Southlands Solar Farm: Scott Schedules between the Appellant and Chelmsford County Council (CCC)

NOTE

- 1. Effects are assessed as adverse unless otherwise stated.
- 2. The Appellant's analysis and assessment is that of Andrew Cook (AC), not the assessment presented within the application LVIA.
- 3. The Viewpoint numbers referenced below are those which were assessed in the LVIA.
- 4. Where a dash/- is used, that parameter has not been assessed, or not assessed in a directly comparable way (for example, AC assessment of visual effects is based on the LVIA viewpoints, whereas Jon Etchells (JE) assessment is of effects on receptors.
- 5. References in [square brackets] correspond to the paragraph numbers of the respective proofs and Appendices (Andrew Cook for the Appellant, Jon Etchells for the Council) where the assessment is set out.
- 6. Some differences in categorisation of effects AC uses a 4 point scale (i.e. negligible, minor, moderate, major), JE uses a 5 point scale (insignificant, slight, moderate, high, major).

	Visual Assessment												
Assessor	Viewpoint	Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity	Magnitude – Construction	Effect – Construction	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect – Year 1 (Winter)	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect – Year 15 (Summer)	Magnitude – Decommissioning	Effect – Decommissioning
Appellant [App 18]	1	PRoW	Medium	High	High	High	Major	High	Major	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
CCC	Assessed a PRoW throu	as users of ugh the site	-	-	High [App C, Table 2]	-	-	High	High	Medium	Moderate to high [App C, Table 2]	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	2	PRoW	Medium	High	High	High	Major	High	Major	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
CCC	Assessed a PRoW throu	as users of ugh the site	-	-	High [App C, Table 2]	-	-	High	High	Medium	Moderate to high [App C, Table 2]	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	3	PRoW	Medium	High	High	High	Major	High	Major	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
CCC	Assessed a PRoW throu	as users of ugh the site	-	ı	High [App C, Table 2]	-	-	High	High	Medium	Moderate to high [App C, Table 2]	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	4	PRoW	Medium	High	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
CCC	Assessed a footpath to the	the west of	-	-	High [App C, Table 2]	-	-	Low	Moderate	Negligible	Insignificant	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	5	Highway	Medium	Medium	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
ccc	Not asses		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	6	Highway	Medium	Medium	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
CCC	CCC Not assessed as a highway receptor - properties at this point are assessed [App C, Table 2]		his point are	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Appellant [App 18]	7	PRoW	Medium	High	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
CCC	Assessed a		-	-	High [App C, Table 2]	-	-	Varies across area, but up to low	Up to moderate	Not specifically stated, but up to negligible	Not specifically stated, but up to low	-	-

	Visual Assessment												
Assessor	Viewpoint	Receptor	Value	Susceptibilit y	Sensitivity	Magnitude – Construction	Effect – Construction	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect – Year 1 (Winter)	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect – Year 15 (Summer)	Magnitude – Decommissioning	Effect – Decommissioning
Appellant [App 18]	8	Public open space	Medium	High	High	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
CCC	Assessed a recreationa		ı	-	High [App C, Table 2]	-	-	Varies across area, but up to low	Up to moderate	Not specifically stated, but up to negligible	Not specifically stated, but up to low	1	-
Appellant [App 18]	9	Public open space	Medium	High	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
ccc	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	10	Highway	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Minor	Low	Minor	Low	Minor	Low	Minor
ccc	Assessed un local r		1	-	Low (motorised) Medium (non- motorised) [App C, Table 2]	-	-	Low	Slight (motorised) Slight to medium (non- motorised)	Negligible	Insignificant (motorised) Slight (non- motorised)-	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	11	Churchyar d	Medium	High	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
CCC	Assessed un PRo		-	-	High [App C, Table 2]-	-	-	Negligible	Slight	Negligible	Insignificant	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	12	PRoW	Medium	High	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
ccc	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	13	PRoW	Medium	High	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
ccc	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Appellant [App 18]	14	PRoW	Medium	High	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
ccc	14	-	ı	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Landscape Elements/ Features

