

**From:** Nick Wright

**Sent:** 08 November 2022 07:37

**Subject:** Sunnica

Dear John

#### Sunnica Industrial Solar Site

I understand you are coordinating Natural England's response to the Sunnica Industrial Solar Site (SISS). I am part of the Say No To Sunnica Action Group (SAG) and a neighbour and local farmer next to the scheme. We would be very grateful for your help on two matters:

ALC Soil Classification – as you know Sunnica submitted with their ES report produced by Daniel Baird Soil Consultancy Ltd (DB). This concluded that in the 981 ha site there was only 3.8% of BMV land. The report omitted the cable route. Natural England have taken this to be correct and based their response to the scheme on this premise. SAG do not believe this is correct for the following reasons:

1/ Three individual soil specialists have looked at the site and you have seen the conclusions of Reading Agricultural Associates. Patrick Stephenson Ltd and Landscape Land and Property Ltd have taken soil samples and dug pits on neighbouring land and have also concluded that the findings of DB are not correct. There is more than 3.8% BMV on this site. Excluding an uplift for irrigation the three experts consider they would expect to find upwards of 50% BMV on this site.

2/ I have attached two plans.

Plan 1 – shows the Sunnica Energy Farm layout with ALC gradings in each site area in hectares. Points to note:

a/ 193 hectares of BMV – 20%

b/ when land east of the A11 is resurveyed it is uplifted by two grades on magic maps.

c/ if you estimate that 50% of the grade 3 land that has not been split is 3A this increases the area of BMV by 264 hectares.

d/ Total BMV is 46%. I accept this is a broad brush approach. However the point I am making is there must be more than 3.8%.

Plan 2 – Produced by Natural England - including the cable route.

a/ this shows that 960 ha of the site is 60% or more likely to be BMV.

b/ the total area within the boundary is 1,162 ha – therefore 83% of the site is 60% or more likely to be BMV.

c/ this would give an overall of 50% BMV on the site.  $960\text{ha} \times 60\% = 576\text{ha}$  is 50

Both plans show a considerable difference to DB. Natural England's own work shows 50% BMV.

Our only point is that in light of the evidence DB's report has to be investigated. You can not allow the UK's largest ever solar scheme to go ahead without querying the findings of this report. The pattern of the three opinions indicate that the site will at least be 50% BMV.

The other area of concern is the concept that 40 years is a temporary loss. Realistically the scheme will take 3 to 5 years to build and the same to decommission making it 50 years. Nowhere in

the DCO application do Sunnica commit to returning the land to agriculture. Sunnica must be considered to be a permanent loss. 50 years is a generation.

I hope you will see the merit of the points made. Please do call me if you have any questions on the above. [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

Nick Wright

On behalf of the Say No To Sunnica Group Ltd.