

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: Response
Date: 26 January 2024 17:24:19

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

My Unique Number : 20030559

My Response to the Planning Inspectorates invitation for interested parties to make further comments are as follows:

From the very start of this project there have been delays and extended deadlines because of details not being ironed out. This in my opinion shows very poor planning and a lack of attention to detail on the applicants part, this does not bode well should the project be allowed to proceed

Even now, in the Pinsent Masons reply, I note the words
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 words that fill me with confidence. Not words that are definite.
I also noted that the data referred to
in Paragraph 1.4 refers to publications in **2010** Research in **2009**. Is there no more recent data on this?

In the ARUP reply at the top of page 3

Should the scheme receive consent then the FINAL DESIGN,

Here we are 4 years on, twice the decision is deferred and still the **design** is not finalised.

From the end of ARUP reply Paragraph 1.2 I quote**and the identified pressing need for renewable energy generation, including solar....**

If the government insisted on Solar panels on all new buildings and especially the large warehouses that have, and are, being built, or to cover car parks, then there would be no need for Solar farms taking up our good

crop growing land.

With all the concern about carbon footprints and saving energy because of the global warming the fact that this could produce a shortage of food worldwide seems to have been sidelined in favour of building large solar farms and housing on what is valuable farming land. Land that we might, very soon desperately, need to grow food on. Has anyone counted the cost of the carbon footprint to import the food that is grown on this land? Land that although Sunnica insist is low grade we know from past experience is able to grow good crops.

I would suggest that the value of the land to grow food on far outweighs this project as Solar panels can be sited on industrial roofs, car parks and other positions whereas food needs land to grow on. This will destroy the land.

Yes we do need to cut carbon and yes perhaps we do need some solar panels but this project is far too big and will destroy nearly 3,000 acres of good food producing land.

I note and agree that all Nationally significant energy projects will have an effect on the landscape, but to take a **Hierarchical** approach as suggested on ARUP reply page 5, is in my opinion an insult.

Yes there are occasions when we have to act for the greater good but Hierarchical means '*rigidly graded formally ranked order.*' Is this what the examination has been just a sop to the locals to say Sunnica have 'done the right thing'? Have we really been listened to? If the boot had been on the other foot would we have been given 'more time'? Would we have been allowed extended deadlines?

An extract from a letter I sent to the planning inspectorate dated 16.05.2022

As stated in your letter dated 22nd April 2022

"The DCLG 'Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent' states that *it should take place within a period from six weeks to two months from receipt of the relevant representations. A delay may be accepted but should be kept.. to the minimum period necessary*".

This application was submitted on 18th November 2021 and accepted 16th December 2021

I also quote from the same letter..

“The Secretary of State's expectation is that Examining Authorities will not normally agree to postpone the start of the examination FOR LONGER THAN THREE MONTHS.....”

And again

.....Delaying the Preliminary Meeting until mid-July 2022 would mean that it would take place some SEVEN MONTHS after the DCO Application was accepted.....

Why no longer than three months?To

.... limit the risk that the application, including pre-application consultation and environmental information, will no longer be sufficiently current to form the basis of an examination.....

Leaving the preliminary meeting to 7 MONTHS PLUS will certainly heighten this risk.

That was nearly 2 years ago. What is the point of having guide lines if they are so flagrantly ignored?

In conclusion no amount of landscaping will cover up the destruction of this landscape and the wildlife, including the stone curlews, that call it their habitat

Brenda Knowles