

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: 13TH SEPTEMBER 2012

COMMITTEE UPDATE: 12/00460/FUL Erection of temporary Endurance E3120 wind turbine, with maximum height of 46.1m and access track and cable trench. Hall Farm, Klondyke Lane, Thorpe Satchville.

The purpose of this update report is to convey the content, and advise upon, additional correspondence to the Committee that has been received after publication of the Committee Report on 8th August 2012.

Since the Development Committee on the 16th August, applications 12/00460/FUL Hall Farm and 12/00454/FUL Park Farm were deferred to allow more time to assess late submissions to the applications. Further correspondence has been received from interested parties.

Additional Correspondence

**(a) Letters of Objection
9 additional letters of objection have been received**

Representations	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services:
<p>ThorpeSayNo opposition group</p> <p>EIA opinion – flawed It is considered that the screening request is not compliant with the Regulation 5 of the EIA Regs in that it fails to provide a description of the possible effects on the environment of the proposed development. It is also flawed because it asserts that the turbine will not be visible in a prominent fashion from a public footpath and that it will be well away from residential properties on which there could be a visible impact. Significantly, the hub height of the turbine is expressed to only be 25m when the application refers to a hub height of 36.4m. It is considered that the screening request is flawed.</p> <p>Impact upon Ecology Brindle & Green have undertaken an Ecological Appraisal on behalf of ThorpeSayNo which concludes that insufficient information has been put forward by the applicants to establish harm on protected species resulting from the laying of tracks and cables.</p> <p>The purpose of the survey was to ensure protected species and habitats would not be affected by the proposed development. All ecological issues relating to the habitat type were investigated during the survey including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breeding and passage birds 2. Specially protected amphibians 3. Reptiles 4. Invasive weeds 5. Botanical interest 6. Bats 7. Badgers 	<p>ThorpeSayNo have commissioned a number of studies to support their opinion that the erection of turbines in this location should be refused.</p> <p>The development of a single turbine was not considered to be EIA development. Whilst it was considered to fall within Schedule 2 it was not considered to have a significant impact upon the environment within the terms set out in the legislation.</p> <p>The larger turbine proposed at Park Farm is also not considered to be EIA development, therefore a turbine at this site of 36.4m would not be considered to be EIA development.</p> <p>Noted. The proposals were supported with ecology reports and both Natural England and LCC Ecology department were notified of the proposals and no objections were received nor were any requests for further survey work made.</p> <p>Correspondence received from residents alerted the presence of Buzzards and a variety of birds and Natural England were notified accordingly.</p> <p>The information received by ThorpeSayNo has been sent to LCC Ecology for comment and they have responded below:-</p> <p><i>“Whilst we take on board the points raised within the reports from Brindle & Green Ecological Consultants (August 2012) our comments remain unchanged from those submitted previously (24th July 2012 for application 12/00460/FUL and 24th July, 3rd August and 6th August 2012 for application 12/00454/FUL).</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 99 of the ODPM Circular states ‘However,</i></p>

