from or towards the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church or the Grade II listed remains of St Martin's Church;
- inadequate consideration within the LVIA of the impact of Site 8 upon this part of the Shotesham Conservation Area, despite Site 8 being identified by the Applicant as the highest-sensitivity landscape site within the Scheme; and
- an apparent inconsistency between paragraph 7.5.22 and the selected viewpoints, which contain no assessed residential viewpoint from Shotesham St Mary or Hawes Green.

2.14 We submit that these are material deficiencies in the environmental information before the Examining Authority and should be addressed during the Examination.

3. Tracker Panels — Orientation, Height and Morning Visual Impact

3.1 Table 4.1 of ES Chapter 4 (APP/6.1.4) confirms that the Scheme is assessed under a Rochdale Envelope including **Option A: Single-Axis Tracker Panels** on all Sites, including Sites 7 and 8.

ES Chapter 7 confirms that the visual assessment has been undertaken on the basis of Option A as the worst-case parameter. The ES identifies the following parameters:

- maximum height at greatest inclination: **4.5 metres**;
- maximum inclination: **60 degrees from horizontal**;
- row alignment: **north-south**; and
- tracking direction: **east in the morning and west in the evening**.

3.2 The orientation of tracker panels is particularly important when assessing visual effects from Hawes Green. During morning operation, the tracker arrays would present a substantially different visual profile towards receptors to the north and north-east than would conventional fixed south-facing panels.

At maximum inclination, panels could reach **4.5 metres in height**, materially increasing their visibility within this rural landscape.

3.3 This is potentially materially different from the effect of a fixed south-facing installation, which would present a different profile towards [REDACTED] and the Hawes Green heritage cluster.

Given that no representative viewpoint assessment has been undertaken from Hawes Green, it is not clear how this tracker configuration has been assessed from residential and heritage receptors in this direction.

3.4 We therefore request that the Examining Authority requires the Applicant to confirm that the LVIA has specifically assessed tracker panels in their morning orientation and at maximum permitted inclination and height from viewpoints to the north and north-east of Sites 7 and 8, including residential and heritage receptors at **Shotesham St Mary and Hawes Green**.

4. Glint and Glare — Bifacial Tracker Panels

4.1 ES Chapter 4 confirms that the Scheme may employ bifacial solar panels. In combination with tracker technology, this means that both panel orientation and the potential visibility of different panel surfaces are relevant when considering effects upon receptors at Hawes Green.

4.2 ES Chapter 7 confirms that a Glint and Glare assessment has been undertaken as part of ES Chapter 18 (APP/6.1.18). The Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion directed the Applicant to use the ZTV to identify ground-based sensitive receptors with potential views who may be affected by glint and glare.

4.3 Given the absence of a representative viewpoint from Hawes Green or [REDACTED] within the LVIA, we request confirmation that the Glint and Glare assessment has specifically considered **residential receptors at Shotesham St Mary and Hawes Green**, including Church View Barn, under the worst-case tracker configuration.

If this receptor direction has not been adequately assessed, we submit that this represents a further material gap in the assessment.

5. Panel Type Flexibility and Post-Consent Risk

5.1 The Rochdale Envelope approach means that the Applicant retains flexibility regarding the final panel technology deployed on individual sub-sites. There appears to be no sub-site-specific commitment within the draft DCO requiring fixed rather than tracker panels on the sub-sites affecting the outlook and heritage setting of Hawes Green.

5.2 We submit that consideration should therefore be given to a DCO Requirement controlling the use of tracker panels where their particular height, orientation or visual effects would materially affect sensitive residential or heritage receptors, or alternatively requiring detailed sub-site-specific assessment and approval of panel type before commencement.

6. Ecology — Barbastelle Bats and Shotesham Woods

6.1 Barbastelle bat activity has been recorded in the Shotesham area and associated woodland. Barbastelle bats are a highly protected species dependent upon connected landscapes, dark corridors and suitable commuting and foraging habitat.

6.2 We understand that maternity colony core sustenance zones overlap parts of Site 8 and associated infrastructure corridors. We are concerned that the ecological assessment does not adequately demonstrate how effects upon this important bat population will be avoided or mitigated.

6.3 Published research has also identified behavioural interactions between bats and horizontally orientated solar panels, including evidence that bats may mistake smooth horizontal surfaces for water.

Given the use of tracking panels proposed within the Rochdale Envelope, we submit that the potential implications for the locally important bat population should be explicitly considered.

