

I've been a resident of Great Moulton for 25 years.

We moved from a large town where amenities, public services, street lighting, shops, restaurants, etc are plentiful and have missed most/all/some of these on a regular basis, but that inconvenience has been offset by being in a peaceful environment and close to nature.

Much of that environment will be impacted by the proposed scheme in some cases, to a great extent and none of that impact will be offset by a positive impact to the residents, there is only the downside of increased noise, light pollution, increased fire risks, glint, loss of nature, impact on property prices, etc.

I support renewable energy, but this development is completely inappropriate for the area suggested.

My main objection relates to the proposed location of the 400kv substation being proposed on the outskirts of Great Moulton.

I live at 21 Potters Crescent and our house will look directly onto the proposed substation (and the tracking panels). Both will be less than a field width from our property.

Proposing to site a substation of this size on grade B farmland is nonsensical, given the multitude of other locations available. This substation could literally go anywhere along the line of the pylons, why on earth would you want to rip up prosperous farmland to site it in a peaceful village, when it could be housed on an industrial estate.

I attended one of the public consultation sessions undertaken by East Pye and below is a brief summary of the discussion regarding the sub station:

- What will the sub station look like once in place? A lady wearing a badge that said 'visuals' "wasn't sure".

- Will the substation be lit at night? "We don't know, but don't worry they won't be near when anyone lives"! (the proposed site is practically at the bottom of people's gardens).

- Why didn't you bring a photo of one? That's a good idea was the response.

The one individual who did offer some useful insight and appeared to know what he was talking about was the 'transport expert'. With regards to the options for the site of the sub-station he agreed that option 1 was clearly preferable given its relative proximity to both the A140 and the planned Bess station.

He intimated that Option 2 would be a hideous site from a logistical and practical point of view - one access point is a bridle path in the middle of a field and the other is a very narrow country lane at the corner of the village.

Whereas option 1 is near the A140 and access is via a proper tarmac road.

Option 1 also would be further from the village and therefore would be less disruptive public both whilst in construction and operation.

There has to be a balance between energy security and food security and to give one up for the other, when you can have both, would be absurd.

The loss of high quality farmland is one of most bizarre elements of this proposal. Solar panels can be attached to almost anything, why on earth would we want to see valuable farmland being sacrificed?

The substation will be a huge eye sore on the local landscape. If it has to be built, why can't it be on an industrial estate away from people's homes.

My second concern relates to the proposed construction and location of the huge BESS. There have been numerous examples of these systems catching fire and the proposed location here means that if that happens, the only viable solution is evacuation of many of the villagers and potential untold damage to property and risk to life.

My third concern relates to the construction of the various sites and the unsuitability of the local roads.

I drove along Frith Way and lodge Lane most days and more often than not you come across a horse, a bike or a dog walker - it's quite difficult to pass these in just a normal car - and the thought of hundreds of lorries and other vehicles trying to navigate these roads during the construction phase is crazy.

It's difficult for two cars to pass each other on the majority of the roads and you only have to look at what happens when there's an accident on the a140 to see the knock effect that has on the local roads when an increased number of cars and vans are diverted.

During construction it would be the equivalent of the a140 being blocked every day - this would not only be intolerable for the locals, but would no doubt heavily impact on the viability of construction within timescales, etc.

The ongoing noise of all three of the above is a huge concern.

My fourth and final main concern relates to the cumulative effect on Norfolk of these projects.

In my view this project does not make sense in isolation and it makes even less sense when considered alongside the multitude of similar projects relating to solar panels, pylons, BESS, etc in Norfolk. These are not solar 'farms', they are massive industrial projects which will alter the landscape across a large part of Norfolk forever.

My final point relates to the financial impact of the development in many homeowners in the village. I've seen one of my close neighbours in potters crescent having to slash the asking price on their property by over £50k and it still won't sell. It appears as though the village of Great Moulton is being sacrificed for a scheme that will make little or no difference to the country's net zero targets.

If net zero is so vital, why isn't the government purchasing industrial land to site the substations on instead of high grade farmland?

In conclusion I would recommend refusal of this application.

If the application does go ahead, I would request at the very least amending the proposed location of the large sub station proposed for the south of Great Moulton to somewhere less harmful and more practical.