



East Pye Solar
Written Summary of the Oral Submissions at the
Open Floor Hearing 2 and the Applicant's
Responses

Revision 1

October 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110014

Document Reference: EXAM/9.19

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Rules 8 (1) (c)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of the Document	1
1.2	Applicant's Oral Submissions	1
2	Summary of Matters Raised in Oral Submissions at Open Floor Hearing 2 and the Applicant's Responses	3
2.1	Cllr Karl Catchpole	3
2.2	Michael Haslam	15
2.3	Victoria Chandler	22
2.4	Cllr Jim Webber	40
2.5	Cllr George Boyd	50
2.6	Ian Mitchell	60
2.7	Ian Neave	65
2.8	Sara Shipley	66
2.9	Jason Crawley	75
2.10	Hilary Battye	81
2.11	Rebecca Mayhew	87
2.12	John Fry	98
2.13	Rodney Aldis	102
2.14	Heather Jackson	103
2.15	Sarah Mallet	106
2.16	Stephen Bamber	112
2.17	Dr Jonathan Newman (on behalf of Sally Walker)	121
2.18	Tony Hall	127
2.19	Kathy Thompson	131
2.20	Ross Jolliffe	139
2.21	Dr Jonathan Newman	142
2.22	Tracey Scarsbrook	153
2.23	Tara Gillam	161
2.24	Melanie Barrow	165
2.25	Jack Lowe	168
2.26	Anne Ginsdale	176
2.27	Sandra Mullett	180
2.28	Keith Stubbings	186
2.29	David Hook	189
2.30	Alison Ray	190
2.31	Robert Hazell	192

Tables

Table 2.1 Cllr Karl Catchpole.....	3
Table 2.2 Michael Haslam	15
Table 2.3 Victoria Chandler	22
Table 2.4 Cllr Jim Webber	40
Table 2.5 Cllr George Boyd	50
Table 2.6 Ian Mitchell	60
Table 2.7 Ian Neave	65
Table 2.8 Sara Shipley	66
Table 2.9 Jason Crawley	75
Table 2.10 Hilary Battye	81
Table 2.11 Rebecca Mayhew	87
Table 2.12 John Fry	98
Table 2.13 Rodney Aldis	102
Table 2.14 Heather Jackson.....	103
Table 2.15 Sarah Mallet	106
Table 2.16 Stephen Bamber	112
Table 2.17 Dr Jonathan Newman (on behalf of Sally Walker)	121
Table 2.18 Tony Hall	127
Table 2.19 Kathy Thompson	131
Table 2.20 Ross Jolliffe	139
Table 2.21 Dr Jonathan Newman.....	142
Table 2.22 Tracey Scarsbrook	153
Table 2.23 Tara Gillam	161
Table 2.24 Melanie Barrow.....	165
Table 2.25 Jack Lowe.....	168
Table 2.26 Anne Ginsdale	176
Table 2.27 Sandra Mullet	180
Table 2.28 Keith Stubbings	186
Table 2.29 David Hook	189
Table 2.30 Alison Ray	190
Table 2.31 Robert Hazell.....	192

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Document

- 1.1.1 This document provides East Pye Solar Limited's (the 'Applicant's') response to oral submissions made at Open Floor Hearing 2 (OFH2), held on 16 September 2026 at Dunston Hall, Norwich, and virtually via Microsoft Teams. OFH2 provided registered Interested Parties (IPs) and local residents with the opportunity to make oral representations. Each IP making an oral submission was requested to provide a written summary to the Examining Authority (ExA) for Deadline 1 (DL1) (6 October 2026).
- 1.1.2 This document sets out the Applicant's response to comments made at OFH2, grouped by speaker. Where multiple representations cover the same topic, a detailed response is provided only for the first occurrence, with relevant application documentation identified. This document also summarises the oral submissions made on behalf of the Applicant at OFH2.
- 1.1.3 References to the application documentation are provided in accordance with the referencing system set out in the Planning Inspectorate's East Pye Solar [Examination Library](#).

1.2 Applicant's Oral Submissions

- 1.2.1 Toby Yeates, Associate Solicitor at Pinsent Masons, thanked everyone for their oral submissions and recognised that it is a deeply personal experience and so the Applicant is grateful that interested parties have taken the opportunity to engage in the process.
- 1.2.2 Mr Yeates provided two points of clarity:
 - Firstly, Mr Yeates confirmed that the Applicant's position is as set out in its **Statement of Need [APP-206]** and the **Planning Statement [APP-209]** which concludes that there are beneficial effects from the Scheme, which represent key drivers for delivering the Scheme, including benefits such as decarbonisation, biodiversity net gain, and the provision of new permissive paths. Mr Yeates summarises that decarbonisation is policy backed as being of critical national priority in the national policy statements and helps to manage environmental harm including heat waves, drought and wildfire, which are experienced at a national and local level. Mr Yeates confirmed that the climate benefits will benefit existing and future generations.
 - Secondly, in respect of compulsory acquisition powers. Mr Yeates confirmed that the Applicant is not seeking to acquire residential property. Often the legislative regime will result in individuals receiving statutory notices as a result of another form of property interest in land included as

part of the Scheme. Mr Yeates confirmed that this may be explored at Compulsory Acquisition Hearings. Further information is also set out in the **Statement of Reasons [APP-020]**.

- Mr Yeates finished by thanking the interested parties again for their contributions and confirmed that the Applicant welcomes continued input from interested parties throughout the rest of the Examination process. Mr Yeates also confirmed that the Applicant will provide a response to the oral submissions made at open floor hearings, at Deadline 1.

2 Summary of Matters Raised in Oral Submissions at Open Floor Hearing 2 and the Applicant's Responses

2.1 Cllr Karl Catchpole

Table 2.1 Cllr Karl Catchpole

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Norfolk County Council (NCC)				
KC-001	General remarks	General opposition to the Development	Mr Catchpole represents the Long Stratton division of South Norfolk for the County Council and chairs the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee. He also grew up in the area which is affected by the development and speaks on behalf of the residents. He opposed the East Pye Solar development in the strongest possible terms, claiming this is not a small planning matter because the development impacts over 2,700 acres of productive farmland, open	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			countryside, and precious wildlife habitat.	
KC-002	Decommissioning	Lasting impact of the Development	Mr Catchpole emphasised that the impacts of the development would last for two generations. He stated that once the scheme is built the countryside would not come back for another 60 years, and claimed that this was not a temporary inconvenience, but rather a generational decision.	The Applicant notes this comment.
KC-003	Soils and Agriculture	Use of farmland	Mr Catchpole expressed concern at the prospect of farmland being chosen for the development, particularly given that food security is spoken of in Westminster as a National Priority. He claimed that residents are being asked to sacrifice thousands of acres of food productive farmland.	ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 - Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] presents an assessment on food production and the rural economy. The Applicant does not consider that food security will be compromised by the Scheme (or solar energy more widely), particularly in the context that the amount of land within the Order Limits is approximately 0.22% of the land within Norfolk, and 1.2% of South Norfolk agricultural land. The UK Food Security Report concludes that food production levels could be maintained or moderately increased alongside the land use change required to meet net zero. The UK Solar Roadmap states that solar development

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				is not considered to compromise food security, and that climate change itself poses the greatest long-term risk to food production - a risk which the Scheme directly helps to address by providing a secure, low-carbon source of electricity. At Paragraph 2.10.21, NPS EN-3 states that <i>'While land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible'</i>.
KC-004	Site Selection and Alternatives	Site selection and use of farmland	Mr Catchpole suggested that there are alternative sites to put this infrastructure, but that farmland has been chosen by the applicant because it is cheap, flat and easy to acquire. Mr Catchpole clarified that he is not against solar power or battery storage and said that he	NPS EN-3 acknowledges that ground-mounted solar is not prohibited on BMV quality land and that land type should be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site selection. NPS EN-3 recognises that, at scale, developments may use some agricultural land. At Paragraph 2.10.21, NPS EN-3 states that: <i>"While land type should not be a</i>

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			understood the need for clean secure energy. However, he said that the right way to do this is on rooftops, commercial buildings, warehouse car parks and brownfield sites, rather than on productive farmland that is cheaper for shareholders overseas who have not visited the area.	<i>predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible."</i> ALC was an important factor for the Applicant in site selection. Land within the Order Limits was identified as likely to be some of the lowest quality land relative to the wider area based on Natural England's 'Predictive Likelihood of BMV' mapping. Non-BMV land was considered during site selection, along with previously developed land and rooftops, as reported in the Site Selection Assessment [APP-215], which considers potential for non-BMV alternative sites identified through desktop mapping to accommodate the Scheme. As set out in the Statement of Need [APP-206], while rooftop and smaller-scale solar installations are an important part of the energy mix, they

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				cannot alone meet the scale of capacity required to achieve clean power and net zero objectives. Large-scale ground-mounted solar therefore remains necessary in addition to, not instead of, rooftop solar. During the design evolution of the Scheme, consideration was given to reducing the impact on BMV quality land, as far as practicable, as described in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 - Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] presents an assessment on agricultural land quality, soils, local agricultural businesses, food production and the rural economy, including consideration of the economic and other benefits of BMV land, in accordance with planning policy. In accordance with the Outline SRMP [APP-204] that includes measures to manage soils as a resource and minimise adverse impacts, a detailed SRMP will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, as secured by a Requirement 18 in the Draft DCO [AS-032].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
KC-005	Landscape and Visual	Landscape	Mr Catchpole stated that the landscape is a beautiful, green area, and that the scheme would damage this landscape permanently.	The Applicant notes the concern raised by the respondent. ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043] presents an assessment of the likely significant effects of the BESS, Project Substations and the National Grid Substation. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148]. The Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] seeks to retain and enhance existing vegetation, where possible, to aid the integration of the Scheme within the environment and respond to the prevailing character as far as practicable. New woodland belts and native tree planting provide screening to the Scheme as well as improves biodiversity and supports green infrastructure connectivity. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. It is considered by the Applicant for the reasons set out in the Planning Statement [APP-209] that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects are demonstrably outweighed by the Scheme's benefits and needs case.
KC-006	Ecology and Biodiversity	Environment – white clawed crawfish	Mr Catchpole expressed concern for the White Clawed Crawfish, a native legally protected species which is in serious decline due to habitat loss and invasive competitors. He wants guarantees that vulnerable species would be protected, and he wants these guarantees to form part of an independent verified survey and an	The Applicant notes the Examining Authority's (ExA) request, in the Rule 6 Letter [PD-005]. The Applicant has provided an update on this at Procedural Deadline A within the Applicants Position on White Clawed Crayfish document [PDA-007]. If in the unlikely event that the species was recorded within watercourses within the Order Limits, adopted precautionary avoidance measures already mitigate

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			enforceable mitigation plan, rather than forming part of the Environmental Statement.	impacts upon the species, and as a consequence the impact assessment conclusions would remain unchanged.
KC-007	Cumulative and In-combination effects	Cumulative effects	Mr Catchpole questioned whether the development was being assessed in the context of the whole county, rather than as an individual scheme. He stated that the county has contributed enough to renewable energy targets. He said that the effects of the various schemes should be assessed together as a whole and that the cumulative toll on his land and his communities need to be considered.	The Applicant is aware of other projects in the region. The ES [APP- 042 to 054] presents an assessment of the cumulative effects of multiple existing and/or approved developments generating cumulative effects which together have an increased effect on the receptors presented in the ES. A comprehensive Cumulative and In Combination Effects Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with Planning Inspectorate guidance, as detailed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology [APP-038]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.4 - Cumulative Schemes [APP-116] details the cumulative schemes considered within the ES. Each topic chapter within the ES [APP-042 – APP-054] sets out how the particular topic area has considered and assessed the cumulative effects arising as a result of other existing or Scheme. A summary of all cumulative effects is provided within Table 20.4 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 20

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				- Summary of Residual Significant Effects [APP-056].
KC-008	Consultation and Engagement	Local opinion	Mr Catchpole suggested that the scheme was similar to HS2, because he claimed the cost and disruption of the project seemed disproportionate to the benefits of the project, and the local people were not truly listened to.	The Applicant notes the comment. Solar energy is one of the cheapest methods of generation. The Statement of Need [APP-206] provides evidence that an unprecedented capacity of new low-carbon generation schemes is urgently needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. The government has confirmed that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [NPS EN-3 (2025) Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. Section 5.6 of the Planning Statement [APP-209] summarises the key national and local benefits of the Scheme. The extensive and iterative consultation process that has been undertaken throughout the pre-application stage is described in the Design Approach Document [APP-174] and the Consultation Report [APP-029]. All Interested Parties are able to submit their views on the Scheme throughout the Examination through written representations.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As set out within the Outline CEMP [APP-196], a Community Liaison Group (CLG) will be established to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order Limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the construction of the Scheme. The CLG is intended to provide an opportunity for regular and formal dialogue between the Applicant and the local community's representatives in relation to the construction and operational aspects of the Scheme. Further, the Applicant considers that the various rounds of consultation and community engagement has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008), the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009.
KC-009	Site Selection and Alternatives	Alternative schemes	Mr Catchpole stated that his political party, Reform UK, believe in British built alternatives like small modular nuclear	The Statement of Need [APP-206] provides evidence in relation to the capacities of main categories of renewable energy generation

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			reactors, like those being developed by Rolls Royce. He claimed this would be a serious, credible alternative to deliver clean, reliable power, which deserves serious, credible consideration before this scheme is accepted. Mr Catchpole offered some paperwork of evidence of the SMRS being manufactured by Rolls Royce and was directed to submit this alongside his written submission.	technologies tasked to support the delivery of a low carbon and secure electricity system. While the need for unprecedented capacity growth is urgent, some technologies (e.g. nuclear, SMRs, tidal) are either unproven at scale, unconsented, unfunded or have long development timescales (and therefore do not meet the urgent need identified in NPS EN-1). Yet, to address the ongoing climate emergency, it is critical that the UK urgently develops a large capacity of low carbon generation. Solar is a proven technology, and the Statement of Need [APP-206] provides evidence of the substantial benefits brought forward by large-scale ground mounted solar electricity generation generally. The Scheme is a viable proposal to use proven technology with short development timescales, thereby delivering dependable decarbonisation benefits. The Applicant agrees that other low carbon technologies are urgently needed in the UK to meet the UK's climate legal targets. The Applicant, however, is a solar and energy storage developer. On that basis, alternative

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				types of low carbon electricity generation have not been considered by the Applicant in the development of the Scheme.
KC-010	General remarks	General opposition to the Development	Mr Catchpole implored Mr Cliff, the Planning Inspector, to approach the examination with rigor and demand further evidence to test the applicant's claims. He also extended an invite to the Minister to come to South Norfolk to visit the land and talk to the farmers, families, and parish councils who will live with this decision for the next 60 years. He then urged the application to be refused or sent back for further scrutiny.	The Applicant notes this comment.

2.2 Michael Haslam

Table 2.2 Michael Haslam

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Saxlingham Nethergate Parish Council				
MH-001	General remarks	General opposition to the Development	Mr Haslam stated that the totality of the Parish Council's objections are included in their Relevant Representations and Written Representations. Saxlingham Nethergate Parish Council strongly objects to this proposal and expressed concern about potential industrialisation of a large part of their parish. He acknowledged the country's need for a move toward green energy but emphasised that this should be done in a sensible and planned way.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has responded to Saxlingham Nethergate Parish Council's Relevant Representations in Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 - Parish and Town Councils, and Parish Meetings [PDA-011].
MH-002	Consultation and engagement	Issues with the consultation process	Mr Haslam expressed concern that the way the consultation has been conducted has caused distress and anxiety for residents. He stated that the consultation process should facilitate informed participation, not create additional barriers for those	The Applicant considers that the consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications:

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			least able to navigate a highly technical process. He claimed that there are too many documents and that the documents provided are unnecessarily complex. He also stated there was an absence of hard copy documents for elderly residents who do not have access to computers, which isolates them from the process. He stated that a responsible developer should do more than the statutory minimum to engage with the local population.	Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. As well as statutory consultation, the Applicant carried out a round of non- statutory consultation with local communities, early in the process, in late 2024. In addition, the Applicant has met with and provided responses to individuals and community groups throughout the pre-application process. The Applicant maintained a series of free-to-use communication channels (phone, post and email) through the pre-application period. These channels were publicised throughout the Applicant's literature (such as newspaper adverts and press releases, on the project website, and on consultation materials including leaflets and posters). The Applicant welcomed enquiries and feedback from any Interested Party through these channels.
MH-003	DCO process	DCO drafting	Mr Haslam claimed that the draft DCO generalises too much and that there is an absence of realistic details for many of the components of the scheme.	The justification for each provision in the Draft DCO [AS-032] is set out in the Explanatory Memorandum [AS-034], by reference to established precedent. The Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213] set out the maximum and, where necessary, minimum

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				parameters with the spatial extents shown on the Works Plan [AS-002 and AS-003]. The Scheme has Work Nos as described in Schedule 1 of the Draft DCO [AS-032] and does not have a detailed design at this stage. The Applicant is seeking flexibility in design parameters to allow for technological advancement to maximise energy production. The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope acknowledges there may be aspects of the Scheme design that are not yet fixed and, therefore, it may be necessary for the EIA to assess likely reasonable worst-case scenario for the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme to be considered. Requirement 5 of the draft DCO [APP-017] sets out that the development must be carried out in accordance with the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213], ensuring that good design will be embedded in the final design and that the impacts of the Scheme will not materially differ from those set out in the Environmental Statement.
MH-004	Lands	Compulsory acquisition	Mr Haslam stated that they are pleased that it has been made clear that the applicant is not seeking to	The Applicant has provided a detailed response on this issue in Q1.8.3 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Transport and Access	& Road use/ traffic	acquire any land from the War Memorial and the frontage of the old rectory along church hill because of the serious harm this would have caused both the conservation area and listed buildings. However, he clarified that the footpath along the War Memorial is not part of the public highway and he stated that they object to the AIL route and narrow village roads being used for delivery vehicles. He expressed concern that this use would damage pipes under the road, the culvert wall alongside the street, and the listed buildings close to the roads which have no foundations.	Authority's First Written Questions [EXAM/9.2]. The Applicant has provided a response to comments raised on the Saxlingham Nethergate war memorial. The Applicant therefore refers to its response to comment ID JF-003 in Written Summary of the Oral Submissions at the Open Floor Hearing 2 and the Applicant's Responses [EN0110014/EXAM/9.19].
MH-005	Landscape and Visual	Environment – conservation areas	Mr Haslam objected to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Saxlingham Nethergate and Saxlingham Green conservation areas.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern and notes the objection. A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In relation to the area between Saxlingham Nethergate and Saxlingham Green, the assessment of heritage and landscape effects has considered the contribution of the surrounding rural landscape to the setting of heritage assets and conservation areas. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032]. With respect of Saxlingham Nethergate and Saxlingham Green Conservation Area, the Applicant refers to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 –

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Parish Councils [PDA-011] comment IDs: SNPC-017, SNPC-018, SNPC-029
MH-006	Hydrology	Flood risk	Mr Haslam expressed concern that the proposals will increase flooding along the street near the War Memorial and some frontage houses that were flooded in the December 2020 floods. He claimed that the applicant's response on page 141 to their relevant representations is factually incorrect. He stated that sites 7D and 7F are within the watercourse catchment that a specialist engineer prepared in 2012 in connection with the flood risk assessment in respect to the properties near the junction of the street with Cargate Lane and Shotesham Lane. He stated that he will provide an extract from the Flood Risk Assessment, which shows the extension into the watercourse catchment, as an appendix to their Written Representation.	The original location of concern was not specified within the relevant representation and assumptions were made on this location, but irrespective of the specific location the point in relation to flood risk requirements remains valid – i.e. ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] has been developed based on the requirements of the NPPF, which requires that development can have no detrimental impact on flood risk to third parties. The development will not impact on the pattern or quantity of runoff arising from the site.
MH-007	Soils and Agriculture	Loss of BMV agricultural land	Mr Haslam objected to the loss of BMV agricultural land, particularly at	The potential effects on food production are considered in the ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 –

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			a time where the impacts of climate change are causing reductions in crop yields, food shortages are expected, and 'El Nino' arrives in Autumn.	Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] . As noted in that Chapter at 15.8.112 to 15.8.123, food security is not identified as a concern by Government. The biggest threat to food production, the Solar Roadmap identifies, is from climate change which solar farms are helping to tackle (15.8.117 refers).
MH-008	Consultation and engagement	Issues with consultation	Mr Haslam expressed concern that the application has been submitted without proper consultation and incorporation of National Gas Transmission. He stated that there is an obvious risk from electricity meeting gas.	The Applicant has engaged with, and received feedback from National Gas Transmission plc, as set out within Section 12.6, Table 13.1, and Section 13.4 of the Consultation Report [APP-024]. The Applicant continues to engage with all statutory parties and parties with interest in the Scheme, including National Gas Transmission plc.

