Interested Party [redacted]

Comments on the Applicant's Deadline 1 documents published on 14 October 2026

**Deadline 2 submission**

## 1 Purpose and opportunity to respond

The short period between publication of the substantial document upload on 14 October and preparation of a Deadline 2 response has made meaningful scrutiny difficult. I am a resident with external commitments, without a professional team to review and reconcile hundreds of pages. The absence of an up-to-date Examination Library covering the new material has added to this burden. I have therefore used the Applicant's document numbers, revision details and published file identifiers where necessary, without inventing Examination Library references.

I ask the Examining Authority to require a corrected, property-specific response to my concerns before relying on the Applicant's conclusions about effects on my home. The clearest example is VC-003 in EXAM/9.18: the Applicant treats Morningthorpe as distant from construction vehicle routing, immediately after recording that my garden is approximately 11 metres from the Order Limits and [redacted] lies between proposed accesses A23 and A24. This is a material inconsistency, not simply a disagreement about the significance of an assessed effect. [A1, VC-002–003]

My Deadline 1 Written Statement already sets out the detailed evidence and questions. I refer back to it rather than reproduce it. I recognise that the Applicant had not received that statement when preparing its own Deadline 1 documents; I do not criticise those documents for failing to answer it. The immediate question is whether they answer my earlier representations and oral points, and whether the new information changes the concerns explained in my statement.

## 2 The wrong geographical basis for VC003

VC-002 [EXAM/9.22] records the proximity of my garden and driveway. VC-003 nevertheless relies on Figure 11.2 to conclude that vehicle routing is a significant distance from Morningthorpe, that this location falls outside the study area, and that construction noise and vibration effects are expected to be negligible. The answer does not explain how that reasoning applies to the home described in the preceding response. [A1, printed pages 156–158]

Morningthorpe is not confined to the village core around St John the Baptist Church. The wider parish and the homes near Site 5 cannot sensibly be represented by a distant village location. My concern has always been about my actual home, garden and driveway beside Site 5A. The Applicant already had this information. The apparent substitution of a general place name for my property has undermined my concerns on a basis which I cannot reconcile with its own account of what I said. [P1, section 1]

The revised Construction Traffic Management Plan confirms accesses A23 and A24 on the B1527 and routes construction traffic to them. That must be reconciled with VC-003. Distance from one part of Morningthorpe cannot establish the exposure of a driveway between those accesses. Nor does a highway routing figure answer the separate question of noise and vibration from nearby piling, access construction, internal traffic and compound activity. [A7, access schedule and Site 5 routing; A1]

I ask EPS to withdraw or correct the geographical reasoning in VC-003 and provide a plan identifying my home and actual residential curtilage, the Order Limits, accesses, relevant works and the noise-sensitive receptors used to represent them. It should state the actual distances, activities, durations and overlapping works assessed. If another receptor represents my home, it should explain why that is appropriate for each impact, rather than assume one representative location answers every question.

I am not asking the Examination to accept my indicative measurements that I took from The Applicant's Works plan or noise calculations where I used The Applicant's methodology as a substitute for a professional assessment. They demonstrate why a clear answer is needed. If EPS disagrees with them, it should provide the corrected inputs and calculation, and explain the difference. Repeating the conclusion from the original assessment does not resolve a question about whether that assessment represents my circumstances. [P1, sections 1 and 10]

## 3 My Category 3 request and the inspection of my home

VC-002 directs me to MC-PDA-001. That response appears under another person in EXAM/9.22, Table 4.14, rather than as a separately identified response to my Category 3 request. VC-002 also gives EXAM/9.2 as the document reference, although the procedural responses are in EXAM/9.22. These errors make it unnecessarily difficult to establish precisely what answer EPS intends to give me and further highlights the inaccuracies we keep finding. How can we trust EPS's assessments when they state distances incorrectly and have my whole property over a mile away from where it is (based on their response that Morningthorpe is not in the order limit). [A1, VC-002; A2, printed pages 373–375]

