

**Dr Catherine Judkins URN 20031441**

Dear Mr Wheadon,

Many thanks for inviting interested parties to comment on the latest submissions by the applicant, Sunnica Ltd, and Natural England (NE), in connection with the NSIP application for the Sunnica Energy scheme.

I have made several representations outlining my opposition to this severely flawed scheme, before, during and since the examination. My views remain unchanged. I stand by the points I have made to date, including those outlined in my response to the Secretary of State's last question and responses (my email dated 11 Sept 2023).

As I said before, I am in favour of renewable energy schemes in the right place and at the right scale and am a particular supporter of solar developments for rooftop and car park spaces, of which there are an abundance in the UK.

To pick up on the most recent comments by NE:

- As a chemist I have carried out a number of scientific studies, some of which have been published. I don't believe that a statutory body should take an opinion on a matter where the research relating to it is not yet complete nor published nor reviewed. I note that in their latest submission NE have confirmed that further work on their research is needed. In the absence of complete and published evidence it would seem prudent to err on the side of caution and proceed with the view that there is a linkage between the stone curlew populations within the scheme boundary and those nearby. I am no expert on stone curlew; however, I did note throughout the examination that multiple experts and bird enthusiasts pointed out flaws in the applicant's survey work with regard to stone curlew (and other farmland birds) and a lack of confidence in their proposed mitigation measures.
- I wholeheartedly support the views of Dominic Woodfield of Bioscan, who has presented evidence on ecology matters over the course of the examination (through the Say No to Sunnica group).
- I also make the point that this is not the only area where there is dispute over evidence and I once again reiterate my support of the submissions of Say No to Sunnica and the 4 independent soil experts, Dr Anne Noble, AG Wright & Sons and others who have all presented evidence verifying what we know to be true – that the land here is some of the best growing land in the UK. Parcel E05, for example, is without question BMV land. I do not recognise this as "poor quality soil."

On the matter of landscape:

- I strongly dispute the suggestion that the design of this severely flawed scheme has been "landscape-led." As you will have noted in my previous submissions, as well as those of many, many local people, this scheme will have a devastating impact on a huge landscape area that we value so much. The spread-out, sprawling layout, wrapping (in places) around villages and homes, highly visible in some areas, means that this scheme will follow us at nearly every turn of our of day-to-day lives.
- I fully agree with the submissions of the Say No to Sunnica group and the landscape assessments of Michelle Bolger Expert Landscape Consultancy.

- The site selection process was flawed from the very beginning. There are areas that cannot be mitigated, and the applicant has failed to understand the value of many parts of the scheme and has underestimated the harm it would do, especially with regard to the famous Limekilns gallops.
- Parcel E05 is a wide-open area with far-reaching views and is located at the eastern edge of Isleham village where I live. The views from Isleham across this area are so uplifting and much loved by my family and many others. To describe development here as an 'opportunity' for the scheme is a further example of the unsympathetic and inaccurate assessment of this site. The harm that would be caused by eradicating the characteristic open Fen landscape with its sparse vegetation and replacing it with a generic woodland/ hedgerow/ solar/ fencing landscape would be irreversible. You will also recall that this site has significant sentimental value to the village and is considered a war grave. It is an important part of our village history, as has been outlined in previous representations, and the value of this has not been suitably recognised by the applicant.

In short, I feel that this scheme fails on so many levels, which have been so thoroughly evidenced throughout the examination, that it simply cannot be allowed to go ahead.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Dr Catherine Judkins