



Comments on the East Pye Application for Deadline One

I would like to make the following points further to my contribution at Open Floor Hearing One. These are all areas which I feel need thorough consideration as part of the planning process.

Tibenham Airfield

I was asked to provide further information on take-off and landing concerns at Tibenham Airfield by deadline 1. I refer you to the submission from Norfolk Gliding Club which provides this information. I was first contacted by the Safeguarding Officer at the Norfolk Gliding Club based at Tibenham Airfield in June 2025. The club was concerned about the combined effect of the Norwich to Tilbury pylon route and two separate solar schemes on the safety of its members, if the schemes were to go ahead. I request that all safety information is considered with the utmost care.

Archaeology and Footpaths

According to the Domesday Book, Great Moulton had a church and a mill in 1086. Neolithic and prehistoric objects have been found here, as well as several Roman items. All Saints Church, Little Moulton, known as The Sanctuary, was a medieval church. A number of local footpaths would be affected by this application, from the old boundary marker, Hundred Lane, to the well-known Boudicca Way. These footpaths have existed for centuries and should be protected. A haul route across Hundred Way would irrevocably alter this footpath pattern.

Agricultural land

I have not found a comprehensive survey of the grade of agricultural land covered by the East Pye application. However, I understand that a larger proportion of it is grade 3 and above and I am concerned about the food security implications of this. In order for the Planning Inspectorate to make an informed decision, it will be necessary to consider this information.

BESS Siting and Safety

I understand that the site currently proposed for the BESS is grade 2 land. Land of this grade should normally be reserved for food production. Furthermore, this site is close to homes, water supplies and heritage assets, all of which may be negatively impacted by its proximity. The fear of a BESS fire would be alleviated if it were placed further away from residential buildings.

HGVs

Single track roads across the area cannot accommodate the HGVs and other large vehicles needed to create this solar installation. I note that Frith Way in Great Moulton has been added to the HGV routes. This single-track road cannot accommodate HGVs and other large vehicles. If changes are made to widen the road, these will be permanent and out of character with the landscape.

Deer and other wildlife

There are two concerns regarding deer in Norfolk and Suffolk and the cumulative impact of infrastructure projects. The first is that the habitat of large animals, such as Red Deer will be split into areas too small for the herd to remain healthy. The second is that smaller deer, such

as muntjac will be forced out of the countryside, into residents' gardens where they are likely to eat the plants they find.

Wildlife will be affected by noise and construction activity.

I urge the applicants for all large solar farms to consider evidence for the ecological outcomes that are achievable for solar farm schemes when they are planned, designed and managed with wildlife as a priority, such as the 12-year ecological monitoring report from Broxted Solar Farm:

<https://www.suffolkwildlifetrust.org/sites/default/files/2026-08/Broxted%20Solar%20Farm%20Report%202026%2C%20SWT%20Wilder%20Ecology.pdf>

Flooding

Parts of the area suggested for solar installations is liable to flood and the flood risk is likely to worsen in coming years. This risk to the solar panels themselves needs to be identified and taken into account.

Long term consequences of this application

East Pye Solar state, on their website: "The design life of East Pye Solar is expected to be approximately 60 years. Therefore, if consent is granted, the permission for it would be temporary. At the end of the period of consent, the land returns to agricultural use." **The questions for me is: "Is it possible for the land to return to agricultural use at the end of 60 years, or will it have been irreparably damaged and changed?"**

I repeat the concern I made in my oral statement that land may be permanently bought up by foreign investors with no interest in the community or food production, either on the open market or through compulsory purchase. This risk needs careful exploration.

Connection to the national grid is a challenge for a solar farm in this location. The connection is to the existing overhead line and there are questions around whether the existing line would be able to accept all the electricity created by a solar farm of this size. Without this assurance, this scheme would be redundant.

Furthermore, National Grid have informed me that the sites of any substations are not yet known, despite East Pye having chosen Site 1B as the location for a new National Grid substation. A substation would be permanent and would not be removed after 60 years. This is the first aspect of the scheme that would be permanent.

If the solar farm itself is decommissioned after 60 years, would it be possible, at that point to put the land back to agricultural use? Food security must be considered alongside energy security and it is important to understand whether any loss of agricultural land is temporary or permanent.

Effect on residents

I know that many local residents, some of whom are my constituents, have experienced stress and illness already, due to this application. It is vital that everyone involved in bringing applications for solar farms works with the local community and this does not appear to have been done well in the case of East Pye.

The cumulative impact of overlapping infrastructure schemes needs to be taken into consideration. People living in the north-west of my constituency have faced applications from East Pye, Tasway and the Norwich to Tilbury pylon line. Even if none of these applications were passed, the stress caused by multiple schemes even being considered in an area is detrimental to residents' health and needs to be considered along with the benefits of such schemes.

Multiple schemes can have the effect of boxing in rural communities with negative mental health impacts for residents.

A number of constituents have contacted me to let me know of the impact that this application is having on their lives. The youngest was 11 years old.

Compulsory purchase

I have been informed that residents have received communications from Dalcour Maclaren about the possible compulsory purchase of their homes. I understand that that this is common where large solar farms are being considered. The anxiety and distress caused to residents by the possibility of compulsory purchase are huge.

If solar farms are temporary and in appropriate places, compulsory purchase options should not be necessary.

Regional Power allocations

Renewable energy from solar is essential for our energy security. However, small-scale solar installations on the distribution network would be preferable to industrial projects on the transmission network. Smaller scale projects create fewer difficulties for the people living around them and do not generally require the creation of access roads, compulsory purchases or the permanent alteration of the landscape.

The transmission network in this area already carries electricity produced by offshore wind, so it may not always be able to carry the additional solar-generated electricity. This could mean that the owners of solar farms receive payment for not producing energy via constraint payments.

In relation to DESNZ targets for 2031 to 2035, East Anglia is oversubscribed for solar. This does not mean we should not invest in renewables, but it does mean we can do it in ways that are more palatable to local communities.



Adrian Ramsay MP
Member of Parliament for Waveney Valley