For accuracy, I acknowledge that I am named in EXAM/9.22: its introductory table lists me, PDA-034, in connection with my site inspection request. My concern is therefore not that my name is entirely absent. It is that the Category 3 answer cited to me is addressed to another named person. Even where representations concern the same property, EPS should expressly identify how its reasoning applies to my own interest and request. I refer to that response solely to examine the answer EPS has directed me to, not as additional evidence from another resident. [A2, printed page 14]

Section 57(4) of the Planning Act 2008 concerns whether a person would or might be entitled to make a relevant claim if the Order were fully implemented. That is not simply the same question as whether an environmental effect has been labelled significant. I do not suggest that proximity alone establishes Category 3 status. I ask EPS to give a reasoned decision on my request, using the correct location and explaining the relationship between the potential physical effects, the applicable statutory test and its conclusion. [N3; P1, section 2]

I welcome the revised Accompanied Site Inspection Itinerary, which includes the request concerning my home within Location 3. The inspection should allow the ExA to understand the garden boundary, historic wall, driveway between the two accesses, borehole location and relevant sightlines. It should not be reduced to a view from the public highway which misses the circumstances underlying my concerns. [A3, Tables 2.1 and 2.3]

## 4 The private borehole and local water conditions

VC-004 acknowledges that my borehole was not identified in the dataset used. That is a significant acknowledgement: a conclusion based on an incomplete inventory cannot, without further explanation, establish protection of the omitted supply. My Written Statement explains its irrigation use and distinguishes it from my mains drinking water supply. EPS should not merge

this with a different private supply or assume that all private supplies have the same purpose. [A1, VC-004; P1, section 3]

Their response relies on the expected geology and the likely source of groundwater, with further investigation after consent. I recognise that ground investigation is now expressly included in the revised CEMP, together with groundwater sampling and further foundation risk assessment. The remaining question is what evidence demonstrates the safety of the proposed permitted works near my particular borehole. [A5, section 3.13; A4, Q1.16.1–Q1.16.2]

The revised Water Framework Directive assessment adds discussion of private water supplies and cross references other assessments. I have not seen my property by name in that document and the listed BGS borehole does not tally with the precise location of mine. I ask EPS to identify the exact assessment entry for each, distinguish the supplies, and show how the additional information changes the source inventory, risk assessment and mitigation. A generic reference to private supplies does not establish that the previously omitted sources have been assessed. [A9; P1, section 3]

The Environment Agency's Deadline 1 material identifies unresolved matters concerning groundwater baseline information, private water supplies, monitoring and the reliance on later investigations. This supports my request for an explicit assessment. EPS should explain which concerns are now resolved and provide the evidence supporting that change. [O3, matters EA11, EA14 and EA33–EA37]

I seek an agreed baseline for my borehole, assessment of water quality and yield, monitoring capable of detecting changes during relevant works, and a clear response if the supply is affected. The assessment should cover drilling, piling, excavation, dewatering and changes to local drainage where relevant. Responsibility for investigation and restoration, and interim arrangements appropriate to the existing use, should be clear before work begins.

## 5 The historic wall and construction vibration

VC-005 answers my concern by citing the general position that historic buildings are not automatically more vulnerable to vibration because of their age. I accept that age alone does not establish vulnerability. My concern, however, is a particular historic freestanding garden wall, with its own form, foundations and condition. A general statement about buildings does not demonstrate that this wall has been assessed. [A1, VC-005; P1, sections 4–5]

The revised CEMP contains best-practice controls, quieter equipment where practicable and a future construction noise monitoring scheme. Those are useful commitments, but I have not identified in that provision an individual assessment or condition record for my wall. EPS should identify whether one exists and explain how its vibration predictions address the closest permitted works, including piling and heavy vehicle activity. [A5, Table 3.7]

I ask for a proportionate condition survey before relevant works, an assessment by a mutually agreed suitably qualified person, appropriate working methods and distances, and monitoring with agreed action thresholds. There should be a prompt process for stopping or changing work if those thresholds are approached or damage is suspected, and for investigating and remedying attributable damage. I am asking for prevention and accountability, rather than an assurance based only on a generic classification.