<p>8. Trees and hedgerows 9. Water courses 10. Protected areas</p> <p>There was no access to the areas of the proposed developments so surveys were carried out using public rights of way. Consequently only a limited ecological appraisal could be carried out.</p> <p>The ecological appraisal ascertained that there are five ecological issues that require attention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Breeding Birds 2 Passage and Winter Birds 3 Badgers 4 Bats 5 Great Crested Newts <p>The report concludes that insufficient survey works have been prepared in order for the council to grant this application in accordance with ODPM Circular 06/2005, that the risk of impact to schedule 1 bird species and bats requires further assessment and that these surveys should be prepared in line with ODPM Circular 06/2005 and delivered prior to the determination of this application.</p> <p>The Council cannot properly assess that there will be no impact as further survey work is necessary.</p> <p>The consultation response from LCC Ecologist dated 24th July is raises no objections, but is contradictory; stating that in order for firm conclusions to be drawn from any ornithological survey a programme of surveys would be required. The consultation is then concluded that ‘we do not feel that ornithological surveys would be required for this exact location’.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact and Heritage Impact</p> <p>Insufficient information submitted. An assessment has been undertaken on behalf of ThorpeSayNo which identifies that applicants for both applications have failed to properly consider the landscape and visual impact of the applications. A robust LVIA (Landscape Visual Impact Assessment) has not been provided. The applicant’s statement that there would be no unacceptable landscape and visual impact amount to unsubstantiated assertions based on flawed and insufficient information.</p> <p>An inspector pursuant to a similar development within High Leicestershire concluded that the landscape are cannot accommodate wind turbine development.</p> <p>Insufficient information submitted to assess impact upon heritage assets Both applications failed to provide detailed heritage impact assessments in relation to Burrough Hill Fort which is within the 5km radius identified by various local planning authorities as the area where significant</p>	<p><i>bearing in mind the delay and cost that may be involved, developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by the development’. The ‘cylinder’ of air affected by each turbine is relatively small and is essentially a small area within the wider landscape. We therefore consider there to be a low risk to wildlife within the area and we do not feel that it would be reasonable to request further surveys for these applications.</i></p> <p><i>This advice is consistent with advice given for similar scale turbine applications within Leicestershire and is consistent with our application of the Local Validation Criteria for ecology.</i></p> <p><i>We therefore have no further comments to make on this application.”</i></p> <p>Following the initial consultation response from LCC no further information was requested as there was no objection to the proposal. However, a further Ecological Assessment was received on 16th August 2012. This assessment concluded that no further research is required at the site regarding birds and bats. This assessment was based upon records within 3km of the site received from the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre.</p> <p>The application was assessed against the Council’s local validation requirements and a development of a single turbine did not require a landscape assessment to be submitted and advises that impact on heritage assets can be included within the design and access statements. A full heritage statement is there not required.</p> <p>Guidance on information requirements for validation advises that local planning authorities should adopt a proportionate approach and not expect applicants to provide the highest levels of technical detail except for major or particularly sensitive development, where this may be appropriate. A single turbine is not considered to fall with the category of a major development and is not located in a sensitive landscape defined by designation. The information submitted was considered to be acceptable in order to consider the application.in order for the officers to consider the application</p>
---	---

impacts on heritage assets are likely. The turbines will harm the heritage assets within the area but no justification for the harm has been provided.

Inadequacies of submitted photomontages (ZTV)

The applicant has not followed guidelines in relation to LVIA's published by Scottish Natural Heritage. It concludes that the Hall Farm turbine would be visually dominant for up to 2km and would have a major visual impact for between 2 and 4km. The submitted photomontages are misleading.

The SNH guidance refers to the Sinclair-Thomas Matrices which conclude that turbines of between 41 and 48m in height (to blade tip) would have a dominant visual impact up to 2km and a major impact capable of dominating the landscape within 2 to 4 km of the turbine.

Academic research on 'The Effect of Focal Length on Perception of Scale and Depth in Landscape Photographs: Implications for Visualisation Standards for Wind Farm Development' (May 2012) by the University of Stirling found that the use of 50mm single frame image for visualisation made the specified focal point (or area) appear too small and too far away relative to its appearance in the actual landscape. The researchers found that images produced at a focal length of between 70mm and 80mm provide the most realistic representations and concluded that a 75mm focal length should be used for wind farm visualisation.

Reversibility of the development

The fact that the turbines have a life span of 25 years does not affect the weight that should be given to the

Also incorporated within the Design and Access statement was a Landscape Impacts Assessment. This concluded that the turbine would have a negligible adverse impact upon High Leicestershire and the Undulating Mixed Farmland areas, and a slight adverse impact upon the Pastoral Farmland areas as defined within the National Character Areas descriptions. Further details are included within Appendix 9 of the Design and Access Statement.