2.3 Victoria Chandler

Table 2.3 Victoria Chandler

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Morningthorpe & Fritton Parish Council				
VC-001	General remarks	General opposition to the Development	Ms Chandler is Vice Chair of Morningthorpe & Fritton Parish Council, which represents two small historic and rural communities.	The Applicant notes this comment.
VC-002	General remarks	Opposition to Site 5	Ms Chandler stated that Site 5 contains many of the constraints that the applicant said should be avoided: • Sensitive landscape; • Nationally important heritage; • High-quality agricultural land; • Ecology; • Nearby homes; • And claims that the applicant has not demonstrated why site 5 is the least harmful location.	The Applicant specifically refers to the following responses to Morningthorpe and Fritton Parish Council in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4: Parish and Town Councils, and Parish Meetings [PDA-011], specifically MFPC-003 in relation to the site selection and design evolution of Site 5, as well as the following which are relevant to the matters raised in respect of each topic: • Landscape and visual effects – please refer to responses under comment IDs MFPC-004 and MFPC-005. • Cultural heritage, including the Grade I listed Church of St Catherine and Fritton Conservation Area – please refer to

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				responses under comment IDs MFPC-013, and MFPC-014. - Ecology and biodiversity – please refer to responses under comment IDs MFPC-001, MFPC-005, MFPC-006, MFPC-008, and MFPC-012. - Proximity to residential properties – please refer to responses under comment ID MFPC-004. Owing to the scale and nature of the Scheme, the Order Limits encompass agricultural land. The Site Selection Assessment [APP-215] considers lower grade agricultural land within the wider region. As confirmed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051], the Order Limits was identified as likely to be some of the lowest quality land in the wider area. Justification for the use of Best and Most Versatile land is further set out within Section 8.3 of the Planning Statement [APP-209]. In relation to whether Site 5 is the least harmful location, Paragraph 4.3.24 of NPS EN-1 states that the Secretary of State should not refuse an application for development on one site simply because fewer adverse impacts would result from

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				developing similar infrastructure on another suitable site and should have regard as appropriate to the possibility that all suitable sites for energy infrastructure of the type proposed may be needed for future proposals.
VC-003	Site selection and alternatives	Assessment of residents living closest to the development	Ms Chandler expressed concern that people living closest to Site 5 have not been properly assessed, because their review identified: • 7 residential properties omitted from the construction noise assessment for vibration; • 6 residential properties omitted from the highway noise assessment; and • Approximately 70 residential properties lying within 500 metres of Site 5 for operational noise have been omitted; which she claims goes against the applicant's own methodology. She questioned the reliability of the assessments and their reported impacts.	The Applicant acknowledges Ms Chandler's concern and has reviewed the properties identified in relation to Site 5. The absence of an individual property from an assessment table or figure does not, by itself, mean that the property was excluded from consideration. The assessment uses representative noise-sensitive receptors within the study area where a receptor or receptor group is capable of representing other properties subject to comparable or lower exposure. For construction noise, a 300 m study area has been adopted from the closest point of construction activity, rather than the order limits. For example, for site compound works, impacts at only NSR29 are considered, as other receptors fall outside the study area. However, for solar PV piling works, the impacts at NSR28, NSR29, NSR30, NSR31, NSR32 and NSR34 were considered. The impacts and effects

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				presented are expected to be lower at greater distances away from the works. In relation to vibration impacts during solar PV piling, the nearest receptor identified is NSR29, where impacts are low, resulting in a minor adverse significance which is not significant. Anticipated vibration levels due to construction works at differing distances are presented within ES Volume 2, Appendix 12.2 – Noise Modelling and Calculations [APP-179]. For construction traffic noise, the assessment was undertaken by road link using forecast traffic flows, rather than by separately modelling every dwelling. The most relevant link considered in relation to Morningthorpe and Fritton is The Street. Based on the results presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [APP-099], this road is anticipated to experience a negligible impact, which results in negligible significance and is not significant. For operational noise, the assessment methodology states that impacts are reported at the nearest or otherwise worst-affected receptor, because receptors farther

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				from the relevant source would ordinarily experience lower noise levels and impacts. In relation to Site 5, residential receptors NSR28, NSR31, NSR32, NSR33 and NSR35 have been assessed. These receptors are representative of those nearest Site 5. At all these receptors during the daytime, evening, night-time and early morning, the impact is anticipated to be negligible, which results in a negligible significance, which is not significant. Daytime, night-time and early morning impacts and effects are detailed in ES Volume 1, Appendix 12.2 – Noise Modelling and Calculations [APP-179]. Evening impacts and effects are detailed in the Evening Noise Assessment [EN0110014/EXAM9.20].
VC-004	Planning	Inconsistencies within the proposal	Ms Chandler expressed concern about inconsistencies within the proposal. She used the glint and glare mitigation along the B1527 as an example, because the proposed visibility splays seem to be based on shorter AILs than the ones for this scheme.	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			She asked the ExA to ensure that these matters are reconciled.	
VC-005	Landscape and Visual impacts	Landscape & Visual effects	Ms Chandler expressed concern over the significant adverse visual effects for residents, which the applicant has identified. She claims they are not occasional views from selected viewpoints, but rather effects that impact the everyday landscape experienced from homes and public rights of way.	The Applicant acknowledges that the LVIA identifies some significant adverse visual effects for certain residential and recreational receptors, particularly during the early years of operation. The Applicant has reported this effect within its assessment in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148]. The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of siting infrastructure. The design evolution of the Scheme in respect of landscape and visual context is set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing)

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. It is considered by the Applicant for the reasons set out in the Planning Statement [APP-209] that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects are demonstrably outweighed by the Scheme's benefits and needs case.
VC-006	Cultural heritage	Historic environment and landscape	Ms Chandler expressed concern about the historic environment and landscape that would be impacted, particularly St. Catherine's grade 1 listed church and St. John the	The Applicant refers to its response to Ms Chandler's relevant representation [RR-1995] in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 5 [PDA-

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			Baptist grade 1 listed church, which sit within the proposed setting. She highlighted that these historic communities date back to the Domesday book, including: • Historic field patterns; • Hedgerows; and mature trees.	012] under comment ID CUL-001 and CUL-005. The Applicant is committed to retaining trees and hedgerows as far as practicable, with trees and hedgerows taken into consideration in the design process. The Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213] sets out the minimum offset distances within the design for the trees and hedgerows that will be retained. Further mitigation measures are set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] that are secured through Requirements 13, 14 and 21 of the Draft DCO [AS-032]. To confirm, the approach taken is as set out in the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213].
VC-007	Landscape and visual	Planting and screening	Ms Chandler stated that the applicant relies on setbacks, planting and screenings, then said that screening is not the same as preserving. She said whilst a hedge can obscure some infrastructure, it cannot preserve open countryside that will be fundamentally changed.	The Applicant acknowledges that there will be changes to landscape character and perceived openness arising from the Scheme. These landscape effects are assessed comprehensively within in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				[APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148]. The Assessment identifies significant effects in some locations and does not seek to suggest that mitigation can wholly preserve the existing landscape in its current condition. The purpose of mitigation is to avoid, reduce and integrate effects where possible, rather than eliminate them entirely. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. It is considered by the Applicant for the reasons set out in the Planning Statement [APP-209] that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects are demonstrably outweighed by the Scheme's benefits and needs case.
VC-008	Cumulative and in-combination impacts	Cumulative effects	Ms Chandler highlighted that her community would not experience Site 5 in isolation. She stated that cable corridors also pass through and around the Parish and that access to site 4B and construction traffic on the B1527 add to the local burden.	The technical assessments within the ES [APP-042 to APP-056] are informed by the description of the Scheme provided within ES Volume 1, Chapter 4 –The Scheme [APP-040] , which includes all components of the Scheme, including the Scheme elements within Site 5, CRCs, and Sub-Site 4B. The assessments within the ES therefore consider the effects of the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Scheme as a whole rather than individual elements in isolation. The effects associated with construction traffic on the B1527 are reported within Environmental Statement Volume 1: Chapter 11 – Transport and Access (APP-047) and were assessed as temporary and negligible. Mitigation measures and management of traffic and access are set out in the Outline CTMP [APP-201] to minimise impacts as far as practicable. A detailed CTMP will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in accordance with the Requirements of the Draft DCO [AS-032].
VC-009	Transport and access	Traffic and Children's safety	Ms Chandler expressed concern about a nursery opposite the A24 and clarified that it was not just concern for increased construction traffic, but also prolonged construction activity near young children throughout the day.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the proximity of construction activity to the nursery. Access 24 serves Sub-Sites 5A and 5B, as identified within Table 3.1 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP-201). Construction traffic accessing these areas would be required to travel between the B1527 and Access 24 and would not utilise the nursery access for turning, waiting or any other construction-related activity.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant further notes that Figure 2.1 of the Outline CTMP (APP-201) shows that construction activities within Sub-Sites 5A and 5B would occur during a defined period within the overall construction programme rather than throughout the full construction phase. The Applicant therefore does not consider that construction traffic associated with Sub-Sites 5A and 5B would result in prolonged construction activity immediately adjacent to the nursery for the duration of the Scheme's construction.
VC-010	Transport and access	Traffic	Ms Chandler stated that local people will experience successive periods of HGV movements, including excavation and trenching, over a 24-month construction programme. She acknowledged that management plans can reduce impacts but stated that they do not remove them.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding HGV movements during the construction period. The likely effects of construction traffic have been assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 – Transport and Access [APP-047], with mitigation measures set out in the Outline CTMP [APP-201]. The assessment was undertaken on a reasonable worst-case basis, assuming peak construction traffic generation across the Scheme. However, Figure 2.1 of the Outline CTMP [APP-201] shows that construction activities would be staggered across the different Sites and Sub-Sites and would not all occur simultaneously. As such,

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				construction traffic levels experienced in practice are expected to vary throughout the construction programme, rather than reflecting a constant peak level over the full 24-month construction period.
VC-011	Transport and access	Public rights of way	Ms Chandler expressed concern over public rights of way stating that temporary closures would impact everyday community life, and that when reopened these routes would not be experienced in the same way.	The interaction between the Scheme and the PRow network has been assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 - Transport and Access [APP-047] and the Outline PRowPPMP [APP-203]. The assessment considered the effects of construction traffic, temporary PRow closures, diversions and managed crossings on users of the PRow network. The Applicant acknowledges the importance of the local PRow network for both recreation and connectivity. Where temporary impacts on PRow are required during construction, appropriate management and mitigation measures are proposed, including signage, alternative routes where necessary, traffic marshal support, reduced vehicle speeds in areas where construction traffic interacts with PRow users, and advance notification of closures. No permanent closures of PRow are proposed as part of the Scheme. Any

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				PRoWs temporarily affected during construction will be reinstated and reopened following completion of the relevant works. The assessment adopts a reasonable worst-case scenario, assuming all construction activities occur simultaneously. In practice, construction activities will be staggered across the programme, reducing the extend of concurrent effects on the PRoW network. The assessment concludes that, with the proposed mitigation in place, effects on PRoW users would not be significant.
VC-012	General remarks Cumulative and in-combination impacts	General opposition to the development & Cumulative effects	Ms Chandler stated that residents have also raised concerns about: • Bats, including red listed species of conservation concern; • Habitat fragmentation; • Watercourses; • The chalk aquifer drainage; • Private water supplies; • Private sewerage systems; • Flooding;	ES Volume 1, Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] has included reference and consideration of the importance of the Site and wider surrounding landscape for bat species and concludes that effects are not significant during the construction and decommissioning phases, and significant beneficial during the operational and maintenance phase. ES Volume 1, Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] also considers impacts to habitats with no significant adverse effects identified, and significant beneficial effects assessed for native hedgerows and tree

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			The examination process being inaccessible to residents who do not use the Internet; • Traffic; • Noise; • Dust; • Vibration; • Change; • Disruption to foot paths; and • Loss of tranquillity She then asked that these issues be taken together and not considered as separate technical issues. She claims that when taken together the burden on these two small communities is substantial and disproportionate.	lines, ponds, rivers, lowland deciduous woodland, scrub, other neutral grassland, ditches, and common and widespread habitats of low sensitivity and/or ecological interest. Potential impacts on flood risk, watercourses, water supplies, and aquifers have been considered in ES Volume 1, Chapter 9 – Water Environment [APP-045] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 16 – Ground Conditions [APP-052] and assessed as not significant. Mitigation measures to protect waterbodies from pollution are set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] that are secured through Requirements 13, 14 and 21 of the Draft DCO [AS-032]. In relation to transport and access, the assessment and mitigation are set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 – Transport and Access [APP-047], supported by ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1 - Transport Assessment [APP-174 to 177], and the Outline CTMP [APP-201]. The Outline PRoWPPMP [APP-203] sets out measures to maintain access and manage potential effects on users of public

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				rights of way and permissive paths during the construction period. In addition, new permissive paths are proposed to maintain and enhance public access, improve connectivity with the wider PRow network and support access to the countryside. Changes to the landscape and views are assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Dust emissions during construction, operation and decommissioning are assessed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1 - Construction and Decommissioning Dust Risk Assessment [APP-180]. The dust risk assessment presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1 - Construction and Decommissioning Dust Risk Assessment determines appropriate mitigation measures, in accordance with best practice guidance, for inclusion in the Outline CEMP [APP- 196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198]. An assessment of noise and vibration, presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [APP-048]. Mitigation measures to control noise and vibration during construction are set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-196]. Mitigation

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				measures to control noise and vibration during operation are described in the Outline OEMP [APP-197]. The Human Health Summary Statement within ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054] brings together the health findings from across the Environmental Statement, including transport and access, noise and vibration, air quality, water environment, climate change, socioeconomics, ground conditions, soils and agricultural land, and electromagnetic fields. ES Volume 1, Chapter 19 - In-Combination Effects Assessment [APP-055]. Provides an assessed of in-combination effects, where receptors are subject to residual effects under more than one environmental topic. In combination effects have been considered during construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Regarding accessibility, the Applicant considers that the consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications:

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant considers the materials provided were adequate and informative, and presented information using standard mapping conventions. The acceptance of the Applicant's application for examination by the Planning Inspectorate serves as confirmation that the Applicant has fulfilled its statutory pre-application duties.
VC-013	Design description	General remarks	Ms Chandler claimed that the applicant has not demonstrated that the harm arising from the proposals is unavoidable or justified.	Paragraph 4.3.24 of NPS EN-1 states that the Secretary of State should not refuse an application for development on one site simply because fewer adverse impacts would result from developing similar infrastructure on another suitable site and should have regard as appropriate to the possibility that all suitable sites for energy infrastructure of the type proposed may be needed for future proposals. The Applicant considers that the Scheme is in accordance with national energy policy, national planning policy, and any relevant development plan when considered as a whole. In the event of a conflict between the development plan and the NPS, the NPS prevails for the purpose of the Secretary of State decision making given the national significance of the Scheme. As set out at

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				paragraph 10.1.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-209] ' <i>...substantial benefits of the Scheme clearly outweigh the residual harms that would arise, including the Scheme's contribution to meeting Government targets on Clean Power by 2030 and Net Zero by 2050, together with more localised significant beneficial effects that are anticipated during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme, such as in relation to biodiversity, green infrastructure strategy, employment and training</i> '.

2.4 Cllr Jim Webber

Table 2.4 Cllr Jim Webber

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Shotesham Parish Council				
JW-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Mr Webber clarified that Shotesham Parish Council is not against solar power and recognises the role that solar can play in meeting energy needs of the country. However, he stated that Shotesham Parish Council object to the "patchwork proposal" and the harms it would cause to individuals, communities, and the environment across the broad area in South Norfolk.	The Applicant notes this comment.
JW-002	Landscape and Visual	Environment – conservation areas & General opposition to the development	Mr Webber raised concerns over the beautiful spaces and conservation areas, stating that he agreed with the majority of previous comments made at OFH1 and OFH2.	The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual, and heritage considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of siting infrastructure. The design evolution of the Scheme in respect of heritage, landscape and visual context is set out in

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032].

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JW-003	Site location and alternatives	Site allocation & Landscape	Mr Webber and the village believe that Sites 8A and 8B are completely inappropriate for solar and inconsistent with other schemes approved for Norfolk. However, he acknowledged that there are less concerns about Site 7, which is also in the Parish. Mr Webber acknowledged that attempts have been made to mitigate the impact of the scheme on the community and the landscape. However, he then stated that that mitigation alone cannot correct poor site allocation. He claimed that the site selection assessment report raises more questions than it answers, stating that the complex layout and lack of proper cross-referencing made it difficult to read.	In relation to the suitability of Site 8, please refer to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 3 [PDA-010], specifically comment IDs SPC-056 to SPC-065 in relation to site selection, as well as the Applicant's Response to Shotesham Action Group [EN0110014/EXAM/9.21].
JW-004	Site location and alternatives	Site allocation & Design	Mr Webber claimed that Sites 8A and 8B should not have passed the applicant's own assessment criteria for the initial criteria given the issues of:	In relation to the suitability of Site 8, please refer to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 3 [PDA-010], specifically comment IDs SPC-056 to SPC-065 in relation to site selection, as well as the Applicant's Response to

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			• Flood risk; • Topology; and • Accessibility. He added that the analysis of possible sites centred on Great Moulton did not seem to identify 8A and 8B as suitable sites, and claimed that the site assessment document itself seems to confirm this, and the applicant recognises that sites closer to the Great Moulton point of contact should be preferred. However, he stated that, as per paragraph 5.1.30, the applicant did not attempt to approach the alternative landowners in the area. He added that he thinks this a poorly designed scheme. Mr Webber questioned whether a supplementary planning document on the susceptibility of the landscape to new energy infrastructure produced by South Norfolk had been read by the applicant, and if so, whether it was read at an early enough stage in the project.	Shotesham Action Group [EN0110014/EXAM/9.21]. The Applicant specifically refers to the following responses to Shotesham Parish Council in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 4 [PDA-011]: • Site selection, alternatives and design evolution in respect of Sites 8A and 8B – please refer to responses under comment IDs SPC-015 to SPC-016 and SPC-056 to SPC-065. • Flood risk and water environment in respect of Sites 8A and 8B – please refer to responses under comment IDs SPC-005, SPC-006, SPC-059, SPC-060, SPC-083, SPC-084 and SPC-090. • Topography – please refer to responses under comment IDs SPC-014, SPC-016, SPC-017, SPC-033, SPC-083, and SPC-116 • Accessibility and transport in respect of Sites 8A and 8B – please refer to responses under comment IDs SPC-007, SPC-008 and SPC-138 to SPC-146. The Design Approach Document [APP-212], considers a consultation draft of the

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				South Norfolk Council Supplementary Planning Document which defines different levels of susceptibility for the various district landscape character areas for different types of infrastructure which is relevant to the Scheme, and the Applicant has reviewed the judgements provided by SNC within the document and reviewed its relevance to the Scheme. SNDC stated that they consider the Landscape Susceptibility SPD in relation to Energy Generation, Storage, and Transmission, adopted February 2026, is not relevant to the proposed development Statement of Common Ground with SNDC [EN0110014/EXAM/9.5].
JW-005	Water Environment	Flood risk	Mr Webber claimed that the applicant has consistently misrepresented the level of flood risk in the area. He provided the example of Market Lane, which is prone to significant flash flooding, and the flood risk extends to properties in the centre of the village. He stated that Shotesham Parish Council fully support the flood risk report privately commissioned by Jill	ES Volume 3: Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] has been developed based on the requirements of the NPPF, which requires that development can have no detrimental impact on flood risk to third parties. The development will not impact on the pattern or quantity of runoff arising from the site. The Applicant understands this comment also relates to the Create Consulting Flood report submitted within Relevant Representations. The Applicant notes this

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			Guy and linked to her relevant representation, which he claims identify continuing concerns and errors.	report is based on matters set out in the PEIR at the Statutory Consultation Stage, and not those within the Application. Notwithstanding, the Applicant confirms that they are engaging with Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and will also engage with Shotesham Parish Council during Examination in relation to any outstanding concerns.
JW-006	General remarks	General opposition to the development & Highways	Mr Webber asked the inspectors to consider whether the relatively small contributions made to solar from these sites are sufficient to offset the multiple harms it would need to. If necessary, he asked the inspectors to consider further what mitigations are required. He also requested that they give full weight to the concerns raised by NCC Highways. He then requested additional visits to the parish, so that further homes and properties are visited. He also requested that the DCO be made as robust as possible.	The Applicant notes this comment. Given the clear and urgent need to deploy renewable energy at speed and scale, the Scheme demonstrably shows substantial public benefits (arising from all constituent parts of the Scheme) that outweigh the less substantial harm identified, as set out within the Planning Statement [APP-209]. The Applicant's position is that it would not be consistent with the government's objectives to deliver a scheme which is smaller than that which has been assessed as acceptable on a planning basis. The Applicant considers that the Scheme is in accordance with national energy policy, national planning policy, and any relevant development plan when considered as a