## 6 Noise at my home and the new evening assessment

The new Evening Noise Assessment and revised Operational Environmental Management Plan provide additional information. They do not remove the need to explain the receptor and baseline used for my home. My earlier questions about MP34, background sound, transformer characteristics and the combined sound from equipment are set out in section 10 of my Written Statement. Those questions should be answered directly. [P1; A6; A8]

The evening assessment applies no acoustic character correction to the assessed plant. The revised OEMP seeks to minimise tonal and other distinctive characteristics, but several measures remain dependent on detailed design and practicability. EPS should explain the evidence for assuming no correction and how procurement, commissioning and subsequent operation will ensure that the permitted equipment meets the assessment assumptions. [A8, paragraphs 1.6.1–1.6.3; A6, Table 3.7]

There is also a distinction between predicted noise and the higher level a control may allow. For example, the evening table gives NSR31 a rating level of 28 dB against a background of 28 dB, while the proposed approach for non-BESS receptors allows the background level or 30 dB, whichever is higher. I do not assume that NSR31 represents my home. I ask EPS to identify the relevant receptor, assess the effects at the actual permitted limit, and explain why the limit adequately protects both the dwelling and garden. [A8, Table 1.13 and paragraph 1.7.7; A6, Table 3.7]

The answer to Q1.6.2 recognises that operational noise requires further design development and mitigation. EPS should specify which measures are essential to the health and amenity conclusions and how they will be secured. A satisfactory prediction for one assumed layout is insufficient if a different, noisier arrangement could be approved within the same consent. [A4, Q1.6.2]

EN-1 requires significant adverse noise effects to be avoided and other adverse effects to be mitigated and minimised. A finding below the significance threshold therefore does not end the question of protection. I ask for enforceable limits, appropriate commissioning checks and a clear route for investigating noise that differs in level or character from the assessment. [N1, paragraphs 5.12.17–5.12.18]

## 7 Access safety and the construction burden beside my home

My concern is the combined operation of A23 and A24 around my driveway, alongside existing traffic and nearby entrances. The revised CTMP's routing and management provisions need to be applied to this actual arrangement. Norfolk County Council's Local Impact Report recommends a single B1527 access at A23 or A24 and raises further concerns about access design, baseline traffic and abnormal loads. These are substantive highway questions, not merely residents' unease about change. [P1, sections 11–13; A7; O1, paragraphs 8.12–8.19]

EPS should provide one coordinated plan showing the proposed accesses, my driveway, nearby existing entrances, vehicle swept paths, visibility and arrangements for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. It should explain how I will enter and leave safely during deliveries, queues, temporary controls and abnormal load movements. The assessment must use the vehicles actually proposed as per EPS's AIL Transport Specialist's assessment, or explain any binding restriction to smaller vehicles.

Section 13 of my Written Statement identifies inconsistencies between the transporter dimensions and route drawings. I ask for those to be reconciled, including any strengthening or alteration of

structures and the space needed for turning and waiting. NCC's request for route feasibility and survey evidence reinforces the need to establish deliverability rather than leave basic feasibility to the contractor. [O1, paragraph 8.19]

In Q1.2.9 EPS confirms the compound locations at Sites 5A and 5B. I welcome the clarification, but it makes the assessment of this local concentration of work more important. Its answer to Q1.14.1 identifies possible temporary traffic measures. EPS should now show how these measures interact with the two accesses (A23 and A24) and existing homes and businesses which already experience difficulties safely joining the highway, and identify the periods when access works, compound use, piling and deliveries could overlap. [A4, Q1.2.9 and Q1.14.1]

The CTMP includes road condition surveys and complaints procedures. My outstanding request is for specific arrangements at my driveway, an accurate baseline and enforceable controls on movements and working arrangements. A promise to deal with complaints after a problem occurs does not establish that the proposed access arrangement is safe. [A7, sections 7.14 and 9; P1, sections 11–13]

