

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: Extended Deadline 3A - Monday 28 November 2022 - COMMENTS ON WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS - SUNNICA - YOUR REF: EN010106
Date: 27 November 2022 10:51:34

Your Ref: EN010106 D

All Interested Parties, Statutory Parties and any Other Person invited to the Preliminary Meeting

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a Co-Landowner of [REDACTED] owning land through which Sunnica are proposing to install an underground cable we are an interested party. I speak on behalf of myself and wife Sue, joint owners of the property

I would comment as below on the **SAY NO TO SUNNICA Written Representation ANNEX G Consultation Dated 11th November 2022.**

In particular:

Item & Clause;

3.3.11. Landowners have a right to know the likely extent of compulsory purchase during the consultation, and approximately how much of the land has been secured by Sunnica and what is remaining. This also impacts the way that communities feel about the scheme, how realistic they consider it to be and ultimately how much time they devote to participating in the consultation.

My comment is to agree totally with this statement and any other so relating.

Our dealings with Sunnica, from a lay viewpoint, was to receive what we always considered the **threat** of legal action if we did not agree to accept the offer made and agree to the compulsory purchase of our land. This we have since understood **could** be an offer of a compulsory 'lease' of our land. We received a constant flow of letters, emails, telephone calls and personal visits, all in what we consider a pressured manner for us to quickly decide, adding because others already had. We were led to believe that the type and route of the cable had been accepted by many along that route which we have since found to be incorrect. The size of the cable has been increased significantly and we remain seriously concerned about the possible health effects to humans and animals by any cable buried in the ground. We were contacted by other small landowners around us whose property was along a route of the proposed cable, the line of which we understand has deviated since. None of this was explained to us in a way we could understand, indeed, one other landowner explained how he had signed over only because of the threat made of legal action and compulsory purchase if he did not.

We therefore support the comment made above by Say No to Sunnica Group.

Sunnica used jargon and technical language in response to what was our lay understanding of the situation. Whilst we accept that renewables are a way forward to finding sustainable energy, we cannot accept the way in which Sunnica have dealt with us and agree, our view is to now seriously question how realistic the scheme actually is.

[Redacted]

Garry Chapman

[Redacted]

Sue Chapman

[Redacted]