

Time and again people make decisions that affect the generations after them. Each time very influential people push their ideas in a convincing way that governments take on board and allow. Usually there is huge monetary gain for someone. Sometimes it is for scientific gain, such as dropping the H bomb on Kiritimati (Christmas Island). People on the island were not removed. Some were put on boats, some were huddled to one side and 'sheltered' with totally inadequate canvas tarpaulins. Perhaps the people did not go through the planning process and fill in multiple inaccessible forms for the Planning Inspectorate. Maybe they could not afford an advocate. So, it went ahead leaving the people living on a contaminated island eating contaminated food and dying miserable deaths with no compensation at all. All because some more powerful body wanted it to happen. The people were not important and they did not object very strongly anyway. The same thing is repeated time after time. After the big event happens people look back and say they should have done it differently... if only they had known... but the ones in charge will have made their money or attained their result. Maybe someone resigns (with a Golden Handshake).

The people / authorities in charge make the rules and tell us what we can and cannot object to, whether it is relevant and they seem to be able to choose to dismiss what we say.

It is not possible to predict in detail what will happen if East Pye Solar use over 2700 acres of our land for solar panels and their own monetary gain. What we should have learned is that if we want to change things we need to do it slowly and look at the consequences so we can manage them. There are other ways of getting our energy through solar power by using rooftops, carparks and brownfield sites. It won't make Macquarie rich but it will share the benefits and profits and keep the cost of electricity lower. It will also reduce the burden on the National Grid. Solar panels on rooftops are also far less vulnerable to strong wind damage as they do not act as aerofoils.

The solar panels are not recyclable and will soon be obsolete. There will be a huge amount of waste in landfill that will contaminate the land. How is this mitigated? What will happen to the land when solar is no longer there?

I did put in a written statement. Most of the points I have raised have been answered partially. This example says the applicant has substantively answered my concerns. I did not say they have ignored the problem. They have apparently done tests on a battery very much smaller than those intended for BESS. The fire service cannot put out EV car battery fires. They have to run their course. Just because EPS say they have modelled safeguards, does not make the model adequate in real life. This point is NOT substantively answered.

Example

BESS fires could produce toxic fumes and pollution that cannot be mitigated. BAT-001–002, pp.923–928: discusses fire testing, equipment separation, plume modelling, containment of firefighting water and emergency planning. It reports no significant effects at assessed residential receptors within 1 km. Substantively answered. It would be inaccurate to say the Applicant ignores this concern. It expressly disputes the claim that mitigation is impossible. The remaining question is whether its modelling and safeguards are adequate, particularly where further testing and detailed design are deferred. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

The point is, that this process is totally inaccessible to most people. If there has, or has not been a suitable response to my initial objections, I could spend a month doing nothing but answering the comments and giving my points clarification. I do not have the time and the system is designed to tie everyone in knots. The Applicant can then say the response was not adequate. I am a scientist. I understand the proposals. I do not have a degree in each specific area of the points I have raised or want to raise, nor do I have the time to answer each point in this kind of detail.

I should not have to sacrifice so much of my life to oppose a scheme that has so many obvious detrimental effects on our lives locally. Coming back at me with nit-picking points saying I was not clear enough or specific enough in my concerns is putting the ball firmly in 'their' court. (EPS)

Discrimination

The whole process is all designed to make it incredibly complicated and time-consuming. Many people I know have given up. They believe they have done their bit and can go no further. ... this is another 'win' for EPS. It is totally discriminatory against everyone, as I have said before.

I am putting in all the footpaths and cycleways in the area. I do not want to say that a few routes are more important to me than others. I want them ALL there so I can use them when I want to and that they are there for other people and future generations.

I want to add ALL the comments put in by Block East Pye Solar. They have made points and answered the 'Applicant' in far better ways than I can possibly do myself. Please consider their comments as my comments.

I am putting the rest of my concerns as bullet points because I simply do not have the energy or time to do more.

I am distressed by the effect such a huge scheme will have on the lives of everyone in Norfolk. It will affect everyone because people drive through and visit other areas. A decline in tourism in one area will affect the number of people coming to Norfolk with knock on consequences.