## 8 The seasonal stream and drainage at Site 5A

My concern is the seasonal watercourse and historic brick tunneled culvert serving the local Site 5 drainage system. A stream does not cease to be relevant because it is dry during part of the year. The revised WFD material's references to Site 5B and CRC6 do not, by themselves, establish that the particular watercourse at Site 5A has been identified and assessed. This is especially concerning as EPS in their response to NCC have stated that A23 is intended for AILs to access Site 5. A23 is shown on the latest maps [EXAM 9.25] as entering Site 5 at a point on the Northern boundary adjacent to the Historic Brick Tunnel entrance but on the Western side of the stream that flows through it. This means that any Vehicle accessing Site 5 by this access point will be required to cross this watercourse. If EPS is planning on using Boylandhall Lane (RB4) to allow for an access point further South into the field, it should be raised that the stream crosses under Boylandhall lane through a smaller culvert before running down the length of the fields adjacent to Boylandhall Lane. CRC4 works will also be require to interact with this watercourse. EPS should provide an annotated drainage plan and the relevant assessment passages and provide robust details of how this watercourse will be bridged (Environmental Agency stated that culverting of watercourses should be avoided in line with the EA's anticulverting policy with the use of clear-span bridging. It also states that if culverting is unavoidable this should be on a temporary – construction only basis. As A23 is proposed as a permanent access point into Site 5 following the EA stance, culverting of this watercourse in 5A (west side of Site 5) is not acceptable. [P1, section 14; A9, paragraphs 2.4.8–2.4.9]

I acknowledge the revised Flood Risk Assessment's additional drainage calculations, including the Site 5A substation provision. The outstanding questions concern the receiving drainage system, outfall feasibility, the culvert and conditions during construction. The answers to Q1.15.1–Q1.15.2 still leave detailed infiltration and outfall matters for further work. NCC's concerns about drainage evidence support a more explicit explanation of what is established and what remains assumed. [A10, Table 9.4; A4; O1, paragraphs 9.14–9.25]

EN-3 requires drainage impacts to be considered, including existing drainage arrangements and culverts. I ask EPS to show how proposed tracks, crossings, compaction, foundations and discharge arrangements affect seasonal flows and neighbouring land, and identify the measures required before those works start. A general pollution-control commitment does not answer a question about obstructed flow or increased runoff. With the field naturally sloping away from the

proposed location of the 400kV Substation and the Construction Compound how will the watercourse be protected from contaminated run off, the road (B1527) protected from increased risk of flooding (it floods near to the proposed access point A23 already) as the Grade 2 BMV land that surrounds the Substation site will have been compacted and degraded due to the construction process. Significant levels of flooding were seen locally when the Long Stratton Bypass was built caused by compaction and churning of the soil by construction vehicles. It flooded the A140 in a section that had not previously had a flooding issue as well as exacerbating the areas it does flood in. [N2, paragraphs 2.10.78–2.10.80]

## 9 Residential amenity and the combined experience of the scheme

The revised Residential Visual Amenity Assessment includes my home, describes existing vegetation and considers views of the arrays from the ground floor and garden unlikely. It also identifies instant hedgerow or fencing as mitigation. This is more specific than VC-003, but the different assessments need to be reconciled. EPS should explain the verified viewpoints, seasonal conditions and assumptions about retained screening, and show how nearby access works, fencing, compound activity and electrical infrastructure are considered alongside the arrays. [A11; P1, sections 18–19]

I am not claiming that every significant visual effect makes a dwelling unacceptable. I am asking for a complete account of the effects at my home. South Norfolk Council's Local Impact Report questions the assessment of openness and the adequacy of mitigation around Site 5. Its concerns support scrutiny of what planting can achieve, when it will achieve it, and what effects remain even after it matures. [O2, section 7.7]

