

I have many objections to this scheme being approved, I will outline the three greatest below.

My first objection to this scheme is that it degrades a significant amenity asset which is currently available and used by an increasing population which includes that of Chelmsford, Braintree and Witham as well as the smaller towns and villages which are located within less than 10 miles of this proposed scheme. The asset is a circa 1400 acre site of mixed arable agricultural land and ancient woodland. This asset has been open via the PROW network as well as country lanes to walkers, cyclists and runners for hundreds of years and will now be significantly degraded by the enclosure within fences, and loss of views. The PROWs which directly cross the site total in excess of 12 kilometres (7.5 miles). In addition the PROWs are part of many more miles of popular routes which traverse the site.

I do not feel that the measures outlined by the applicant to provide visual screening and the addition of permissive pathways in any way compensate for this degradation. The point being that much of the beauty depends on the absence of hedgerows and fences allowing long uninterrupted views of attractive landscape and thus addition of "mitigating features" cannot help.

My second objection is that my home sits on a plot of land through which significant surface water drains and that there is no evidence in the plan of any recognition of this nor of measures which will be taken to avoid flooding in my home, garden and of the highway [REDACTED] on which my property [REDACTED] sits.

Water from a very large field between my home and Wakerings Farm drains via a culvert [REDACTED] into the remnants of the moat which surrounded WHF. From there surface water drains via a second culvert under my property and, leaving my property [REDACTED] continues via a pipe across the field, (Church Field) to the north of WHF emerging to cross a further ditch at [REDACTED] and hence into an ancient drainage ditch system to the river Ter. During the winter months this flow is considerable, (hundreds of litres per minute), and when the drain has been obstructed in the past this has resulted in flooding of Boreham Road causing a number of road traffic collisions (RTCs) and in the floodwater approaching a level which would flood the house. As Church Field (the field traversed by the pipe carrying this water and which lies to the north of WHF) is planned to be covered by panels, I would like to know what arrangements will be made for access to this watercourse throughout its length, necessary to deal with any obstruction to flow.

My third major objection to this scheme is that I purchased my property in 1990 because of its peaceful rural setting with views across farmland. I am unhappy because this scheme will negate these positive qualities with adverse effects on the enjoyment of my home and surroundings. Further, I have been assured by estate agents that the construction and operating stages of the scheme will adversely affect the monetary value of the property. I would like to know what measures the developer, operator and/or the landowner might put in place to address my financial loss.

The rest of my objections have been eloquently laid out by other contributors and as far as I can ascertain have not been adequately addressed by the developer.