

From Catherine Judkins

Isleham resident

I very much welcome Cambridgeshire County Council's (CCC) detailed review of the Sunnica DCO application and the many excellent points that have been raised. I have the following questions:

- 1) Since there appears to be agreement across the 4 host local authorities that the level of detail provided by Sunnica in their DCO application is severely lacking, making it impossible to assess the scheme with any confidence, is there scope for Cambridgeshire County Council to include a similar statement to that in the Suffolk County Council representation, in which they state that they are, *"Unable to support the proposal as it stands, and considers that development consent should not be granted for the proposal as submitted?"*
- 2) The lack of detail on battery compounds is of particular concern. It is appreciated that Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service appears to have taken a lead role on the battery energy storage system (BESS) commentary. But without knowing sufficient details about the BESS – even if in draft form – such as the technology type, the approximate number of cabins, the possible layout of the huge 77 acres of BESS compounds, it is impossible to draft any meaningful Outline Battery Fire Safety Management plan.

Local residents are quite rightly concerned at the well known fire hazards presented by BESS which, at present, are inadequately regulated. Without further detail it is impossible to make any judgement as to the safety measures that may be needed, which is of paramount importance given the very close proximity of the proposed BESS compounds to people's homes.

Could CCC include this concern at the lack of detail provided about the BESS in it's representation?

- 3) This scheme is vast, and affects 16 parishes (see below).

Cambridgeshire: Isleham, Chippenham, Kennett, Snailwell, Fordham, Burwell, Reach, Newmarket (both counties)

Suffolk: Mildenhall, West Row, Barton Mills, Freckenham, Worlington, Red Lodge, Exning/Landwade, Newmarket

The extensive cable route connects the 4 solar PV sites together, and then connects to a *new substation expansion*, which is to be built by Sunnica Ltd at Burwell National Grid Substation.

Please can this size and scale be reflected in CCC's report? At present only a few villages are highlighted (under The Proposal). Please could the substation expansion (12m high infrastructure) at Burwell also be mentioned?

- 4) Clarification sought on:

- pg. 34, section 9.14.9, does the final statement relate to the whole representation, or just the section 9 points? And

- Appendix 5a (relates to cumulative impact), wasn't visible on the publicly available notes. Is this missing?