EPS says in Q1.11.4 that a sequential assessment of public rights of way will be submitted at Deadline 2. I welcome that further work and ask for an opportunity to comment. Retaining a path legally does not necessarily preserve its quietness, character or practical accessibility. My concerns about access to local routes and the experience of using them safely remain as explained in sections 12, 18 and 23 of my Written Statement. [A4, Q1.11.4; P1]

The Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum acknowledges that individuals may experience anxiety, disturbance, uncertainty and reduced enjoyment even where a significant population-level effect is not identified. This is directly relevant to a household experiencing several effects together. EPS's answer to Q1.6.1 also recognises that a health conclusion can differ from the significance finding in the originating technical chapter. Separate negligible or minor findings cannot simply be added together as proof that the overall experience is negligible. [A12, paragraphs 5.3.37–5.3.42 and 6.1.1; A4, Q1.6.1]

I ask for an account of the combined effects at my home and on the routes I use, including their timing and duration. The CEMP already provides for liaison, advance information about noisy work and complaints investigation. These commitments should be translated into direct notices, a named contact, 24hr telephone and postal access, and a clear escalation process and what legal enforcement will ensure the protection of residents not only at the construction/decommissioning phase but throughout the entirety of the project. Monitoring should actively check whether arrangements work, rather than rely entirely on residents repeatedly complaining. [A5, section 2.14 and Table 3.7; A12, sections 6–7; P1, sections 22–23 and 26]

## 10 Design flexibility and the relevance of other solar decisions

I recognise the strong national policy support for renewable energy. EN-1 nevertheless retains the requirement to assess effects and apply mitigation, while EN-3 requires design flexibility to

remain within the assessed parameters. My request is that the authorised scope near my home should match the evidence relied upon to justify it. [N1, section 4.2; N2, paragraphs 2.10.62–2.10.64]

The Green Hill decision of 8 October 2026 granted consent and the decision gave no weight to sheep grazing where this was not secured. The relevant lesson is to distinguish assessed and secured benefits from possibilities. EPS should apply that discipline to claims about continuing agriculture and restoration, alongside the local effects over the full proposed life. [D1, paragraphs 4.20, 4.43 and 4.86; P1, sections 16–17]

The answers to Q1.2.7 and Q1.9.3 introduce important detail about replacement equipment and potential panel replacement activity. EPS should explain how replacement works near my home would be controlled, including traffic, noise, lighting and changes to equipment characteristics. The scheme-wide replacement period should not be mistaken for continuous work at my property, but neither should replacement be treated as consequence-free operation. [A4; P1, sections 10, 17 and 23]

The revised Design Principles and Parameters Code allows substantial electrical infrastructure and foundation works at Site 5A. The outstanding questions about alternatives, landscape, groundwater and the concentration of effects should therefore be answered against the permitted parameters, rather than an illustrative arrangement which may subsequently change. My detailed grounds are in sections 15–20 of my Written Statement. [A13, Table 4.3; P1]

## 11 Accuracy of the responses attributed to RR1995

My Deadline 1 statement, particularly section 24, identifies inaccuracies in the earlier themed response to RR-1995, PDA-012. I reiterate that request for correction here; I recognise that PDA-012 predates my statement. Grouping representations by theme is understandable, but it must not attribute statements to me which I did not make or obscure the specific question I did raise. [P1, section 24; A14]

Examples include CON-005's account of a declined January 2026 site visit request; CON-011's attribution of a £5,000 printed-copy issue rather than my difficulty establishing what material was needed; and CON-012's account of repeat objection submissions. My statement explains why these do not accurately represent my own points. I ask EPS to correct the record against my original RR, rather than require me to keep disproving an attributed position. [A14, printed pages 101, 106 and 108; P1]

Section 24 also identifies the mismatch between WAT-018's discussion of Site 8 and my Site 5 watercourse concern, and the treatment in TRA-038 of existing entrances and proposed access points. These distinctions matter because an answer about a different location or entrance cannot resolve the question I raised. [P1, section 24; A14, WAT-018 and TRA-038]

Taken together with VC-003 and the incorrect Category 3 cross reference and the incorrect placement of my dwelling in respect to the Order Limits, these errors have undermined my confidence that my concerns have been considered on their actual facts. I ask EPS to provide a short correction and response schedule identifying my original point, the correct location, its substantive answer, the supporting evidence and any resulting change to assessment or mitigation. A further collection of general document references would not resolve the problem.

