

I would like to clarify a point I made during the oral examination in relation to the nature of the agricultural land and the sources evidencing its grade.

At the examination, in response to a question, I only mentioned one of these sources – namely the neighbouring land evidence. An expert assessment (Patrick Stephenson's report which is part of Say No To Sunnica Action Group's submission at Deadline 2 – Written Representation – Annex C – Agricultural Land Classification – pages 171-172 – Point 6.0 – Table 2) states that the neighbouring land is 78% BMV.

I ought to have also mentioned a desk top review conducted by Reading Agricultural Consultants attached to the Say No To Sunnica report submission (Deadline 2 – Written Representation – Annex C – Agricultural Land Classification – page 25 – paragraph 7.38) which finds that up to 60% of the proposed development should be classed as BMV.

It is clear that Sunnica's assessment that only 3.8% of the land is BMV is significantly contested.

Given the importance of this issue to the application, and the fact that Sunnica's evidence is highly contested, I ask either that the Examiners direct an independent assessment of the soil, or that, without being required to do so, Sunnica allows an independent assessment to proceed.