

Record of Officer's Decision

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Date of Decision:	13 Aug 2026
Decision Maker (Officer):	Gary Guiver
Authority for Delegated Decision (Cabinet/Committee Decision or Scheme of Delegation – provide reference):	Part 3, Schedule 3 – Responsibility for Executive Functions delegated to Officers paragraph 4.3 (1) – the Corporate Director has delegated authority to discharge executive functions within their respective service areas (Part 3.38). All delegations are subject to consultation where considered appropriate in the circumstances (paragraph 4.3 (4)(ii) – Part 3.39).
Identify which Portfolio Holder(s)/Committee Chairman consulted?	Concurrence has been obtained in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing & Planning, Cllr. A Baker.
Ward Member(s) consulted?	No. Ward Members representing those areas most directly affected by the Tarchon Interconnector proposals, notably Ardleigh, Little Bromley, Lawford, Manningtree, Mistle, Great Oakley, Little Oakley and Wix, have not been formally consulted on Tendring District Council's final response to this non-statutory consultation. However, they have been afforded the opportunity to participate in Tarchon's consultation process and to engage directly with the promoter through the various public consultation events and associated consultation materials.
Is it a Key Decision?	No
Is it subject to call-in?	No
Decision Made:	To submit Tendring District Council's comments on Tarchon No-Statutory Consultation Q3 – 2026.

Reason for Decision (if a report was produced to support the Decision, refer to or attach it):	To facilitate the timely submission of TDCs response to the Tarchon Interconnector non-statutory consultation and to ensure that the Council continues to actively influence the evolution of the project at this formative stage. This includes seeking to influence key matters such as site selection and the justification for the preferred options, as well as the potential impacts on landscape character, National Landscapes, ecology and designated habitats, heritage assets, highways and transport infrastructure, local communities, and future skills, employment and economic opportunities within the district. The submission of timely representations will help ensure that the Council's concerns and expectations are fully understood and taken into account as the project progresses towards a future Development Consent Order application.
Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations:	No significant financial, legal, procedural or equality risks have been identified in relation to submitting TDCs comments on this latest non statutory consultation.
NEW : Details of Local Government Reorganisation and/or Devolution considerations	The decision to submit TDCs comments has no direct impacts on Local Government Reorganisation (LGR).
Details of any Alternative Options Considered and rejected (together with reasons):	The main alternative would be for the Council not to submit a response to the non-statutory consultation and therefore not to engage at this important pre-application stage of the DCO process. This option was rejected as it would significantly reduce the Council's ability to influence the development of the project and to advocate for the interests of the district and its communities. In particular, it would limit opportunities to raise concerns and seek improvements relating to site selection, the assessment of alternatives, design and layout, impacts on landscape character and National Landscapes, ecology and biodiversity, heritage assets, highways and transport infrastructure, health and wellbeing, emerging Local Plan allocations, and the identification and delivery of appropriate mitigation measures. Early engagement is a fundamental part of the NSIP process and provides an important opportunity for the Council to ensure that local issues, constraints and aspirations are properly understood and taken into account before the project is finalised and a DCO application is submitted.

	Furthermore, a decision not to participate could create the perception that the Council is either unwilling or indifferent to engaging with a project that has the potential to affect a significant number of residents, businesses and environmental assets across the district. Active participation is therefore considered necessary both to protect the interests of the district and to demonstrate the Council's commitment to representing the views and concerns of affected communities.	
Details of any declarations of interest (by Portfolio Holder/Committee Chairman who was consulted by the officer, which related to the decision) If relevant, a note of the dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer:	N/A	
Reason Decision, or supporting Report, is not published: <i>Tick one or more of the specific exemptions,</i> <u>and</u> <i>Give more information in the final box with regards to why the exemption applies and outweighs the public interest test (which is in favour of disclosure).</i>	X	Not applicable – no reason why this officer decision and TDCs written response cannot be published.
	If Report is not to be published – tick one of the following boxes:	
	☐	
	☐	N/A
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	

Officers

Office Decision and TDC response prepared by:

Jacob Jaarsma

Title: Policy Planning

Signed off by: Paul Woods

Title: Planning Policy Team Leader

In consultation with: Cllr. A. Baker

Dated: 10 Aug 2026