

Written Representation 2/10/26 [REDACTED]

Having sat through some of the preliminary hearings by the Examining Authority, I have a better understanding of the applicant, the process and requirements.

I am concerned about the Traffic and transport effects on the narrow country lanes (ExQ1.14.1 of 23 Sep 2026). A photo shows the scale of the lanes compared to large vehicles and their ability to cause damage to the verges and drainage ditches. There are few passing places, perhaps 2 per Km. It necessitates the smaller vehicle being able to reverse for 5-800m. Not a skill every driver can manage.

It is a danger to walkers and cyclists.

Further, the presence of construction traffic on other lanes will displace other “normal” traffic onto the single track lanes, blindly following maps on phones. It is a concern for older residents, who may need access to hospital or medical appointments, managing to exit their property and travel down the lanes without having to reverse multiple times. (photo attached)



Public Rights of Way. (ExQ1.11.4) I have looked at our regular circular walking routes and note the SN-FPs 9 & 10 will be “managed” and FP-SN 11, 12, 13 & 14 are likely to be closed for indefinite periods. This will seriously affect our freedom to walk. Other paths through the different elements of site 8 will jeopardise our ability to walk a circular route via Little Wood, Shotesham, Market Lane to the bakery at Golden Owl Barn on Baxter’s Lane, Shotesham and back down Baxter’s Lane to Woodton Farm and the PRow opposite back to Market Lane. The opacity of the applicant’s maps and data means I am unable to detail the precise designation of these PRowS.

Water environment (ExQ1 15.1 & 2.). In previous documentation by East Pye, it was clear they were unaware that we rely on our own private borehole for water supply. East Pye appear to be assuming they can go ahead without any checks on water quality (PINS ID 3.2.5 ENO 110014) before any start.

I demand that they pay for monthly water quality testing for all private water sources and if there is any degradation in quality, they pay for its rectification, by, if necessary providing bulk supplies from Anglian Water to all those affected.

Little has been said about mental and physical well being. The inability to take regular walks in peaceful countryside will lead to a degradation of both. There will be no enjoyment of peaceful countryside, instead there will be an industrial site with noisy moving machines.

I feel that we will be deprived of much of why we moved to the area 18 years ago. At the time we were very concerned to minimise our environmental impact and the home, an old barn, was restored with these principles.

The applicant makes much about design principles:

“APP/7.17. The proposal also offers the opportunity to deliver wide-ranging benefits beyond renewable energy production including recovery of natural environments, economic growth and social benefits such as education and skills opportunities.”

I fail to see that there is anything in the proposal to help recovery of natural environments. Instead, it fosters the destruction of the natural environment of South Norfolk.

I have been unable to find any calculation about the net carbon cost of the construction, which will be huge, owing to transport, destruction of trees and hedges and the import of solar panels from China and their embedded carbon cost. The applicant may have made such a calculation, but finding such a

reference is made almost impossible by the complexity and opacity of the applicant's documents.

The proposal to grant such wide ranging powers that a DCO provides, to an organisation that has failed to provide the necessary details, seems outrageous. The scheme has echoes of the Enclosure Acts of the 18th century, when the inhabitants of the rural community were thrown off their land to the advantage of the wealthy few.