

RR33

Thank you for taking on board several of the comments and suggestions made within my earlier representation.

Overview â€œ

There are still several points where greater clarity is requested. I also felt that the Applicants responses towards mitigation that will directly support the community is lacking. The majority of my issues with the proposal is that the impacted communities are receiving minimal investment into their local community infrastructure. The CBF is welcome but puts each community asset in competition. Other contribution are being discussed with Host authorities and offers will be made that meet their wider objectives; the local community representation seems lacking as part of these negotiations.

The Community Benefit Fund is not a requirement of the scheme. Whilst it may be a legal agreement to commit to providing funding, Terling parish council / community representatives should be party to how the terms of the application criteria will be set and how the assessments will be weighted to prioritise directly affected communities. eg distance from the scheme.

Solar panels should be made available to the key community facilities within Terling. These are not residential properties therefore agreements can be set to ensure not ongoing responsibility for the applicant. ECC should have stronger negotiation to support the parish council take this forward. It is an easy win in their climate commission action plan. The school, swimming pool, cricket club, church and village hall should all be eligible.

Several community mitigation measures are being discussed between the Applicant and the host authority and whilst legally binding are separate to planning. Terling parish council and or local community representation should be party to these discussions to ensure the interests of the locality are being considered above general policy principles/approaches.

I do not agree with a community ownership scheme as I don't feel individuals in a low income situation will be able to benefit equally/ have the same opportunity to participate as those households on a higher income.

Permissive Paths â€œ maintenance schedules. What is the long term commitment from the applicant for maintenance of the permissive paths to ensure they remain accessible and of a good quality terrain for the duration of the scheme post construction and the 5 year follow on arrangement. The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan gives information about the management of the internal operational areas of the scheme. Information and clarity is lacking on how permissive pathways will remain operational/accessible for the 40 years of the scheme.

Community benefit â€œ The scheme does impact on the mental well being of the residents across the area. The applicant does not commit to any community infrastructure investment which would go some way to offer mitigation for the direct impact felt by locals. The longer term investment into the community fund is welcome, it is however a sanitised standard response. The applicant should be required to invest in capital items for the benefit of the local community within Terling. There are several organisations/facilities which could benefit â€œ the swimming pool, the tennis courts, the children's playground, cricket club, church, village hall and primary school. All offer a reprieve or supportive environment for Terling parish members. The applicant providing solar panels and associated connection offers a simple win for all parties. It is recognised that the applicant would not want the ongoing responsibility or be held accountable in such instance as a breakdown, but this can be addressed through written agreement.

Learning facility â€œ The primary school staff / governors should be party to the discussions linked to the skills fund. It is recognised the need for training support for displaced agricultural workers. What requires greater clarity is how the local primary school is supported/ invested in as a facility that supports the children both now and future generations of residents over the 40 years impacted by the scheme. Capital investment to build space to support students with their sensory

needs should be part of the ECC discussions.

Traffic mitigation – traffic calming in Boreham to be completed in readiness for post construction. The impact of widening Cranham Way will increase the volume of traffic and size of vehicle that uses the route to bypass Chelmsford (A12 Hatfield Peverel and local traffic to and from Essex Regiment Way) . The applicant traffic management plan considers only the impact of the construction traffic and fails to address the impact long term. Improving the link between Boreham and North Chelmsford will increase local traffic and freight movement along this route. Offering traffic calming such as investment in a dedicated cycle lane through Boreham would offer both active travel space as well as appearing to –slow' the B1137 down at minimal cost.

Public rights of way. Again there is very little benefit given to Boreham parish. As a community who will be impacted by increased local traffic in the longer term, this should be compensated with inclusion and connectivity to the proposed permissive path network thus facilitating leisure travel. Currently it is impossible for young families to cycle safely out of the village. The scheme footprint could with a small adaptation create a PROW / permissive path network between Boreham and Terling. Access through the Boreham industrial park can with only minimal tree loss can connect easily into land that forms part of the scheme and then into the existing PROW network.

Group of schemes impacts – the traffic calming solutions for Boreham could be a shared solution and held by ECC to create a collective investment into the highway network.

Maintenance of Hedges and verges on the outside of the scheme security fencing. – The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan states: Screening - Existing vegetation along the boundary of the Order limits will be retained and managed where practicable to ensure its continued presence and to aid the screening of low-level views into the Order limits.

At what point does practicable define what can and cannot be done. It is not clear if the land to the edge of the scheme (no mans land hedgerows) which forms road verges will be maintained and cut and ditches kept clear or if this reverts to Lord Rayleigh.

The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan states: It is anticipated that there will be up to eight permanent staff onsite during the operational phase of the Solar Farm Site, –!

Only one Environment Manager is mentioned with roles more akin to strategic in nature. This does not give detail as to the split between engineering/ equipment maintenance and environmental/ landscape management. This matters as there will be extensive maintenance activities which are –external– to the site which are of interest to the local community and currently delivered by the existing tenants. The applicant if they want to be considered a good neighbour should commit to continue these responsibilities – verge cutting of the highway banks and snow clearance of the rural network. Has the necessary equipment been accounted for/ included within the future operational requirements of the site?

Community Ownership Scheme - The parish council should be party to the wider community benefits being discussed with the host authorities. A community ownership model must consider the ability of all members of the community and their ability to participate. A means tested approach should form part of the criteria and either offer –shares– for free or proportionate cost to a higher income household. The participation criteria should also consider not just households that are within the parish of Terling but also those families that have a link with the community via attendance at the school.

£50 for a low income household is a full weeks food shopping, for a higher income household the same amount is just a top up shop done several times a week. The higher income household can do without a takeaway, the lower income household is unable to participate in the scheme as there is no spare funds.