

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)  
**Subject:** Ref : EN010106 Sunnica new requested timetable and amendments  
**Date:** 18 May 2022 06:19:15

---

As a registered interested Party here is my response to your letter:

Dear Sirs,

Sunnica are proposing hugely significant changes to their Development Consent order (DCO) application. Much of the documentation submitted will no longer be accurate and their suggestions will lead to major alterations to the original planning request.

It is essential there is a considerable delay to the timetable to allow residents and interested parties access to detailed information on scheme changes, for the impacts to be adequately reviewed and provide for fair participation in the response. Sunnica are unclear how any new consultation will occur.

The previously proposed grid connection to Burwell was, Sunnica said, the key driving factor behind the choice of location of this scheme. The fact that this connection is not viable gives huge cause for concern for Sunnica's technical abilities to deliver the DCO at all since success involves this Grid connection, further questioning the entire suitability of location.

I wholly object to the rushed timetable suggested by Sunnica for the assessment, evaluation, consultation, etc, of the new 'Option 3' especially as this brings more potential land acquisition, serious issues of higher rated cabling and different cabling route impacts. It is not an amendment but a whole new scheme proposal. This is not sufficient, and changes that affect over 40,000 people in over eight villages, should have adequate time allowed to consult with these people. I am very concerned that this change could not be fairly assessed with a tight timetable once the Examination process begins.

The feasibility of their new proposals needs to be established before any further examination process is undertaken. Sunnica will need to carry out new impact assessments on landscape, traffic, construction, wildlife noise etc. Many could cause significant change and require change to the previous documentation on which the public consultation was based, rendering previous communication null and void.

Beyond this, a full and thorough consultation, including face-to-face, with local residents, interested parties and other stakeholders must be undertaken. There should be adequate time for the result of this consultation to be considered along with further considerations emerging and any amendments. Sunnica hoping to achieve this by mid-July is unrealistic, and if granted this could potentially push through ill thought through adjustments, leading to further public safety issues. Their intent is this request is questionable.

Sunnica will also need time to update their DCO application documentation, this will also need further time for re-review. Along with additional resources (on top of the considerable expense already incurred reviewing the current submitted vast DCO application documents).

The suggested short timeframe is unworkable, it will not allow those most impacted to review changes especially with the Platinum Jubilee and summer holidays imminent. Any proposed timetable must be fair and allow for fair participation.

Given this schemes scale and complexity, **I believe the application should be completely withdrawn and be resubmitted, if and when Sunnica can get their plans effectively in order.**

**Isabel Cross**

Registered Interested party