

From: [Jon N](#)
To: [East Pye Solar](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Subject: Formal Objection to East Pye Solar Project (Reference: EN0110014) – Visual Encroachment and Heritage Settings Harm at Hawes Green (Site 8)
Date: 20 September 2026 20:10:30

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Examining Authority, Case Officers, and Copied Statutory Parties,

I am writing to register my formal objection to the proposed **East Pye Solar Project**, specifically concerning the unacceptable, unmitigated visual impact of **Site 8** (sub-sites 8A and 8B) on **Hawes Green** within the **Shotesham Conservation Area**.

I am a permanent resident of Hawes Green, living within a highly sensitive and protected historic landscape. Our properties sit in immediate visual and historic alignment with an exceptional national heritage cluster, including the Grade II* listed **St Mary's Church** and the Grade II listed ruins of **St Martin's Church**.

Recent new research by a neighbour has highlighted that the panels will be visible from Hawes Green. While the panels for Site 8 sit **1.2 miles away to our northeast along Brooke Road / Mill Lane**, the developer's own paperwork (**Table 7.4 of Chapter 7**) explicitly flags the Hawes Green ridge as a receptor zone with direct cross-valley views of the site. I object to the project based on the following critical planning and heritage grounds:

1. Methodological Deficiencies in Table 7.4:

The developer has attempted to dismiss the visual impacts on our homes by classifying Hawes Green purely as a transient, recreational public footpath view. This is a severe omission designed to downplay the true impact. The

developer has failed to conduct a proper **Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)** under **Landscape Institute TGN 02/19** to evaluate the permanent visual intrusion on our permanent family homes. Furthermore, the surveys were conducted carelessly, as evidenced in Appendix 7.4 where a permanent residence on our road is factually misidentified as a commercial holiday home.

2. **Unmitigated Heritage Harm (Historic England GPA3):**

Under Section 66 of the Planning Act 1990 and Historic England's GPA3 policy framework, the rural backdrop and immediate approach to our homes and medieval churches are strictly protected. The developer explicitly admits that **"glimpses" and "glimmers"** of the industrial solar arrays will pierce the tree lines right outside St Mary's Church path. An admission of a glimpse is a legal admission of an unmitigated line of sight. Introducing a massive, metallic, industrial infrastructure layer into this historic viewshed shatters the rural tranquility and group value of this designated Conservation Area.

3. **The Fallacy of Woodland and Hedge Screening:**

The developer claims that ground-level hedges along the valley floor and existing woodland blocks will screen the panels. This is a topographical fallacy. Because the terrain rises toward Hawes Green, ground-level hedges at the bottom of the valley cannot hide 4.5-metre-high panels viewed from an elevated ridge.

Furthermore, the woodland between our ridge and Site 8 is heavily deciduous; it completely loses its leaves for half the year, leaving the stark, industrial grid completely on view all winter.

I formally request that the Examining Authority mandate the developer to produce a **verified line-of-sight topographical cross-section** from the St Mary's Church path directly to Site 8, and that an **Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI)** be conducted from our ridge. I urge the Inspectorate to recommend the total removal of Site 8 from the final masterplan.

Yours faithfully,

Jon and Lucy Nott

[Redacted signature block]

Email: [Redacted email address]