With regards to the Appeal decision relating to High Leicestershire, the proposed turbine is not located within the area defined as High Leicestershire.

The guidance referred to was commissioned in relation to wind developments in Scotland by Scottish Natural Heritage and supports Scottish Governments adopted policies on renewable energy. The document advises that Scotland is renowned, at home and internationally, for its diversity and quality of landscape and scenery, particularly its distinctive coast, mountains and lochs and the guidance was produced to help direct wind development to less sensitive landscapes. Whilst the objectors' advisors consider it to be best practice it is not adopted by English Government. There is no requirement for developers to adopt this practice and sufficient information has been submitted to allow an assessment of the proposal. Being dominant in the landscape is not a sufficient reason for refusal. The NPPF advises that the impacts should be **significant** (emphasis added).

Noted. The agent has not yet confirmed the type of camera or lens used to take the photographs upon which the photomontages were produced. The photomontages detail the location of the photograph, distance to the proposed site and elevation of the camera. The photomontages submitted are only one method of assessing visual impact. A Planning Inspector when considering five turbines (APP/R1038/A/09/2107667 and APP/P1045/A/09/210837) acknowledged that photomontages and ZTV's are useful tools but stated that they cannot replace the human eye and personal judgement. Impact upon the landscape is a subjective matter and one that the officer considers to be acceptable in this instance taking into account the Borough's Landscape Character Assessment and as witnessed on a site visit around the location of the turbine.

Noted.

unacceptable landscape and visual impact. The impacts can not be mitigated by condition and the proposals are contrary to the development plan policies. The fact that these effects will be theoretically reversible after 25 years can only be given very limited weight

Noise Impacts and Consideration of Health Impacts

An assessment has been undertaken on behalf of ThorpeSayNo which states that the information submitted with the applications do not demonstrate that there will not be an unacceptable impact in relation to noise.

That in the absence of a robust assessment, the guidance and literature indicates that the turbines would have significant adverse impacts on the health of residents notwithstanding any asserted compliance with ETSU-R-97.

The proposed turbines do not accord with appropriate separation distances set out in recent guidance of other LPA's and recommended by leading experts.

Medical research on the impact of wind turbines on health demonstrates that the turbines are likely to have an unacceptable impact on the health of occupiers of residential properties within the vicinity of the turbines.

The NPPF includes footnote 17 which states that in determining application for wind developments LPA should follow the approach set out in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure. This guidance states in very clear terms that **ETSU-R-97 "should be used"** and states also that the Government is satisfied it is "a sound basis for planning decisions".

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment wind turbine considers the model type of the turbine rather than its site specific impact. Its purpose is to assess compliance with ETSU-R-97. It is based on the manufacturer's specification and figures. The manufacturer's figures have not been validated by any independent validation or on site assessment of the turbine. It concludes that ETSU-R-97 can be complied with at a distance of 250m.

The nearest residential dwelling is to the South of the site; The Hall, which is situated in the village of Thorpe Satchville. The distance is approx. 470 metres away from the proposed turbine at Hall Farm. There is a dwelling to the East of the site (The Bungalow approx 700m), to the North East (Hillside approx 730m), to the North (Park Farm approx 500m), to the North West (Grange Farm approx 780m), to the West (Ashby Grange approx 1.2km), to the South West (Markham House approx 1km). To the South West the landscape consists of a changing topography and mature dense trees provide a high level of screening. The distances are greater than the recommended distance for a turbine of this size and it is considered that a refusal based upon noise could not be substantiated in this instance.

It is considered that given the NPPF is recent and up to date National Policy which endorses the use of ETSU R 97, and the clarity of the position within the National Policy Statement, that this methodology is appropriate.