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				whole. In the event of a conflict between the development plan and the NPS, the NPS prevails for the purpose of the Secretary of State decision making given the national significance of the Scheme. As set out at paragraph 10.1.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-209] '<i>...substantial benefits of the Scheme clearly outweigh the residual harms that would arise, including the Scheme's contribution to meeting Government targets on Clean Power by 2030 and Net Zero by 2050, together with more localised significant beneficial effects that are anticipated during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme, such as in relation to biodiversity, green infrastructure strategy, employment and training</i>'. The Applicant remains in active discussion with Norfolk County Council, and a Statement of Common Ground is submitted at Deadline 1 [EXAM/9.4]. The Applicant has provided the Applicant's Draft Itinerary for the Accompanied Site Inspection [EN0110014/EXAM/9.1] at Deadline 1. This has considered all requests for site visits and set out a rationale behind their inclusion or exclusion.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Draft DCO [AS-032] is considered to be robust, with mitigation set out within outline management plans secured by Requirement.
JW-007	Consultation and engagement	Issues with the consultation	Mr Webber said that there was a lack of trust between residents and the applicant. He suggested that this had been caused by: • Poor quality of information from East Pye Solar; • A lack of transparency, even at application stage; and • A failure to provide the detailed information that planners and residents expect.	The Applicant has sought to provide information to Interested Parties and stakeholders through its communication channels (email, freepost and freephone number), which remain open and managed. The Applicant remains committed to engaging with stakeholders and responding to any concerns they may have about the Scheme.
JW-008	Transport and access	Traffic & General opposition to the development	Mr Webber claimed that the proposed use of local roads for HGVs and AILs is entirely inappropriate and in complete conflict with the County Council. He stated that the applicant will use narrow, short, unclassified roads, rather than construct a crossing within the red line boundary. He also stated that the proposed route runs over a culvert which is	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the suitability of the proposed construction traffic and AIL routes, including potential effects on local roads, highway infrastructure and nearby receptors. The Applicant considers the proposed construction traffic routes suitable for their intended use and notes that the likely transport effects associated with construction traffic have been assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 –

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			unlikely to withstand heavy loads, and the culvert becomes a seasonal ford prone to flooding. He said there is also a drop from the field to the road level. He claimed the above would cause significant damage to: • Verges; • Banks; • Trees; • Hedges; and • High levels of noise and disruption for Market Lane Farm and other road users particularly because Market Lane Farm's only metres away.	Transport and Access [APP-047] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1 – Transport Assessment [APP-174 to APP-177]. The proposed AIL route has been developed with input from a specialist abnormal load transport consultant who assessed the constraints present along the route in determining its suitability for AIL movements. AIL movements are expected to be infrequent and occur only on a limited number of occasions during the construction period. The Outline CTMP [APP-201] sets out the framework for the management of AIL movements, including advance communication with stakeholders along the route regarding the timing and details of movements, and the use of escort vehicles where required. The Applicant does not agree that the use of the proposed construction traffic or AIL routes would result in significant damage to verges, banks, trees, hedgerows or other highway features. The proposed construction traffic routes and AIL route have been assessed and are considered suitable for their intended use. If deemed appropriate a pre-construction road condition survey will be undertaken on

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the AIL route using video recording or photography prior to the movement. The geographical scope, extent and timing of the survey will be agreed with the LHA. A post-construction survey will also be carried out to identify any additional defects that can reasonably be attributed to the AIL movement. Any highway defects identified as attributable to the AIL movement will be rectified to the satisfaction of the LHA without any betterment to the pre-construction condition.

2.5 Cllr George Boyd

Table 2.5 Cllr George Boyd

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Norfolk County Council (NCC)				
GB-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Mr Boyd is the County Councillor for the Waveney Valley Division in Norfolk, his main interest being to represent the residents of Woodton and the surrounding hamlets in his division, which will be the most affected by this proposal. They object the proposal in the strongest possible terms, and he claimed that you would struggle to find support for the project in his area.	The Applicant notes this comment.
GB-002	Landscape and visual	Landscape	Mr Boyd is a keen walker and has used many of the footpaths in the area encompassed by the scheme, where he claims the natural landscape will be decimated for generations to come.	A visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				and visual considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of siting infrastructure. The design evolution of the Scheme in respect of landscape and visual context is set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032].
GB-003	Cumulative and in-combination impacts	Cumulative effects	Mr Boyd emphasised that the project should not be taken in isolation, and that cumulative effects must be assessed.	The Applicant is aware of other projects in the region. The ES [APP- 042 to 054] presents an assessment of the cumulative effects of multiple existing and/or approved developments generating cumulative effects which together have an

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				increased effect on the receptors presented in the ES. A comprehensive Cumulative and In Combination Effects Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with Planning Inspectorate guidance, as detailed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology [APP-038]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.4 -Cumulative Schemes [APP-116] details the cumulative schemes considered within the ES. Each topic chapter within the ES [APP-042 – APP-054] sets out how the particular topic area has considered and assessed the cumulative effects arising as a result of other existing or Scheme. A summary of all cumulative effects is provided within Table 20.4 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 20 - Summary of Residual Significant Effects [APP-056].
GB-004	Transport and access Noise and Vibration	Traffic & Noise	Mr Boyd expressed concern over the proposed construction phase. He stated that the excess traffic will cause noise congestion and will speed up the wearing of the road surfaces and weak bridges, which will fall on the taxpayer to repair.	The assessment of construction traffic noise is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [APP-048]. The assessment demonstrates that construction traffic is not anticipated along Norwich Road, and that noise impacts and effects due to construction traffic are negligible. The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of construction traffic on the local highway network. The likely transport effects associated with construction traffic have

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				been assessed within Environmental Statement Volume 1: Chapter 11 – Transport and Access (APP-047) and Environmental Statement Volume 3: Appendix 11.1 – Transport Assessment (APP-174 to APP-177). As set in point 7.14 of the Outline CTMP [APP-201] A pre-construction road condition survey will be undertaken on the LRN using video recording or photography prior to the commencement of construction activities. The geographical scope, extent and timing of the survey will be agreed with the LHA. The Applicant and LHA will seek to coordinate and utilise the LHA routine highway condition survey schedule where practicable as part of this process. A post-construction survey will also be carried out to identify any additional defects that can reasonably be attributed to construction traffic associated with the Sites. Any highway defects identified as resulting from construction activities will be rectified to the satisfaction of the LHA without any betterment to the pre-construction condition.
GB-005	Landscape and Visual Socioeconomics	Visual effects & Tourism	Mr Boyd claimed that post-construction there would be a perpetual issue of a change in the physical characteristics of the area.	ES Volume 1, Chapter 14 – Socio-Economics [APP-050] provides an assessment on local tourism assets. The sensitivity of the tourism industry receptor is assessed as Medium, reflecting that the share of South Norfolk's employment in tourism is comparable to

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			He stated that some residents will see the solar panels from their homes, and all will see them when walking in the area, creating a permanent intrusion into people's lives. He also expressed concern that footpaths and roads would run through and adjacent to the site. He claimed that the site would have a visual effect that deters visiting walkers, cyclists, and birdwatchers. He then said this would result in a reduction of visitors, which would cause a loss of revenue for local businesses that rely on tourism. He claimed that many businesses in the hospitality sector locally already struggle to turn a profit and that even a slight decrease in the number of customers could cause a detrimental impact.	the regional level. No significant effect has been identified based on: • There being no known tourist assets within the Order Limits with the exception of a limited area of the Pulham Patch activity farm, for which any losses incurred by will be addressed through an agreed compensation arrangement; and • The potential for disruption during construction, but the countervailing potential for additional expenditure by the workforce to benefit the tourism industry. The Applicant does not therefore consider that the Scheme would make the area unattractive to visitors.
GB-006	Human health	Mental health	Mr Boyd expressed concern that the crisis of isolation and loneliness in the UK would be exacerbated at a local level, due	Human health has been assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054] which considers human health in relation to transport and access, noise, air quality,

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			to residents being surrounded by "a desert of solar panels" and the potential closure of businesses where they can meet and socialise (e.g. pubs). He claimed that this would have knock-on effects on mental health.	PRoW, socio-economics, and landscape and visual effects. Mental health and wellbeing have also been considered through the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-214], which applies a Mental Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment framework focused on community resilience, participation, social inclusion and individuals' sense of control. The Equality Impact Assessment recognises that temporary disruption or diversion of PRoW, together with changes in access to community facilities, open space and social infrastructure, could contribute to community severance, reduce opportunities for social participation and increase the risk of loneliness, particularly for older people, disabled people and those without access to a private vehicle. The assessment also considers concerns relating to changes in landscape character, visual amenity, attachment to place, perceived safety, and potential effects on local and tourism-related businesses. However, these effects are anticipated to be temporary or limited in extent and are addressed through embedded mitigation measures and ongoing community engagement. During operation, no PRoW are expected to require long-term closure, and three new permissive paths are proposed to improve access

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				to the countryside and connectivity with the wider PRoW network. The assessment identifies that these routes could support recreation, active travel, social participation and wider health and wellbeing benefits. In addition, landscape planting, screening and buffer planting would progressively reduce visual effects over time. The Equality Impact Assessment acknowledges that, notwithstanding the proposed mitigation, some individuals may continue to perceive adverse effects arising from changes to neighbourhood character or from effects experienced at specific homes or businesses. However, the assessment concludes that, at a population level, mental health and wellbeing effects during operation would be neutral, with significant negative equality impacts considered unlikely. The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Addendum supports the conclusions of the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment, finding that the Scheme is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing at population or identified vulnerable-group level. Its findings will be reported and considered as part of the Examination and, where appropriate, may inform additional mitigation, monitoring and engagement commitments. The Applicant has not identified evidence that the Scheme would cause the closure of the community facilities referred to in the submission. The assessment of potential effects on local businesses, tourism businesses and community facilities is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 14 – Socio-Economics [APP-050], including construction effects (paragraphs 14.8.37 to 14.8.40) and operational effects (paragraphs 14.8.55 to 14.8.58).
GB-007	Landscape and Visual Water Environment	Environment – chalk stream	Mr Boyd claimed that there are major environmental issues to consider. He discussed Site 10, which is partially situated in a chalk stream catchment area. He estimated that there are only 250 of these ecosystems globally and	The solar panels will not contain PFAS and will be cleaned with distilled water as secured within the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213]. As such, there is considered to be no impact in relation to leaching of chemicals from solar panels to the wider environment.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			that 85% of them are located in England. He expressed concern that over multiple years, toxic elements within the solar panels could leach into the soil and then groundwater, potentially contaminating the chalk streams. He stated that studies of solar farms, like SUNY in the United States and Upper Silesia in Poland, have found abnormally high levels of elements such as indium, antimony, and cadmium. He acknowledged that these elements are naturally found in soil, but stated that they can build up over time to dangerous levels. He concluded that it seems strange to situate a solar site above such a biologically sensitive habitat in Norfolk and suggested that a vigorous assessment needs to be carried out to determine the long-term effects of placing these panels above groundwater, which feeds	

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			into local chalk streams. He commented that residents do not want their countryside and local fragile ecosystems to be used as an experiment. He was asked to include the above mentioned studies in his written submissions.	

2.6 Ian Mitchell

Table 2.6 Ian Mitchell

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of The Ramblers				
IM-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Mr Mitchell lives in Norwich, but has walked many of the public paths in the area covered by this application, and represents The Ramblers of the Norfolk area.	The Applicant notes this comment.
IM-002	Landscape and visual Human health	Landscape and Physical health & Mental health	Mr Mitchell identified that some of the speakers today were horse riders and others will have walked the public paths quite frequently. He stated that there are also village walking groups, which host social walks, and he belongs to one of The Ramblers' groups, which consisting mainly of retired people. His walking group tend to do walks of six miles or less on a weekly basis and tend to walk in South Norfolk every few weeks, usually parking at the village hall. From there, 20-30 people will take one of two circuits,	A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149]. In response to the ExA request. The Applicant will create a sequential assessment on the PRow and this will be submitted in deadline 2. The Applicant recognises the concerns raised regarding the importance of walking, outdoor recreation and access to nature for physical health, mental wellbeing and social interaction, particularly for older people and community walking groups.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			led by members who live in the vicinity. He stated that there are various reasons for walking, either solo or as part of a group, including: • Physical health; • Mental health; • Social life; • Enjoying the views; and • Enjoying being in nature. He acknowledged that there are already solar farms in Norfolk but said that they are mostly only a few fields and can be soon passed by. However, he said in this application, the view of solar panels will go on for field after field. The ExA asked him to submit their typical walking routes as part of the Written Representations.	Potential effects on wellbeing associated with access to recreational routes, opportunities for physical activity and connection to the local environment have been considered within the ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. The Human Health Summary Statement recognises that landscape character, visual amenity, recreation and access to nature are important determinants of health and wellbeing. The Applicant acknowledges that maintaining the legal availability of a route is not the same as maintaining its existing character or recreational experience. The assessment therefore considers access and connectivity alongside landscape, visual amenity, perceived safety and connection to nature. The Human Health Summary Statement also considers the potential effects of changes to Public Rights of Way and recreational routes. The Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [APP-203] provides a framework to maintain access to routes throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning phases where possible. The assessment concludes

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				that accessibility to communities and services, opportunities for active travel and recreation, and perceptions of safety are expected to be maintained at levels that do not materially affect physical or mental wellbeing. Overall, the Human Health Summary Statement concludes that the Scheme would not result in any likely significant adverse effects on population and human health during construction, operation or decommissioning. The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment. The Addendum supports the conclusions of the Human Health Summary Statement, finding that the Scheme is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on mental

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				health and wellbeing at population or identified vulnerable-group level. Its findings will be reported and considered as part of the Examination and, where appropriate, may inform additional mitigation, monitoring and engagement commitments.
IM-003	Landscape and visual	Hedge planting	Mr Mitchell proposed hedge planting to restore a green view to walkers. He claimed that hedge planting will provide an effective screen within seven years. He claimed that to be effective, it needs to be two metres high for walkers, or three metres high for horse riders. In his submission on 9 June 2026, Mr Mitchell suggested that there should be well-developed young trees on one-meter stems about two metres apart. In between, he suggested short cuttings to fill in the lower part as they grow. A table of lengths of screening hedge required for public paths, both on one side of a panel field and going between panels also formed part of his submission on 9 June 2026. It	A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032].

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			amounted to about four kilometres of new hedge. He requested that if the inspectors are minded to approve this application, in part or in whole, then they should impose a condition of effective hedge screening within seven years.	

2.7 Ian Neave

Table 2.7 Ian Neave

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
IN-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Mr Neave stated that he agrees with issues raised at OFH1.	The Applicant notes this comment.
IN-002	Water Environment	Flood risk	Mr Neave expressed concern over the flood risk assessment in Saxlingham Nethergate. He stated that by Church Hill and Wash Lane there is a confluence of two streams and water coming together near the war memorial. He claimed that the proposed panel structural steel, concrete, and associated works south of the village would cause an increase in the hard surface water area runoff. He was concerned that this increase would cause increased flow rates for the two streams.	ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] has been developed based on the requirements of the NPPF, which requires that development can have no detrimental impact on flood risk to third parties. The development will not impact on the pattern or quantity of runoff arising from the site.

2.8 Sara Shipley

Table 2.8 Sara Shipley

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SS-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Ms Shipley spoke on behalf of her family and their family farm in Woodton, stating that they have farmed there for many generations. They strongly oppose the East Pike solar proposal because she claimed it would impact their farm and their home, the wildlife, and the countryside.	The Applicant notes this comment.
SS-002	Consultation and engagement	Issues with consultation	Ms Shipley was particularly concerned by the lack of consultation over the proposed cable route. She claims they were repeatedly told that the applicant would work with them to identify the most suitable route. However, she said this has not happened, despite their knowledge of the land and sensitive environmental areas.	The Applicant considers that the consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The acceptance of the Applicant's DCO application for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate serves as confirmation that the Applicant has fulfilled its statutory preapplication duties.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Consultation material at pre-application stage made many references to the proposed cable route and details were presented in the PEIR.
SS-003	Site selection and alternatives	Site selection	Ms Shipley expressed concern that the site had been selected to suit the applicant's requirements, rather than to suit the needs of landowners.	The Applicant draws attention to the fact that the site selection process has been undertaken in accordance with the factors influencing site selection set out in Section 2.10 of NPS EN-3 and the Horlock Rules for the National Grid Substation, as detailed in the Site Selection Assessment [APP-215] and summarised in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 – Reasonable Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-041]. The Applicant draws attention to paragraph 4.3.9 of NPS EN-1, which expressly confirms that there is no general policy requirement for an applicant to consider alternatives or to establish that the proposed project represents the best option from a policy perspective. The Applicant draws attention to the fact that land availability is an important consideration in the site selection process because it is preferable that land is leased rather than permanently acquired, given that solar farms comprise temporary structures. Without willing landowners, acquiring land through compulsory acquisition powers would be necessary, which the Applicant has sought to

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				avoid as far as practicable while still delivering a suitable Scheme. The Site Selection Assessment [APP-215] describes the consideration of the factors identified in NPS EN-3 in relation to the site selection process. Consideration has included both technical constraints (i.e. proximity to grid connection, site size, compatibility of land uses) and consideration of the avoidance and reduction of environmental impacts by excluding ecological, landscape and heritage designations. Land availability (i.e. the participation, or willingness of landowners) is a key consideration for site selection, as the Applicant intends to avoid compulsory acquisition as far as practicable.
SS-004	Water environment Soils and agriculture	Drainage & Soil	Ms Shipley emphasised the impact the proposed cable route would have on their drainage systems and soil. She stated that her family have invested significant time and money improving their fields, and she fears once damaged, there is no guarantee they can ever be fully restored.	The Respondent is directed to the responses within The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 2 comment IDs WAT-011 and WAT-034. The potential effects on agricultural land are considered in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051]. The solar PV arrays will not result in the loss or downgrading of agricultural land or land quality.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SS-005	Design	Farming operations	Ms Shipley stated that the proposed cable would bisect 200 acres of their 500-acre holding. She claimed this would create permanent obstacles to modern farming operations and challenges to everyday operations.	The Applicant notes the concerns raised in respect of impact to the respondent's agricultural operations. As set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051], the effects of the Scheme on agricultural land and farming operations have been assessed. There will be temporary impacts within the CRC during installation of the cables. Following installation, the cable trenches would be backfilled, soils reinstated in accordance with the Outline SRMP [APP 204], and agricultural use of the land would resume. During construction there would be temporary disruption to farming activities within the CRC. However, the working width is limited (see Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213] and Outline Cable Route Construction Statement [APP-216]). The construction methodology has been developed, where reasonably practicable, to maintain access to land on both sides of the corridor, thereby reducing temporary severance effects and enabling farming activities to continue.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant will continue to engage with the respondent regarding access arrangements, the provision of crossing points where necessary, and detailed construction planning to reduce disruption to farming activities in advance of construction works. Any temporary farming business losses because of the works or disruption experienced by the respondent would be addressed through the statutory compensation framework. The proposed easement will not restrict normal agricultural cultivation practices.
SS-006	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment - wildlife	Ms Shipley expressed concern about the impact on wildlife. Their farm includes Beckets Wood, which is classified as a county wildlife site, and owls have nested in their farm buildings for 20 years. She claimed that the proposed cable route passes within metres of the woodland and barns.	Beckets Wood County Wildlife Site is located approximately 100m to the south of temporary works associated with CRC9. An assessment of impacts upon County Wildlife Sites (including Beckets Wood) is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] with no significant effects anticipated.
SS-007	Transport and access	Traffic	Ms Shipley expressed concern over the impact on roads, footpaths and	The interaction between the Scheme and the local road network and PRoW network has

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			bridleways, which she claims will become "dominated" by traffic, disruption and infrastructure that they were not designed to accommodate.	been assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 -Transport and Access [APP-047] and the Outline PRowPPMP [APP-203] . The assessment considered the effects of construction traffic, temporary PRow closures, diversions and managed crossings on users of the PRow network. The assessment concludes that, with the proposed mitigation in place, effects on PRow users would not be significant.
SS-008	Soils and agriculture	BMV land & The NPPF	Ms Shipley suggested that the proposal to remove over 1,000 hectares of versatile BMV land goes against the NPPF, which recognises the importance of BMV land and directs development towards poorer quality land.	The effect of the Proposed Development on agricultural land and relevant policy is considered in ES Chapter 15 [APP-051]. Policy in NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3 and the NPPF does not prohibit the use of BMV land, and its use will be considered in the planning balance.
SS-009	Cumulative and in-combination impacts	Cumulative effects & General opposition to the development	Ms Shipley emphasised that East Pye Solar should not be viewed in isolation. She stated that Norfolk is already being asked to accommodate multiple solar farms and claimed that these schemes have been assessed separately. However, she stated that the communities affected experience these schemes cumulatively.	The Applicant is aware of other projects in the region. The ES [APP- 042 to 054] presents an assessment of the cumulative effects of multiple existing and/or approved developments generating cumulative effects which together have an increased effect on the receptors presented in the ES. A comprehensive Cumulative and In Combination Effects Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with Planning

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			She claimed the cumulative impacts extend to: • Aggregated loss of BMV land; • Impacts on the character of landscapes; and • The environment.	Inspectorate guidance, as detailed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology [APP-038]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.4 -Cumulative Schemes [APP-116] details the cumulative schemes considered within the ES. Each topic chapter within the ES [APP-042 – APP-054] sets out how the particular topic area has considered and assessed the cumulative effects arising as a result of other existing or Scheme. A summary of all cumulative effects is provided within Table 20.4 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 20 - Summary of Residual Significant Effects [APP-056].
SS-010	Planning policy	Policy changes	Ms Shipley questioned whether the current application process is appropriate in light of the government commissioning the first spatial energy plan and acknowledging the need for a strategic approach. She described the current process as “piecemeal” and “developer-led”, claiming that it is inappropriate for major projects.	Paragraph 3.2.4 of NPS EN-1 explains that <i>“It is for industry to propose new energy infrastructure projects that they assess to be viable within the strategic framework set by government. This is the nature of a market-based energy system.”</i> The Applicant notes that the PA2008 makes it clear that, in making a decision, the relevant Secretary of State (SoS) <i>“must decide the application in accordance with any relevant NPS”</i> (s104(3)), subject to certain provisos. Essentially, the provisos are that the application must not breach legal or treaty obligations, and that any adverse

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				impact of the Scheme would not outweigh its benefits. The SoS is therefore entitled to disregard any representations that relate to the merits of the designated National Policy Statement (NPS). That said, Section 2.8 and Section 2.9 of the Statement of Need [APP-206] provide information on NESO's prioritisation of the Connections Queue and the further development of NESO's strategic planning processes through a national-level Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP), a Centralised Strategic Network Plan (CSNP), and eleven Regional Energy Strategic Plans RESPs. NESO hope to consult early next year and publish the first SSEP at the end of 2027. However, the Applicant notes that NESO's analysis informed the CP2030 capacity ranges at national and regional level, and NESO remain responsible for developing further their planning processes. The Applicant therefore considers it unlikely that any future planning activity by NESO would deliver a materially different spatial plan to that which is currently envisaged by the CP2030 ranges which NESO also helped to set, and through which the Scheme has

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				been re-prioritised as Gate 2 Phase 2 connection.

