

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: La Hogue and Dane Hill Farms
Date: 12 October 2022 15:11:49

Interested Party Reference: 20030923
SUNN-AFP172

My name is Joanna Reeks and I am a part owner of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. As a family we have owned and farmed these farms for over 50 years. I also [REDACTED] and run a large farm shop & cafe from the farm.

I would like to update you as to our current position regarding the Sunnica scheme. In 2020 having looked at the Sunnica proposal, plans and information they provided we formally gave notice that we wished to withdraw our land from the scheme as we did not want solar panels placed anywhere on our farms. Our reasons were we felt the scheme was too large, the landscaping proposals were totally insufficient and the covenant strength of the applicant and the proposals for site clean up were wholly inadequate. The scheme is also very likely to adversely impact my business – having taken the views of our customers they are very against the scheme and feel that the proximity of it to our premises would put them off coming to visit my shop. This would be seriously detrimental to my trade and could lead to job losses.

Sunnica responded by informing us that our views were irrelevant as they will simply compulsorily purchase the parts of our farm that they wanted. They were incredibly aggressive and intimidating. They suggested that if we co-operated they would take only approximately 100 acres on [REDACTED] over which they would require a long lease in the form they provided. Otherwise we would lose most of our farm to compulsory purchase for solar panels. We have been involved in long discussions and negotiations about the drafting of the lease and apart from simply not wanting to be part of the Sunnica scheme in any way, we have some major objections to the current form of the lease:

Dane Hill

- The gate from the B1085 is our only way in and out of the land from the highway. Sunnica are insisting on including this area in their lease. If we are forced to sign a lease for the solar area, as we have repeatedly offered, we could agree to Sunnica having an easement between the gate and solar area. This easement would provide an indefeasible right for Sunnica to access the solar area at all times throughout the term of the lease. We think it is extremely unreasonable to refuse this easement and insist on a lease. We propose an easement width of 6.7m wide which we understand to be the width of the B1085 leading onto Dane Hill Farm.
- We passionately do not wish to see any felling of trees on our land, as required by the present draft lease that allows this. We feel the current landscaping proposals for Dane Hill are wholly inadequate.
- We must retain use of our existing track around the area Sunnica wish to acquire

so that we can continue farming what we are left with. We are content for Sunnica to share use of this (with an appropriate contribution to maintenance).

- We have repeatedly raised our concerns about clean up costs and covenant strength and these have been ignored.

La Hogue

- We passionately do not wish to see any felling of existing trees (Sunnica have demanded a 10m tree free zone on either side of their cable).

So to conclude we find ourselves in a position where we do not want our land to be included in the scheme but have reluctantly entered into negotiations with Sunnica over a lease. They are now being deliberately difficult and intimidating (eg threatening to make us pay their injunction costs if we continued to refuse access for their surveys) and they are generally being wholly unreasonable about how we are going to be able to access and work on our farms. I felt you should know the truth about how it is for an unwilling landowner to deal with this company.

Kind regards

Joanna Reeks