A cumulative noise impact assessment was submitted by the developer and the development would have been updated on the 16th August however the application was deferred to allow further consideration of submitted information. The Cumulative Noise Assessment was undertaken at the nearest sensitive receptors, Gifford Lodge, Capon Gate, Grange Farm and Hillside Cottage. It concludes that the predicted cumulative noise levels are acceptable and comply

<p>Health Issues</p> <p>That in the absence of a robust assessment, the guidance and literature indicates that the turbines would have significant adverse impacts on the health of residents notwithstanding any asserted compliance with ETSU-R-97.</p> <p>Expert evidence has been submitted by an appropriate qualified and experienced professional that the turbines will harm human health. (Dr CD Hanning)</p> <p>That the medical research now available on the impact of wind turbines on health demonstrates that the turbines are likely to have an unacceptable impact on the health of occupiers of residential properties within the vicinity of the turbines.</p> <p>The impact on residential amenity caused by the turbines by noise is a material consideration that must carry significant weight. The identified health risks must also be given appropriate weight.</p> <p>That the proposed turbines would not accord with appropriate separation distances set out in the recent guidance of other local planning authorities and with the distances recommended by leading experts.</p> <p>No in situ wind assessments have been undertaken and the localised wind conditions are therefore not known. The wind conditions have a direct impact on noise levels and hence in situ tests should have been undertaken</p> <p>It is also necessary for the local planning authority to ensure that the proposed development would not be likely to lead to nuisance complaints from surrounding residential properties and would not cause unacceptable noise impact (irrespective of any technical compliance with ETSU-R-97).</p> <p>Exceptional Personal Circumstances</p> <p>A resident (referred to as 'X') of Thorpe Satchville suffers with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. An assessment has been undertaken by the client that concludes that the proposed turbines are likely to harm the health of that resident and jeopardise prospects of recovery from the debilitating illness. This conclusion is supported by medical evidence in the form of correspondence from Nottingham Children's Hospital and a report written by Dr CD Hanning, a Honorary Consultant in Sleep Medicine to the University Hospitals of Leicester.</p>	<p>with the recommended noise levels endorsed by ETSU-R-97</p> <p>Dr Hanning disputes the ETSU-R-97 recommendations for acceptable night time noise limits and advises that it is guidance and not law. He advises that where material evidence is produced the document can be set aside. Dr Hanning has provided a report based upon his previous research and own findings in regards to both turbines at Hall Farm and Park Farm. In the case of Park Farm, notwithstanding that he has incorrectly referred to the turbine as a 900kw (500kw is proposed), Dr Hanning acknowledges that no research has been undertaken on smaller turbines such as that proposed for Park Farm or Hall Farm. He does however recommend that a setback of at least 1km would be prudent for the turbine at Park Farm but offers no assistance for Hall Farm.</p> <p>No evidence has been produced to state that the turbines proposed would create health issues to nearby residents. Set back distances are not endorsed in policy and the government recommends the use of ETSU-R-97 for determining planning proposals. The proposals at Park Farm and Hall Farm meet the recommended separation distances based on noise emissions. The cumulative noise assessment also reinforces the position and it is considered that a refusal based on health fears cannot be sustained.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The assessments are predictive in nature and in order to provide a safeguard conditions can be applied in relation to noise emissions and complaints. These can specify that upon receipt of a valid complaint the operation of the turbine shall cease until the noise complaint has been resolved. It is considered that this approach can provide satisfactory mitigation measures and can be put in place to safeguard residential amenity.</p> <p>A letter has been submitted by Dr D Wood a Consultant Paediatrician at Nottingham Children's Hospital has advised that the resident (referred to as 'X') is currently under the care of Nottingham University Hospital Paediatrician Team for symptoms of Chronic Fatigue. 'X's condition is being managed by a combination of graded exercise, pacing, management of sleep and rest periods. 'X's prognosis is considered to be good given his young age and his progress to the treatment. However it is stated that 'X's recovery might be prolonged if his day time rest and night time sleep be disrupted by environment</p>
---	--

The personal circumstances of individuals who have pre-existing medical conditions that would be vulnerable to the impact of turbines have been considered important material considerations that have led to the refusal of planning permission in numerous planning appeals.

