

Below is my written representation following attendance at the hearings which commenced on 15th September. I gave oral input at the OFH1 – Part 2 session on 15/09 where the Planning Inspectorate asked that I submit responses in my Written Representation to specific questions raised by the Planning Inspectorate at the end of my oral input. For clarity I am attaching a copy of the input I relayed at OFH1 - Part 2 on 15th September (document named 'Patricia LEATE's OPH1 input') and four photos evidencing the issues I outlined as part of the OFH1 input. Photo creation information is as follows

Church Hill 1 was taken on 14 March 2024

Photo taken by [REDACTED] 'Underwater Portraits by [REDACTED]'

Church Hill 2 was taken on 18 October 2023

Photo taken by [REDACTED] 'Underwater Portraits by [REDACTED]'

Church Hill 3 was taken on 25 September 2026

Photo taken by Patricia Leate

Church Hill 4 was taken on 25 September 2026

Photo taken by Patricia Leate

PLEASE NOTE : AI was used to blur the Registration Numbers of the cars shown in the photos.

First bullet point of the document named 'Patricia LEATE's OPH1 input' attached.

This bullet point outlines the major problems already being experienced on a regular basis in Church Hill, Saxlingham Nethergate. Parts of the road are extremely narrow (Wynn's swept path map has the narrowest point at circa 4.11 metres (maps can be found in the Transport Assessment Part 3 Page 58). Far too narrow for the AIL vehicles. 2 photos were shown as the OFH1 (photos Church Hill 1 & Church Hill 2). These photos show the situation when two-way traffic involves larger vehicles. The Planning Inspectorate wanted to know the frequency of the buses travelling through Church Hill. I was unsure of the frequency at the OFH1 session as the buses have just changed their bus routes to accommodate improved transport for school children in the local areas. Looking at the revamped timetable there are 12 buses travelling via Church Hill Monday to Saturday. I did mention, when asked the frequency by the Planning Inspectorate, that the buses aren't the crux of the problem. Basically, it is any vehicle larger than a small car size that completely stops/slows down traffic flow. Photo 'Church Hill 4' is another example of slowed traffic flow due to the narrowness of Church Hill.

My third bullet point outlines the precarious access for vehicles and pedestrians accessing Orchard View Barn Courtyard in Church Hill. Photo 'Church Hill 3' shows a typical access situation – the driver of the mini car coming down Church Hill has to slam on their brakes as they see a vehicle is exiting from the courtyard. This photo also shows the dangerous situation where the driver exiting the courtyard has hardly any notice should a car come round the bend from 'The Street'. My fourth bullet point outlines the risks to a number of structures in Church Hill and how the very heavy vehicles could also damage the infrastructure beneath the road stating that I believed the sewer at the top of Church Hill, which has leaked in the past, to be made of asbestos. Enquiries with our water supplier, Anglian Water, has ascertained the following information:

The correct name for Asbestos Sewers is pitch fibre. These were popular post-war but quickly found to be not fit for purpose and most existing ones are now well beyond their shelf life.

A few years ago there was a prolonged road closure just before the bend at the top of Church Hill near Low Farm Cottages while Anglian Water tried to undertake a repair and ended up having to 'sleeve' failing pitch fibre sewer pipes. It is known for definite that there is pitch fibre in that area but it isn't known how far it stretches.

This April, Anglian Water, in the absence of any information on file, physically checked the nature of the sewers here (at the bottom of Church Hill) and confirmed they were made of Vitrified Clay. However, what is not known is what's happening sewer 'fabric' wise between the bottom and very top of the Church Hill.

I don't believe that anyone has visited Saxlingham Nethergate and undertaken a thorough assessment of the village as a potential AIL/HGV route and I believe that any assessment is likely to have been a desktop exercise. Anyone visiting would immediately see that AILs are far wider than the road in places.

In my summing up of my input at the OFH1 I asked that the Examining Authority should visit Saxlingham Nethergate to undertake a thorough risk assessment, the Planning Inspectorate asked that I include this request in my Written Representation.