2.9 Jason Crawley

Table 2.9 Jason Crawley

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JC-001	Site selection and alternatives	Issues with Site 8	Mr Crawley lives in Shotesham All Saints and claimed that Site 8 is unsuitable for development. He claimed that Shotesham Action Group and Shotesham Parish Council have consistently disagreed with the applicant's assessment for Site 8. He stated that Site 8 should be removed from the scheme for the following reasons: • Confirmed valued landscape; • River valley location; • Topography of the site, which cannot be mitigated; • Increased flooding on market lane, due to increased surface water runoff; • The rare and protected barbastelle bat maternity colony in the nearby Shotesham Little Wood SSSI,	Site 8 has been subject to significant constraint-led refinement through the iterative design process, as set out within the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. These design changes demonstrate that the constraints affecting Site 8 have been addressed through a rigorous, evidence-led application of the mitigation hierarchy. Given the clear and urgent need to deploy renewable energy at speed and scale, the Scheme demonstrably shows substantial public benefits (arising from all constituent parts of the Scheme, including Site 8) that outweigh the less substantial harm identified, as set out within the Planning Statement [APP-209]. The Applicant's position is that it would not be consistent with the government's objectives to deliver a scheme which is smaller than that which has been assessed as acceptable on a planning basis. In relation to Site 8, please refer to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 3 [PDA-010], specifically comment IDs SPC-056 to SPC-

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			which has been confirmed by Norfolk Barbastelle Study Group; The proximity of dwellings, particularly Golden Eye Barn on Baxter's.	065 in relation to site selection, SPC-067 to SPC-074 in relation to ecology, SPC-075 to SPC-092 in relation to flood risk, and SPC-119 to SPC-126 in relation to landscape and visual, with SPC-169 to SPC-172 summarising the Applicant's overall conclusion in response to comments made by Shotesham Parish Council with respect of Site 8, as well as the Applicant's Response to Shotesham Action Group [EN0110014/EXAM/9.21].
JC-002	Site selection and alternatives	Design	Mr Crawley emphasised the requirement of good design for energy and infrastructure, citing National Policy Statements EN1 and EN3, and the Island Green Power Design Principles, claiming that Site 8 should not have passed the applicant's own assessment. He suggested that the site is "significantly flawed and non-compliant" and should not proceed.	The design evolution process that has been applied to Site 8, as described in the Design Approach Document [APP-174] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 – Reasonable Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-041], which demonstrates how the design has responded iteratively to environmental, heritage, landscape, flood risk and residential amenity considerations in accordance with the Scheme's Design Principles.
JC-003	Landscape and visual	Visual effects	Mr Crawley requested that the RVA, Residential Visual Amenity Assessment, be reviewed and suggested that the distance should be exceeded to more than 100 metres.	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), as presented in ES Volume 2, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148], has been undertaken in accordance with the Landscape Institute's Residential Visual

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Amenity Assessment (RVAA) Technical Guidance Note 2/19 (2019). There is no prescribed or standardised study area for an RVAA. The Applicant's RVAA adopted a 100m study area from the Scheme element parameters, reflecting the proximity within which visually overbearing, overwhelming or oppressive effects are most likely to occur. The properties referred to above fall outside this study area and were therefore scoped out of the RVAA on the basis of distance. The assessment concluded that no residential properties within the defined study area would experience visual effects of such magnitude that they would become unattractive places in which to live. The absence of any effects meeting the RVAA threshold within the 100m study area, where such effects would be most likely to occur, further demonstrates that the study area was appropriately defined and provides confidence that properties located at greater distances would not experience the visually overbearing, overwhelming or oppressive effects required to trigger an unacceptable impact on residential visual amenity.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JC-004	Transport and access	Access & Traffic	Mr Crawley expressed concern about access. He stated that road access to Site 8 is proposed via single carriageway, single track, country lanes less than 3 metres wide. He claims the lanes are in very poor condition and not suitable for HGV traffic.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the suitability of the proposed access arrangements to Site 8. The Applicant considers the proposed access route suitable for its intended use. The suitability of the roads proposed to serve Site 8 was assessed as part of the ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 - Transport and Access [APP-047] . In identifying the proposed access route, consideration was given to the characteristics of the local highway network, including the nature and constraints of the rural roads that would be used. The assessment was undertaken in accordance with relevant industry best practice, including IEMA guidance, and considered the interaction between forecast construction traffic and local road conditions. The assessment concluded that the effects of construction traffic on the highway network would not be significant and the Applicant therefore does not agree that the proposed access route is unsuitable for the forecast construction traffic.
JC-005	Landscape and visual	Landscape	Mr Crawley claimed that over 600 slips have been signed to object to the panels seen from the public footpaths that bisect Site 8A. He stated that the	The Applicant acknowledges Mr Crawley's concerns and recognises that users of the public rights of way crossing Site 8A will experience a change in their views and

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			solar panels would completely change the character of the landscape.	experience of the landscape. These effects have been assessed as part of Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043], which considers impacts on both landscape character and visual receptors, including public rights of way. Significant effect is identified associated with Site 8. The Applicant considers that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects on Site 8 have been minimised as far as practicable through the design evolution and embedded mitigation. Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. It is considered by the Applicant for the reasons set out in the Planning Statement [APP-209] that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects are demonstrably outweighed by the Scheme's benefits and needs case.

2.10 Hilary Battye

Table 2.10 Hilary Battye

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HB-001	Soils and agriculture	Agricultural land	Ms Battye is a local resident and retired solicitor, and she strongly objected to the project. She stated that 2,700 acres of mainly Grade 2, good quality agricultural land would be impacted by the project. She suggested that they should retain their land in times of global uncertainty.	The potential effects on food production are considered in the ES Chapter 15 [APP-051]. As noted in that chapter at 15.8.112 to 15.8.123, food security is not identified as a concern by Government. The biggest threat to food production, the Solar Roadmap identifies, is from climate change which solar farms are helping to tackle (15.8.117 refers).
HB-002	Scheme description	Fencing General opposition to the development	Ms Battye expressed concern about the significant infrastructure and disruption caused with battery energy storage systems, substations, grid connection, cable route corridor, plus ancillary work such as security fencing. Ms Battye emphasised that the 15 feet high fencing was a serious concern.	The Applicant notes Ms Battye's comments regarding the infrastructure, disruption and fencing associated with the Scheme. The assessments within the ES [APP-036 to APP-195] have considered all components of the Scheme as a whole, including the National Grid Substation and Grid Connection Infrastructure, the Project Substations and the BESS, together with the Solar PV Arrays. Measures to avoid, mitigate and minimise impacts as far as possible are secured via the Requirements contained within Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO [AS-032].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				With regard to fencing, the Applicant draws attention to the parameters and commitments secured in the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213]. Fencing around Solar PV Arrays will be a 'deer fence' consisting of wire mesh and wooden or metal posts, with a maximum height of 2.5m around individual fields or groups of fields. The Conversion Units/33kV Sub-Distribution Switch Rooms, Standalone Conversion Units, BESS Compound and Substation Compound will be enclosed by palisade fence at a maximum height of 3m above ground level . Pole-mounted, internal-facing CCTV systems will be installed around the perimeter of the Sites, comprising galvanised steel poles externally finished to be in keeping with the prevailing surrounding environment, with a maximum height of 3m, with the exception of the National Grid Substation which has a maximum height of 4.2m . In addition, a 4m high solid fence is proposed for noise mitigation which will only enclose the BESS and not the adjacent 400kV substation. The fence will be externally bounded by existing and proposed planting . The Applicant confirms that no

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				fencing element of the Scheme reaches 15 feet (approximately 4.57m) in height.
HB-003	Lands	Compulsory acquisition	Ms Battye expressed concern that compulsory purchase of land held for many years would impact residents.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern expressed by Ms Battye regarding the potential impact of compulsory acquisition on land held by residents for many years. The Applicant is seeking to secure all land and rights required for the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement wherever possible. The land required for the solar array has been offered voluntarily by the relevant landowners and the Applicant is progressing agreements with those landowners accordingly. The land required for the underground cable route is required on a temporary basis to facilitate construction and installation of the cables. Following completion of the cable installation and reinstatement, the land will be returned to the relevant landowners, subject to any permanent rights required for the operation and maintenance of the cables. The compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers sought in the DCO therefore provide a backstop where voluntary agreement cannot be reached and are necessary to ensure that the land and rights

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				required to deliver the Proposed Development can be secured. The Applicant will continue to seek voluntary agreements with affected landowners throughout the Examination.
HB-004	Developer	Issues with Macquarie Asset Management	Ms Battye was unimpressed with the ultimate ownership that Macquarie Asset Management would have over the solar farm, stating that the Australian company paid \$79.8 million to cover federal fraud charges in the US.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Notwithstanding, the Application demonstrates the Scheme's compliance with all statutory requirements under the Planning Act 2008 and applicable legislation such as The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Applicant is subject to legally binding DCO Requirements. The Planning Act 2008 also contains enforcement provisions regarding compliance with the terms of a DCO. The Applicant has a strong track record of developing NSIP scale projects, notably the consented Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, alongside a strong pipeline of further applications coming forward. The Applicant confirms that the owners of Island Green Power, Macquarie, has a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs. The Funding Statement [APP-021] provides details of the corporate structure of the Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, and how the Scheme is being funded. The Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, is a 100% subsidiary of IGP UK Projects Limited. Both are registered in England and Wales and subject to UK tax law and regulations. Investment may come from a range of sources, including international ones. This is common practice with UK infrastructure schemes and helps fund the transition to clean energy at the scale required.
HB-005	Decommissioning and Construction	Decommissioning	Ms Battye questioned who would remove or replace the project after its 60-year lifespan.	Decommissioning is expected to occur after the 60-year design life of the Scheme in 2091 and take between 12 and 24 months. A requirement to decommission the Scheme is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The decommissioning environmental management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline decommissioning environmental management plan and must include a timetable for its implementation, with the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				undertaker responsible for its preparation, submission and implementation as approved by the relevant planning authority.
HB-006	General remarks	Definition of "farm"	Ms Battye suggested that it was inappropriate to call the proposal a "farm", citing the Oxford English definition of a farm which is an area of land and the buildings on it used for growing crops and/or keeping animals. She suggested that the proposal was more like a factory because it is an industrial facility.	The Applicant notes the representation but does not agree that the term "solar farm" is inappropriate. "Solar farm" is a widely recognised and commonly used term within planning policy, guidance and industry practice to describe ground-mounted solar photovoltaic developments.
HB-007	DCO process	Democracy	Ms Battye stated that it is undemocratic to override local opinion, and urged the Planning Inspectorate not to do so in their decision about this project.	Local views are a central part of the examination process and will be considered alongside national policy and other important and relevant matters. The final decision will be taken by the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero, following consideration of the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation. The Secretary of State is a member of the Government formed by elected representatives and is accountable to Parliament for decisions made in that role.

2.11 Rebecca Mayhew

Table 2.11 Rebecca Mayhew

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RM-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development financial risk	Ms Mayhew's farm (Old Hall Farm, Woodton) is 1,000 meters of proposed cable corridor line. The farm consists of: • The farm; • A farm shop; • Restaurant; • Butchery; • Farm park; and • Vineyard; • And has 1,250 on-site customers every week. Ms Mayhew claimed that the proposals pose a financial risk to her business, putting 36 full-time employees and 10 part-time employees at risk of job loss. She also stated that the cable corridor is less than 200 metres from her restaurant. She claims that the	As set out in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4: Parish and Town Councils [PDA-011] at comment ID: AYPC-002, the Applicant has met with the Respondent on site to understand their farm and business and will continue to engage with landowners throughout the development process and work closely with them to understand their operational requirements and minimise disruption wherever temporary works are required This, includes making appropriate provision to maintain normal farming activities where possible. As part of this engagement, our agents have been working with landowners and their agents along the cable route corridor to understand any specific concerns or operational requirements relating to their farming practices and to explore practical solutions, which may include fencing, crossing points and the provision of water supplies where land may be temporarily severed by the works. Any temporary direct physical loss as a result of the works would

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			risk to income during the build has been downplayed by land agents. Ms Mayhew questioned how she would be able to mitigate the above risks. She also expressed concern that the scheme would severely hinder her online business, which feeds over 1,500 families.	be addressed through the statutory compensation framework.
RM-002	Soils and agriculture	Incorrect land classification	Ms Mayhew's farm is not arable. However, she stated that the land had been incorrectly classified in the application. She claimed that she and others have informed the land agents of the incorrect land classification.	The land within the cable route corridor has not been classified. Therefore it is not understood what has allegedly been incorrectly classified. For the cable route corridor, there will be limited impact from the works on agricultural land and soils as the works to install the cabling will take place over narrow strips of land and will be of short duration. The works will be carried out in accordance with the detailed SRMP which will be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority, as secured by Requirement 18 in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The CRC will be subject to soil surveys to record soil physical characteristics such as horizon depth, texture and ALC grade prior to construction

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				as set out in the Outline SRMP [APP-204] . The ALC of the CRC will be undertaken pre-construction, once the cable route has been refined to a specific alignment within the CRC. The Applicant commits to restore the land to comparable ALC grade after the cable has been installed. Localised disruption to farm businesses will be minimised by good practice.
RM-003	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment & Ecology	Ms Mayhew stated that there are environmental and ecological risks to: • 87 species of birds; • Over 40 varieties of plants in our species-rich pasture, including 3 types of orchid; • Over 30 species of butterflies and moths; • Species of newts, including great crested newts; • Species of dung beetle; and • A variety of insects	An assessment of impacts upon habitats, invertebrates, breeding birds, and great crested newt has been undertaken and provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044]. Measures to avoid ecological impacts are included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.10 - Outline Protected Species Mitigation Strategy [APP-161].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RM-004	Ecology and biodiversity	Ecology & Biodiversity	Ms Mayhew stated that she has multiple species of bats roosting on the farm and badgers, but claimed that the applicant has not checked. She also claimed that the risk to soil ecology and general site biodiversity should be "obvious". She claimed that the applicant has not undertaken adequate ecological surveys.	In relation to the adequacy of surveys, the Applicant draws attention to Section 8.5 and Table 8.7 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 [APP-044] and the supporting technical appendices, including the Ecological Desk Study and Extended Habitat Survey [AS-017]. A comprehensive suite of baseline ecological surveys was undertaken between 2024 and 2026 in accordance with the CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (v1.3), the agreed EIA Scoping Opinion at ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2 [APP-114], and Natural England guidance. The potential impact of the Scheme on soil resources is assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] and effects are assessed to be not significant.
RM-005	Site selection and alternatives	Site selection	Ms Mayhew claimed that her suggested alternative route had been ignored.	The design evolution of the Cable Route Corridor is set out within the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. The key technical and environmental considerations for the cable route corridor are set out in 5.1.13 of the Design Approach Document [APP-212], which include utilising existing gaps in the hedgerows as far as possible to

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				minimise temporary hedgerow loss, avoiding existing landscape and ecological features. The Applicant considered alternative cable routes at this location. The chosen route was considered to have less environmental impacts, in respect of hedgerows and ecology; and less impact on an existing vineyard, than alternative routes.
RM-006	Socioeconomics	Farming operations	Ms Mayhew stated that work to the proposed one-kilometre corridor would cut her off from her grazing platform. Her farm graze all year round with dairy and beef cattle, sheep, and rare breed working horses. She claimed that other farmers who have had similar cables corridors in their land report soil temperatures permanently four degrees higher all year round above the cables. She stated that this was unnatural and expressed concern for the unintended consequences of the scheme.	The Applicant refers to its response to Ms Mayhew's relevant representation [RR-1594] in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Part 5 [PDA-012] under comment ID CON-079. Farm businesses are assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 - Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.2 - Farm Reports [APP-183] provides details of the effects of the Scheme on farm businesses. As part of the assessment into farm businesses, the landowners were interviewed in person to establish the farming circumstances. The Scheme uses approximately 26% of the land controlled by farm business.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant notes the Respondent's concern that the proposed cable route for the project will bisect their farm. During construction there would be temporary disruption to farming activities within the cable route corridor. However, the working width is limited and construction methodology has been developed, where reasonably practicable, to maintain access to land on both sides of the corridor, thereby reducing temporary severance effects and enabling farming activities to continue. The Applicant will engage with affected landowners and occupiers regarding access arrangements, the provision of crossing points where necessary, and detailed construction planning to reduce disruption to farming activities in advance of construction works. Any temporary farming business losses as a result of the works or disruption experienced by affected landowners would be addressed through the statutory compensation framework. The Applicant met with the Respondent in early 2026 to discuss these impacts and remains committed to working with the Respondent to minimise disruption and would welcome a further meeting in person.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The thermal dynamics of the sheathed cables are limited to their immediate proximity and the Applicant has considered the potential thermal effects of the buried cables within ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 9 – Water Environment [APP-045] .
RM-007	Socioeconomics	Animal welfare	Ms Mayhew also expressed concern for animal welfare and claimed that grazing animals are very sensitive and will not react well to the significant disturbance during construction. She stated that keeping the animals indoors, as the land agents have suggested, is not an option for their health and welfare. She claimed the suggestion demonstrates how poorly farmers are being treated.	Please refer to the response provided at RM-001 of this document.
RM-008	Human health	Mental health & Compulsory acquisition	Ms Mayhew claimed that her farm and farmers' rights are being violated by the scheme and that this is to the detriment of their mental health. She stated that the use of compulsory powers is an overreach.	The Applicant recognises the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Scheme on farmers' wellbeing and mental health. Potential effects on wellbeing associated with environmental change, disruption, uncertainty and concerns regarding potential

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				impacts have been considered within the ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. The Human Health Summary Statement acknowledges that large-scale infrastructure projects have the potential to affect mental wellbeing through these pathways and, in response to consultation feedback, an assessment of mental wellbeing and equality-related impacts was undertaken through the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-214]. The agricultural assessment within Environmental Statement Volume 1: Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land (Revision 1) [App-182] identifies the effects on land holdings, access and agricultural operations and the measures proposed to maintain access and limit disruption (see sections 15.8.80 and 15.10 for discussion on the potential impacts and Section 15.7 for mitigations proposed during construction, operation and decommissioning). The Applicant has not identified evidence through that assessment that the Scheme would be likely to result in a population-level health effect through impacts on agricultural livelihoods. This does not determine individual compensation or compulsory-

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				acquisition matters, which are addressed separately. Overall, the assessment concludes that the Scheme would not result in likely significant adverse effects on population and human health during construction, operation or decommissioning. The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment. The Addendum supports the conclusions of the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment, finding that the Scheme is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing at population or identified vulnerable-group level. Its findings will be reported and considered as part of the Examination and, where appropriate, may

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				inform additional mitigation, monitoring and engagement commitments. In accordance with the 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land', the Applicant has sought to acquire the relevant land by voluntary agreement, with compulsory acquisition powers sought only where necessary to deliver the Scheme. These powers sought are necessary and proportionate to ensure the deliverability of the Scheme. See the explanation in the Statement of Reasons [APP-020]. The Applicant confirms that negotiations are tracked in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-023]. The Applicant seeks to minimise disruption to affected farming businesses where practicable and is committed to working with all land interests to achieve this. Where there are any residual impacts on farm businesses, the Applicant will engage with landowners to compensate them through voluntary agreements or the compensation mechanisms available for the use of compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicant is continuing to engage with landowners regarding their businesses and welcomes engagement from the respondent.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The CRC is one aspect of the Scheme that requires design flexibility. Decisions are yet to be taken regarding detailed cable routing within the parameters of the CRC. The detailed design and construction of the cable route will be undertaken within the parameters authorised by the DCO. Ongoing engagement with landowners can inform the detailed design stage.