Contrary to the Development Plan Policies

The proposals are contrary to local plan policies OS2, C2, C14 and C15. It is also contrary to paragraphs 17, 97, 109, 128 and 132 of the NPPF.

Whilst Energy production is largely promoted this support does not mean that all other material considerations must be given limited weight.

The opposition groups own professional reports conclude that both applications should be refused.

National Planning Policy cannot require, or be given 'primacy' over statutory local policies.

changes. A telephone conversation with Dr Wood confirms that the letter is based on his professional opinion and not on any scientific evidence.

It is not known where 'X' lives however all residential properties are considered to be sufficiently separated from the turbines as advised within ETSU-R-97. The Environment Health Officer is satisfied that there would be no noise nuisance created and has requested conditions in order safeguard residential amenity through any possible affects on noise.

The appeals referred to relate to very different circumstances. The residents suffered from severe Autism (ASD) where the children had a fixation with 'spinning and rotating' objections and the erection of a wind farm which would be viewed from the house was considered to seriously impact on the children and their families.

Planning decisions are required to demonstrate and support with evidence that adverse affects will arise and it is not considered that evidence exists in this case to enable this. As such, it is not considered that it forms a ground to formally object.

Noted. The NPPF is the most current guidance that the Authority has in relation to wind developments. The NPPF advises that due weight should be given to its content and that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, local authorities should grant permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the harm.

It is considered that in relation to wind developments, the Local Plan is of limited relevance as it has no policies that address wind energy proposals and also because it pre-dates PPS22, which itself has now been replaced by the NPPF. **The NPPF is therefore considered to provide the policy guidance for the applications.**

The NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of planning permission being granted. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that there is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development**, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. It further states that for decision-taking; that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting planning permission unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the polices in this Framework as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate

	<p>development should be restricted.</p> <p>There are specific policies which refer to climate change and the NPPF states that local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation.</p> <p>The NPPF also includes a footnote which states that in assessing the likely impacts of potential wind energy developments when identifying suitable areas, and in determining planning applications for such developments, planning authorities should follow the approach set out in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure.</p> <p>Therefore, a balance of all of these policy issues will need to be considered in the determination of the application. The key judgement with regards to Policy OS2 and the NPPF is whether the harm is <u>significant</u> to justify a ground for refusal.</p>
<p>Somerby Parish Council – Object</p> <p>Somerby Parish Council is opposed to both applications (Hall Farm and Park Farm) on the following grounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed wind turbines will fundamentally damage the character of the local landscape. • The size of the turbines will result in a high visual impact particularly from Burrough Hill one of the foremost historical sites in the county. • There are a growing number of applications throughout the borough and the Development <p>Committee should consider the cumulative effect of such developments. If this application is approved then a precedent is likely to be set leading to further approvals for large/high wind turbine applications in conspicuous locations around the area. This could then lead to impacts on noise pollution, nature conservation and an adverse effect on the area’s cultural and predominantly rural heritage.</p> <p>There are clearly better locations elsewhere.</p>	<p>Noted. All matters are considered within the main Committee report.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of both Hall Farm and Park Farm proposals have been considered and it is concluded that there would not be a detrimental impact upon the landscape or residential amenity through noise resulting from both turbines.</p>
<p>Campaign to Protect Rural England: Objects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant adverse impact on the landscape character –High Leicestershire. • Significant adverse impact on the setting of a nationally important scheduled ancient monument – Burrough Hill Iron Age Hill Fort • Loss of amenity for residents and visitors • Major cumulative adverse visual impact on the landscape with the Park Farm wind turbine if 	<p>Noted. All matters are considered within the main Committee report.</p> <p>CPRE have advised of an appeal being dismissed for two turbines within the High Leicestershire character area. Representations from ThorpeSayNo have also submitted copies of appeals where turbines have been refused due to impact upon the character of High Leicestershire to support their objection. However it must be noted that Thorpe Satchville does not sit within the High Leicestershire character area.</p>

