

From: [Archie Wright](#)
To: [Sunnica Energy Farm](#)
Subject: Sunnica Energy Farm EN010106
Date: 08 September 2023 17:34:21

To whom this may concern,

EN010106

Sunnica

Having read the Pinsent Mason letter from the 10th August 2023 I am keen to comment on Point 7 specifically. For the past 20 years I have lived right next to where the proposed Sunnica East B site. I do loads of activities in the area including riding, walking, running and cycling and therefore know it incredibly well. I have also worked on various agricultural and equine farms locally and therefore know the quality of soil and variety of crops it can produce.

The reason I state the above is to provide context for my statement that the soil report submitted by Sunnica is incorrect. I know it is not possible to conclude there is only 1% best and most versatile (BMV) on 924 hectares. Going in to more detail and reading submissions on this matter during the Examination process I know that my position is confirmed by the following information:

- 1/ Natural England's predictive mapping
- 2/ The Agricultural Land Classification mapping
- 3/ The detailed soil series mapping at 1:63,363 and 1:10,560
- 4/ Four soil experts including a Fellow of the British Society of Soil Science
- 5/ Sunnica's soil report does not comply with the British Society of Soil Science guidelines or the Government's document 'Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land dated 5/02/2021. This allows for the conclusions it reaches to be incorrect.
- 6/ If Sunnica were confident of the soil report they had submitted they would have allowed access to the site for other surveys to take place. Despite three requests for access to do this it was always denied by Sunnica and the landowners.

Due to the overwhelming evidence highlighting Sunnica's incorrect methodology they have once again deliberately failed to address the core issue in point 7. Why does their Soil Report vary so dramatically from all the established opinion and evidence? The Secretary of State is now being asked to make a decision on a scheme not knowing how much of it is BMV. All she will know for certain is that there is more than 1%. This is an impossible position to be put in and must lead to the application being refused. You cannot guess BMV and Sunnica's attempt to mislead the examination committee on this critical point should bring to light the poor quality of their submission.

The Examination process has highlighted so many reasons why the sprawling industrializing Sunnica scheme should be refused. There have to be better more critically analyzed schemes to help us reach Net Zero without such harm being placed on an established and successful farming environment.

All the best

Archie

Archie Wright