2.12 John Fry

Table 2.12 John Fry

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JF-001	Cultural heritage	Conservation areas & Listed buildings	Mr Fry lives in Church Hill, Saxlingham Nethergate, on the access route to the solar development for both large trucks and abnormal loads. He stated that this route passes through the conservation area of Saxlingham Nethergate, where there are 43 listed buildings. He claimed quarters of these listed are directly on the route, including 11 listings in Church Hill. Of these listings, 3 are grade 2 listed buildings: • Tudor old hall; • The thousand-year-old church with the oldest stained glass in Norfolk; and • The former rectory (Mr fry's home).	The Applicant refers to its response to Mr Fry's relevant representation [RR-0931] in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations -Part 5 [PDA-012] under comment ID CUL-002 and CUL-010.
JF-002	Transport and access	Traffic	Mr Fry expressed concern about road use, stating that his house is at the narrowest point on the entire route,	The Applicant has provided a detailed response on this issue in Q1.8.3 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			where the road is less than 4.4 meters wide, bounded on one side by the granary and on the other by our two-star listed retaining wall and hedge. He claims the Soane Museum and keeper of the Soane archive have objected and confirmed the importance of the wall. He added that vehicles would have to turn sharply by the War Memorial.	Authority's First Initial Questions [EXAM/9.2].
JF-003	Lands	Compulsory acquisition & Highways	Mr Fry stated that there have been threats of compulsory purchase to facilitate the route. He claims this includes: • The War Memorial; • The Old Hall; and • His home. However, he acknowledged that on page 138 of a recent response from the applicant, dated the 4th of September [PDA-010], they state that no part of the curtilage of the War Memorial or the old rectory fall within the order limits.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Respondent regarding the land and rights required in the vicinity of the War Memorial, The Old Rectory and his property. As previously confirmed in the Applicant's response to the Interested Parties relevant representation [RR-0931] in The Applicants Response to Relevant Representations Part 5 - By Theme [PDA-012], no part of the registered title of either the Saxlingham Nethergate War Memorial or The Old Rectory falls within the Order Limits. Accordingly, no compulsory acquisition or acquisition of rights is sought over either property or their respective curtilages The Applicant can further confirm that Plots 03-001 and 03-002, identified in the Land

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			He then stated that the transport plan [APP-047] still requires plot 03-001, partially belonging to his home, and 03-002, the footpath alongside the War Memorial, which is assumed to be highways authority land. Mr Fry claimed that this is not the case. He stated that no vehicle overhang is possible on his side of the road, but that the applicant has assumed an overhang of around 400 millimetres.	Plan [APP-006] and Book of Reference [APP-022], are wholly within adopted highway land. The rights sought are limited to the adopted highway and do not extend to any land outside the highway boundary, including land associated with the War Memorial, The Old Rectory or the footpath. The Applicant confirms that they are not seeking compulsory acquisition of the War Memorial or the Respondent's property at The Old Rectory. The Applicant has provided a detailed response on this issue in Q1.8.3 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [EXAM/9.2].
JF-004	Water environment	Flooding risk & Surveying work	Mr Fry claimed that the reply to flooding questions on pages 140 to 142 [PDA-010] relate to the street in Hempton, not the street in Saxlingham Nethergate, and are therefore wrong. He suggested that this error demonstrates the poor quality of the surveying work done by the applicant.	The original location of concern was not specified within the relevant representation and assumptions were made on this location, but irrespective of the specific location the point in relation to flood risk requirements remains valid – i.e. ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] has been developed based on the requirements of the NPPF, which requires that development can have no detrimental impact on flood risk to third parties. The development will not

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				impact on the pattern or quantity of runoff arising from the site.
JF-005	Ecology and biodiversity Cultural Heritage Arboriculture	Environmental damage	Mr Fry stated that the environmental damage done to trees, wildlife, and heritage buildings is "enormous". He referenced the first picture in the conservation area document (of an ancient yew hedge above the retaining wall), claiming that the hedge is full of wildlife like newts, toads, and snakes. He stated that many mature trees line the route and will require reduction, which he claimed would damage them forever.	There would be no loss of ancient hedgerows. Mitigation measures are secured through the Outline CEMP [APP-196]. Requirements for pruning will aim to prioritise trees of low quality (BS5837:2012 Category U and C trees) over trees of moderate or high quality (BS5837:2012 Category A and B trees). Crown reduction will be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010 'Recommendations for Tree Work'; current arboricultural industry guidelines and best practice; and all relevant Health & Safety standards. The most suitable level of crown reduction will be advised by the Arboriculturist and this can allow light penetration and air circulation through the tree's structure, improve tree health and promote healthier growth by removing weak, diseased or damaged branches. Excessive pruning that would damage the retained trees will not be allowed. All tree pruning works including reduction will have due consideration for ecological mitigation and protection.

2.13 Rodney Aldis

Table 2.13 Rodney Aldis

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RA-001	Ecology and Biodiversity	Biodiversity	Mr Aldis stated that the way solar farms are managed can have a large impact on biodiversity. He referenced a British Trust for Ornithology study carried out in Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire last year, which found that solar farms which let wildflowers grow and are not mowed or grazed regularly had a greater range of biodiversity than arable land or solar farms that were mowed or grazed regularly. He attributed this to solar farms using less pesticides and fertilizer than arable land. However, he acknowledged that there were some strong arguments from other speakers as to why this scheme would be “detrimental” to biodiversity.	The Applicant welcomes this input, and acknowledges the study referred to which details the biodiversity benefits of solar developments. Additionally, research by scientists from the RSPB and University of Cambridge (Copping J P et al. 2025) as part of the Centre for Landscape Regeneration found that (hectare for hectare) solar farms in agriculturally dominated East Anglia contained a greater number of bird species and overall number of birds than surrounding arable farmland. With (appropriately managed) solar farms having the greatest variety of species and nearly three times as many birds, compared to nearby arable farmland. Thereby highlighting further studies undertaken within the region which detail the ecological benefits of solar.

2.14 Heather Jackson

Table 2.14 Heather Jackson

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HJ-001	Consultation and engagement	Issues with consultation - Communication/ Notice from the applicant	Ms Jackson is representing herself but is also the Chairman of Shotesham Parish Council. She claimed that, after speaking with her clerk, the Parish Council had not been notified by the applicant about the application at the start of the process. She added that she thinks "others" have not been properly notified either.	The Applicant considers that the consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. Shotesham Parish Council was notified of all phases of consultation, and was identified as a host parish council within the core consultation zone as set out in Consultation Report [APP-024]. Further, Shotesham Parish Council's submission of feedback at Statutory consultation and the Applicant's consideration of concerns raised in Consultation Report, Appendix 11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table [APP-035], highlights proportionate engagement at the pre-application stage of the Scheme's development. The Applicant's Community Relations team has also been available to assist members of the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				public via a series of free-to-use communication channels (phone, post and email). These channels were publicised through newspaper adverts and press release, on the Applicant's website, in consultation materials and on- site notices.
HJ-002	Landscape and Visual	Environment	Ms Jackson said that she agrees with the speakers who previously discussed: • Shotesham being a conservation village; • listed buildings; • churches; • the countryside; • the "undulating" landscape; • the River Tas; • the conservation area • the SSSI; and • the importance of green spaces	The Applicant notes the discussion on Shotesham. A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149]. The effect of the Scheme on the landscape is assessed and recorded. Furthermore, the effects of the Scheme on conservation areas, listed buildings and churches are discussed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10 - Cultural Heritage [APP-046].
HJ-003	Consultation and engagement	Issues with consultation - Communication/ Notice from the applicant	Ms Jackson stated that many of the residents thought that the leaflets from the applicant about the solar farm were actually leaflets selling solar panels. She claimed that there are people who still do not realise what is happening. She added concern that the application process has been "overwhelming" and difficult for residents to understand. She	The Applicant's Community Relations team has been available to assist members of the public via a series of free-to-use communication channels (phone, post and email). Members of the public are welcomed to use these channels to ask about the application documents, as well as how to access and read Scheme maps.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			agreed with previous speakers about people's ability to understand the process.	The application documents were made available in hard copy format on request by contacting the Applicant's communication channels, with reasonable printing costs depending on the number/size of documents requested. Furthermore, USB memory sticks were available to be sent directly to individuals upon request. The Applicant's Section 56 Notice [OD-003] , which confirmed acceptance of the DCO application by the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State), provided further information on obtaining DCO application documents.

2.15 Sarah Mallet

Table 2.15 Sarah Mallet

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Andrew Gibson				
SMAG-001	Site selection and alternatives	General opposition to the development – Site 1	Ms Mallet represented Mr Gibson who could not attend the hearing in person. She read out a speech he had given her. Mr Gibson lives on High Green, Great Moulton and is the wildlife warden for the local parish. He lives near the area that has been designated for Site 1. Ms Mallet stated that Mr Gibson walks the paths of proposed Site 1 frequently. The ExA asked for details of those walks in his written submission.	The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes further written submissions.
SMAG-002	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment - wildlife	Ms Mallet explained that during prolonged dry weather and drought Mr Gibson provides wildlife, including: • deer; • hares; • foxes; • small mammals; • grass snakes;	The Applicant welcomes this response and confirms that impacts upon these species/species-groups have been assessed and considered in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044]. Measures to avoid ecological impacts are included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.10 - Outline

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			• badgers; • great crested newts; • bats; • bugs; • bees; • beetles; and • owls; with drinking water, where Site 1 has been proposed.	Protected Species Mitigation Strategy [APP-161]. Landscape enhancements for Site 1 are set out within the Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Outline LEMP) [APP-199] these will ensure the long-term suitability of Site 1 for these species.
SMAG-003	Socioeconomics	Lifestyle	Ms Mallet expressed Mr Gibson's concern that the rural lifestyle he chose to get away from urban living is now at risk because of the solar farm.	The Applicant notes this comment. While the Scheme would introduce solar infrastructure into a predominantly agricultural landscape, the Site would remain largely undeveloped in character, with the vast majority of land retained as open grassland and available for continued agricultural management, including grazing. Unlike conventional industrial development, the solar arrays are low in height, non-permanent, and do not involve extensive built form, large buildings, or significant areas of hardstanding
SMAG-004	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment - birds	Ms Mallet explained that Mr Gibson also recorded 130 different varieties of bird, 24 of which are on the red list. Ms Mallet expressed Mr Gibson's concern that migrating birds would be disorientated by the project and their breeding habits would be damaged.	An assessment of breeding birds is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] . With the exception of skylarks, it was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate (ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2 – EIA Scoping Opinion [APP-114]) to scope out impacts on breeding birds during the operational of the Scheme.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Measures to avoid impacts on skylark and other ground nesting birds are included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.10 - Outline Protected Species Mitigation Strategy [APP-161] and consideration of breeding birds in the long-term management of the green infrastructure of the Scheme is included in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] . In accordance with these, a Protected Species Mitigation Strategy and a detailed LEMP will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in line with Requirement 8 and Requirement 7, respectively, of the Draft DCO [AS-032] .
SMAG-005	Noise and vibration	Noise	Ms Mallet expressed Mr Gibson's concern that the constant hum of high-tension cable, the whir of tracking motors, and vibrating from the generators and transformers would create a "hostile environment" for walkers, birds, and bats.	The Scheme will utilise underground cabling, and therefore this is not expected to result in noise. Noise generated by tracking motors has been assessed, with the results presented in ES Volume 1, Noise and Vibration – Chapter 12 [APP-048]. The assessment demonstrates that noise from tracking motors is expected to be considerably below background sound levels at all receptors, with associated impacts and effects being negligible. Noise generated by generators and transformers has been assessed along Public Right of Ways (PRoWs). The calculated sound levels on PRoWs are expected to be 50 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ or below, which results in a negligible or low impact, which at a

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				medium sensitivity receptor, results in a negligible effect. A commitment has been made within the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan to ensure that the overall sound level from the Scheme along the PRowS will not exceed 55 dBA, and where practicable, will be mitigated to not exceed 50 dBA. In addition, as a precautionary measure, the embedded design principles adopted and detailed within the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213] include for minimum offsets from important ecological features. Habitat creation will be undertaken within these buffers. These measures will reduce the current baseline noise/visual disturbance events associated with agricultural practices (currently right up to the woodland edges for example), avoid significant operational noise disturbance and provide enhanced supporting habitats.
SMAG-006	Landscape and visual	Landscape	Ms Mallet expressed Mr Gibson's concern that if the project went ahead they would be the last generation to appreciate the countryside. He claimed that the project came at the cost of their natural environment.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding the future appreciation of the countryside and the perceived loss of the natural environment. The Applicant does not agree, however, that the Scheme would result in the loss of the countryside or prevent future generations from experiencing and enjoying it. The Scheme would retain the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				underlying rural land use characteristics of the area, with part of the Order Limits remaining as agricultural land, whilst also retaining and enhancing existing landscape features where practicable, including hedgerows, tree belts, woodland blocks and watercourses. The Scheme has been designed to incorporate buffers, setbacks and landscape mitigation measures intended to maintain the rural character of the area and integrate the development within the existing landscape framework. The effect on the landscape and visual amenity will reduce as the landscape mitigation proposed establish. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening / reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] , respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032] .

2.16 Stephen Bamber

Table 2.16 Stephen Bamber

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SB-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Mr Bamber has lived near Long Stratton to work as a GP since 1989. He has gotten to know the majority of residents in his practice area, which includes over 100 square miles. He claims that most local residents share his objection to the project.	The Applicant notes this comment.
SB-002	Cultural Heritage	Conservation area	Mr Bamber's property is Grade 2 listed and sits directly opposite the proposed solar arrays, which are less than 50 metres away. He stated that in December 2019, the council published a document called 'Fritton Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines', which stresses the importance of the historical, scientific, architectural, agricultural, natural, and visual aspects of the immediate area. He claimed that all these things would be permanently and irretrievably destroyed by the proposal.	The Applicant notes that assessment of the potential impact to Fritton Conservation Area has been provided within ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1 – Heritage Statement [APP-165 – APP-168], which also takes into account the detail provided in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan provided by South Norfolk Council (2019). Conservation areas exist to manage and protect the special architectural and historic interest of a place that make up its character and appearance and, as such, the designation of Fritton Conservation Area recognises that the encompassed section of the hamlet holds significance informed by these heritage interests. This is largely vested in the historic settlement layout around the common grazing land to the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			The ExA requested that he submit the above document with his written submission.	south, the variety of vernacular architecture and the aesthetic quality of the village with its large verges at property frontages and mature planting regimes. The northern boundary of Fritton conservation area abuts the southern limit of Sub-Site 5B and it is considered, therefore, that it forms part of the wider setting of the conservation area and hence the removal and setting back of the Solar PV Panels within this area of Sub-Site 5B The assessment concluded that, based on the existing environmental baseline together with the proposed landscape mitigation, the Scheme will cause no harm to the conservation area.
SB-003	Landscape and visual Air quality Socioeconomics	Visual effects & Pollution & House prices	Mr Bamber stated that the proposed arrays at 4.3 meters are much higher than standard ones and would contribute to the visual upset for residents. He said that the proposed 13-meter-tall battery storage system is in a position in clear line of sight from his house. He added that light pollution from security features, glare and glint from the sun, electrical and construction noise pollution would be "intolerable". He claimed that all properties have already suffered a reduction of value	The maximum height of the tracked panels will be 4.5m when titled at their maximum angle. However, this will only occur in the morning and in the evening. Majority of the time the panels will not be at its maximum tilt. A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			directly from this proposal, and that value would drop further with the presence of a solar farm.	reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The assessment of construction noise is presented within ES Volume 1, Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [APP-048] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.2 - Noise Modelling and Calculations [APP-179]. Construction noise levels are unlikely to exceed the daytime threshold of 65 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ at residential properties. The resultant impacts are negligible to low, which results in negligible to minor effects which are not significant. The Applicant can provide further information on impacts and effects of construction noise if the Respondent provides the location of their property. In relation to property value and the potential impact of the Scheme, the Applicant refers to its responses at SOC-001 as set out in Part 5 – Thematic Response to Relevant Representations [PDA-012]. See response to CON-055 within The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representation Part 5: By Theme [PDA-012].
SB-004	Human health	Welfare & well-being	Mr Bamber stated that her fears for his welfare and the welfare of the	The Applicant recognises the concerns raised regarding the welfare and wellbeing of local

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			local people if the project goes ahead. He added that the proposal is “detrimental” to local people’s well-being.	residents and the view that the Scheme would have detrimental effects on the local community. Potential effects on wellbeing associated with environmental change, landscape and visual effects, noise, access, recreation and perceived risks have been considered within the ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. The Human Health Summary Statement acknowledges that large-scale infrastructure projects can affect wellbeing through pathways including disruption, uncertainty and concern regarding potential impacts. In response to concerns regarding wellbeing, a dedicated assessment of mental wellbeing and equality-related impacts was undertaken through the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-214]. The findings of the EqIA are taken into account alongside the Human Health Summary Statement when considering potential impacts on local communities. Overall, the Human Health Summary Statement concludes that the Scheme would not result in any likely significant adverse effects on population and human health during construction, operation or decommissioning.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment. The Addendum supports the conclusions of the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment, finding that the Scheme is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing at population or identified vulnerable-group level. Its findings will be reported and considered as part of the Examination and, where appropriate, may inform additional mitigation, monitoring and engagement commitments.
SB-005	Landscape and visual	Landscape & Nature	Mr Bamber stated that it is "unacceptable" to destroy the: • rural nature; • seasonally changing character and views; • tranquillity; and • sense of natural rhythm	The Applicant acknowledges Mr Bamber's concerns regarding the potential effects of the Scheme on the rural character, seasonal variation, tranquillity and experiential qualities of the landscape. The Applicant accepts that the introduction of solar PV arrays and associated infrastructure will result in changes to the landscape and that some

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			with a solar farm.	receptors will experience changes to views and the perception of the countryside. A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148]. However, the Applicant does not agree that the Scheme would destroy these qualities. The existing landscape is characterised by an actively managed agricultural environment containing arable farmland, hedgerows, hedgerow trees, woodland blocks, farmsteads, public rights of way and existing energy infrastructure. The Scheme has been designed to retain and reinforce many of these defining features, including existing vegetation and field boundaries, whilst incorporating additional landscape mitigation and habitat creation. The assessment concludes that whilst significant effects would occur in some locations, these effects are generally reduced as mitigation planting matures and integrates with the existing landscape framework. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening / reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032].
SB-006	Soils and agriculture	Agricultural land	Mr Bamber claimed that the loss of high quality agricultural land would never be reversed, because the natural constitution of productive soil would be "lost for good". He highlighted that domestic food security is increasingly important in times of widespread geopolitical trouble.	As set out in ES Chapter 15 [APP-051], the impacts on agricultural land quality and soil are minimal, except in areas disturbed for fixed infrastructure such as tracks. In areas that have been intensively managed, the soils will benefit from being in long term grassland, as described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] at 15.8.67 and its following paragraphs.
SB-007	Transport and access	Traffic	Mr Bamber stated that his village and my house sit on the C201 from Norwich to Starston and suggested that traffic would increase there.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding potential increases in traffic on the C201. However, ES Volume 2, Figures 11.2-11.8 – Likely and Suitable Routes to the Scheme (APP-095) identify the proposed construction traffic routes to the Scheme, and these do not route construction traffic along the section of the C201 referred to by the representor. The Applicant

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				therefore does not anticipate a significant increase in construction traffic on this route as a result of the Scheme.
SB-008	Ecology and biodiversity Soils and Agriculture	Environment	Mr Bamber claimed that the damage this solar farm would do to the natural environment of soil, fauna, and flora is irreversible.	The likely effects on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] , together with mitigation measures. The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with ecology and biodiversity considerations embedded into the design principles, design buffers and design evolution, as set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212] .
SB-009	General remarks	Definition of "farm"	Mr Bamber stated that the name "solar farm" is misleading and likened the proposal to an "industrial factory".	The Applicant notes the representation but does not agree that the term "solar farm" is inappropriate. "Solar farm" is a widely recognised and commonly used term within planning policy, guidance and industry practice to describe ground-mounted solar photovoltaic developments.
SB-010	Site selection and alternative	Local opinion & Site selection	Mr Bamber claimed that local opinion is being "wilfully ignored", and added that a proposal in a site of similar visual, historic, and natural interest (like Hampstead Heath or Regent's Park) would not be accepted. He expressed that "rural folk's"	The Applicant does not agree that local opinion has been ignored. The examination process has been established to ensure that the views of local communities, statutory consultees and other Interested Parties are considered by the Examining Authority before it reaches its recommendation. The Applicant has also undertaken consultation and engagement throughout the development of

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			objections being ignored aggravates him further.	The Scheme and has had regard to feedback received in the evolution of the proposals. The Applicant does not consider comparisons with other locations to be determinative. The acceptability of development proposals must be assessed on their individual merits, having regard to the characteristics of the site, the nature of the development, the likely effects identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment, relevant planning policy and all representations made during the examination process. The Examining Authority is responsible for considering all evidence and representations before determining whether any matters require further examination and before reaching its conclusions and recommendation.