approved.	
<p>Blimp Photographs</p>	<p>Photographs have been submitted and circulated to Members of the Development Committee for consideration by ThorpeSayNo. The Blimp was flown at a different grid reference to both proposed turbines; Hall Farm and Park Farm and are therefore not a true representation.</p> <p>With regards to the blimp flown by ThorpeSayNo it should be noted that Blimps are not a reliable way of assessing the visual impact of wind developments. The recognised means for assessing the potential visual impact of a wind farm development is through the production of photomontages.</p>
<p>Photomontages and ZTV's</p> <p>The submitted photographs are not a true representation of the impact of the turbines.</p> <p>The photomontages should be considered as unreliable to make a judgement on the impact or harm, as they are not a true representation of what the human eye would receive.</p> <p>The photomontages of the visual impacts have been produced using the familiar misleading technique of using an ultra-wide-angle lens zoomed out as far as possible. It has been shown that using such "tricks" a turbine can be made to appear up to four times smaller than reality.</p>	<p>Noted. As reported within the committee report photomontages are only one tool to assess visual impact they cannot replace the human eye. whilst impact upon the landscape is a matter of judgement the council has a published Character and Landscape Assessment which places the proposed development in a character of 'Pastoral Farmland', a pleasant, rural, gently rolling lowland pastoral farmland landscape, generally well managed, with diverse field shapes and sizes, good hedges and scattered trees.</p>
<p>Impact upon the Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The large turbine would have a visual impact upon this attractive landscape • The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact upon the landscape and character of the surrounding area • It will be visible from miles around and neighbouring villages • It will be a blot on the landscape, far higher than any other structure and close to Burrough Hill Fort • Why position them in one of the most scenic parts of the County also the size of both is of great concern to us. • Will affect the views from nearby popular footpath walks and Leicestershire Rounds. 	<p>Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee Report.</p>
<p>Impact upon residential amenity through noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The turbine will affect the visual amenity, create noise and disturbance and will inevitably impact upon the immediate neighbourhood and beyond • Concerned with possible noise from the 	<p>Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee Report.</p>

<p>turbines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location is too close to the settlement of Thorpe Satchville • There is no noise impact assessment 	
<p>Impact upon Burrough Hill Fort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The turbine is too close to the Heritage site. • It will spoil a beautiful view from the Burrough Hill and generally the beauty of High Leicestershire 	Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee Report.
<p>Impact upon Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns with the effect on the bird life in the area • The constant humming will have an impact upon bird flight paths 	Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee Report.
<p>Efficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind power is erratic and unreliable • Wind power (unlike solar PV and ground-source heat pumps) is also notoriously unreliable • A wind mast should have been erected to allow an assessment of the wind. • Wind turbines are not cost effective 	Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee Report.
<p>Contrary to Development Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The turbine is not “farming technology” nor is it a valid farm based diversification as required by Melton Policy C2; the amount of electricity produced would be well in excess of farm requirements. • Contrary to OS2 as it is outside the village and town envelopes and is not essential to the operational requirements of agriculture • BE1 would be breached as the development does not respond positively to the context of the area surrounding the site, nor would it enhance. • Contrary to NPPF – believe that turbines of such a size will be visually very intrusive and will significantly harm the landscape 	<p>With regards to policy BE1 this policy relates to the erection of new buildings. A wind turbine is not classed as a new building, therefore policy BE1 is not considered to be relevant to the application.</p> <p>All other matters are noted, and are addressed within the report.</p>
<p>Other Considerations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well aware that there is a planning presumption in favour of wind farms but MBC do have to exercise some coherent control over these. Single very large turbines at random positions throughout the borough cannot be the right answer. • Concerned that there will be many more applications from individual farms in the future and the cumulative potential impact 	Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee Report.

