

I am, with my husband, the joint owner/occupier of [REDACTED] which is within a cluster of barns at Gowing Way which would be surrounded by the proposed Site 5 within the proposed scheme.

I object to the proposed scheme. I have no objection to solar schemes generally, but this attractive rural area is entirely unsuitable for a major national solar scheme, with all of the associated infrastructure. The vast proposed substation in Site 5 couldn't be in a less appropriate place, within an historic landscape, just across from St Catherine's Church, Fritton, built in the 15th century.

We own the wood to the south of our property, which is directly adjacent to the proposed solar pv site. Our property includes woodland, a small orchard and three ponds and is a haven for wildlife, with regular sightings of a variety of deer, foxes, bats and numerous birds including barn owls, kingfisher, heron, egrets, little owls and grey wagtails. These species thrive in the existing rural landscape. There are many newts in our ponds. The deer roam across site 5 and into our wood, particularly through the southern boundary, adjacent to the proposed site. We use the footpaths across site 5 to walk and run and to visit the Church. The proposed scheme would industrialise and destroy the surrounding environment.

I emailed Dalcour Maclaren on 04/05/06 regarding a letter we'd had asking for a survey on our property and notified them of the need to survey the bats and newts. On 18/06/26 I received a text message from a [REDACTED] on an unknown number asking to visit our property the next or the following day. This was not possible and I asked for a formal letter identifying who this person was and suggesting other dates and pointing out that we have 2.5 acres of woodland directly adjacent to site 5. Nothing further has been heard from him or Dalcour Maclaren and no surveys have been carried out by them.

The village of Fritton and the neighbouring village of Hempnall are ancient, historic parishes, both of which are mentioned in the Domesday Book. The landscape throughout the scheme comprises productive arable land and in many parts is scenic, gently rolling countryside and has always been a desirable place to live and work. The scheme proposes to turn this gentle rural landscape into semi-industrial land which will never be returned to agriculture, causing a loss of food production and compounding a rising lack of food security in the UK.

Whilst I believe that solar power has its place, along with other renewables, our county of Norfolk is taking a disproportionate share of national infrastructure schemes, degrading our rural landscapes with no benefit to local residents and with questionable contributions to net zero. This scheme in particular is entirely unsuitable for an area of attractive small South Norfolk villages and is causing enormous concern to local residents and more widespread concern about the effects of a multitude of major infrastructure projects on the county generally.

The fact that the developer needs to make provision for additional highway visibility splays and to allow for the removal of roadside vegetation (which presumably includes trees) in order for abnormal loads to pass through its historic villages is because of the complete inappropriateness of the local rural and village landscape and small country roads for this scheme.