2.17 Dr Jonathan Newman (on behalf of Sally Walker)

Table 2.17 Dr Jonathan Newman (on behalf of Sally Walker)

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Comments on behalf of Sally Walker				
JNSW-001	Landscape and visual	Visual impact General opposition to the development	Dr Newman spoke on behalf of Mrs Walker, who did not attend the hearing, and he read out her personal impact statement. Dr Newman is chair of Brooke Parish Council and Mrs Walker is a resident of Brooke. Dr Newman explained that Mr and Mrs Walker live within 20 metres of the boundary of Site 9. Dr Newman expressed Mrs Walker's concern that the image of her surroundings would be altered by the solar farm, and that this would have an impact on her life, home and memories. He said that she has lived in her house for 30 years and detailed a list of personal memories including her wedding and burying a dog in the garden.	A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148]. The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of siting infrastructure. The design evolution of the Scheme in respect of landscape and visual context is set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. It is considered by the Applicant for the reasons set out in the Planning Statement [APP-209] that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects are demonstrably outweighed by the Scheme's benefits and needs case.
JNSW-002	Socioeconomics	Financial impact	Dr Newman expressed Mrs Walker's concern that the value of her house is linked to the solar farm and that she fears she may not even be able to sell it at all because of the proposal.	In relation to property value and the potential impact of the Scheme, the Applicant refers to its responses at SOC-001 as set out in Part 5 – Thematic Response to Relevant Representations [PDA-012] .
JNSW-003	Landscape and visual	Landscape & Site selection	Dr Newman expressed that Mrs Walker thinks the countryside should	Please refer to the response provided at comment ID JNSW-001.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Site selection and alternatives		not be sacrificed for a solar farm, but she acknowledges the need to consume less and reduce emissions for the sake of the planet.	
JNSW-004	Developer	Issues with Macquarie Asset Management	Dr Newman expressed Mrs Walker's concern that lives would be ruined for the profits of foreign investment companies.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The Application has demonstrated the Scheme's compliance with all statutory requirements under the Planning Act 2008 and applicable legislation such as The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Applicant is subject to legally binding DCO Requirements. The Planning Act 2008 also contains enforcement provisions regarding compliance with the terms of a DCO. The Applicant has a strong track record of developing NSIP scale projects, notably the consented Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, alongside a strong pipeline of further applications coming forward. The Applicant confirms that the owners of Island Green Power, Macquarie, has a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs. The Funding Statement [APP-021] provides details of the corporate structure of the Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, and how the Scheme is being funded. The Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, is a 100% subsidiary of IGP UK Projects Limited. Both are registered in England and Wales and subject to UK tax law and regulations. Investment may come from a range of sources, including international ones. This is common practice with UK infrastructure schemes and helps fund the transition to clean energy at the scale required.
JNSW-005	Human health	Mental health	Dr Newman read out an extract from Mrs Walker's original personal impact statement, submitted on 5 February 2025. It detailed the toll this proposal has had on her mental health for the last 18 months.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns expressed regarding the effect that the proposed development and the examination process have had on the wellbeing of some residents. The Applicant recognises that large infrastructure projects can give rise to stress, anxiety and uncertainty for some individuals. These matters have been considered within the Human Health Summary Statement in the ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054] and the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Equality Impact Assessment [APP-214], which recognise mental wellbeing as a potential pathway of effect and consider issues such as perceived environmental change, uncertainty, attachment to place and concern regarding potential risks. The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment. The Addendum supports the conclusions of the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment, finding that the Scheme is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing at population or identified vulnerable-group level. Its findings will be reported and considered as part of the Examination and, where appropriate, may

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				inform additional mitigation, monitoring and engagement commitments.

2.18 Tony Hall

Table 2.18 Tony Hall

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TH-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Mr Hall lives in Great Moulton and his property extends to the boundary of the proposed National Grid substation on the north side. He stated that his land is not agricultural land and is used by family and friends who enjoy horses, pet sheep, archery, fishing lake, and the Scandinavian-style barbecue hut. There is also a large apiary with over 400,000 bees. He urged that the effects of the substation on his family should not be underestimated. He added that one of the fishing stages on the fishing lake is only 12 metres from the substation.	All topics chapters within the Environmental Statement consider the project as a whole, as defined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 – The Scheme [APP-040]. The in-combination effects between the significant effects identified in individual topic chapters are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 19 – In-Combination Effects Assessment [APP-055]. The final location of the National Grid Substation within the Works Area No.4 is not yet determined.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TH-002	EMF	Risks of the substation site	Mr Hall expressed particular concern over the following issues in relation to the main substation site (not the lithium battery site): • the electromagnetic exposure by emissions from the site; • the exposure to low-frequency, non-ionising radiation; • the skyline view; • the low frequency hum, which he said would travel right to the village 24/7 due to wind direction; • light pollution; • risk of electrical explosions and fire; • escape of toxic chemicals; • ozone-depleting gases; and • water contamination.	An assessment of Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) pertaining to human health is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 17 - Electromagnetic Fields [APP-053] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.1 – High Level Electromagnetic Field Assessment [APP-188]. While the evidence indicates that no significant adverse human health effects are expected, mitigation measures for EMF are set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline OEMP [APP-197]. Electric fields are contained within the cable's protective insulation and sheath; therefore, no external electric fields are expected to occur due to the underground cables. The maximum levels of electromagnetic radiation during construction, operation and decommissioning phases will be below International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection reference levels. Landscape and visual effects associated with the National Grid Substation are presented within ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043] and visualisations are provided within ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.6 Visualisations [APP-137 to APP-146].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The potential for major accidents and disasters as a result of the Scheme are assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. The impact of the Scheme on climate change, including a GHG assessment, is provided within ES Volume 1, Chapter 6 – Climate Change [APP-042]. The overall GHG impact of the Scheme is assessed as significant beneficial. The mitigation measures set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] and secured through the Outline CEMP [APP-196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] demonstrate there will be no detrimental impact in water quality as a result of the Scheme.
TH-003	Transport and access	Haulage rules	Mr Hall questioned whether the haulage rules for this type of project have been considered.	The Applicant acknowledges the comments regarding haulage associated with the Scheme. Industry-standard assessment methodologies and best practice guidance have been applied in the assessment of construction traffic effects, including the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professions (ISEP) Guidelines for Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement. The assessment is reported within

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 – Transport and Access (APP-047).
TH-004	Scheme description	Technical documents	Mr Hall expressed that he has struggled to find a definitive site plan for the National Grid site, and he has had difficulty navigating the plans and maps associated with this project.	The Applicant has provided an indicative layout within ES Volume 3, Appendix 4.1 Illustrative Technical Information [APP-195] - an updated version of this document is provided at Deadline 1 [EN0110014/EXAM/6.3.4.1] .
TH-005	Site selection and alternatives	Site selection	Mr Hall claimed that the proposed site for the National Grid substation is in the wrong place.	The Applicant notes the comment. The site selection process for the National Grid Substation has been undertaken in accordance with Section 2.10 of NPS EN-3, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-5, as set out in the Site Selection Assessment [APP-215] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 – Reasonable Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-041] . The chosen location at Sub-Site 1B lies beneath the existing Bramford to Norwich 400kV overhead line, close to the A140 and with existing highway infrastructure, and is not within a nationally designated landscape or local landscape designation. The proposed National Grid Substation Site can be suitably accessed from the SRN, is not located within any statutory ecological, landscape, or heritage designations, and sits entirely within Flood Zone 1.

2.19 Kathy Thompson

Table 2.19 Kathy Thompson

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
KT-001	General remarks	Lifestyle & Environment	Ms Thompson has lived in Topcroft for 34 years. She stated that she goes for bike rides, walks, and sits outside with her family listening to owls and watching bats and shooting stars when they come to visit. She expressed concern for her lifestyle changing if the proposals go ahead. The ExA asked her to submit any walks and bike rides in her written submissions.	The Applicant notes this comment.
KT-002	Consultation and engagement	Issues with consultation & General opposition to the development	Ms Thompson expressed concern that many local people are still unaware of the impact the scheme would have, because they do not read local papers or watch the news. She claimed that people have to actively look for the solar farm to realise that the proposal exists. She added that she and others have been trying to alert the community to the impact the development would have on their countryside, their environment, their heritage and their daily lives.	The Applicant considers that the consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant considers the materials provided were adequate and informative, and presented information using standard mapping conventions. It is the Applicant's view that the consultation material provided sufficient

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				information for the emerging Scheme to be understood. The acceptance of the Applicant's DCO application for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate serves as confirmation that the Applicant has fulfilled its statutory pre application duties. Each of the host and neighbouring authorities provided adequacy of consultation representations [AoC-001 to AoC-008], confirming that they considered the Applicant met the statutory consultation requirements. The consultation process is set out in the Consultation Report [APP-024], which details the Applicant's approach to pre application consultation. Throughout the consultation period, anyone was welcome and encouraged to get in touch using any of the free-to-use communication channels provided, including email, freephone, and post. Respondents were also invited to attend the in-person and virtual community information events, where they could view the maps and ask questions or seek clarification directly from the Applicant's project team.
KT-003	Battery safety	Safety risks of BESS	Ms Thompson listed the safety risks she believes the BESS storage systems pose, including:	The safety objectives for the design of the Applicant's BESS site are listed in Section 1.4 of the Outline BSMP [APP-200] .

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			- the non-recyclable waste; - the destruction of local livelihoods; and - food security.	The Applicant confirms that the disposal of BESS will be undertaken in full accordance with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 (as amended), Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) or any future relevant legislation that covers disposal of waste energy storage devices. Onsite procedures to safely remove damaged, or end-of-life BESS units are set out Section 3.3.14-18 of the Outline BSMP [APP-200] which sets out legal compliance and safety mechanisms to ensure removal of BESS is undertaken safely by the appropriate specialists and to an appropriate management facility. BESS systems are largely recyclable, with an 80% recovery rate reported by UK market leaders for Lithium-ion (Li-ion) battery recycling. The Applicant is committed to applying 'Best Available Treatment Recovery and Recycling Techniques' to ensure the proportion of BESS weight that is recycled is maximised. Where non-recyclable material remains, this will be handled by the approved battery waste specialists, and treated as hazardous waste in full compliance with the relevant waste management and environmental permitting and legislation. The Applicant therefore does not consider that the BESS has any measurable impact to the communities

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				around East Pye Solar with regard to handling of waste from BESS. Section 1.4.2 of the Outline BSMP [APP-200] stipulates: <i>"Final BESS design and site layout will have been validated through mandatory Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT must establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or ESS equipment. NFRS intervention in worst case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and Energy Storage System (ESS) units to prevent the fire from spreading. This strategy will be finalised with NFRS and be clearly communicated in the Emergency Response Plan (ERP);</i> • <i>To ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases does not significantly impact site operatives, first responders, and the local community; and</i> • <i>To ensure that firewater run-off is contained and tested before release or, if necessary, removed by tanker and treated offsite."</i>

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				A plume study has been undertaken as presented in Appendix B of the Outline BSMP [APP-200]. The Plume Study demonstrated that there were no significant impacts on any sensitive residential receptor location with 1km of the BESS compound in the event of a BESS fire. A risk assessment of the potential impact on visibility has also been undertaken for nearby road and rail. The predicted visibility distances in the event of a BESS fire are greater than the safe stopping distances for roads and rail. The Outline BSMP [APP-200] includes mitigation measures, including the preparation of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) at detailed design stage that will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. The ERP could also contain measures such as notification of potentially affected residents and temporary closure of PRow. By way of a Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [AS-032] prior to the commencement of construction of the BESS, the Applicant will require a BSMP to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority that must consult with the with Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service and the EA. As part of

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				preparation of the detailed BSMP, the Applicant will incorporate the latest good practices for battery storage safety, failure detection and prevention, along with the emergency response planning, as guidance continues to develop in the UK and internationally. ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 - Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] presents an assessment on food production and the rural economy. The Applicant does not consider that food security will be compromised by the Scheme (or solar energy more widely), particularly in the context that the amount of land within the Order Limits is approximately 0.22% of the land within Norfolk, and 1.2% of South Norfolk agricultural land. The UK Food Security Report concludes that food production levels could be maintained or moderately increased alongside the land use change required to meet net zero. The UK Solar Roadmap states that solar development is not considered to compromise food security, and that climate change itself poses the greatest long-term risk to food production - a risk which the Scheme directly helps to address by providing a secure, low-carbon source of electricity.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				At Paragraph 2.10.21, NPS EN-3 states that <i>'While land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible'.</i>
KT-004	Landscape and visual	Landscape	Ms Thompson expressed concern that the development would affect everyone who drives, walks, or relies on our outdoor spaces for recreation or business. She added that she found each previous speaker's experience compelling.	A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043] . Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148] .
KT-005	Site selection and alternatives	Site selection & Legality & Issues with Macquarie Asset Management	Ms Thompson claimed that the proposals "break the law" because an NSIP is meant for critical national infrastructure that cannot be built any other way (like airports). Whilst she acknowledged the need for green energy, she stated that the proposed site is needed for agriculture	The Applicant does not agree that the Scheme is unlawful or that NSIPs are limited to infrastructure which cannot be delivered in any other way. The Planning Act 2008 and the National Policy Statements specifically identify nationally significant solar developments as a form of

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			and that they cannot grow crops on roads, houses, or rooftops, but suggested that the applicant could put solar panels there. She claimed that the applicant has not bothered to research the above alternatives. She claimed that this site has been chosen because Macquarie can extract the most profit there. She added that other countries which are better suited to solar do not allow solar farms to be built on farmland. She then questioned why representatives from Macquarie had not attended the hearing to hear from residents.	nationally significant infrastructure for which there is a recognised and urgent need. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of alternatives as set out in the Site Selection Assessment [APP-215] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 – Reasonable Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-041]. Whilst rooftop solar and other smaller-scale forms of solar generation are an important component of the energy mix, Government policy recognises that these are required in addition to, rather than instead of, large-scale ground-mounted solar schemes. The Applicant does not agree that the Site was selected simply to maximise profit. The location of The Scheme was informed by environmental, planning, technical and operational considerations, including grid connection requirements, as set out in the application documents. The Applicant further notes that examples from other countries are not determinative and that the Scheme should be assessed against the relevant UK planning and energy policy framework.

2.20 Ross Jolliffe

Table 2.20 Ross Jolliffe

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RJ-001	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment – white clawed crayfish	Mr Jolliffe lives on the banks of the River Tass in Saxlingham. He stated that in 2020 he discovered a rare breeding colony of white-clawed crayfish, an endangered and protected species. He spent 10 years providing advice to government on marine and freshwater environmental and fisheries management, so when he heard about the proposal he provided information on the crayfish in his Relevant Representation [PDA-078], he claimed that the applicant's evidence was inadequate and stated that over 90 Relevant Representations indicated crayfish presence. He clarified that whilst he discussed the crayfish specifically, his overarching concern is the watercourse, not just this particular species.	The Applicant notes the Examining Authority's (ExA) request, in the Rule 6 letter [PD-005]. The Applicant has provided an update on this at Procedural Deadline A within the Applicants Position on White Clawed Crayfish document [PDA-007]. If in the unlikely event that the species was recorded within watercourses within the Order Limits, adopted precautionary avoidance measures already mitigate impacts upon the species, and as a consequence the impact assessment conclusions would remain unchanged.
RJ-002	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment – white clawed crayfish	Mr Jolliffe stated that the applicant's position on white clawed crayfish is "compromised" because:	Hydrological connectivity of the Scheme to watercourses has been acknowledged and assessed within ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] and ES

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Water Environment		- the applicant now no longer relies upon their original desk study to indicate relevant crayfish absence; - the ecological assessment process must include mandates of the Water Framework Directive; - any development must not prevent the whole water body from ultimately achieving good environmental status; the connectivity of the watercourse means that a contamination or disease introduced in any part of the river catchment will flow downstream to its end.	Volume 1, Chapter 9 – Water Environment [APP-045]. Embedded mitigation for pollution management for all phases of the Scheme is set out and secured within the Outline CEMP [APP-196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198]. With the inclusion of this embedded mitigation, the impacts in relation to the water environment on water receptors has been assessed as 'Not Significant', with the exception of the cessation of agricultural use/fertiliser application which has been assessed as 'Significant Major Beneficial'. The Applicant notes the Examining Authority's (ExA) request, in the Rule 6 letter [PD-005]. The Applicant has provided an update on this at Procedural Deadline A within the Applicants Position on White Clawed Crayfish document [PDA-007]. If in the unlikely event that the species was recorded within watercourses within the Order Limits, adopted precautionary avoidance measures already mitigate impacts upon the species, and as a consequence the impact assessment conclusions would remain unchanged.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RJ-003	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment – white clawed crayfish & Ecology	Mr Jolliffe expressed that the proposed development does not achieve the requirements of the precautionary approach for ecology, which would require them to comprehensively prove that their activity will not cause unacceptable harm before it can proceed.	The Applicant notes the Examining Authority's (ExA) request, in the Rule 6 letter [PD-005]. The Applicant has provided an update on this at Procedural Deadline A within the Applicants Position on White Clawed Crayfish document [PDA-007]. If in the unlikely event that the species was recorded within watercourses within the Order Limits, adopted precautionary avoidance measures already mitigate impacts upon the species, and as a consequence the impact assessment conclusions would remain unchanged.