It will affect:

- House prices (my retirement)
- Health and well being by restricting outdoor spaces
- Walks and cycling, outdoor activities. Where will there be open countryside to visit?
- Views of open countryside we know and love.
- Visual impacts in general, even when driving.
- Peace and quiet and dark skies. It will be disturbed by the noise created by invertors and BESS etc, the lighting and CCTV cameras.
- The environment and ecology from the micro-organisms to the fungi, lichens, insects, spiders, reptiles, birds, bats and larger mammals.
- Water supplies
- The archaeology and history of our forebears
- Our businesses
- Our livelihoods
- The willingness of our friends and families to visit the area

- The lives of children growing up missing out on the experience of our countryside
- The destruction of the environment during construction.
- The huge inconvenience and health risks (dust disturbance, noise and exhaust etc) and contamination etc.
- Damage to local buildings (listed and otherwise) roads and footpaths
- Food security. We cannot grow crops on rooftops. The sun cannot power solar panels AND grow crops / grass underneath them (these ones are to be mounted low down and tilt with the sun)
- Our freedom
- Our lives

All this so Macquarie, an investment company, can make huge profits that we, everyone in Norfolk, will all have to pay for with our way of life and our money.

I have included the rest of the comments the Applicant made and AI made, in a separate document. It basically says how inadequate and non-specific my comments were and how the Applicant only partially answered my concerns.

I am tired of the whole process. I am anxious about the outcome and also very depressed. I do not sleep well because of the anxiety.

I absolutely support aiming for 'Net Zero'. It will take a lot of planning and needs to be a cross-party project. We also MUST take into consideration the carbon footprint and energy consumed by everything we import, not just what we do on this island. Net Zero needs to be world wide.

After my initial concerns, I have included the rest of the comments the Applicant made and AI made, below.

I said... "compare PDA-012 to RR- written submission. looks for omissions as well as points attributed to RR-1043 incorrectly. does the applicant address the points that rr-1043 raises if not how not"

Comparison of the concerns actually raised

What RR-1043 says	Applicant's treatment	Does it answer the concern?
The £5,000 paper copy charge makes the process discriminatory.	CON-011, pp.106–108: explains printing costs, free electronic access, library computers, USB sticks and assistance with selected printed documents.	Partly. This is a substantive response about available access arrangements. However, electronic access and selected extracts do not fully answer whether someone unable to use electronic documents can practically scrutinise the complete application without paying the charge. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Information is jumbled, difficult to navigate, extremely lengthy and impossible for most people to examine properly within the available time. Details allegedly reveal inadequate research or inaccuracies.	CON-013, p.109: reduces this to the consultation being "too technical" and replies that non-technical summaries, communication channels and seven information events were provided.	Incomplete. Difficulty understanding technical language is only one part of the complaint. The reply does not directly address document organisation, the volume of material, available reading time or the practical need for substantial research assistance. The allegation of inaccuracies is also not answered expressly, although RR-1043 gives no particular examples for the Applicant to investigate. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Support for Block East Pye Solar's researched objection.	APL-016, p.195: records this and directs readers to Part 3 of the Applicant's responses, EXAM/8.8.	Correctly recorded and expressly referred elsewhere. This is not an omission. Whether the underlying arguments are adequately answered would require examining that separate response. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Brownfield land and rooftops should have	SOI-001, pp.802–804: says those alternatives were	Partly answered. The Applicant supplies its reasoning and

