

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: Response to Sunnica enquiry
Date: 26 January 2024 17:34:59

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero,
Date: 26.1.2024

Interested Party Reference number: 20030556

Thank you for the opportunity to make further comments.

From the inception of Sunnica's scheme there have been delays and extended deadlines because of essential details not being in place. In my opinion this demonstrates very poor planning and a lack of attention to detail on the applicants part, this does not bode well should this scheme be given consent.

Even at this stage, in the Pinsent Masons response of 11th January 2024, for Sunnica, I note the 'words' used in paragraph 1.3 line2 **assumes**
line 4 **is not secured**
line5 anti glare coating **is generally** now included
line7 **Many** of the solar modules
1,5 Sunnica is **content** to secure an anti-glare coating. This **could** be added
But **For simplicity ...could** be secured... **could** be amended

Not definite words that fill me with any confidence.

I also noted that the data referred to in Paragraph 1.4 refers to publications in **2010** for research done in **2009**.
Is this the most recent data?

In ARUP's recent response of 11th January 2024, for Sunnica at the top of page 3 they state
Should this scheme receive consent then the FINAL DESIGN will be produced.
I thought this enquiry was about the completed design being in place so it can be properly scrutinised, before a decision can be made.

At the end of Paragraph 1.2 they go on to state*and the identified pressing need for renewable energy generation, including solar.*

If it was government policy to include solar panels on new buildings, especially large warehouses then there would be no requirement for solar schemes taking up so much historically good crop growing land.

A shortage of food worldwide seems to have been side lined in favour of building large solar schemes on what has been historically good crop growing farming land. With hostilities bringing volatilities as is happening around the world, for example shipping lanes being obstructed, Ukraine's ports being embargoed these large areas of historically good cropping arable land, will be needed to grow more food for the UK.

Has any consideration been given to the cost and the carbon footprint that would be used to import the food that has traditionally been grown on this land?

Allowing solar schemes to be put on historically good cropping land, with the consequence of less food production, has seemingly been put aside, conserving these historically good crop growing land, far outweighs the need for Sunnica' scheme.

In ARUP's recent response (11.1.2024), page 5, I note and agree that all nationally significant energy projects will have an effect on the landscape, but to have taken their **hierarchical** approach as they have, pays scant regard to the communities affected.

In effect they are saying that we the people that live in these communities are not as important as this scheme and therefore must just put up with it. This is a scheme designed by people who have no regard other than their scheme. Sunnica's schemes intention to site dubious as yet undefined huge BES units, where they propose, is a case in point.

Sunnica's designers are not the people that would be affected in the likelihood of these huge BES units catching fire, or live with the views of solar panels for the rest of their lives. Hedges and trees take time to grow and not all will eventually screen there view!

I agree we do need to cut carbon footprint worldwide and perhaps we do need some GREEN solar panels but this scheme is far too large taking nearly 3,000 acres of historically good food producing land out of the UKs food chain that would sprawl over a vast area, that would upset local communities' environmental equilibriums with the hidden potential, of causing mental health issues for residence.

With all the concern about cutting our worlds carbon footprint and the need for GREEN energy production, because of global warming; given the amount of carbon footprint that will be used in the production of the solar panels, transporting to the UK, site installation and decommissioning at the end of this schemes life, along with my reasoning above, this scheme will NOT be a GREEN energy source.

Peter Knowles

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows