

SUNNICA ENERGY FARM

EN010106

Volume 8

8.11 Applicant's Comments on Say No To Sunnica's Deadline 1
Submission (Changes Application)

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010



Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Sunnica Energy Farm
Development Consent Order 2022

**Applicant's Comments on Say No To Sunnica's Deadline 1 Submission
(Changes Application)**

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	EN010106
Application Document Reference	EN010106/APP/8.11
Author	Sunnica Energy Farm Project Team

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 00	11/11/22	Application version

Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
1 Applicant's comments on Say No To Sunnica's Deadline 1 Submission (Changes Application)	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Applicant's response	3



Table of Tables

Table 1-1 Summary of comment made and the Applicant’s response3

1 Applicant's comments on Say No To Sunnica's Deadline 1 Submission (Changes Application)

1.1 Background

1.1.1 This document sets out the Applicant's response to Say No to Sunnica Action Group Ltd's comments on the Proposed Changes to the Application **[REP1-046]** submitted at Examination Deadline 1.

1.1.2 The Applicant has summarised the comments made and included its response in Table 1-1.

1.2 Applicant's response

Table 1-1 Summary of comment made and the Applicant's response

Summary of Comment	Applicant's Response
<p>Unhelpfully, the applicant's latest 400kv drawings still aren't presented in a way which allows for direct comparison with the equivalent 132kv drawings because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scale of the drawings varies between the original 132kv and 400kv versions of the same drawings. E.g., compare the original GA 132kv drawing (Figure 3-10b) with the equivalent 400kv drawing (Figure 3-29b) for the East Site A substation. The order in which the different elevations are presented on the page differs between the original and 400kv drawings. For example, on the original elevations for West Site A Substation, the elevations are presented with the view from the east at the top of the page followed by the views from the north, south, and west. In the 400kv drawings the order is east, west, north, and south. The same issue occurs on the elevations for the East Site A and East Site B Substations. Information is missing from the 400kv drawings. Most notably, the 10m high wall / barrier proposed as part of the 400kv solution is missing from the East Views on the 400kv elevations for Sunnica West 	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the arrangement and general elevation figures for an illustrative 400kV substation arrangement [PDC-003 to PDC-008] fail to allow for direct comparison with the illustrative 132kV arrangements and elevation figures submitted with the Applicant's application [APP-144 to APP-149].</p> <p>We will address each of the points made in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Scale of the figures</i> – neither the 400kV figures nor their 132kV equivalent have been produced to scale as the figures have been provided for illustrative purposes only. The figures in each case represent one way that the Scheme substations could be constructed within the parameters that have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES). With particular reference to Figure 3-29B [PDC-006] and Figure 3-10B [APP-147], the figures have been produced at sufficient detail to allow for comparison between the equivalent 400kV and 132kV figures. <i>Ordering by which the elevations are presented</i> – the respective elevations are clearly labelled on both the 400kV and 132 kV figures. The Applicant does not consider the order in which they appear on the page to present an obstacle to comparing each 400kV figure with its 132kV equivalent. <i>Missing information</i> – as noted above, the figures have been provided for illustrative purposes only and allow the viewer to see a visualisation of the illustrative substation infrastructure both with, and without, a wall being present. The wall is not presented from both east and west elevations as its footprint is identical within each elevation and its presence in both is not considered to benefit the reader.

Summary of Comment	Applicant's Response
<p>Site A (Figure 3-28A) & Sunnica East Site B (Figure 3-30A).</p>	
<p>The proposed parameters approach means that the substation infrastructure including the 10m high wall could be located anywhere within the proposed compounds.</p> <p>Although the elevation drawings use geographical references (e.g. north, south, east, west views), there is no indication of which viewing direction is considered to be a worst case scenario, and whether or not this has been modelled. The best case scenario for one viewpoint can be another viewpoint's worst case and the applicant's explanation of the design rationale in this regard appears to be missing.</p>	<p>The Applicant's approach in assessing parameters with the greatest impact has assumed that the entire maximum footprint of the substations is developed. The respective location of the wall within the substation compound does not therefore affect the rigour and acceptability of this assessment. With particular reference to viewpoints, the maximum impact has been assessed for all viewpoints in that the assessment has assumed that the entire substation area will be developed.</p>