

# East Pye Solar - EN0110014

## Written Representation - Deadline 1

|                         |                |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Name                    | Richard Dunham |
| Property                |                |
| Interested Party Ref    |                |
| Relevant Representation | RR-1611        |
| Date                    | 5 October 2026 |

### 1. Purpose of this representation

I am the owner and occupier of The Cedars, a Grade II listed property (NHLE 1304177) affected by Sites 4A and 4B. This Written Representation develops the matters raised in my Relevant Representation RR-1611, with particular focus on heritage setting, residential visual amenity, lighting, the Cedars Cluster, and my unresolved Category 3 / Book of Reference position.

The Applicant records The Cedars as approximately 70m west of Sub-Site 4B [APP-165, Table 8]. Its own heritage assessment also acknowledges that The Cedars is a three-storey former farmhouse with wide-ranging countryside views and that its significance derives partly from its relationship with associated historic farm buildings and the surrounding agricultural landscape [APP-165, paras 6.37-6.43]. That is central to my objection.

### 2. Heritage setting and the “no harm” conclusion

The Applicant accepts that the agricultural landscape of Site 4 forms part of the setting of The Cedars and contributes to understanding its historic context [APP-165, para 6.43]. It nevertheless concludes that there would be “no harm” [APP-165, paras 6.66-6.67].

I do not consider that conclusion consistent with the Applicant’s own description of the asset or with the actual relationship between the house, its grounds and the surrounding farmland.

Paragraph 6.66 states that there are no views from The Cedars to the north-east including Sub-Site 4B because of mature planting. The photographs in Appendix A show the actual outlook from the first and second floors and from the garden towards Site 4B. The relationship with the surrounding agricultural land is direct and readily experienced.

The Applicant’s Heritage Statement photographs [APP-165, Plates 18-20] and Heritage Views [APP-167, Sheets 42 and 44] show The Cedars from Site 4. Appendix A provides the complementary evidence in the opposite direction: from The Cedars and its grounds towards Sites 4A and 4B.

### 3. Tumbrel Barn, Dairy Barn and the Cedars Cluster

The Cedars, Tumbrel Barn and Dairy Barn should be understood together as a historic rural group rather than isolated receptors. The Applicant’s response to Relevant Representations acknowledges this concern and states that the relationship has been considered [PDA-012, CUL-022].

I have asked the Examining Authority to visit this Cedars Cluster and have offered access to The Cedars and its grounds. Figure A1 shows the close relationship between the three properties and the directions of views towards Sites 4A and 4B.

### 4. Residential visual amenity

The Residential Visual Amenity Assessment identifies properties within 500m but only takes properties within 100m of the maximum development parameters through the individual assessment process [APP-148, paras 2.1.11-2.1.13]. The Residential Receptors Plan for Site 4 states “NO Residential Properties within 100m” [APP-084, Sheet 6].

That sits uneasily with the heritage evidence recording The Cedars approximately 70m from Sub-Site 4B [APP-165, Table 8]. I recognise that the documents may be measuring from different reference points - the Site boundary in one case and maximum development parameters in the other - but this makes a clear property-specific explanation necessary.

The Cedars should not fall between assessment methodologies simply because solar panels are set back from a site boundary. The effect on residents arises from the development as a whole, including changes to landscape and setting, fencing, access, construction activity, planting and associated infrastructure.

APP-148 also focuses its Step 3 assessment on Year 15, when landscape mitigation is assumed to be established, and excludes construction and decommissioning effects [APP-148, para 2.1.17]. I ask for The Cedars to be assessed expressly at Year 1 and through the establishment period, including winter and leaf-off conditions.

## **5. Lighting and rural character**

The Lighting Strategy classifies the Order Limits as an E2 “Rural” Environmental Lighting Zone with low ambient light levels [APP-151, paras 3.1.8-3.1.10]. That reflects the existing character around The Cedars.

APP-151 says operational lighting is expected principally at the National Grid Substation, BESS and project substations, and that controls, colour temperatures and luminaire orientations will be considered at detailed design [APP-151, paras 5.1.3-5.1.4]. I ask that effects on nearby residential and heritage receptors are understood before consent and that enforceable controls prevent unnecessary light spill, glare and sky glow.

