

**APPLICATION BY SUNNICA LTD FOR AN ORDER FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT  
FOR THE SUNNICA ENERGY FARM PROJECT  
EN010106**

---

**DEADLINE 4: POST HEARING SUBMISSIONS FROM:**

**(1) DRUG DEVELOPMENT SOLUTIONS LIMITED (REF:SUNN-015)**

**(2) LGC LIMITED AND LGC BIORESEARCH LIMITED (REF: UNKNOWN)**

---

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 These short written submissions relate to the oral case put forward on behalf of Drug Development Solutions Ltd (**DDS**) and LGC limited and LGC Bioresearch Ltd (together **LGC**) at **Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1)** held on Tuesday 6 December 2022.
- 1.2 DDS and LGC were represented by Jonathan Bower, partner and solicitor at Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP.

**2. SUMMARY OF CASE**

- 2.1 The DDS and LGC submissions followed on from those made by Isabella Tafur of Counsel on behalf of HPUT A Limited and HPUT B Limited (together **HPUT**).
- 2.2 HPUT have provided draft protective provisions to the Applicant and in the response to written representations (REP3A-035) @P.272 the Applicant has committed to using an alternative HGV access route which will not make use of the existing access road through the campus (parcels 16-06 and 16-05 on the land plans).
- 2.3 HPUT stated that with the alternative access that has been proposed for HGV movements it was not clear why all traffic can't use that alternative access, so as to avoid the campus altogether. That is the subject of continuing discussions between the parties. It was hoped that the protective provisions and a separate legal agreement could be concluded before CAH 2 in February 2023. The Applicant stated they were very willing to negotiate protective provisions in respect of the site given sensitivities on the campus and close proximity working of the Applicant's works to the campus.
- 2.4 DDS and LGC supported the submissions made by HPUT and made 3 main points:
- 2.4.1 The access through the campus was only proposed by the Applicant post statutory consultation and now the Applicant has identified an alternative route as this stage for HGV access. DDS and LGC, like HPUT, do not understand why the Applicant can't take all vehicular movements away from the campus using this alternative route;
- 2.4.2 They welcome the comments made by the Applicant in relation to the protective provisions seeking to take account of their interests as well as those of freeholder HPUT; and
- 2.4.3 Discussions with the Applicant have not proceeded at pace to date – it took at least 3 months following the meeting in July for a substantive response to be received in mid-

November proposing the alternative HGV access. The issues set out in DDS and LGC's written representations are still of concern to DDS and LGC but with movement being made by the Applicant on the access and their willingness to engage on protective provisions it is hoped that agreement can be reached such that the objections can be withdrawn ahead of CAH2.

### **3. POST HEARING UPDATE**

- 3.1 Since CAH1 the Applicant has provided written confirmation that they are considering the draft protective provisions presented to them – understandably the Applicant has been focused on the Deadline 4 submissions and post hearing actions since CAH1.
- 3.2 The Applicant has also confirmed that the Applicant is willing to accept that the Campus access road is not used by construction traffic and ***all*** traffic will be routed to the north [*emphasis added*].
- 3.3 DDS and LGC look forward to receiving a substantive response on the draft protective provisions and is willing to engage in tri-partite discussions with the Applicant and HPUT to seek to resolve these issues. If they are not resolved in time then DDS and LGC will present their case in detail at CAH2 in February 2023.

**Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP**

**16 December 2022**