2.21 Dr Jonathan Newman

Table 2.21 Dr Jonathan Newman

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JN-001	Site selections and alternatives	Alternative energy solutions & Issues with Macquarie Asset Management	Dr Newman is Chair of Brooke Parish Council. He stated that solar panels are an old, inefficient technology for supporting the National Grid. He acknowledged that they can be beneficial for homeowners by allowing some independence from major electricity suppliers, but argued that by the end of its 60-year lifespan of the solar farm will be outdated. He added that alternative electricity supplies, such as modular reactors that Cllr. Catchpole discussed [KC-009], would be better and emphasised the use of British technology.	The Applicant does not agree that solar photovoltaic technology is outdated or inefficient. Solar power is identified in the National Policy Statements as an established, proven and cost-effective form of low-carbon electricity generation and forms a key component of the Government's Clean Power 2030 ambitions. The Applicant acknowledges that technology is likely to continue to evolve throughout the operational life of The Scheme. However, the assessment of the Scheme has been undertaken on the basis of the infrastructure proposed as part of the application. As with other forms of nationally significant infrastructure, future technological developments do not negate the current need for new electricity generation capacity. Furthermore, the Scheme includes a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), which would support the operation of the solar arrays by storing electricity when generation is abundant and releasing it to the grid when required. The Applicant therefore considers that the Scheme would make a useful

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				contribution to the security, resilience and decarbonisation of the electricity system throughout its operational lifetime. The Applicant notes that the future evolution of energy technologies does not alter the urgent need for additional low-carbon electricity generation identified within the National Policy Statements and the Government's Clean Power 2030 objectives. Whilst construction of a scheme of this nature does involve the use of imported materials and technologies, the Applicant will take measures to maximise benefits through the supply chain to local businesses. These measures are set out in the Outline ESSCS [APP-205] and include informing small businesses about contract and purchasing opportunities available from the Scheme and early engagement with potential contractors.
JN-002	Decommissioning and construction	Decommissioning & Issues with documents	Dr Newman expressed concern over decommissioning difficulties that lead to permanent damage, as discussed by earlier speakers. He claimed these are not adequately addressed in current documentation from the applicant.	The decommissioning of the Scheme has been assessed within the ES [APP-036 to APP-195] , with mitigation measures provided within the Outline DEMP [APP-198] . At the end of the Scheme's operational life, apart from the National Grid Substation and Grid Connection Infrastructure, the Scheme would be decommissioned and the land returned to the landowner

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JN-003	Soils and agriculture Lands	Food security & Compulsory acquisition	Dr Newman expressed concern that the development would result in permanent loss of food security and questioned the rationale of acquiring 1,100 hectares of South Norfolk by compulsory purchase.	The potential effect on food security is considered in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 – Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] at 15.8.108 and following paragraphs. The effect will be negligible, as set out in 15.8.130. The Applicant acknowledges the Respondent's concern. The Applicant is seeking to secure all land interests and rights required for the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement wherever possible. The compulsory acquisition powers sought in the DCO are intended to provide a backstop where voluntary agreement cannot be reached, ensuring that the land and rights required to deliver the Proposed Development can be secured. The Applicant will continue to seek voluntary agreements with affected landowners throughout the Examination.
JN-004	General remarks	Impacts on residents	Dr Newman listed that the proposals would impact the: • homes; • surroundings; • environment; • health; • wellbeing;	All topics chapters within the Environmental Statement consider the project as a whole, as defined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 – The Scheme [APP-040] . The in-combination effects between the significant effects identified in individual topic chapters are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 19 – In-

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			• safety; and • future • of the residents of Brooke.	Combination Effects Assessment [APP-055].
JN-005	Consultation and engagement	Issues with consultation	Dr Newman claimed that, despite being a statutory consultee, Brooke Parish Council have not received a formal invitation from the applicant. He stated that they have had to investigate the local impacts by themselves. He added that 'Block East Pye Solar' have been helpful in providing them with information. Dr Newman expressed disappointment about his experience of the formal consultation event held in Brooke Village Hall. He claimed there was a lack of clarity and that the documents were repetitive and confusing. He also expressed concern that there was a lack of adequate statutory consultation on the highway routes for AILs.	The Applicant considers that the consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. Brooke Parish Council was notified of all phases of consultation, and was identified as a host parish council within the core consultation zone as set out in the Consultation Report [APP-024]. The Applicant's Community Relations team has also been available to assist members of the public via a series of free-to-use communication channels (phone, post and email). These channels were publicised through newspaper adverts and press release, on the Applicant's website, in consultation materials and on-site notices. At the Applicant's consultation event held in Brooke Village Hall, a broad range of Scheme team members were present to

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				discuss technical details and help members of the community understand complex material, including EIA specialists and Island Green Power (IGP) representatives. Where questions could not be answered on the day, attendees were invited to leave their contact details, and the Applicant followed up after the event to provide the requested information. This approach was designed to ensure all queries received an informed response, even if not immediately available at the event. In determining how to consult on the localised changes the Applicant had regard to paragraphs 020 of the Planning Act 2008: Pre-application guidance for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, which sets out: <i>“For any material change to a part of the proposed application where a project as a whole is not fundamentally changed... a bespoke and targeted approach to further consultation can be adopted, which can address the specific consultation obligations arising proportionately.</i>

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<i>"Targeted consultation can be statutory or non-statutory, or a combination of the two depending on whether new persons needing to be consulted under section 42 of the Planning Act have been identified, but such targeted consultation will not require the production of PEI provided proportionate and appropriate information on environmental implication of any changes, where necessary, is provided."</i> In line with this guidance and the Applicant's commitments set out in the published SoCC, the approach taken for the targeted consultation and in relation to additional changes required for AIL movements, was considered to be proportionate, given the scale and nature of each of the localised changes. A full re-consultation (in line with consultation under Section 47 and section 48 at Statutory Consultation) was therefore not proposed.
JN-006	Arboriculture	Environment - hedges	Dr Newman stated that following the lack of consultation, ancient hedges have already been removed from Site 9.	The Applicant does not have control over actions undertaken independently by individual landowners. Any such activities would fall under the relevant environmental and planning legislation and enforced, where

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				appropriate, by the competent regulatory authorities.
JN-007	Human health	Physical and mental health	Dr Newman emphasised his concern for resident's physical and mental health, particularly: • their ability to sleep; • their freedom from anxiety; and • their confidence that they can continue living peacefully in their own homes.	The Applicant recognises the concerns raised regarding sleep disturbance, anxiety and residents' ability to continue enjoying their homes and local environment. Potential effects on wellbeing associated with environmental change, disturbance, perceived risk, landscape and visual effects, noise, access and recreation have been considered within the ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. The Human Health Summary Statement acknowledges that large-scale infrastructure projects can affect mental wellbeing through pathways including uncertainty, disruption and concern about potential risks. The Human Health Summary Statement also considers potential health effects associated with noise. Operational noise has been assessed on a conservative worst-case basis and, with mitigation in place, residual operational noise effects are assessed as not significant. The assessment concludes that the Scheme is not expected to give rise to significant noise or vibration effects on

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				human health. However, the Applicant recognises that Scheme-generated noise is not the only pathway through which disturbance, sleep disruption or effects on wellbeing may occur. These matters will be considered separately and qualitatively within the Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum, alongside the findings of the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment. Overall, the Human Health Summary Statement concludes that the Scheme would not result in any likely significant adverse effects on population and human health during construction, operation or decommissioning. The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Addendum supports the conclusions of the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment, finding that the Scheme is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing at population or identified vulnerable-group level. Its findings will be reported and considered as part of the Examination and, where appropriate, may inform additional mitigation, monitoring and engagement commitments.
JN-008	Electromagnetic fields	Radiation	Dr Newman questioned the specific impacts of electromagnetic radiation on residents living within the recommended World Health Organisation 1,500-metre buffer zone for solar panels and substations and transformers, particularly on people with EMF-susceptible epilepsy.	An assessment of Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) pertaining to human health is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 17 - Electromagnetic Fields [APP-053] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.1 – High Level Electromagnetic Field Assessment [APP-188]. While the evidence indicates that no significant adverse human health effects are expected, mitigation measures for EMF are set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline OEMP [APP-197]. Electric fields are contained within the cable's protective insulation and sheath; therefore, no external electric fields are expected to occur due to the underground cables.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The maximum levels of electromagnetic radiation during construction, operation and decommissioning phases will be below International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection reference levels.
JN-009	General remarks	General issues with the development	Dr Newman stated that residents are worried about the: • years of disruption; • loss of countryside; and • increased traffic.	All topics chapters within the Environmental Statement consider the project as a whole, as defined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 – The Scheme [APP-040] . The in-combination effects between the significant effects identified in individual topic chapters are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 19 – In-Combination Effects Assessment [APP-055] .
JN-010	Ecology and biodiversity	Environment - bats	Dr Newman agreed with Dr Berry's assessment of barbastelle bats [ANB-001] and expressed concern about the lack of detail about this species in the applicant's documentation.	ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6 - Bat Activity Survey Report [APP-157] have acknowledged the presence of Barbastelle bat maternity colonies locally and also referenced material detailing the Core Sustenance Zones (CSZ's) of these colonies, clearly stating that the Order Limits occupy land within these CSZ's. As a precautionary measure, the embedded design principles adopted and detailed within the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213] include for a minimum of 30m buffer of all ancient

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				woodlands immediately adjacent to the Order Limits. Habitat creation will be undertaken within these buffers. These measures will reduce the current baseline disturbance events associated with agricultural practices (currently right up to the woodland edges), and provide enhanced supporting habitats surrounding woodland parcels for the benefit of Barbastelle bats (if present), thereby contributing towards the species favourable conservation status.

2.22 Tracey Scarsbrook

Table 2.22 Tracey Scarsbrook

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TS-001	Socioeconomics Landscape and visual	Financial risks & Tourism & Landscape	Ms Scarsbrook owns Hunters Lodge, a small rural holiday let business located on Frith Way in Great Moulton. She stated that her home, business and livelihood are “a stone’s throw away from” the heavy industrial core of the proposed development. She said that the South Norfolk visitor economy is a crucial socioeconomic asset, generating 146 million in direct annual spend, and supporting thousands of local jobs. She stated that her guests come to enjoy the landscape, tranquillity, and night skies, and to escape from urban industrialisation. She claimed that the development would compromise this and put tourism at risk. She added that no compensation has been offered.	ES Volume 1, Chapter 14 – Socio-Economics [APP-050] provides an assessment on local tourism assets. The sensitivity of the tourism industry receptor is assessed as Medium, reflecting that the share of South Norfolk’s employment in tourism is comparable to the regional level. No significant effect has been identified based on: • There being no known tourist assets within the Order Limits with the exception of a limited area of the Pulham Patch activity farm, for which any losses incurred by will be addressed through an agreed compensation arrangement; and • The potential for disruption during construction, but the countervailing potential for additional expenditure by the workforce to benefit the tourism industry.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant does not therefore consider that there will be significant adverse effects on the local tourism industry. Hunters Lodge is located north of High Green, the principal linear settlement within Great Moulton. The view towards the Scheme is largely obscured by other settlement and the existing vegetation. ES Volume 2, Figure 7.5 -Site 1 ZTV [APP-079] indicates limited visibility of the Scheme within Site 1 from Hunters Lodge, with the exception of the proposed pylons. However, the property already has views of existing pylons within the landscape. Therefore, the introduction of the proposed pylons is not considered likely to result in a significant change to either landscape tranquillity or visual amenity, and significant effects are therefore not anticipated. Landscape and visual effects of the Scheme, include tranquillity is assessed I in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. Further, a visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149] and on residential properties in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8 [APP-148].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TS-002	Landscape and visual	Visual effects	Ms Scarsbrook described the development as an industrial zone, and listed the: • national grid; • battery energy storage system; • 11-foot high metal battery blocks; • 50-foot high electrical substations; • security fencing; and • intrusive 360-degree CCTV masts to support her description.	The applicant note the sentiment towards the Scheme. ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043] presents an assessment of the likely effects Scheme and includes considerations of the worst-case scheme parameters including the BESS, Project Substations and the National Grid Substation. The Applicant acknowledges that the introduction of energy infrastructure would result in a change in land use and that key characteristics of Site 1, the BESS Site at a local level and the district character of LCA E2 would be altered. These effects have been transparently assessed and reported within the LVIA, including the identification of significant effects where appropriate. The Applicant would like to point out that the maximum development envelope of the National Grid substation represents a worst-case assessment parameter. In reality, the development would comprise a range of electrical infrastructure elements within the substation compound, with a maximum height of 15m, and would be viewed in the context of existing transmission infrastructure within the area.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The presence of energy generation and transmission infrastructure does not necessarily equate to the creation of an industrial landscape. Furthermore, Site 1 is located adjacent to a railway line and rural road network, energy infrastructure is already present as existing 400KV OHL and its pylon towers are located within Site 1, the Scheme would be experienced within this existing context. The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of siting infrastructure. The design evolution of the Scheme in respect of landscape and visual context is set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032] . Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] , respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032] .
TS-003	Noise and vibration Lighting	Noise and light pollution	Ms Scarsbrook stated that the operational layout of the introduces 24/7 acoustic and light pollution and used the BESS facility's cooling fans and chillers as examples that would emit a permanent low-frequency hum. She stated that the applicant cannot mitigate these impacts.	The Applicant has provided a response to noise concerns at Hunters Lodge in SOC-026 within The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 5: By Theme [EXAM/8.10]. <u>Lighting</u> Lighting will only be operational when the Site is occupied, Luminaires with zero upward light ratio (ULR) will be used to ensure light does not spill into the night sky. The luminaires will be orientated so that they are pointing towards the compounds and away from any boundaries. Shields will be utilised to further minimise light spill if required.
TS-004	Battery safety	Hazard & Financial risk	Ms Scarsbrook claimed that the risk of lithium battery fires would scare off potential guests from her business. She also expressed concern for her business' digital reputation.	The safety objectives for the design of the Applicant's BESS site are listed in Section 1.4 of the Outline BSMP [APP-200]. Section 1.4.2 of the Outline BSMP [APP-200] stipulates: "<i>Final BESS design and site layout will have been validated through mandatory</i>

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<i>Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT must establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or ESS equipment. NFRS intervention in worst case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and Energy Storage System (ESS) units to prevent the fire from spreading. This strategy will be finalised with NFRS and be clearly communicated in the Emergency Response Plan (ERP);</i> <i>• To ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases does not significantly impact site operatives, first responders, and the local community; and</i> <i>• To ensure that firewater run-off is contained and tested before release or, if necessary, removed by tanker and treated offsite."</i> A plume study has been undertaken as presented in Appendix B of the Outline BSMP [APP-200]. The Plume Study demonstrated that there were no significant impacts on any

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				sensitive residential receptor location with 1km of the BESS compound in the event of a BESS fire. A risk assessment of the potential impact on visibility has also been undertaken for nearby road and rail. The predicted visibility distances in the event of a BESS fire are greater than the safe stopping distances for roads and rail. The Outline BSMP [APP-200] includes mitigation measures, including the preparation of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) at detailed design stage that will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. The ERP could also contain measures such as notification of potentially affected residents and temporary closure of PRow. By way of a Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [AS-032] prior to the commencement of construction of the BESS, the Applicant will require a BSMP to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority that must consult with the with Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service and the EA. As part of preparation of the detailed BSMP, the Applicant will incorporate the latest good practices for battery storage safety, failure detection and prevention, along with the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				emergency response planning, as guidance continues to develop in the UK and internationally.
TS-005	Socioeconomics	Financial risk & Tourism & Hospitality	Ms Scarsbrook stated that the proposal itself has caused properties to remain unsold. She expressed fear that if the development went ahead then local tourism and hospitality businesses would face operational failure.	The Applicant's Book of Reference [APP-022] includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the DCO is granted and the Scheme developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Scheme, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views. This is consistent with established planning law. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.

2.23 Tara Gillam

Table 2.23 Tara Gillam

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TG-001	Transport and access	Access	Ms Gillam agrees with Mr Fry's concerns about the narrowness of the road on Church Hill. She added that she thinks the pavement there would be impacted by the scheme and pointed out that this pavement used by children to access the primary school.	The Applicant has provided a detailed response on this issue in Q1.8.3 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Initial Questions [EXAM/9.2] .
TG-002	Cumulative and in-combination impacts Soils and agriculture	Cumulative effects & BMV land	Ms Gillam agreed with other speakers about the cumulative impact on South Norfolk of this scheme and others, and the use of BMV land.	The Applicant is aware of other projects in the region. The ES [APP-042 to 054] presents an assessment of the cumulative effects of multiple existing and/or approved developments generating cumulative effects which together have an increased effect on the receptors presented in the ES. A comprehensive Cumulative and In Combination Effects Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with Planning Inspectorate guidance, as detailed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology [APP-038]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.4 -Cumulative Schemes [APP-116] details the cumulative schemes considered within the ES. Each topic chapter within the ES [APP-042 – APP-054]

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				sets out how the particular topic area has considered and assessed the cumulative effects arising as a result of other existing or Scheme. A summary of all cumulative effects is provided within Table 20.4 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 20 - Summary of Residual Significant Effects [APP-056]. The cumulative effects are considered in ES Volume 1, Chapter 15 - Soils and Agricultural Land [APP-051] at section 15.11 and have the potential to result in the loss of more than 20ha of BMV, which would be significant in EIA terms, and will need to be considered in the overall planning balance.
TG-003	Transport and access	Public rights of way & Leisure	Ms Gillam expressed concern about the impact of the development on people using the footpaths, particularly in areas 7B, C, D, E, F, and G. She stated that this area includes a landscape that quite rare in South Norfolk. She explained that land is undulating, green, wooded, beautiful and accessible to the public. She claimed that it attracts local people and visitors. She also claimed that much of the rest of South Norfolk is either less visually interesting or less accessible to the public.	The interaction between the Scheme and the PRow network has been assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 -Transport and Access [APP-047] and the Outline PRowPMP [APP-203]. The assessment considered the effects of construction traffic, temporary PRow closures, diversions and managed crossings on users of the PRow network. The Applicant acknowledges the importance of the local PRow network for both recreation and connectivity. Where temporary impacts on PRows are required during construction, appropriate management and mitigation

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			She added that Norfolk already has about half the public right of way density per kilometre than the country as a whole. She suggested that this means the impact on leisure amenity and the rural character of the area from this proposed scheme extends beyond the nearest villages to the whole of South Norfolk.	measures are proposed, including signage, alternative routes where necessary, traffic marshal support, reduced vehicle speeds in areas where construction traffic interacts with PRow users, and advance notification of closures. No permanent closures of PRowS are proposed as part of the Scheme. Any PRowS temporarily affected during construction will be reinstated and reopened following completion of the relevant works. The assessment adopts a reasonable worst case scenario, assuming all construction activities occur simultaneously. In practice, construction activities will be staggered across the programme, reducing the extend of concurrent effects on the PRow network. The assessment concludes that, with the proposed mitigation in place, effects on PRow users would not be significant.
TG-004	Landscape and visual	Screening	Ms Gillam disagrees with 'The Ramblers' and explained that screening would be inappropriate because it is the open views that provide a visually interesting landscape for walkers and riders. She said that the screening would prevent the amenity from being	The Applicant has considered the potential effects of the proposed landscape mitigation on the open landscape character, and these effects have been transparently assessed and reported within ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043].

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			used but that people would not be able to find an alternative. The ExA requested that she submit examples of walks in her written submissions.	

2.24 Melanie Barrow

Table 2.24 Melanie Barrow

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MB-001	Socio-economics	Neurodiversity	Ms Barrow lives in Great Moulton and expressed concern for elderly, disabled and mentally ill residents, but placed particular emphasis on the impact the development would have on neurodiverse people. She explained that people with autism would be more adversely affected by the construction noise and the low hum emitted from the substation once built. She added that some people would be unable to get away from the noise if they are at home all the time. She added that she was shocked that no mitigation had been suggested by the applicant, even though they acknowledged that neurodivergent people are significantly more uniquely sensitive to specific effects of noise and vibration in both the Noise and Vibration section of their response [APP-048] and the Equality Impact Assessment [AP214]. She claimed that the impact would happen in two phases:	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of construction and operational noise on neurodivergent people, including autistic people and those with sensory sensitivities. The Applicant recognises that some individuals may be more sensitive to environmental noise and change than the general population. This was considered within the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-214], which identifies neurodivergent people as a group that may experience differential effects from noise, vibration, changes to access and environmental change. Potential effects associated with construction and operational noise have been assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [APP-048] and within the Human Health Summary Statement in ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. Construction noise would be temporary and would be managed through embedded mitigation measures, including

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			- the violent, unpredictable construction noise would trigger distress to a lot of people; and - the long-term operational hum could cause permanent sleep deprivation. She added that even if neurodivergent people closed their windows to avoid the noise impact, they cannot regulate their body temperatures properly and may overheat. She also stated that the applicant's environmental noise data relies entirely on a neurotypical average and fails to assess the acoustic environment that would be acceptable to someone who is neurodivergent.	silenced plant and equipment, acoustic enclosures, temporary screening, construction controls and working hour restrictions. Operational noise from the BESS, substations and associated infrastructure has been assessed on a worst-case basis. Additional mitigation, including low-noise equipment selection, acoustic enclosures and noise barriers where required, is secured through the Outline OEMP [APP-197] and the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213]. With mitigation in place, residual operational noise effects are assessed as negligible or minor adverse and not significant. Low-frequency noise from substations and the BESS was also assessed and was found to remain below the relevant assessment criteria. The Equality Impact Assessment acknowledges that neurodivergent people may experience environmental change differently and that individual responses to noise may vary. However, taking account of the proposed mitigation, the assessment concluded that significant negative equality impacts are unlikely at a population level.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MB-002	DCO Process	Planning process	Ms Barrow expressed concern over how complicated this process has been and added the example that she was late to the meeting because she had been provided with the incorrect link to the hearing.	The Applicant notes this comment.
MB-003	Decommissioning and disruption	Construction	Ms Barrow pointed out that in extreme heat residents would open their windows and this could cause dust disruption from construction inside people's homes.	Measures to mitigate construction dust in accordance with Institute of Air Quality Management guidance have been identified in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1 - Construction and Decommissioning Dust Risk Assessment [APP-156] and have been incorporated into the Outline CEMP [APP-183] . The Outline CEMP [APP-183] is secured by the Draft DCO [AS-032] and includes the implementation of a Dust Management Plan to be approved by the local authority.
MB-004	Socioeconomics	Housing market	Ms Barrow claimed that the development would cause socioeconomic deprivation because houses will not sell and people will feel trapped. She agreed with similar statements made by previous speakers.	In relation to property value and the potential impact of the Scheme, the Applicant refers to its responses at SOC-001 as set out in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 5 – By Theme [PDA-012] .

