



**EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL**
THE GRANGE, NUTHOLT LANE,
ELY, CAMBRIDGESHIRE CB7 4EE
Telephone: Ely (01353) 665555
DX41001 ELY
www.eastcambs.gov.uk

This matter is being dealt with by:

Andrew Phillips

Submitted via website

Telephone: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]@eastcambs.gov.uk
Unique 20031149
Reference:
Your ref EN010106

Date: 13 January 2023

Dear Mr Kean

RE: Application by Sunnica Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for Sunnica Energy Farm Project – Deadline 5

Thank you for your letter dated 5 January 2023.

This document sets out East Cambridgeshire District Council's (ECDC) responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)

Question No.	Question	Council's Response
Q2.0.9	Land parcels E12, E13, E05 If the ExA were to recommend that parcels E12, E13 and E05 should remain, please identify the extent of the PV solar panels in those parcels that would effectively mitigate impacts.	The Council notes that this question is directed at Suffolk County Council (SCC). ECDC shares the views of SCC and the other Councils in relation to land parcels E12, E13 and E05. The Council fully endorses SCC's response to this question.
Q2.1.2	Battery energy storage system (BESS): COMAH and P(HS) regulations Please comment on the precise legal authority (if any) on which one might rely to exclude the scope of the COMAH and P(HS)Regulations 2015 from application to BESS.	Please see attached response from No.5 Chambers in response to this question.

Q2.1.5	<p>Discharge of Requirement 7: DCO</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the arrangements for discharge of DCO Requirement 7 in relation to the OBFSMP, as currently drafted (Rev 03, 18 December 2022 [REP4-006])? If not, please explain and supply your proposed form of amended wording</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied with the arrangements for discharge of DCO Requirement 7.</p> <p>It is requested that the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive confirm they are happy with this requirement and will provide detailed comments.</p>
Q2.2.6	<p>Stone Curlew and archaeology</p> <p>Please explain what you consider to be the potential conflicts between management of the archaeological areas and the Stone Curlew plots, as referred to in your joint Local Impact Report [REP1-024].</p>	<p>ECDC supports the views of West Suffolk Council and Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
Q2.10.6	<p>Baseline conditions</p> <p>We note the Applicant's response to our ExQ1.10.81 [REP2-037] relating to baseline traffic conditions [REP2-037], where it is stated that "The LHAs concern was whether there was a scenario where construction flows and baseline flows combined were likely to be higher than in the weekday assessment, and not whether there would be a higher proportionate impact". Surely a Saturday assessment should be undertaken as the additional weekend construction traffic will be proportionally higher and impact more on peaceful enjoyment?</p>	<p>While additional assessments can be useful in the determination of this DCO; the Council's Environmental Health Team is satisfied that, from a public health perspective, that a Saturday assessment is not required on noise grounds.</p> <p>The comments made by Suffolk County Council are supported.</p>
Q2.10.8	<p>Assessment methodology</p> <p>We note your response to our ExQ1.10.98 [REP2-078], particularly in respect of the assessment of links,</p>	<p>The Council does not have any specific comment on this question and defers to Suffolk County Council as a local highway authority.</p>

	and to the Applicant's response [REP3A-036] [REP2-041]. Are you satisfied with this response?	
Q2.10.11	<p>Joint LIR</p> <p>We refer to the joint LIR [REP1-024] and to the Applicant's Response [REP3A-034]. Other than topics raised elsewhere in this section of questions ExQ2, are there any other outstanding transport and access issues? If so, please give details and indicate whether or not these issues are capable of satisfactory resolution.</p>	The Council does not have any specific comment on this question and defers to Cambridgeshire County Council as the local highway authority.

The Council's Tree Officer would like the following point to be raised:

"The AIA submitted at deadline 3 was insufficient as such it needs revision prior to determination not as part of a CEMP, details as to the short comings with the AIA were provided to the applicant following the public meeting where commitment was given to provide an updated AIA to respond to the long list of issues shared.

Page 19 of statement of common ground states revised AIA will be submitted at deadline 5?"

ECDC awaits to review the compressive update in tree information that should be submitted at Deadline 5.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Phillips
 Planning Team Leader