been explored before farmland; commercial returns appear to have driven the choice.	considered in APP-215 and that rooftop solar alone cannot meet required capacity. ALT-006, pp.300–301: describes site selection and grid connection constraints.	identifies supporting assessments. However, the reply does not set out the actual brownfield or rooftop options rejected, or explain their comparative financial and environmental merits. A claim that both rooftop and ground mounted solar are needed does not, by itself, establish why these particular farmland sites were chosen. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
The Scheme prioritises private profit over public welfare, with profits going abroad.	APL-004–006, pp.184–188: cites national energy need, regulatory obligations, UK investment and the companies’ registration and liability to UK tax.	Partly. These replies explain the Applicant’s position, but UK registration and taxation do not answer where profits ultimately go. They also do not directly examine the respondent’s concern about how benefits and local harms are distributed. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Contracts for Difference could provide large, low risk returns funded by bill payers.	The entries citing RR-1043 address profit and ownership generally. APL-007, p.188, elsewhere in the document, says the development is privately financed and its financial risks fall on the developer.	No clear direct answer identified. Private financing does not explain whether a CfD is intended, what revenue support it might provide or how that relates to the claimed burden on bill payers. This finding does not establish that the financial allegations in RR-1043 are correct; it identifies the missing explanation. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
BESS fires could produce toxic fumes and pollution that cannot be mitigated.	BAT-001–002, pp.923–928: discusses fire testing, equipment separation, plume modelling, containment of firefighting water and emergency planning. It reports no significant effects at assessed residential receptors within 1 km.	Substantively answered. It would be inaccurate to say the Applicant ignores this concern. It expressly disputes the claim that mitigation is impossible. The remaining question is whether its modelling and safeguards are adequate, particularly where further testing and detailed design are deferred. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

The fire service is not equipped to deal with a BESS incident.

BAT-003, pp.929–931: describes water tanks, hydrants, future assessment of water requirements, firefighting equipment and consultation with Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service.

Partly answered. It explains the proposed approach, but does not provide a completed demonstration of the necessary staffing, equipment and response capability. Important details remain for later design and emergency planning. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

Safer ways of storing energy should be considered.

The battery entries explain how the proposed BESS would be made safer.

Not directly answered in the entries citing RR-1043. Demonstrating safeguards for the chosen technology does not explain whether alternative storage technologies were compared or why they were rejected. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

Ecology will suffer lasting damage and protected species cannot be adequately protected through mitigation.

ECO-001, pp.435–437, and ECO-019, pp.476–477: describe avoidance, buffers, habitat corridors, management plans, projected biodiversity gains and protected species measures.

Answered at the broad level of the representation. The Applicant disputes the predicted destruction and identifies its assessment and safeguards. RR-1043 does not name particular species or locations, so the response cannot fairly be criticised for failing to answer a species-specific example that was not supplied. The effectiveness of mitigation remains open to challenge. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

Hydrological effects could destroy water supplies.

WAT-036, pp.570–572: identifies assessments of private supplies and abstractions, well locations, pollution controls and a conclusion of no significant effects.

Substantively addressed, with a limitation. Much of the explanation concerns contamination and supplying water to the Scheme. It is less explicit about whether construction could alter groundwater movement or the yield of existing supplies. RR-1043 does not identify a particular supply. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

Archaeology will be destroyed.	CUL-001, pp.591–592: refers to heritage assessments, design changes and further archaeological trenching, including around the Roman Pye Road.	Partly. Archaeology is addressed, but the reply is dominated by wider heritage issues. It does not clearly explain what archaeological remains may be lost, what will be preserved in place and what would instead be excavated and recorded. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Loss of countryside and open space will harm mental health and wellbeing.	LAN-001, LAN-003 and LAN-005 address landscape change, scale and lasting harm. HUM-001, pp.903–904: cites health and equality assessments, mitigation and a community liaison group.	Partly. The Applicant acknowledges landscape effects and gives a health response. However, information sharing and liaison do not themselves answer the particular concern that losing the valued countryside will cause lasting distress. The reply does not explain the assessment of that connection in detail. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Food security will be sacrificed.	SOI-002, pp.816–817: expressly disputes harm to food security, cites the agricultural assessment and national reports, and puts the land area in a wider context.	Substantively answered. The respondent may contest the evidence or conclusions, but this concern has not been omitted. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Commitments cannot be trusted and decommissioning is not guaranteed.	APL-005 refers to enforceable DCO requirements. RR-1043 is not cited in the construction and decommissioning entries. Nevertheless, C&D-004–006, pp.265–268, explain Requirement 21, decommissioning plans and continuing obligations after ownership changes.	A specific concern is not clearly traced to its relevant reply. There is an answer elsewhere, so it should not be described as wholly ignored. The response would be clearer if it expressly linked RR-1043 to those provisions and explained how decommissioning would be secured in practice, including funding. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...
Rooftop solar would share benefits more widely; local generation would reduce transmission losses.	NEE-002, pp.203–204: explains national grid distribution and the benefits of pooling generation and demand. BEN-001, pp.957–958: describes community benefits but	Partly. This explains the chosen national grid model, but does not directly compare transmission losses or the distribution of financial benefits with the respondent’s proposed rooftop