2.25 Jack Lowe

Table 2.25 Jack Lowe

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JL-001	DCO Process	Democracy	Mr Lowe lives in Wacton. He pointed out that to attend the hearing he had to take time off work. He suggested that an evening session in the future is possibly better for the diversity of democracy. He agrees with the earlier speakers from OFH1 and OFH2.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Examination timetable is a matter for the Examining Authority.
JL-002	Water environment	Water courses	Mr Lowe has an MSC in water security and has helped to write water policy. He expressed concern that East Pye Solar would be "cataclysmic" for rural water courses.	ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] has been developed based on the requirements of the NPPF, which requires that development can have no detrimental impact on flood risk to third parties. The development will not impact on the pattern or quantity of runoff arising from the site. The mitigation measures set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] and secured through the Outline CEMP [APP-196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] demonstrate there will be no detrimental impact in water quality, and the scheme will not impact on water

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				quantity as it will mimic existing natural drainage arrangements.
JL-003	Socioeconomics	Community Impacts	Mr Lowe expressed concern that East Pye Solar threatens: • population levels; • short-term employment; and • the destruction of community and psychogeography, • and claims that its legacy will be 'the culture of old-fashioned green venture capitalism'. He also expressed concern that community grant funds could cause more cultural damage.	The estimated number of jobs, and the education, skills, training and supply chain opportunities created by the Scheme are identified in ES Volume 1, Chapter 14 – Socio-Economics [APP-050], which is based on standard best practice. Impacts are summarised in Table 14.28. In the Construction Phase it identifies: • Major Beneficial (Significant) effect on Jobs, Employment and Supply Chain (workplace-based) in South Norfolk. This reflects the scale of employment relative to the construction sector in the area. • Minor Beneficial (Not Significant) effects on Jobs, Employment and Supply Chain (workplace-based) in Norfolk and the East of England. • Negligible (Not Significant) effects on Jobs, Employment and Supply Chain (resident-based) in all geographies considered. • Moderate Beneficial (Significant) effects on Skills and the Labour

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Market. This is due to the sensitivity of the skills receptor (Table 14.4). In the Operation and Maintenance Phase it identifies: • Minor Beneficial (Not Significant) effect on Jobs, Employment and the Supply Chain. This reflects the small level of operational employment generated. • Moderate Beneficial (Significant) effects on Skills and the Labour Market, consistent with the Construction Phase. Therefore, over a 24-month Construction Phase some short-term employment will be generated, but this is not significant in relation to the size of the existing resident workforce. Whilst it will be significant in relation to the current workplace-based construction employment in South Norfolk, this largely reflects employment of people from elsewhere in the region and country (see Table 14.22); whilst some of these are expected to temporarily relocate to South Norfolk, this impact would not be significant in relation to the current resident population.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The employment impacts during the Scheme's operation will be smaller. There will, however, be positive and significant impacts on Skills and the Labour Market through the provision of opportunities for upskilling and training. The Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Strategy [APP-205] sets out how the benefits can be maximised for local residents. The Scheme could therefore support improved labour market outcomes for residents in the longer term.
JL-004	DCO process	Transparency	Mr Lowe claimed that none of the negatives that have been discussed are being countered with positive arguments in favour of the development at a local or national level.	The need for the Scheme is set out within the Statement of Need [APP-206]. The benefits of the Scheme are set out within Section 5 of the Planning Statement [APP-209]. At a national level, the Scheme will make a significant contribution to meeting the urgent need for low carbon electricity generation and the Government's legally binding net zero and energy security objectives At a local level, as part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005], landscaping features would be enhanced through strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree, woodland and wildflower or species rich mix grassland, together with the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				restoration of ghost ponds, where practicable. Skylark mitigation plots would also be provided. This would collectively strengthen habitat connectivity at a landscape scale and positively contribute to local green infrastructure. The Scheme has the potential to deliver significant beneficial effects including a potential net gain of 37.42% for habitats, a net gain of 31.35% for hedgerows and 16.08% for watercourses. In total, approximately 850m of permissive paths would be created within the Order Limits for the lifetime of the Scheme for pedestrian use to improve accessibility. These permissive paths, which would connect to existing PRow, would collectively help to strengthen the network of greenways and active connections within the landscape. The Scheme would include the provision of new community accessible spaces for pedestrian use in Sub-Site 4B and Sub-Site 7F. During the construction phase, it has been estimated that 360 net direct jobs and 684 net indirect and induced jobs would be created during the construction phase, totalling 1,044 net additional jobs. The Scheme is estimated

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				to generate £137m in Gross Value Added over the construction phase. Approximately 120 net direct jobs are estimated during the operational phase based on the peak replacement scenario. The Scheme is likely to produce a number of skills and education opportunities, including apprenticeships and targeted outreach.
JL-005	Developer	Issues with Macquarie Asset Management & Community	Mr Lowe questioned whether £1 billion led by an Australian-based company could be described as smart UK energy security. He acknowledged the importance of green energy. He then claimed that this project has been put forward because solar is the most profitable for shareholders and because it is easy to get through the planning system. He claimed that the process is dominating his community, eroding wellbeing, and preying on vulnerable people. He supported this by saying people are moving out of the area following this proposal.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Notwithstanding, the Application has demonstrated the Scheme's compliance with all statutory requirements under the Planning Act 2008 and applicable legislation such as The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Applicant is subject to legally binding DCO Requirements. The Planning Act 2008 also contains enforcement provisions regarding compliance with the terms of a DCO. The Applicant has a strong track record of developing NSIP scale projects, notably the consented Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, alongside a strong pipeline of further applications coming forward.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant confirms that the owners of Island Green Power, Macquarie, has a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs. The Funding Statement [APP-021] provides details of the corporate structure of the Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, and how the Scheme is being funded. The Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, is a 100% subsidiary of IGP UK Projects Limited. Both are registered in England and Wales and subject to UK tax law and regulations. Investment may come from a range of sources, including international ones. This is common practice with UK infrastructure schemes and helps fund the transition to clean energy at the scale required. The Applicant welcomes the interested party's statement on the importance of green energy. The Applicant has prepared a Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum [EN0110014/EXAM/9.27] in response to matters raised during the Examination. The Addendum provides further consideration of pathways including perceived environmental

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				change, place attachment, access to nature, social participation and cumulative wellbeing effects. The Addendum supplements, rather than replaces, the Human Health Summary Statement and Equality Impact Assessment.

2.26 Anne Ginsdale

Table 2.26 Anne Ginsdale

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AD-001	Landscape and visual	Landscape & Environment	Ms Dinsdale expressed concern about the future of her grandchildren and others who were unable to attend the hearing. She lives at the end of Market Lane in Shotts, and she often goes for walks with her grandchildren around the fields where Site 8 is proposed. She claimed her grandchildren are knowledgeable about the nature in the area and that they do not want to see their landscape “spoiled”.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern. With regard to design evolution, the Applicant draws attention to the fact that the design of the Scheme, including Site 8, has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of the siting of infrastructure, as set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. Specific design responses relevant to Site 8 include the exclusion of solar PV panel development within Sub-Site 8A and 8B in proximity to residential properties on Market Lane and Wash Lane and from Shotesham, and Ancient Woodland. Furthermore, a circa 20m offset of solar PV panel development within Site 8A and 8B when in proximity to PRowS, namely Shotesham FP19 and FP22, to reduce proximity of development, allow for sufficient space for landscape mitigation planting, and reduce potential effects to visual amenity for users of these routes. Landscape and visual mitigation measures for Site 8 are set out within the Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] and

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Outline LEMP) [APP-199] , which include the strengthening and reinforcing of existing hedgerows (infill planting, laying and coppicing) together with new tree and woodland planting to provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape measures during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through Requirement 7 in the Draft DCO [AS-032] .
AD-002	Transport and access	Traffic	Ms Dinsdale stated that her grandchildren do not want the lanes they use to be used by HGV vehicles and AILs.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the use of local roads by HGVs and Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs). The management of construction traffic and AIL movements is set out within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-201] .
AD-003	Site selection and alternatives	Site selection	Ms Dinsdale suggested that more suitable places for solar panels would be: • industrial roof spaces; • car parks for supermarkets, like they have in France; • agricultural buildings; • the roofs of new houses; and	As set out in the Statement of Need [APP-206] , while rooftop and smaller-scale solar installations are an important part of the energy mix, they cannot alone meet the scale of capacity required to achieve clean power and net zero objectives. Large-scale ground-mounted solar therefore remains necessary in addition to, not instead of, rooftop solar.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			• other roofs. She stated that she is in favour of solar and even has solar panels on her house but that she objects to this proposal.	
AD-004	Developer	Issues with Macquarie Asset Management	Ms Dinsdale objects to an Australian company making profit for investors at the expense of local residents.	The Applicant acknowledges the comment. Notwithstanding, the Application has demonstrated the Scheme's compliance with all statutory requirements under the Planning Act 2008 and applicable legislation such as The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Applicant is subject to legally binding DCO Requirements. The Planning Act 2008 also contains enforcement provisions regarding compliance with the terms of a DCO. The Applicant has a strong track record of developing NSIP scale projects, notably the consented Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, alongside a strong pipeline of further applications coming forward. The Applicant confirms that the owners of Island Green Power, Macquarie, has a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs.

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Funding Statement [APP-021] provides details of the corporate structure of the Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, and how the Scheme is being funded. The Applicant, East Pye Solar Limited, is a 100% subsidiary of IGP UK Projects Limited. Both are registered in England and Wales and subject to UK tax law and regulations. Investment may come from a range of sources, including international ones. This is common practice with UK infrastructure schemes and helps fund the transition to clean energy at the scale required.

2.27 Sandra Mullett

Table 2.27 Sandra Mullett

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SM-001	General remarks	General opposition to the development	Ms Mullett is from Great Moulton and agreed with the points Tracey Scarsbrook mentioned.	No response required.
SM-002	Cultural heritage	Cultural heritage	Ms Mullett stated that Great Moulton was settled in the Saxon times, dates back to the Domesday Book, and is one of the oldest villages in the area. She added that even now the village is a rural farming community.	The Applicant refers to its response to Ms Mullett's relevant representation [RR-1720] in The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations -Part 5 [PDA-012] under comment ID CUL-001.
SM-003	Ecology and biodiversity	Ecology	Ms Mullett said that Great Moulton is home to 24 birds of the red list.	An assessment of breeding birds is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] . With the exception of skylarks, it was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate (ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2 – EIA Scoping Opinion [APP-114]) to scope out impacts on breeding birds during the operational of the Scheme. Measures to avoid impacts on skylark and other ground nesting birds are included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.10 - Outline Protected Species Mitigation Strategy [APP-161] and consideration of breeding birds in the long-term management of the green infrastructure of the Scheme is included in the Outline LEMP [APP-

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				199] . In accordance with these, a Protected Species Mitigation Strategy and a detailed LEMP will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in line with Requirement 8 and Requirement 7, respectively, of the Draft DCO [AS-032] .
SM-004	Landscape and visual Human health	Landscape & Wellbeing	Ms Mullet stated that the landscape brings tranquillity, peace and calm, and creates a sense of wellbeing.	The Applicant note the value of Landscape. A detailed landscape and visual assessment is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043]. The Applicant recognises the concerns raised regarding the contribution that the local environment makes to wellbeing, including feelings of tranquillity, peace and calm. Potential effects on wellbeing associated with environmental change, landscape character, visual amenity and connection to nature have been considered within the ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]. The health assessment considers the magnitude and duration of the change, the number and sensitivity of people affected, the availability of alternative recreational opportunities and the proposed landscape mitigation. On the basis of those factors, it does not identify a likely significant population-level health effect through this pathway. This does

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				not mean that no individual would perceive the change adversely.
SM-005	Site selection and alternatives Consultation and engagement	Planning principles & Site selection & Issues with consultation	Ms Mullet pointed out that Great Moulton was not part of the original scheme. She claimed that if the Horlock rules had been followed, the site would have been deemed unsuitable. She also expressed concern about the applicant's use of the Rochdale Envelope. She claimed that too much detail is being left unclear or undecided. She suggested that this has led to residents lacking understanding about the project.	The Applicant can clarify that Sub-Site 1B / the Great Moulton area has consistently formed part of the Scheme since it was identified as suitable Point of Connection against the criteria set out within the Site Selection Assessment [APP-215]. Please refer to the response to ISH Action Point 1 on the site selection process for the National Grid Substation (Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions and Responses at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Response to Action Points [EN0110014/EXMA/9.17]). Two site options were considered in the EIA Scoping Report and the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) for the proposed new National Grid Substation comprising a site to the North of Site 1 (south of Great Moulton); and a site to the South of Site 1 adjacent to the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS); and East Pye Substation. Both options therefore sat within Site 1 in the Great Moulton area, meaning infrastructure has always been proposed within this location.
SM-006			Ms Mullet stated that a consultation meeting is not the same as standing by the impacted homes. She said that the	To assist Interested Parties in understanding the relationship between the proposed infrastructure and nearby receptors, the

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			invitation for the applicant to visit Great Moulton was declined. She requested that residents receive one clear and easy-to-read plan showing how close the National Grid point of connection and associated infrastructure would actually come to the nearest homes and to Narrowgate Way.	Applicant submitted at Deadline 1 a plan identifying buffer distances around the principal infrastructure elements – Indicative Masterplan with Buffers from proposed Infrastructure [EN0110014/EXAM/9.25]. This enables residents to estimate the distance between the proposed work areas and their properties.
SM-007	General remarks	Lifestyle	Ms Mullet stated that the residents have chosen a rural way of life that values peace, countryside, and the character of the area. She emphasised that they had not chosen to live beside major energy infrastructure.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Scheme has been designed through an iterative, environmentally-led process that has sought to respond sensitively to the landscape character and the setting of surrounding villages and residential properties, as set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-174]
SM-008	Landscape and visual	Landscape & General opposition to the development	Ms Mullet questioned whether it was at all acceptable to allow permanent industrial development in this rural landscape at all. Then she objected to the development in full.	The Applicant note the comment. ES Volume 1, Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual [APP-043] presents an assessment of the likely effects Scheme and includes considerations of the worst-case scheme parameters including the BESS, Project Substations and the National Grid Substation. The Applicant acknowledges that the introduction of energy infrastructure would result in a change in land use and that key characteristics of Site 1, the BESS Site at a local level and the district character of LCA E2

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				would be altered. These effects have been transparently assessed and reported within the LVIA, including the identification of significant effects where appropriate. The design of the Scheme has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded into the design principles and design evolution of siting infrastructure. The design evolution of the Scheme in respect of landscape and visual context is set out in the Design Approach Document [APP-212]. A Green Infrastructure Strategy [AS-005] has been developed which includes strengthening/reinforcing existing hedgerows (infill planting/laying coppicing) and new tree and woodland planting. Such measures would provide visual screening and landscape integration. The proposed implementation, management and monitoring of the landscape during construction and operation of the Scheme is secured in the Outline LEMP [APP-199] through a Requirement in the Draft DCO [AS-032]. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are secured in the Outline CEMP [APP-196] and Outline

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				DEMP [APP-198], respectively via the Draft DCO [AS-032]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would introduce changes to the landscape character and views. It is considered by the Applicant for the reasons set out in the Planning Statement [APP-209] that the residual adverse landscape and visual effects are demonstrably outweighed by the Scheme's benefits and needs case.

2.28 Keith Stubbings

Table 2.28 Keith Stubbings

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
KS-001	Landscape and visual	Visual amenity	Mr Stubbings is co-chairman of 'Block East Pye Solar' but spoke as an individual. He expressed concern about residential visual amenity, particularly the applicant's decision to stop the detailed assessment [APP-043] at 100 meters. He stated that the study area starts at 500 metres and identifies 250-metre, 150-metre, and 100 metre distances, but that in practice, only two properties within 100 metres have been individually assessed. He then said the applicant concluded that no further detailed assessment is needed beyond 100 meters. He claimed that this was unacceptable and that the impact needed to be properly assessed, pointing out that factors like position, elevation and orientation would have an impact when assessing a development of this scale.	The Applicant would like to clarify that Chapter 7 Landscape & Visual [APP-043] stop the assessment at 100m. The LVIA has visual receptors up to 5km away from the Scheme. The RVAA [APP-148] has been undertaken in accordance with the Landscape Institute's Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) Technical Guidance Note 2/19 (2019). The Applicant's RVAA adopted a 100m study area from the Scheme element parameters, reflecting the proximity within which visually overbearing, overwhelming or oppressive effects are most likely to occur. The properties referred to above fall outside this study area and were therefore scoped out of the RVAA on the basis of distance. The Applicant has assessed 20 properties within 100m from the Scheme elements. Of that only 2 required detailed assessment. The assessment concluded that no residential properties within the defined study area would experience visual effects of such magnitude that they would become unattractive places in which to live. The absence of any effects meeting the RVAA threshold within the 100m

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				study area, where such effects would be most likely to occur, further demonstrates that the study area was appropriately defined and provides confidence that properties located at greater distances would not experience the visually overbearing, overwhelming or oppressive effects required to trigger an unacceptable impact on residential visual amenity. The purpose of an RVAA is not to identify all properties from which the development may be visible, nor to assess general visual effects experienced by residents. Rather, it is intended to determine whether the scale and proximity of a development would result in residential visual amenity being affected to such an extent that the property would become an unattractive place in which to live, through effects described as visually overbearing, overwhelming or oppressive.
KS-002	General remarks	Consistency	Mr Stubbings compared the applicant's detailed assessment [APP-043] to that of the Botley West examination where the examining authority proposed a 250-metre separation between the edge of the solar array and the residential curtilage. He acknowledged that Botley West is not binding on this	Please refer to the response provided by the Applicant on this matter within ISH Action Point 22 of the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions and Responses at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Response to Action Points [EN0110014/EXAM/9.17] .

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			examination but then questioned why East Pye would be different.	

2.29 David Hook

Table 2.29 David Hook

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DH-001	General remarks	General	Mr Hook is from Hempnall Parish Council and he endorsed the comments made by Tara Gillam about the screening 'The Ramblers' proposed.	The Applicant notes this comment.

2.30 Alison Ray

Table 2.30 Alison Ray

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AR-001	Water environment	Water quality	Ms Ray is a member of 'Forncett Nature Matters', which is a local nature group. She expressed concern over importance on a large area of the South Norfolk community beyond the actual footprint of this scheme, explaining that the impact on the whole River Tas catchment is significant. She stated that lots of people have raised concerns about water quality and its impacts. She added that there are reports which itemise the impact of contamination from existing solar panel sites, on nature and soil quality. The ExA asked her to submit these reports with her written submission.	ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] has been developed based on the requirements of the NPPF, which requires that development can have no detrimental impact on flood risk to third parties. The development will not impact on the pattern or quantity of runoff arising from the site. The mitigation measures set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 - FRA and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [AS-018] and secured through the Outline CEMP [APP-196], Outline OEMP [APP-197] and Outline DEMP [APP-198] demonstrate there will be no detrimental impact in water quality, and the scheme will not impact on water quantity as it will mimic existing natural drainage arrangements.
AR-002	Transport and access	Footpath use & Wildlife access & Landscape	Ms Ray stated that the 3.5 and 4 metre high fencing that encloses footpaths would not just stop walkers, it would also prevent wildlife from being able to stray. She claimed that this is an	In relation to animal movement, minimum offset distances from key ecological features are secured through the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP-213], and habitat corridors across the farmed

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Ecology and biodiversity Landscape and visual		important factor for an area of open landscape, and raised particular concern for animals like the brown hare, which would be severely impacted by these restrictions.	landscape are reinforced. The perimeter fencing will allow the large majority of native fauna (including brown hare) to pass beneath (via gaps in the fencing) and freely utilise habitats within the Scheme. Green corridors are included in the Scheme, such as along ditches, hedgerows and their surrounding buffers, which allow for the movement of mammals. The Applicant has taken the approach to balance the extent of perimeter fencing in the landscape with these green corridors. The fences are located along the boundary of the panel area instead of against the public right of way, therefore the PRow will not be enclosed or boxed in. Parameters and Commitments [APP-213] sets out the minimum offset distances within the design for the PRow. A visual amenity assessment of Public Rights of Way is present in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9 [APP-149]

2.31 Robert Hazell

Table 2.31 Robert Hazell

ID	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RH-001	Transport and access	The footpath and green attached to the War Memorial	Mr Hazel asked for a clear and unequivocal answer as to what the applicant proposes to do with the footway attached to the memorial and potentially the green to get AILs past it. He questioned whether the foot path would be removed, narrowed, altered, overrun, or in any other way affected. He reminded the ExA that this foot way is a school pedestrian route with child safety implications to consider.	The Applicant has provided a detailed response on this issue in Q1.8.3 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [EXAM/9.2] .