Additional issues that came to light at the Open floor hearings/issue specific hearings which deeply concern me are as follows:

Wildlife Mitigation

With regard to the areas included in East Pye's proposal we all know that we can never re-create the spectacular countryside, habitat and wildlife we currently have therefore the impact on wildlife should be mitigated as far as possible by thoroughly assessing and documenting mitigation actions within the planning, implementation, maintenance and decommissioning plans. I have severe worries regarding the lack of wildlife mitigation activities taking place. [REDACTED] at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 – Part 4 (video timing 46.38-49.45), outlined his concerns which totally echo mine in that when a project such as this is started you have to have a strategy that acknowledges the fact that having high fences (2.4 metre deer fencing, 3 metre industrial-type fencing) cordoning off equipment blocks, solar arrays, site compounds (lifetime being c2 years) the planned mitigation seems to be that when everything is working hedgerows will be put in, etc. This lack of planning/mitigation at the outset is definitely going to adversely affect the abundance of wildlife in the area covered by the East Pye Solar Plan. The Norfolk Wildlife Trust recommended a document in their relevant representation, but this seems to have been dismissed as the Applicant stated that guidance has been carried out by the relevant statutory nature conservation body, Natural England, which reports that there is no conclusion of likely significant affect. In my view the Norfolk Wildlife Trust should be listened to because of their in-depth/broad local wildlife knowledge. I would urge the Planning Inspectorate to assess Norfolk Wildlife Trust's submitted documentation.

Night lighting

Night lighting was also raised separately as an issue at the hearings, highlighting that the area does not currently have any night lights and the impact of lighting for some wildlife would be severe. The Applicant's view was that no adverse lighting would be installed. However, they failed to give details of the lighting that was proposed to understand their view of adverse lighting.

Safety

I have outlined many of my issues in previous documents submitted in the past but an additional aspect of safety relating to East Pye's plans was evidenced when the Tibenham Airfield was discussed which outlined that East Pye were proposing to have solar panels installed on the emergency run off area at the airfield!

Having sat through a large part of the different hearings where so many insurmountable issues came to light, I am even more convinced that the East Pye Solar Plan is totally unsuitable for the proposed areas and absolutely disastrous for Norfolk business/residents/wildlife/tourist industry due to the cumulative impact of all the different solar/windfarm/pylon projects underway/planned. The Applicant's own Statement of Need accepts that prioritised schemes already meet the relevant Clean Power 2030 regional solar capacity ranges for 2031-5 therefore East Pye Solar is not specifically needed in this location or region to meet stipulated targets.









My brief input to these proceedings will be concentrating on Church Hill, Saxlingham Nethergate as I understand that Abnormal Indivisible Load vehicles and construction lorries will be routed through Church Hill. My focus is predominantly on safety.

I believe that it would be extremely beneficial for the Examining Authority to visit Church Hill early in proceedings. The 4 key issues that have led me to this urgency are:

- Church Hill is far too narrow for the width of these vehicles – the road is only 4.2 metres wide at its narrowest point therefore not wide enough for AIL vehicles. In today's world, let alone what East Pye Solar Farm is planning, we already have major issues with two-way traffic up/down Church Hill on a very regular basis. These photos are just a couple of examples that show the severe problems that are experienced on a very regular basis. Church Hill is on a bus route and traffic must come to a halt whenever a bus or large vehicle is travelling up/down Church Hill because of the narrowness of the road.
- My second issue is that there is a footpath on one side of Church Hill, this is the only footpath we have and is needed to access a wide range of facilities. Safety when using this footpath is absolutely critical for the community:
 - Protecting the large number of school children going to and from the school located in Church Hill.
 - Protecting children to'ing and fro'ing to the Scout and Guide Group premises.
 - Protecting parishioners and visitors making their way to and from the Community Social Club, Playing Field and Meadows, the Church and the very popular walking routes accessed via Church Hill.

There isn't any street lighting in our conservation village which, for me is wonderful, no light pollution etc., however, it reinforces the need for a safe footpath in Church Hill.

- My third point relates to access into Church Hill from the Orchard View Barn courtyard which has 3 properties. Access for vehicles and residents is already dangerous – the East Pye proposal exacerbates this situation.
- Lastly the AILs and the large number of HGVs that would be travelling along Church Hill could cause vibrations and damage to structures – a number of the older properties don't have foundations. In addition, the heavy vehicles could also damage the infrastructure beneath the road – we believe the sewer, at the top of Church Hill, which has leaked in the past, to be made of asbestos.

To sum up, I believe that Church Hill is not at all suitable for what East Pye are proposing and I would like the Examining Authority to visit Saxlingham Nethergate and undertake a thorough risk assessment. This assessment should provide evidence that will lead them to the same conclusion as myself that the land around Church Hill should be removed from the scheme and an alternative AIL/HGV route planned.

Point 4 – Source - The sewer at the top of the hill around the bend by [REDACTED] house has leaked. It was made of asbestos and the weight of traffic or other ground movement caused the leak. A plastic sleeve has been put inside the old sewer to stop the leak.