

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: Sunnica timetable feedback. FAO Mr Grahame Kean and team
Date: 18 May 2022 22:36:06

Interested Party ID 20031443

Dear Examining Authority,

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the following aspects of the Sunnica proposal:

1. The issue of whether the Preliminary Meeting (PM) should be delayed until mid-July 2022
2. The Applicant's proposed timetable to consult further on amendments intended to form the formal Change Request to be made to the ExA.

I object to the grounds on which this delay is being requested. The Grid connection is vital to this scheme and is something that should have been agreed before the application was submitted (we were led to believe this was more or less the case during the consultation).

What we are now presented with is an energy producing scheme that cannot supply energy into the national grid. The proposed new Grid extension option is a significant change to the scheme and is in an entirely different location to the 3 options that were discussed in the consultation.

Sunnica have had plenty of time to put this application together. This scheme has been hanging over us since early 2019 and it seems that this latest problem with the Grid extension has largely come about due to Sunnica's poor level of engagement with National Grid. Lack of engagement with communities and other stakeholders has been consistent throughout this whole process. So this latest 'hurdle' does not particularly come as a surprise.

There have already been a number of delays and changes made to the timetables that we were presented with during both the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as well as prior to the application being submitted and even since then. For example, in the non-statutory consultation, we were briefed that the pre-examination would begin in autumn/winter 2020. In the statutory consultation the pre-examination period changed to summer 2021. It eventually started in late January 2022.

On the delay itself:

If there is no delay to enable the Grid connection problem to be resolved, and the PM is held before this work (and consultation, etc) is completed, this would be grossly unfair to all those registered. I would essentially be basing my views on a sub-standard and incomplete application that will be subject to a significant change. I would have to review the changes and re-review all the new DCO papers whilst the examination is underway and the clock is ticking. This would be unacceptable and would hinder my participation in the process.

I have already submitted my Relevant Representations, which obviously did not take this newly suggested Grid option into account, so are already out of date. Having reviewed many DCO application documents, I have now almost completed drafting my Written Representations, but I feel that I cannot finalise these because I am now unsure of the exact nature of this significant change to the scheme (exact location unknown, etc) nor the impact it will have.

If Sunnica has the option of withdrawing their application and resubmitting once all of their 'gaps' have been filled, they should do this. If this is not possible then a delay (longer than mid-July) has to be granted, otherwise myself and other registered parties would be prejudiced for the reasons outlined above.

On the timetable proposed by Sunnica:

I strongly object to Sunnica's suggested timetable, and to the suggestion of holding the PM in mid-July. This is a totally unacceptable timeframe. To start the next phase of the process at the beginning of peak holiday season would be very unfair and would severely limit how many registered parties could attend. I, myself, have work travel plans and leisure travel plans already in place for July and August. I have already had to reschedule these from last year due to Covid. I cannot afford to reschedule them again simply because Sunnica wants to work to their own timetable, which is clearly

biased in their favour. I would not be pleased if the PM took place in July/August while I was away, and I was unable to attend. I have been working hard to follow this scheme from the very beginning and, on my part, I have always reviewed documents and responded to consultations etc. in a timely manner. Adhering to timelines is not something that has been reciprocated by the applicant.

In addition, if the examination were to begin in mid-July I would also find it very difficult to re-review all of the revised DCO documents and submit my revised Written Representations in a timely manner during the peak summer period for the above reasons, so this would also limit my ability to assess the scheme and would reduce my participation in the examination process.

Furthermore, I consider Sunnica's suggested timetable to be unrealistic (too short) to assess the proposed Option 3 (which is different from the "old" Option 3). Aside from not knowing yet if this option is technically feasible (which will take time to evaluate), there will need to be assessments of the various environmental impacts. Then a full (and no less than 30-day) public consultation on the thoroughly evaluated revised scheme plans which will likely lead to further revisions being necessary after the consultation responses have been taken into account. The suggested timetable is over-optimistic to say the least and is based from the outset on an uncertain connection option. I believe there would be a high probability of further delays.

In summary, if the application isn't withdrawn, then the PM should be held at a later date that does not prejudice registered parties (as above), and not before the new Grid option has been fully assessed, fully consulted on and the revised DCO documents have been published for a reasonable length of time to allow registered parties and any consultants etc to review them ahead of the meeting.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Justin Fuga

Sent from [Outlook](#)