7. Ecology — White-Clawed Crayfish and Aquatic Survey Methodology

7.1 Sites 7 and 8 lie within the catchment of the **River Tas chalk stream system**. We understand that survey evidence held by Norfolk Rivers Trust records White-Clawed Crayfish within the Tas catchment.

We are therefore concerned by any conclusion within the Applicant's assessment that the Tas is unlikely to support this protected species.

7.2 We further understand that some aquatic survey work associated with the Scheme may have been undertaken during periods when relevant streams or ditches were dry.

If so, we submit that the Examining Authority should satisfy itself that the ecological baseline is sufficiently robust for a chalk-stream catchment known to support White-Clawed Crayfish and that appropriate surveys have been undertaken under suitable hydrological conditions.

8. Ecology — Rare Botany

8.1 Sites 7 and 8, together with associated access routes and cable corridors, are understood to contain botanical assemblages of significant ecological interest.

We understand that an experienced botanist familiar with the botanical record of this area has written to East Pye Solar recommending that appropriate full-season botanical surveys be undertaken.

8.2 If adequate seasonal surveys have not yet been undertaken, we submit that this represents a potentially significant gap in the environmental baseline and should be resolved before conclusions are reached regarding ecological effects and mitigation.

9. Water Environment

9.1 Sites 7 and 8 lie within the sensitive **River Tas chalk-stream and chalk-aquifer catchment**.

We are concerned that the hydrological connectivity of the development, including its potential relationship with groundwater, surface-water flows, private drainage systems and the wider chalk-stream ecosystem, has not been sufficiently assessed.

9.2 We are particularly concerned about proposals involving directional drilling beneath the Tas to connect parts of the Scheme, given the ecological sensitivity of the river system and the reported presence of White-Clawed Crayfish.

10. Heritage — [REDACTED], the Shotesham Conservation Area and the Hawes Green Heritage Cluster

10.1 [REDACTED] is itself a **Grade II listed building within the Shotesham Conservation Area**.

It forms part of an unusually concentrated group of historic buildings at Hawes Green, including other Grade II listed residential buildings, the **Grade II*** listed Church of St Mary and the Grade II listed medieval remains of the Church of St Martin.

The heritage significance of [REDACTED] cannot therefore be considered solely in terms of its fabric. Its setting, its relationship with neighbouring heritage assets, and the surviving rural landscape around the group are all relevant to understanding its significance.

10.2 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. The Court of Appeal in *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC* [2014] confirmed the considerable importance and weight to be given to harm to the setting of listed buildings.

This duty is directly relevant not only to the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church and Grade II listed St Martin's remains, but also to [REDACTED] **itself as a Grade II listed building.**

10.3 The relationship between [REDACTED] and this historic landscape is especially apparent from the principal outlook of the house. From the **Garden Room and front porch, the eye is drawn across Hawes Green and down the valley through the landscape framed by the two historic churches.** This allows the house, the churches and the agricultural valley beyond to be experienced as part of a coherent historic rural landscape.

The relevant heritage question is therefore not simply whether solar panels would technically be visible from an individual window. It is whether the introduction of industrial-scale energy infrastructure into this view would harm the contribution that the rural setting makes to the significance and experience of the listed building and the wider heritage group.

An independent Landscape Architect commissioned by objectors has assessed the impact of Site 8 upon the Shotesham Conservation Area and concluded that this is a valued landscape and that the harm caused by the Scheme would be significant.

10.4 We submit that the proposed development would introduce a substantial new industrial character into a rural historic landscape identified by the Applicant itself as being of **High landscape value, High susceptibility and High sensitivity.**

This is a location-based harm arising from the particular relationship between Sites 7 and 8 and the historic landscape surrounding Shotesham.

11. Construction Traffic — Abnormal Loads, Saxlingham Nethergate and Heritage Assets

11.1 The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP/7.6) identifies that Abnormal Indivisible Load movements associated with the Scheme may be routed via **The Street, Saxlingham Nethergate.**

We understand that abnormal loads associated with the transformer serving Sub-Site 7F may be up to approximately 5.5 metres wide and that physical highway alterations may consequently be required.

11.2 We are particularly concerned by proposals that could require interference with the historic wall at the Old Rectory and encroachment upon the triangular parcel of land associated with Saxlingham Nethergate's Grade II listed war memorial.