Assessor	Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity	Magnitude – Construction	Effect – Construction	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect – Year 15	Magnitude – Decommissioning	Effect – Decommissioning
Appellant	Topography	Low [para 4.2]	Low [para 4.2]	Low [para 4.2]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]	Negligible [para 4.3]
CCC	Topography	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Appellant	Trees/ Tree Cover	High [para 4.4]	High [para 4.4]	High [para 4.4]	Negligible [para 4.4]	Negligible [para 4.4]	Low [para 4.5]	Moderate (beneficial) [para 4.5]	Increase (from year 1) as trees mature [para 4.5]	Increase (from year 1) as trees mature [para 4.5]	Negligible [para 4.4]	Negligible [para 4.4]
CCC	Trees/ Tree Cover	-	-	Medium to High [App C, Table 1]	-	-	Not specifically stated, but negligible	Not specifically assessed, but insignificant	Not specifically as numbers wo	•	-	-
Appellant	Hedgerows	High [para 4.6]	High [para 4.6]	High [para 4.6]	Negligible [para 4.13]	Negligible [para 4.13]	Low [para 4.14]	Moderate (beneficial) [para 4.14]	Increase (from year 1) as hedgerows mature [para 4.14]	Increase (from year 1) as hedgerows mature [para 4.14]	Negligible [para 4.13]	Negligible [para 4.13]
CCC	Hedgerows	1	-	Medium to High [App C, Table 1]	-	-	Not specifically stated, but negligible	Not specifically assessed, but insignificant	Not specifically as: lengths of hedgero	sessed, but agreed ws would increase	-	-
Appellant	Land use/ land cover	Medium [para 4.16]	Low [para 4.16]	Medium [para 4.16]	Negligible [para 4.17]	Negligible [para 4.17]	Medium [para 4.18]	Moderate [para 4.18]	Medium [para 4.18]	Moderate [para 4.18]	Depending on whether the land is converted to arable or left as pasture [para 4.18]	Depending on whether the land is converted to arable or left as pasture [para 4.18]
CCC	Assessed as existing open a		ı	Not specifically stated, but medium to high [App C, Table 1]	ı	-	High	High, in terms of replacement of open fields by solar farm	Not specifically stated, but medium	Moderate to high	ı	-
Appellant	Public Rights of Way	High [para 4.31]	High [para 4.31]	High [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]	None [para 4.31]
CCC	CCC Not assessed as landscape features, assessed in terms of visual effects on users.			-	-	Agreed no effects in terms of routes or ability to use them.			-	-		
Appellant	Water features	Medium [para 4.33]	Medium [para 4.33]	Medium [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]	Negligible [para 4.33]
ccc	Water features	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Landscape Character											
Assessor	Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity	Magnitude – Construction	Effect – Construction	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect – Year 15	Magnitude – Decommissioning	Effect – Decommissioning
Appellant	Landscape Character within the appeal site	Medium [para 4.51]	Medium [para 5.50]	Medium [para 5.52]	Medium [para 4.54]	Moderate [para 4.54]	Medium [para 4.54]	Moderate [para 4.54]	Medium [para 4.54]	Moderate [para 4.54]	Medium [para 4.54]	Moderate [para 4.54]
CCC	Landscape Character within the appeal site	Medium [App C, Table 1]	Medium to high [4.2.18]	Medium to High [App C, Table 1]	-	-	High [App C, Table 1]	High [App C, Table 1]	Not specifically stated, but medium to high	Moderate to High [App C, Table 1]	-	-
Appellant	Landscape Character <u>beyond</u> the appeal site	Medium [para 4.51]	Medium [para 5.50]	Medium [para 5.52]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]	No change [para 4.54]
CCC	Landscape Character <u>beyond</u> the appeal site	Medium [App C, Table 1]	Medium to high [4.2.18]	Medium to High [App C, Table 1]	-	-	Medium [App C, Table 1]	Moderate [App C, Table 1]	Not specifically stated, but low	Slight to Moderate [App C, Table 1]	-	-

Green Belt									
Assessor	Parameter	Assessment							
Appellant	Openness	Local moderate adverse effect [para 8.27]							
ccc	Openness	Significant harm [6.7.5b, page 41]							
Appellant	Purposes	Limited impact at the lower end of the scale [para 9.14]							
CCC	Purposes	Significant harm in terms of encroachment [6.7.5c, page 42]							