

Submission ID: 11087

I object to this development for reasons given by others which include food security of the nation, size of the proposed site, lack of scrutiny of other sites and inadequate consultation process.

Longfield have not in their mitigation addressed the effect that this development will have on our home. In the plan they have moved the panels away from the road as they tell me drivers do not want to see panels. From our home there will be views of panels from our garden and from our house and this mitigation does not alter that. Reassurance from the developer has been that the view from our bedrooms will look like water. Why is the view for those driving past more important than what I shall look out on everyday? I am concerned about the glint and glare from the panels . I request that should this development go ahead Church Field is excluded from the plans so as to protect the nature of the surroundings to our farmhouse. English Heritage told me many years ago that they thought we were one of the oldest moated farmhouses in Essex. I realise that this is of no consequence to the landowner and developer and that I have no right to a view but we would be grateful if further consideration could be made into protecting the environment in which we live.

█ years ago I moved to my current home to live in a peaceful rural environment in a house next to a protected lane. If this scheme goes ahead this will change the environment in which I live and I will find myself living surrounded by an industrial power plant. It will no longer be the rural retreat I chose and have enjoyed. My home will be adjacent to solar panels and all of our daily walks will be surrounded by panels, views lost and the enjoyment of wildlife, flora and fauna will have gone forever. Will I still be able to hear the church bells over the hum of the inverter? The view across the Ter valley will certainly have gone.

1) No account has been taken of the detrimental effects of low level hum on mental health. The medical literature evidences the detrimental effects on mental and physical health and well being. Please consider those who live here aware of their sensitivity to noise.

2) Over the last few years we have been planning █ and have sort and gained planning permission to convert a barn next to our house. If this scheme goes ahead it is not the environment in which we would choose to reside and thus we have wasted time and money in our efforts to secure a suitable home. The developers and the landowner offer no compensation for this.

3) I have mentioned previously my concerns about the suitability of this site. I can find no references to other sites that were considered and rejected. In Essex there are many brownfield and industrial sites that would be more appropriate than agricultural land but these do not appear to have been considered. Chelmsford is expanding rapidly but there is no requirement for solar panels to be placed on rooftops and no requirements for ground source/air source pumps

4) Is this scheme carbon neutral? I find no evidence of the carbon cost of manufacturing, transportation, replacement, recycling of panels or of the carbon cost of building and decommissioning. Are solar panels the best way forward to solve the energy crisis? Will the technology be obsolete before it is up and working? Is it really going to be agricultural land again in 40 years or will it then be a brownfield site. Are the developers or the landowner selling the top soil?

5) The loss of visual amenity will be forever. No evidence in the reports that this will not be detrimental to the physical and mental health not only of those of us, now and in future generations, that live here but those who use and enjoy the countryside.

6) Boreham Road is a protected lane unsuitable for HGVs. The traffic for this site has been designated to use Cranham Road and Waltham Road. But who will stop them using Boreham Road? How can that be enforced?

7) No screening has been started. I am told by the developers that they will plant hedging whips. If that is the case there will be no screening █. The panels should be moved from the line of view from our homes. There is also an opportunity to reinstate the old orchards that we're here in the 20th century with the many varieties of apples that originate from this area and are in danger of being lost.

Who will make sure that no trees are cut down?

8) I find no plans for the herds of deer that will no longer be able to use their usual routes. If plans go ahead, then they will be channelled through our garden and destruction of █ years hard work will occur. The landowner and developers show no concern or mitigation for this.

9) It is stated that our water supply will continue. What about the drainage?

10) What schemes are available to give those of us effected, and who will look at the solar array daily, electricity for the duration of the solar farm?

11) Lastly this consultation has been inadequate. We have never been on the mailing list despite the fact that we will be living beside the solar panels. This may be because our address is Little Waltham. I have relied on friends who live some 5 miles away to inform me of anything Longfield sent out. I also know that my neighbour has never received anything.

I have repeatedly told Longfield that information has not been getting to us or to my neighbour. Their response has been to ask me to supply names and addresses of those who should be on the mailing list. I do not see it as my role to go around the area knocking on doors to see who Longfield inform. They appear have inform those who live away from the proposed site.

So who else is not aware of this consultation process who maybe would have liked to have given a submission?