11.3 Such a route appears difficult to reconcile with the stated objective of the Outline CTMP to avoid routing construction vehicles through local villages wherever practicable.

The use of this route for the Scheme's largest abnormal loads requires particularly careful justification.

11.4 We note the concerns raised by Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority regarding construction traffic management and the suitability of local roads.

11.5 We request that the Applicant be required to demonstrate that all reasonable alternative AIL routes have been properly examined and that harm to designated heritage assets and historic fabric within Saxlingham Nethergate will be avoided.

12. Residential Amenity at Church View Barn

12.1 [REDACTED] is a Grade II listed residential barn conversion whose character and amenity are closely related to its rural setting.

The most important outlook from the Property is from the **Garden Room and adjoining front porch**. The Garden Room contains our **primary set of windows and provides the principal open view from the house**. Because [REDACTED] forms part of the close historic cluster at Hawes Green, the other aspects of the house are largely enclosed, interlocked with or surrounded by neighbouring properties. There is no equivalent open outlook elsewhere within the Property.

12.2 From the Garden Room and front porch we enjoy an **elevated and expansive view across Hawes Green and the valley beyond, framed by the two historic churches of St Mary and St Martin**. The rural landscape beyond the churches is therefore not a distant or incidental feature of our outlook: it forms the central focus of the principal view from our home.

It is directly within and beyond this landscape that the proposed development at Sites 7 and 8 would be experienced.

12.3 We are particularly concerned about the **winter condition**. During the summer months existing vegetation and tree cover may provide some screening. During winter, however, when deciduous trees and hedgerows have lost their leaves, we consider it likely that the proposed solar arrays would become substantially more visible from the Garden Room and front porch.

Any assessment which relies significantly upon existing vegetation for screening must therefore consider **winter visibility**, rather than assessing the receptor only under summer or full-leaf conditions.

12.4 This seasonal issue is especially relevant given the potential use of tracker arrays reaching **4.5 metres at maximum inclination**. From our elevated position, reduced winter foliage combined with the height and changing orientation of the tracker panels could result in a substantially greater degree of visibility than might be suggested by viewpoints taken at lower elevations or during periods of full vegetation.

12.5 The introduction of utility-scale solar infrastructure — potentially including tracker arrays, perimeter fencing, CCTV infrastructure and associated electrical infrastructure — into this view would materially alter the character of an outlook which is currently overwhelmingly rural and agricultural.

The significance of this concern is reinforced by the Applicant's own assessment of **Site 8 as High value, High susceptibility and High sensitivity**, and its identification of Significant adverse landscape effects.

Despite this, no specific or representative assessment appears to have been undertaken of the view from Church View Barn.

12.6 We therefore submit that the visual effect upon [REDACTED] cannot properly be represented by a nearby public footpath viewpoint alone. The relevant receptor is an **elevated, permanent residential receptor within a Grade II listed building**, experiencing the view through the principal windows of its principal living space throughout the year.

12.7 Of particular concern is the potential cumulative visual effect of **Sub-Sites 7I, 7J, 7K, 7L, 8A and 8B**, experienced together within the landscape surrounding Hawes Green.

The combination of the scale of development, tracker-panel movement and orientation, panel height, seasonal loss of screening vegetation, the elevated position of the Property and the acknowledged sensitivity of Site 8 means that effects upon residential amenity at [REDACTED] are both foreseeable and require proper assessment.

13. Requests to the Examining Authority

We respectfully request that the Examining Authority:

(a) requires the Applicant to confirm whether [REDACTED] **Hawes Green** falls within the ZTV for Sites 7 (Figure 7.5.5) and 8 (Figure 7.5.4) and, if so, to explain why Hawes Green has not been assessed as a named or representative residential receptor in the LVIA, given that paragraph 7.5.22 identifies Shotesham as a settlement from which visual effects are likely;

(b) requires the Applicant to produce an appropriate viewpoint assessment and visualisation from [REDACTED] **Hawes Green, or a genuinely representative nearby location at a comparable elevation**, assessing the outlook experienced from the Garden Room/front porch and the combined impact of Sub-Sites 7I, 7J, 7K, 7L, 8A and 8B under the worst-case tracker-panel configuration;

(c) requires that this assessment specifically considers **winter conditions and the reduction in screening provided by deciduous trees and hedgerows**, rather than relying solely upon summer or full-leaf conditions;