## **6. Other Site 4 matters raised in RR-1611**

I maintain the wider Site 4 concerns raised in RR-1611 concerning ecology, the water environment, landscape and the absence of a demonstrated need for this particular development in this location. RR-1611 referred specifically to barbastelle bats, white-clawed crayfish within 2km of Site 4A and risks to the Tas chalk-stream and chalk-aquifer catchment. I do not duplicate the detailed technical evidence being submitted by BEPS and specialist parties, but ask the ExA to consider that evidence alongside the property-specific effects set out here.

## **7. Category 3 and the Book of Reference**

This issue was raised in RR-1611 and remains unresolved.

The Book of Reference explains that Part 2 contains persons whom the Applicant considers would or might be able to make a relevant claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 and/or section 152(3) of the Planning Act 2008, including persons with interests in land outside the Order Limits [APP-022, paras 3.2.1-3.2.3].

Neither Richard Dunham nor Amanda Dunham appears in the submitted Book of Reference. On 19 September 2026 we jointly asked the Applicant to reassess each of us individually as Category 3 persons in relation to The Cedars. The Applicant has also recorded RR-1611 under its Category 3 theme and acknowledges the request [PDA-012, CON-037].

CON-037 gives a generic explanation that a detailed assessment was undertaken when preparing the Book of Reference, but does not explain why The Cedars specifically was excluded. I ask the Applicant either to amend the Book of Reference or provide a reasoned, property-specific explanation applying the relevant statutory tests to The Cedars and to Richard and Amanda Dunham individually.

## **8. Effect on our home**

At Open Floor Hearing 1 I explained the practical effect on our home, including concern about future saleability and value. I do not advance this as a new standalone planning issue, but as a real-world consequence of the heritage, landscape and residential effects already raised.

We chose The Cedars because of its historic rural character and open countryside setting. If that setting is materially altered, the burden is concentrated on a small number of neighbouring households.

## **9. Site inspection and requested outcome**

I ask the Examining Authority to visit The Cedars, Tumbrel Barn and Dairy Barn during leaf-off conditions. The Appendix A photographs were taken in October 2026 while substantial deciduous foliage remained; screening will reduce further in winter.

My primary request remains that development consent is not granted for Sites 4A and 4B, and particularly that Site 4B is removed because of its relationship with The Cedars and the surrounding historic agricultural landscape. If the Scheme is nevertheless taken forward, I ask that The Cedars receives a property-specific heritage and residential assessment; that Year 1-15 and leaf-off effects are expressly assessed; that lighting controls are secured; and that the Category 3 / Book of Reference issue is resolved with a reasoned property-specific response.

### **AI declaration**

OpenAI ChatGPT was used to help draft, structure, cross-reference and edit the wording throughout this Written Representation. The source material comprised my Relevant Representation RR-1611, my oral representation at Open Floor Hearing 1, the Applicant's examination documents cited above, the Examining Authority's procedural documents, my correspondence concerning Category 3 status, and factual information and photographs supplied by me. I have reviewed the final submission and take responsibility for its accuracy, completeness and content.

# Appendix A - Photographic Evidence

All images supplied by Richard Dunham. Figures A2-A6 are photographs taken in October 2026 and are unaltered apart from scaling for document layout. Figure A1 is an annotated aerial image supplied by the author.



Figure A1 - Annotated aerial view of the Cedars Cluster. Red arrows indicate the general direction of views towards Sites 4A and 4B; they do not indicate the Scheme boundary.



Figure A2 - View from the second floor of The Cedars looking north-east towards Site 4B.



*Figure A3 - View from the first floor of The Cedars looking north-east towards Site 4B.*



*Figure A4 - View from the garden of The Cedars looking east towards Site 4B.*



*Figure A5 - View from the garden of The Cedars looking north towards Site 4B. The foreground and boundary vegetation includes substantial deciduous planting.*



*Figure A6 - View from the second floor of The Cedars looking north-west towards Site 4A across Norwich Road.*