<p>must be a consideration. The time to call a halt is now before it is too late and, at the very least, have a consistent policy throughout the borough which should preclude such proliferation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing the turbines will set a precedent which is very difficult to repudiate in planning law 	
--	--

(b) Statement from Mr Duncan MP

<p>I write to make clear my strong objections to the applications for two proposed wind turbines at Thorpe Satchville.</p> <p>I have followed the process carefully with this application and at other sites in my constituency. I have also been briefed by the opponents to the proposed siting of these wind turbines at Thorpe Satchville.</p> <p>Having seen an indication of the size of the proposed turbines, at the flying of blimps in my constituency, I find them to be massive in scale and would be highly inappropriate for the area. They would be an irreversible and permanent blot on the landscape, visible for miles in every direction, in return for relatively little capacity gain.</p> <p>I therefore wish to place on record my firm opposition to the application, which I hope the Planning Committee will reject in the interest of the local residents who would be burdened with the presence of these huge and inappropriate turbines.</p>	<p>Noted. These matters are addressed within the main Committee report.</p>
--	---

(c) Information from the applicant

<p>(i) Cumulative noise assessment: The cumulative noise assessment provided by the agent / applicant at Park Farm shows that the cumulative effect of noise does not exceed the noise levels prescribed by ETSU at any of the nearby dwellings.</p> <p>In response to ThorpeSayNo representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC have concluded that an EIA was not required on 21st December 2011 (letter to Aeolus Power – albeit for the same turbine mounted on a shorter pole); • The submitted LVIA did assess the potential impacts upon the Church of St Michael in Thorpe Satchville, Burrough Hill Fort and the Church of St Mary the Virgin and the Conservation Area at Burrough on the Hill. • Appeal Decision APP/F2415/A/10/2134781 	<p>The Cumulative Noise Assessment was undertaken at the nearest sensitive receptors, Gifford Lodge, Capon Gate, Grange Farm and Hillside Cottage. It concludes that the predicted cumulative noise levels are acceptable and comply with the recommended noise levels endorsed by ETSU-R-97.</p> <p>Noted. These matters are addressed above and within the main Committee Report.</p>
---	---

<p>was based upon the negative impact upon the spire of a Grade I Listed Church; the secondary noise issue pertained to a property 450m directly down-wind of the prevailing SW winds with no intervening copse of trees.</p> <p>In response to ThorpeSayNo studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The turbine will not be overlooked by Thorpe Satchville – this is not a village perched on a hill looking downslope – the village is surrounded by trees and downslope of the turbine. • Thorpe Satchville Hall residents are unlikely to have a clear view of the turbine – due to the intervening trees • The potential impacts upon Burrough Hill Scheduled Ancient Monument and its wider landscape were included in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the accompanying tables and supporting photomontages. 	
---	--

(d) Letters of support
5 additional letters of support

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is extremely important as a nation that we build as many wind turbines as possible over the coming years to enable the country to become much less reliant on imported gas and oil. I am not a supporter of nuclear so we must therefore rely upon our natural resources of wind, wave and water. • It is clear that a lot of people object on the grounds of unsightliness or spoiling of the natural beauty of certain countryside areas. This must take second importance to the bigger picture and I trust that the council will be brave enough to allow these developments to take place. • These installations are necessary to repair the damage we have caused to the planet • Animals are able to adjust to their introduction • Noise is almost negligible • Visual intrusion is similar to that of pylons and telegraph poles • Solar panels don't need permission and turbines shouldn't either • This type of turbine is preferable to the 'lattice' type • Farms require wind turbines to remain viable • The turbine could power 170 homes – the equivalent of Great Dalby and Thorpe Satchville . Surely this is a positive thing? • The site is away from the villages so will have no adverse impact. 	<p>Noted. Turbine proposals need to be assessed on their individual merits however not all locations will be suitable.</p> <p>The Government has a commitment to reduce reliance on fossil fuel and recognises that wind power will greatly assist in reducing impact upon climate change.</p>
---	--