From:
To:

@beis.ecase.co.uk

Subject: FW: *Not a constituent* FW: Large DCO Solar Appicayions ~ Sunnica etc

Date: 09 April 2024 10:12:39

Attachments:

From: Secretary Of State (Energy Security) < @energysecurity.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, April 8, 2024 5:16 PM

To: BEIS Correspondence < @energysecurity.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: *Not a constituent* FW: Large DCO Solar Appicayions ~ Sunnica etc

Hi team,

Please log for TO response.

Thanks,



Amaya Pinnock (she/her)
Business Manager to the Secretary of State

From: COUTINHO, Claire C < <a>@parliament.uk>

Sent: Monday, April 8, 2024 4:50 PM

To: Secretary Of State (Energy Security) < <u>@energysecurity.gov.uk</u>> **Subject:** *Not a constituent* FW: Large DCO Solar Appicayions ~ Sunnica etc

Lewis IIsley | Senior Parliamentary Assistant

Office of Claire Coutinho MP | Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero | Member of Parliament for East Surrey

House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA |

From: Christopher Wilson < <a>@wwreglobal.com>

Sent: Monday, April 8, 2024 1:49 PM

To: COUTINHO, Claire C < months

Subject: Large DCO Solar Appicayions ~ Sunnica etc

Dear Hon Claire Coutinho MP,

I am hereby writing to vehemently object to the DCO application on the above project.

"As the overall scheme is split into more areas, the amount of land and the number of people affected by the scheme increases. Siting compounds and solar sites between and close to a number of closely

related historic villages cause significant and detrimental industrialisation of a wholly rural area.

The perimeter of the scheme, and thus the number of people directly affected by its presence and appearance, is vast when compared to one contained site. It means that the scheme dominates the landscape because it is not contained; it is spread across it and engulfs locations.

Its design necessarily maximises the possible harm to the location and local communities by being sizeable in both area and perimeter, degree of change and impact on communities. At its purest, therefore, the scheme is an example of bad solar and an example of exceptionally poor design."

"Contrary to the Development Plans of West Suffolk and East Cambridgeshire, the development would, due to its location and scale, result in significant, long-term harm to the character of the landscape, including the setting of settlements.

It would not be consistent with policy ENV 1 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan as, due to its location and scale, it would fail to protect, conserve, or enhance space between settlements and their wider landscape setting, key views into and out of settlements and the unspoiled nature and tranquillity of the area.

Overall, the proposals conflict with the relevant national policy statements and national and local landscape policies."

Land Quality.

"The extent of land of BMV quality affected by the proposed development has, therefore, been understated. Contrary to the Applicant who has assessed that the proportion of BMV land is just 3.8%, the experts employed by SNTS assess that the true proportion is at least 50% of grades 2 and 3a."

Christopher D G Wilson

Executive Chairman Worldwide Renewable Energy Global Ltd



UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.