



SUNNICA ENERGY FARM

EN010106

8.121 SoCG Update Note for Combined LPA

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009



Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

Sunnica Energy Farm

8.121 SoCG Update Note for Combined LPA

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	EN010106
Application Document Reference	EN010106/APP/8.121
Author	Sunnica Energy Farm Project Team

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 00	24 March 2023	Deadline 10 Submission

Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
1 SoCG update	3
1.1 Introduction	3

Table of Tables

Table 1-1	Matters agreed	4
Table 1-2	Matters not agreed	5

1 SoCG update

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared to provide an update to the Examining Authority on the points under discussion between the Local Authorities and the Applicant within the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) **[REP8-029]** submitted at Deadline 8.
- 1.1.2 Table 1-1 below outlines the additional points that are now agreed with the Lead Officers within each of the Local Authorities (Cambridgeshire County Council, Suffolk County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council and West Suffolk Council). These matters have moved from matters under discussion in Table 3 of **REP8-029**. Table 1-2 outlines the additional points where agreement has not been reached. These matters have moved from Table 3 to Table 4 in **REP8-029**.
- 1.1.3 This document should be read in conjunction with the SoCG **[REP8-029]** submitted at Deadline 8.
- 1.1.4 It has not been possible to record these matters in an updated SoCG for Deadline 10 as the Councils were unable to obtain authority to sign the updated SoCG in time. The intention is that they will submit a representation at Deadline 11 to confirm to the ExA that the Lead Officers agree with the contents of this document.

Table 1-1 Matters agreed

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
Transport and Access	Side Agreement	The Parties agree that a Side Agreement will be beneficial for the Scheme.
	Assessment - Vehicle occupancy	<p>Vehicle occupancy is secured as 1.5 at peak construction in 7.2.32.</p> <p>Whilst this is acceptable the LHA will expect as part of the final CTMP to be provided with an approved profile of car occupancy for the duration of the program to ensure that dynamic assessment of the target car occupancy is monitored and achieved at peak construction.</p> <p>The cap on the maximum number of worker vehicle trips is secured in 7.2.43.</p> <p>This is acceptable to SCC</p>
	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement of the F-CTMP/TP	The Parties are agreed on the monitoring, reporting and enforcement measures within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan submitted at Deadline 7 [REP7-017].
Socio-economics	Mitigation – Compensation package for local communities	The Parties agree on the measures outlined in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan submitted as part of the DCO Application [APP-268], updated at Deadline 7 [REP7-044] and Deadline 10. This seeks to secure the potential improvements, mitigation and compensation to local communities that would be implemented as part of the Scheme.
S106	Provision of S106	The Parties have agreed to enter into a Deed of Obligation in order to secure the performance of obligations contained in it. The agreed document is currently circulating for signature and it is anticipated that a copy of the completed agreement will be submitted into examination at Deadline 11.

Table 1-2 Matters not agreed

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
Transport and Access	Site Access Proposals	The Parties are not agreed on all technical points related to the Site Access Proposals for the Scheme. The Applicant considers there are sufficient safeguards in place to ensure that such matters will be addressed at detailed design.
Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and Permissive Paths	Provision of accessible routes	The Parties are not agreed on the provision of PRoW through the Scheme and potential impacts on users of existing routes, including noise, health etc. The Councils' view is the proposed mitigation does not properly reflected the way that PROW and connecting local roads are viewed and used by local communities and user groups as part of the wider landscape that is significantly impacted by the scheme. The Councils' principal position is they consider the adverse impact is felt by communities across parish boundaries at a broad landscape scale, not just within parish boundaries. It is not agreed that the S106 contribution adequately mitigates, in the Local Authorities' view, the impacts on users of PRoW and Permissive Paths. Public Access Mitigation opportunity has been significantly constrained by the private land agreements that prevent the Applicant from allowing the Council to use their statutory powers to create paths by order under s26 Highways Act. The Applicant disagrees with the position of the Councils, and its position has been set out clearly elsewhere in documents it has submitted to the Examination.