

My name is [REDACTED] **Morningthorpe and Fritton Parish Council.**

We represent two small, historic rural communities.

Site 5 would introduce a **13m high 400kV substation, 4.5m high tracking panels, transformers, construction compound, fencing, lighting and CCTV** into countryside in and around Fritton and Morningthorpe.

The first question is: **why here?**

Site 5 contains many of the very constraints the Applicant says should be avoided: sensitive landscape, nationally important heritage, high-quality agricultural land, ecology and nearby homes. Yet the Applicant has not demonstrated that Site 5 is the least harmful location.

We are also concerned that people living closest to Site 5 do not appear to have been properly assessed.

The Applicant's own methodology sets assessment distances of 300 m for construction noise, 100 m for vibration, 50 m from the highway construction traffic noise, and 500 m from the Order Limits for operational noise.

Yet our review identifies 7 residential properties omitted from the construction-noise assessment, 4 for vibration assessment distance, and 6 for the highway noise distance. Approximately 70 residential properties lie within 500 m of Site 5 for operational noise and have been omitted.

If receptors within the Applicant's own assessment criteria have not been properly assessed, there must be serious doubt over whether the reported impacts on those living closest to Site 5 are reliable.

We also have concerns about inconsistencies within the proposal. For example, glint-and-glare mitigation along the B1527 requires screening

in locations where permanent access points **A23 and A24** and their visibility splays are proposed. There are also concerns that those splays have been based on shorter AILs than the specialist transport company states are required. We ask the Examining Authority to ensure these important matters are reconciled.

The Applicant's own assessment identifies significant adverse visual effects. For residents, these are not occasional views from selected viewpoints. They are the everyday landscape experienced from homes, lanes and public rights of way.

The historic environment is equally important.

Fritton Conservation Area, Grade 1 listed St Catherine's Church and Grade 1 listed St John the Baptist sit within a landscape that forms part of their setting. That significance does not stop at a line on a map.

Site 5 sits in communities that date back to the **Domesday Book**. Historic field patterns, lanes, hedgerows, mature trees and archaeology survive today. The open farmland forms the setting of Fritton Conservation Area and the Grade I listed Church of St Catherine.

The Applicant relies on setbacks, planting and screening, but **screening is not the same as preserving setting**. A hedge may obscure some infrastructure in time; it cannot preserve open countryside once that countryside has fundamentally changed.

Site 5 also occupies much of the northern foreground when approaching Fritton, where the transition from open countryside into the historic village remains remarkably intact.

But our community will not experience Site 5 in isolation.

Cable corridors pass through and around the parish. Site 4B, access to the Site 7s via The Krons, and construction traffic on the B1527 add to the same local burden.

Of particular concern is **Access Point A24, opposite Jack in the Box Nursery**. The nursery cares for babies and very young children who use outdoor spaces for play. This is not simply about traffic at drop-off and collection times, but prolonged construction activity beside children throughout the day.

The Applicant describes an overall construction programme of around 24 months. For residents, one activity may finish as another begins elsewhere.

People will then experience successive periods of **HGV movements, excavation, trenching, piling, noise, dust and vibration**. Management plans may reduce those impacts, but they do not remove them.

Public rights of way are also part of everyday community life. The Applicant confirms temporary closures of a number of these. When reopened, those routes will be experienced very differently.

Residents have also raised concerns about **bats, including barbastelle, farmland birds, habitat fragmentation, watercourses, the chalk aquifer, drainage, private water supplies, private sewage systems and flooding**.

We also ask that the examination process remains genuinely accessible to residents who do not use the internet.

Most importantly, residents will experience **traffic, noise, dust, vibration, landscape change, disruption to footpaths and loss of tranquillity together — not as separate technical issues**.

Our community experiences **one landscape, one road network and one historic environment**.

Taken together, the burden on these two very small communities is substantial and, in our view, disproportionate.

We ask that full weight is given to the omitted residential receptors, the unresolved inconsistencies and the enduring change to this historic rural landscape.

For those reasons, we submit that the Applicant has not demonstrated that the harm arising from Site 5 is unavoidable or justified.

Thank you.

East Pye Solar - EN0110014

Interested Party No; [REDACTED]

Morningthorpe and Fritton Parish Council – Follow-up from ISH1

At ISH1, **Morningthorpe and Fritton Parish Council** sought to raise a question regarding the Applicant's approach to site selection for East Pye Solar. The Parish Council was advised that the matter would be more appropriately addressed under a later agenda item and that the ExA would return to it. The point was raised again later in the hearing, but the Parish Council was again advised that it would be covered subsequently. The hearing concluded before there was an opportunity to return to the question, so the Parish Council is submitting it at Deadline 1.

For context, The Drovers Solar Farm NSIP (EN0110013) is also being promoted by Island Green Power in Norfolk and is a 500MW solar project.

At The Drovers Examination on 7th May 2026 at approx. 27 mins into ISH1 the representative for the Applicant, Island Green Power told the ExA at that “single continuous sites with as few landowners as possible” were prioritised as part of its site search. This approach is also set out in the associated project's written Site Evaluation Report [APP-043], paragraph 4.3.3, which explains that minimising the number of landowners simplifies negotiations, reduces project risk arising from multiple ownerships, and reduces reliance on compulsory acquisition.

East Pye is materially different: it is a fragmented, multi-site scheme involving multiple landowners, together with further land interests required for cable routes, access and compulsory rights.

The Parish Council therefore asks the Applicant to explain how the East Pye site-selection and land-assembly approach is reconciled with Island Green Power's stated site-selection approach at The Drovers. East Pye's own application material describes IGP as overseeing the development process, including sourcing land, securing grid connections and obtaining planning consents. The comparison with the site-selection approach stated by IGP at The Drovers is therefore directly relevant to East Pye

Submission ID: [REDACTED]

Morningthorpe and Fritton Parish Council (MFPC) raised a question at ISH1 regarding the proposed use of the construction compound at Site 5. MFPC sought clarification on whether the compound would serve Site 5 only, or whether it would also support other sites, such as Sites 7A–F, including for material deliveries, storage and personnel. MFPC wished to understand the potential impact of the compound on the local road network around Site 5, including routes from the A140 and Hempnall, as well as the potential impact on nearby residential properties and businesses. The Applicant's response did not provide a clear answer to this.