Submission ID: S017A33B3

Formal objection to Site 7 (Sub-Sites 7D and 7F) — baseline deficiencies, cumulative visual threat to Hawes Green heritage cluster, and request for topographical cross-section and ASI — [redacted] Jane Shearer — PINS Ref [redacted] — EN0110014

To: The Planning Inspectorate

Project Reference: EN0110014 (East Pye Solar Project)

Submission By: [redacted] Jane Shearer — Interested Party

PINS Reference: [redacted]

Property Address: [redacted]

Date: 19 October 2026

Subject: Formal Objection to East Pye Solar Project (Reference EN0110014) — Site 7 (Sub-Sites 7D and 7F) — Major Baseline Deficiencies and Cumulative Visual Threat to the Hawes Green Heritage Cluster Setting

Dear Examining Authority,

I am writing to formally lodge my strong objection to the proposed Site 7, specifically Sub-Sites 7D and 7F, of the East Pye Solar project (EN0110014). My past submissions focused primarily on Site 8. However, recent review of the application masterplan has revealed that the eastern parcels of Site 7 — Sub-Sites 7D and 7F — appear from the mapping to lie to the south-west [redacted], potentially at a comparable or lesser distance than Site 8. Because the Applicant has failed to conduct an accurate real-world survey of Hawes Green, I am wholly unable to verify the true distance or visual impact of these parcels from my home and heritage cluster.

I wish to be clear that I cannot state a verified precise distance to Sub-Sites 7D and 7F — and that inability is itself one of the failures I am raising. The developer's failure to survey this area properly means that I, as a resident of a [redacted] within the Shotesham Conservation Area, am left entirely unable to judge the true visual, glare and heritage settings impacts of Site 7 on my home and historic cluster.

1. Sloppy, Outdated Desktop Survey Data and Complete Misorientation

In Table 7.4 of their Environmental Statement, the Applicant bases their visual assessment of the Hawes Green area on a fictional receptor — "Highfield Lodge Holiday Home". This property does not exist on Hawes Green. The actual property is a permanent residential home called Highfield House.

If the Applicant attempts to argue that they simply confused Highfield Lodge Holiday Home with Highfield House, their assessment remains completely invalid for a further reason: Highfield House faces entirely the wrong way. It is a permanent new-build residential property that faces inward toward the main village — not outward toward Site 7 or Site 8. Its orientation is completely different from the heritage cluster properties including Old Hall Barn, Church View Barn and Old Hall Farm, which face east and south-east across the Shotesham Beck Valley toward the proposed solar

sites. Using a property that faces in a fundamentally different direction to calculate the potential visual impact on our heritage cluster is functionally useless as a visual assessment methodology.

2. Severe Harm to the Setting of a Protected Heritage Cluster

Old Hall Barn does not sit in isolation. It is a vital part of a historically continuous heritage cluster that includes:

- Old Hall Farm — Grade II listed
- Church View Barn — Grade II listed
- Watendlath — neighbouring residential property forming part of the historic curtilage of the Hawes Green cluster
- Remains of St Martin's Church — Grade II listed (List Entry 1152468)
- St Mary's Church — Grade II* listed (List Entry 1050642)

The open agricultural valley floor and the rural approach to Hawes Green form the shared historic setting that binds these assets together and defines the immediate approach to St Mary's Church (Grade II*). Under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Court of Appeal's judgment in Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC [2014], the decision-maker must give considerable importance and weight to harm to the settings of these listed buildings. NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.6 requires wholly exceptional justification for harm to the setting of a Grade II* asset — justification that cannot be provided when no field survey of this heritage cluster has been conducted.

By failing to conduct a real-world field survey, the Applicant has completely ignored how introducing a vast industrial energy landscape to the south-west of our ridge directly impacts the collective group value and the uninterrupted rural setting of this entire cluster.

3. The Visual Pincer — Unassessed Cumulative Risk

The failure to correctly survey Hawes Green means the Applicant has omitted what may be a severe cumulative impact on [redacted] sits on an elevated ridge at approximately 38 metres AOD, looking across open valley landscape in multiple directions. We already face the confirmed threat of industrial visual disruption from Site 8 to our south east.

If Sub-Sites 7D and 7F of Site 7 are located to our south-west at a comparable or lesser distance — as the masterplan mapping suggests — then our historic cluster faces the risk of industrial visual disruption from two directions simultaneously. This would constitute an unassessed and potentially severe cumulative visual enclosure of the Hawes Green heritage cluster between two large-scale solar infrastructure schemes.

This cumulative pincer effect has not been assessed anywhere in the Environmental Statement. The developer's own cumulative impact assessment does not consider the combined visual effect on Hawes Green of both Site 7 and Site 8 together, and cannot do so while the baseline data for this area remains as fundamentally flawed as I have described above.

4. The Geometry Flaw of Valley Mitigation Viewed from an Elevated Ridge

Hawes Green sits on an elevated ridge at approximately 38 metres AOD. The valley floor where the proposed solar panels would be located lies at approximately 30 metres AOD. The Applicant's desktop assumption that ground-level perimeter hedgerows will successfully screen 4.5-metre tracker panels is a geometric impossibility when those panels are viewed from a higher elevation looking downward across open valley landscape.

A hedge planted at 30 metres AOD reaching 3 metres in height achieves a top elevation of approximately 33 metres AOD — still 5 metres below the eye level of a resident standing on Hawes Green at 38 metres AOD. The screening arithmetic does not work and the developer has provided no verified topographical cross-section to prove otherwise.

5. Our Formal Requests to the Examining Authority

I formally request that the Examining Authority:

- (a) Requires the Applicant to provide a verified topographical cross-section from the Hawes Green ridge and St Mary's Church footpath to the nearest boundaries of both Site 7 (Sub-Sites 7D and 7F) and Site 8 (Sub-Site 8A), to establish the precise distances, elevations and lines of sight that the desktop survey has failed to provide
- (b) Requires the Applicant to reassess the visual impact on the Hawes Green heritage cluster from Sub-Sites 7D and 7F of Site 7, using a corrected receptor identification and a field survey methodology that reflects the actual orientation and elevated position of the heritage cluster properties
- (c) Requires the Applicant to conduct a cumulative visual impact assessment combining the effects of Site 7 and Site 8 on the Hawes Green heritage cluster, which has not been carried out
- (d) Includes the Hawes Green ridge and St Mary's Church footpath in the Accompanied Site Inspection itinerary for Site 7 as well as Site 8, so that the Examining Authority can assess firsthand the elevated ridge position and its relationship with the proposed solar infrastructure to the south-west as well as the east — I note that my husband has already submitted a formal response to EXAM/9.1 requesting these locations be added for Site 8

Because of the developer's failure to survey this area properly, I am entirely unable to verify what impact Site 7 will have on the heritage cluster and my home. The total

lack of clarity, combined with the prospect of industrial infrastructure potentially enclosing our historic cluster from two directions, is causing me extreme anxiety and stress. The rural setting and historic tranquillity of Hawes Green is not an abstract planning consideration — it is the daily lived experience of our home and community, and it deserves to be properly assessed.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted] **Jane Shearer**

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

19 October 2026