

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)  
**Subject:** Reponse to reponses sent 27.07.2023 by Sunnica and Natural England  
**Date:** 04 September 2023 18:32:55

---

Dear Examiners

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the submissions from Sunnica and Natural England.

2.3 Sunnica seem to show a disregard for the assessment of hazardous substances saying;

*“it is not known at this stage (i.e. prior to detailed design taking place) whether hazardous substances consent is required for the Battery Energy Storage System (“BESS”) element of the SEF; and 2.2.2 in any event, if hazardous substances consent is required then there is no necessity for that to be obtained alongside the application for the development consent. “*

It seems that they do not want to provide this assessment unless they have the go ahead for this project which could become unviable if the hazardous substance assessment was unfavourable.

2.6 Sunnica have sited other Solar farms which have not been required to provide such an assessment prior to development consent. This project covers a larger area and is close to a school and other settlement giving rise to greater concern over the safety of this development. Surely this increases the need for such an assessment.

4 The Highways section seems to assume that the necessary changes to highways and permissions will be granted. It is well known that both Suffolk and Cambridgeshire County councils have objected to this development.

5. Numerous times in this paragraph (5.2 5.3 5.4) mitigation is sited as proposed screening by vegetation. When asked directly during the online consultation Sunnica said that they would be planting immature vegetation which would take between 15 and 20 years to become effective which is approximately half the projected lifespan of the project.

As for the potential glare occurring for more than half the year “March to October” twice a day, coincides with times popular with people who walk or ride prior to and after work, subjecting them, their animals, and residents for half the lifespan of the project seems at best inconsiderate.

6. The response from Natural England seems inadequate in that they say,

*“The draft evidence document, which will provide advice on whether populations of stone curlew are functionally linked to Breckland SPA is not yet publicly available and we are not currently able to provide a date by which it will be published.”*

It is also lacking in justification in its statement that;

*“birds found within the area.... are not functionally linked to the SPA and therefore do not need to be considered.”*

I think a more transparent explanation is required.

As a resident I have seen and head these birds for years in the site area. If they are displaced where is the evidence that they will relocate nearby and not saturate an already existing nesting site thereby diminishing this amber category protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981.

The whole nature of their response does not seem consistent with "*a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.*" Their submission needs to be made public in a timely manner and with adequate justification.

7. In this section Sunnica seem to be point scoring. Their statement that 96% of the project comprises of poor-quality agricultural land seems not to be born out by the objective evidence of food production which is increasingly needed in our Economy with the threat of climate change, the impact of war and the ever-increasing population.

I had the opportunity to walk the fields adjacent to my house with Mr Luke Murray, a Director of Sunnica, and the examiners. He seemed totally dismissive of the crops seen and the impact on the loss of production and local environment.

Thank you for taking time to consider these points and the significant threat to the environment in which we live.

Yours Faithfully

Dr J A and Mrs S M Bruton