

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: Sunnica Unique Ref Number 20030655
Date: 18 May 2022 16:05:01
Attachments: [Sunnica Timing App Objection 18.05.22.pdf](#)

Please find attached an objection to the Revised Timing Application by Sunnica.

Kind regards

Cathy

Cathy Lecheheb

PA to John H M Gosden OBE

John Gosden Ltd

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

John Gosden Ltd, Clarehaven Stables, Bury Road,
Newmarket, Suffolk CB8 7BY

DISCLAIMER : JOHN GOSDEN LTD

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. This message is issued on the basis that John Gosden Ltd disclaims all responsibility and accepts no liability for the consequences of any person acting, or refraining from acting on it. It must not be disseminated, copied, disclosed, modified, distributed and/or published without the express written authority of John Gosden Ltd. Please note that electronic mail may be monitored in accordance with the Telecommunications (Lawful Business Practices) (Interception of Communications) Regulations 2000.

JOHN GOSDEN LTD

CLAREHAVEN STABLES, BURY ROAD, NEWMARKET, SUFFOLK CB8 7BY

By email: sunnica@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

18th May 2022

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)
Application by Sunnica Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for the
Sunnica Energy Farm
Request by the Applicant in Respect of the Timing of the Preliminary Meeting /
Examination

Dear Sir/Madam,

Unique ref number: 20030655
Objections to the Preliminary Meeting being delayed until mid-July 2022

We strongly object to the request by Sunnica for a revised timetable. Apart from all the other reasons to object this will have the unfair advantage to Sunnica of not allowing enough time for consultation on the revised, as yet, unknown plans. Sunnica have a very bad record for "consultation" and this will turn into yet another shallow and ineffective consultation.

Please note:

1. There will not be enough time in which to consult with residents and interested parties about revised plans.
2. The reason given for the delay request is not justified. It is dependent upon a new theoretical Grid extension option, which may not be technically feasible and further work is required to establish the feasibility.
3. The new 'Option 3' is a different one, on a different site, to the old 'Option 3' that was proposed during the statutory consultation (which was also the original extension location proposed in the scoping report). Clarification is needed. Which of the two different 'Option 3' locations was previously considered?
4. Sunnica state that they do not expect further adverse effects on the environment for the revised option. But this hasn't been assessed or consulted upon. Changes may be needed. Sunnica do not state where in the large 'West A' site they intend to site the new Grid extension. This could and we believe will impact landscape, heritage, transportation / highways, noise, ecology, rights of way, CPO etc. Their proposed rapid timetable is unrealistic and does not give sufficient scope for consultation and, crucially, consideration and response to the consultation.

5. Over the course of the entire process, It seems that Sunnica still have not yet looked at multiple options for the Grid extension (3 options were proposed in the statutory consultation) before submitting the DCO application in November 2021. The most viable option has yet to be determined. There may be other locations that need to be investigated. This does not appear to be a 'near-term' project at this stage.
6. There appears to be a 'blame game' between Sunnica and National Grid. The Grid extension is a fundamental part of the scheme and should have been established prior to submission of the application. This is yet another aspect of this DCO application that is incomplete (as has been indicated by the local authorities, parish councils, and many other residents and stakeholders). There are already many parts of the DCO that cannot be assessed because of the lack of information. This is another item to add to that list.
7. The proposed rapid timetable for resolving this issue is over-optimistic and likely to result in further delays being necessary. This is unfair and it affects the ability of local residents to participate. Sunnica Ltd is suggesting the Examination should start at the beginning of peak holiday season, school summer holiday period, etc. Many residents have prebooked plans during this time. It is unfair to expect local people who have had this Scheme hanging over them for over 3 years already to accommodate further unknown delays and expense.
8. There is an unfair expectation and lack of consideration on the part of Sunnica with regard to the amount of time (and expense) that people have spent reviewing their DCO application documents. To suggest they will 'simply' issue revised DCO documents demonstrates a lack of appreciation of this. It will not be possible in some cases for these revised DCO documents to be re-reviewed by residents or experts during the proposed rapid timeframe. This will hinder people's ability to comment on the scheme and participate in the examination. All in all, it is unreasonable for the applicant to suggest a further, as yet unassessed, change to the scheme to add to this list of 'unknown' information.

Finally, if it is considered that the proposed timetable needs to be amended, please could the Examining Authority have regard to the prejudice caused by this change and the rapid timetable that Sunnica has proposed to assess this change, and ensure this is remedied? If a new, more realistic timetable, based on known information, cannot be determined, the application must be withdrawn and Sunnica must repay peoples' costs.

Yours faithfully

John Gosden Ltd

By 

C A Lecheheb