confirms no current plans for approach. EN0110014-000565-
direct subsidised electricity or 8.10 The Appli...
rebates.

Statements associated with RR-1043 that are not in its supplied text

Entry	Additional material in the collective summary	Assessment against RR-1043
NEE-003, pp.204–205	Solar is inefficient, becoming obsolete, unreliable, unsuitable for the UK because of cloud and limited sunlight, or unlikely to achieve its stated 500 MW peak capacity.	The clearest mismatch. None of these arguments appears in RR-1043. Its call to put solar on rooftops demonstrates support for solar generation in a different form.
NEE-002, p.203	Electricity would be sent to data centres in London, Cambridge and Oxford.	RR-1043 favours local generation but makes no data centre allegation .
APL-006, p.187	Profits leaving the reach of UK tax authorities, or questions about offshore tax status.	RR-1043 says profits will go abroad. It does not allege tax avoidance or ask about tax jurisdiction. Those are different points.
ALT-006, pp.300–301	Willing landowners, lack of capacity at Norwich Main and using land lease funding for renovation subsidies.	The commercial motivation concern is relevant, but these specific arguments are absent .
BAT-001, pp.923–924	Named fires at Liverpool and Moss Landing, risks near schools and nurseries, evacuation plans and a policy of allowing fires to burn.	The general BESS concern is genuine. These examples and specific claims were not made.
BAT-002, pp.926–927	A proposed 6 km evacuation area and requests for particular evacuation zones or buffers.	RR-1043 makes no distance or evacuation-zone claim .
BAT-003, pp.929–930	Long Stratton's tender numbers, a recycling fire requiring 27 tenders, water sourcing and claims that the fire service was not consulted.	RR-1043 questions whether the fire service is equipped, but gives none of those supporting assertions .
WAT-036, pp.570–571	Water supplies in Lundy Green and Market Lane.	RR-1043 names neither location .
CUL-001, pp.591–592	Listed buildings, conservation areas, their settings, Boudicca Way and the Roman Pye Road.	RR-1043 raises archaeological destruction generally , without identifying these assets or routes.
SOI-001–002	Specific alternative locations, detailed BMV policy arguments and quantified national farmland losses.	Farmland, rooftops, brownfield land and food security are genuine concerns. The detailed locations, policy assertions and statistics are not in RR-1043.

These collective summaries and their additional material appear in the relevant PDA-012 entries. EN0110014-000565-8.10 The Appli...

RR-1043 also adopts Block East Pye Solar's objection generally. That should be acknowledged, but it does not make every extra statement in a thematic row a statement written by RR-1043. The Applicant would need to make any such connection clear.

The strongest points to pursue are therefore:

- **Correct NEE-003:** RR-1043 supports rooftop solar and did not make the listed arguments against solar technology.
- **Answer the full accessibility complaint:** document organisation, volume and time for scrutiny, as well as price and technical language.
- **Provide a direct CfD response:** distinguish private project financing from any intended revenue support and explain the claimed public benefit.
- **Address safer storage alternatives:** explain what was considered and why the proposed technology was selected.
- **Link the decommissioning concern to an explicit answer:** identify the practical and financial safeguards.
- **Answer the rooftop comparison:** address shared benefits and transmission losses, rather than only explaining the national grid model.

The defensible conclusion is that **RR-1043 has received several substantive thematic replies, but its specific accessibility, financial and alternatives arguments remain incompletely answered, while some collective summaries attach claims absent from its text.**