

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: IP Ref: EN010106 - MY COMMENTS RELATING TO: Sunnica Ltd - Request by the Applicant in Respect of the Timing of the Preliminary Meeting / Examination
Date: 12 May 2022 15:15:38

Dear Sirs

My interested party ref No. is 20030250

As my family reside in [REDACTED] I wish to comment on the PI letter of the 4th May 2022 regarding the Sunnica Energy Farm ref EN010106.

I am aware that only 2 basic points can be commented on: the delay requested for the preliminary Examination; and the timetable set out by Sunnica.

I have grave concerns regarding the reasons for the delay requested which I cannot agree to and I do not feel the timetable as set out by Sunnica is acceptable.

A period of 3 years since Sunnica put forward its plans to the local communities has meant a very stressful time for residents and it is already running 12 months late which is purely due to delays by Sunnica.

Any further delays will only add to the stress and uncertainty for local residents, which include my family. My parents live in [REDACTED] and have been deeply affected by the [REDACTED] relating to this huge scale development on their doorstep. The Sunnica proposal has had a severe impact on their mental health and any further delay will simply exacerbate this which is a major concern for me as my parents are senior citizens and extremely worried about the effect of the proposal. My sister lives in [REDACTED] and is also very distressed by the proposal and the thought of this continuing to drag on. Therefore, in my view, it is important for the Secretary of State to make a decision on this scheme by June 2023, to avoid any more anguish and uncertainty.

The issues which the National Grid have highlighted through their lawyers regarding the Grid connection at the Burwell substation should have been negotiated in full by Sunnica and an agreement reached well in advance of the presentation of the DCO in November 2021. Agreement by the National Grid was fundamental to Option 1 detailed in Sunnica's proposal so it is highly unsatisfactory and quite unbelievable that such issues have surfaced at this late stage in the process.

The implications of the request by Sunnica to seek an alternative for Option 2 at this point are completely unknown and clearly were not part of the original proposal on which the public have had an opportunity to comment. It cannot be acceptable practice for Sunnica to add a major new component (i.e. Option 3) to their proposal at the very end of the application process for which the impact on landscape, local communities, wildlife, noise, traffic etc. has not yet been fully evaluated and the public not given a chance to put forward their views. The public must be able to consult on such a major change and this will inevitably mean months of delay. This consultation must be thorough and cannot be rushed.

There have been other delays caused by Sunnica within the last 3 years such as the commencement date for the Public Consultation and the actual date for the DCO submission. It is unacceptable for Sunnica to have their own agenda for their plans, instead they must respect the strict rules and regulations of the Planning Inspectorate and The Planning Act.

These consistent delays by Sunnica point to a highly unprofessional approach to this behemoth proposal and provide the local communities with no confidence that the project, if accepted, will be completed within the timeframe put forward. We are already looking at 2027 for completion of the project if Sunnica misses the current deadline. This is a year too long and the point is that we need green energy now, not in 2027.

My request is for the start date for the preliminary meeting **NOT** to be extended and the Sunnica timetable to be disallowed. I feel strongly that Sunnica should have to withdraw their application at this stage.

Yours faithfully,

Claire Mills