## 12 Action requested from the Examination

I ask the ExA to pursue a corrected assessment of my actual location; a separately identified and reasoned response to my Category 3 request; specific safeguards for my borehole and wall; and coordinated evidence about noise, access safety and drainage at Site 5. The proposed inspection provides an opportunity to check the physical circumstances underpinning those questions.

I also ask that any assurances relied upon be linked to identifiable, enforceable provisions, with responsibility, timing and monitoring made clear. Where essential evidence remains outstanding, it should be supplied in time for meaningful examination and response. Residents should not have to wait for construction to discover whether assumptions made about their homes were correct.

References

The labels below are used only within this submission. They are not newly assigned Examination Library references as these were still not available at the time of writing and submission.


Written Statement at Deadline 1

A1 Applicant response to Open Floor Hearing 1
EXAM/9.18, Published file EN0110014-001358.

A2 Applicant response to Procedural Deadline A submissions
EXAM/9.22,. Published file EN0110014-001360.

A3 Accompanied Site Inspection Itinerary
EXAM/9.1, Revision 1, October 2026,

A4 Applicant responses to the Examining Authority's first written questions
EXAM/9.2, published file EN0110014-001403.

A5 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
APP/7.1, Revision 2, clean version, October 2026. Published file EN0110014-001314.

A6 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan
APP/7.2, Revision 2, clean version, October 2026, Published file EN0110014-001316.

A7 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
APP/7.6, Revision 2, clean version, October 2026. Published file EN0110014-001324.

A8 Evening Noise Assessment
EXAM/9.20, Revision 1, October 2026. Published file EN0110014-001337. The revised OEMP refers to EXAM/9.21; the assessment's own cover identifies EXAM/9.20.

A9 Water Framework Directive Assessment
ES Volume 3 Appendix 10.2, Revision 2. Published file EN0110014-001369.

A10 Flood Risk Assessment
ES Volume 3 Appendix 10.1, Revision 3, clean version, Published file EN0110014-001376.

A11 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
ES Volume 3 Appendix 7.8, Revision 2, clean version,. Published file EN0110014-001364.

A12 Mental Health and Wellbeing Addendum
EXAM/9.27, October 2026. Published file EN0110014-001371.

A13 Design Principles and Parameters Code
APP/7.18, Revision 2. Published file EN0110014-001311.

A14 Applicant response to Relevant Representations Part 5 By Theme
PDA-012, APP/8.10. Published file EN0110014-000565.

O1 Norfolk County Council Local Impact Report
Deadline 1, published file EN0110014-001412,

O2 South Norfolk Council Local Impact Report
Deadline 1, published file EN0110014-001448,

O3 Environment Agency Deadline 1 submission
Published file EN0110014-001205,.

N1 Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN1
2025 designated version, effective 6 January 2026;. Official accessible publication on GOV.UK.

N2 National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure EN3
2025 designated version;. Official accessible publication on GOV.UK.

N3 Planning Act 2008
Section 57,. Legislation.gov.uk.

D1 Green Hill Solar Farm decision letter
Secretary of State, 8 October 2026, EN010170-001960, paragraphs 4.20, 4.43 and 4.86. Decision publication on GOV.UK; signed letter also published by Holcot Parish Council.


Due to the very tight timescale between availability of the documents and Deadline 1 I have used OpenAI ChatGPT to assist in preparing this submission, including reviewing and summarising published examination documents, analysing information, and helping to structure, draft and refine the written text.

The AI assistance was based on published East Pye Solar examination material, relevant supporting documents, and information and observations provided by me.

The views, concerns and conclusions expressed are my own. I have reviewed the final submission, checked factual information and references against original sources, and accept full responsibility for its accuracy and content.