(d) requires appropriate assessment of views from and towards the **Grade II* listed Church of St Mary, the Grade II listed remains of St Martin's Church, and the Hawes Green group of listed buildings including [REDACTED]**, where those views contribute to their heritage significance;

(e) requires the Applicant to confirm that the Glint and Glare assessment has specifically considered tracker-panel configurations and sensitive residential receptors at **Shotesham St Mary and Hawes Green**, including [REDACTED];

(f) considers whether DCO Requirements should restrict tracker-panel use where the particular height and orientation of those panels would materially affect sensitive residential or heritage receptors, or alternatively require sub-site-specific approval of panel technology;

(g) gives appropriate weight to the independent Landscape Architect's assessment of significant harm to the Shotesham Conservation Area, particularly given the Applicant's own assessment of Site 8 as the highest-sensitivity landscape site within the Scheme;

(h) satisfies itself that the statutory duty under **Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990** has been properly discharged, including in relation to [REDACTED] itself and the Grade II* listed Church of St Mary;

(i) requires adequate seasonal botanical surveys for Sites 7 and 8 where these have not already been undertaken;

(j) requires any necessary further aquatic survey work for Sites 7 and 8 to be undertaken under appropriate hydrological conditions;

(k) requires the Applicant to demonstrate that reasonable alternative AIL routes have been properly investigated which would avoid or minimise harm within Saxlingham Nethergate; and

(l) includes this Written Representation within the evidence considered at any Issue-Specific Hearing concerning **landscape and visual effects, heritage, ecology, water environment and transport**.

14. Conclusion

14.1 We do not object to renewable energy development in principle. We recognise both the seriousness of climate change and the national importance of the transition towards renewable energy.

14.2 Our objection concerns the siting, scale and assessment of this particular development in this particularly sensitive landscape.

The Applicant's own LVIA identifies **Site 8 as the only solar site within the Scheme assessed as High value, High susceptibility and High sensitivity**, with significant adverse landscape effects identified.

Yet there appears to be **no representative residential viewpoint from Hawes Green, no viewpoint from [REDACTED], and no adequate visual assessment representing the Grade II* listed Church of St Mary or the Grade II listed remains of St Martin's Church.**

The LVIA itself identifies Shotesham as a settlement from which visual effects are likely. The absence of an appropriate residential and heritage receptor assessment from Hawes Green is therefore particularly significant.

14.3 In the particular case of [REDACTED], the potentially affected view is our **principal residential outlook**. From the primary windows of the Garden Room and from the front porch, the Property occupies an elevated position looking across Hawes Green and the valley, through a landscape framed by the two historic churches.

Other aspects of the Property are substantially enclosed by neighbouring buildings within the historic cluster. The affected outlook is therefore not one of several equivalent views: **it is the principal open landscape view from our home.**

14.4 We are particularly concerned that the effect could be greatest during winter, when vegetation is reduced and the proposed arrays are more likely to be visible across the valley. Any conclusion concerning the effectiveness of landscape screening should therefore be based upon a proper assessment of **winter as well as summer conditions.**

14.5 [REDACTED] is not simply a residential property from which the Scheme may be visible. It is itself a **Grade II listed building within the Shotesham Conservation Area**, forming part of an exceptional historic group centred upon the Grade II* listed Church of St Mary and the remains of the medieval Church of St Martin.

The effect of the Scheme upon this historic group and upon the rural landscape which contributes to its setting requires proper assessment.

14.6 The combination of tracker-panel height and orientation, the scale of Sites 7 and 8, seasonal loss of vegetation, the elevated position and principal outlook of [REDACTED], the acknowledged high sensitivity of Site 8, and the absence of an assessed residential viewpoint from Hawes Green means that the Examining Authority presently lacks an adequate evidential basis upon which to conclude that effects upon [REDACTED] **its residential amenity and its heritage setting** have been properly assessed and mitigated.

14.7 We are also concerned that important questions remain regarding ecology, botanical surveys, the River Tas chalk-stream catchment, White-Clawed Crayfish, bats, construction traffic and potential effects upon heritage assets associated with the proposed abnormal-load route.

14.8 We therefore respectfully submit that the Applicant should be required to address these deficiencies during the Examination and that, unless and until the identified impacts can be satisfactorily assessed and mitigated, consent should not be granted for Sites 7 and 8 in their presently proposed form.

[REDACTED]

Rev Dr David Lloyd & Mrs Anna Lloyd

[REDACTED]