

Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources



Option	Total	Percent of All
Support	<u>23</u>	5.055%
Object	<u>52</u>	11.43%
Support with observations	<u>27</u>	5.934%
Other	<u>5</u>	1.099%
Not Answered	348	76.48%

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

Name	User ID	Support/Object	Issue or comment	What changes would you like to see made to this policy?	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
Robert Ian Lockey	ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	Object		All renewable energy proposals should be rejected.		
Angus Smith	ANON-BHRP-4HZK-D	Support	Support fully and especially like the limitation on the heights of the wind turbine guidance, this is clear enough to prevent them imposing too heavily on the landscape although supporting the need for renewable energy sources. Turbines are always going to be emotionally charged - but will eventually be accepted into the skyline as with electricity pylons which were once just as contentious	Not sure if Kirby Bellars input is properly registered in the above listing, one of our councillors submitted a view in relation to the area around us (councillor Ford who was also on the consultation groups for the Melton Plan. Our expectation is to fit with the 25m height limitation and support where this is to enable local agricultural businesses to provide their own supply source and improve sustainability for that business.	Noted	
Gordon Raper	ANON-BHRP-4H3N-9	Support with observations	I agree that policies on renewable energy should be assessed carefully, as per your guidelines. However, I would prefer that the proliferation of wind-turbines throughout the area was much reduced.	As above	Policy EN10 seeks to ensure that only appropriate wind energy development is delivered.	
John David Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H4X-M	Support with observations	Wind turbine installation proposals should be subject to local consultation.	Wind turbine installation proposals should be subject to local consultation.	All proposals will be subject to consultation.	
Lesley Judith Twigg	ANON-BHRP-4HEH-N	Support with observations	rather a lot and they are an eyesore	need to scrutinize each application or they will be everywhere and will ruin the landscape	All applications will be determined in accordance with Policy EN10.	
Mark Colin Marlow	ANON-BHRP-4HEJ-Q	Object	NO WIND TURBINES	Abolish all wind turbines. The data regarding wind turbines is unsubstantiated and they are not viable as a source of energy. THEY ARE AN EYESORE.		
Alan Luntley	ANON-BHRP-4HEQ-X	Support	Encourage siting of wind turbines and solar farms in preference to 'fracking'			
brian kirkup	ANON-BHRP-4HE9-6	Object	Should be looking to minimise the visual impact of wind turbines on our beautiful countryside. This looks like too much.			
Renewable Energy Systems	ANON-BHRP-4HEK-R	Object		I don't think it is necessary to have height restrictions on turbines. Detail such as this should be considered on a case by case basis.	The guidance on acceptable heights is supported by evidence in The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014	
Anthony Thomas	ANON-BHRP-4HFX-6	Object	Wind Turbines greater than 15M in overall height should not be permitted in The Vale of Belvoir, on The Belvoir escarpment, anywhere	All new planning permissions and where possible alterations to existing properties should have a condition that Solar PV panes and	This considered that the Vale of Belvoir is of low-moderate sensitivity to small clusters of turbines of up to 25m. This does not mean that <i>any</i> such proposal	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			they may be seen from 500 metres away or within 3 kilometres of a dwelling.	Solar Thermal panels must be installed.	would be permitted as the policy requires that cumulative effects and other criteria such as the effect on townscape and heritage assets and residential amenity are taken into account. In addition, the supporting text to the policy requires that the layout and design of proposals should be informed by detailed guidance contained in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. The Belvoir Escarpment is not identified as an area suitable for wind energy development in Policy EN10. Planning regulations do not allow for such a condition. Planning policy can only encourage the installation of renewable technology.	
Douglas Bingham	ANON-BHRP-4HFF-M	Support with observations	<p>1. It is not clear whether the height limit is hub height or maximum blade tip height. If it is hub height, this equates to a machine capable of generating up to 800 kW or so with a tip height of around 75m.</p> <p>2. Even medium size wind turbines have the capability of causing noise nuisance if sited too close to residential properties, and in particular may exhibit a very unpleasant characteristic termed amplitude modulation. ETSU-R-97, the assessment and rating of noise from wind farms, which is embedded in the NPPF, is neither capable nor intended to prevent noise nuisance arising in quiet background conditions, particularly at night and typically in rural and semi-rural residential locations. It is a paper written in 1996 with no revisions and contains far too many unjustified opinions and assumptions still to make it a justifiable component of the NPPF. It considers BS 4142:1990 Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and</p>	<p>1. Qualify whether height limit is tip height or hub height.</p> <p>2. That BS 4142:2014 should be used both at the planning and operation stages to determine conditions such that significant adverse effects are not regularly experienced at nearby residences.</p>	<p>Heights refer to turbine tip height.</p> <p>At present the Council is still guided through ETSU, however whilst the 2014 guidance is current, throughout the life of the Local Plan that may change.</p>	Amend policy to specify that heights refer to blade tip heights.

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			industrial areas, inappropriate due to scope restrictions, which is fair comment. However, 4142 has now been revised, extended, and re-titled as BS 4142:2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial sound. The scope restrictions are now such that it is fully appropriate for the purposes of noise nuisance assessment both at the planning and operational stages. It is recommended in ETSU that BS4142 should be used where appropriate, which it now is in its revised form.			
Stephen Denman	ANON-BHRP-4HEU-2	Support with observations	High quality agricultural land is noted as one of the factors on which proposals for energy technology, associated infrastructure and integration of renewable technology is issued..... yet your proposals show housing development on farm land off Melton Spinney Road, this land is of high agricultural quality..... how does this square up with the above? Wind energy development should be curtailed as this technology, in some quarters, has yet to be proven in the long term, plus the fact it is a "blot" on the landscape!		Planning proposals for the North Sustainable Neighbourhood will require the submission of a soil survey and masterplanning will require that high grade agricultural is preserved wherever possible.	
Dr Jerzy A Schmidt	ANON-BHRP-4H4P-C	Support with observations		Need to consider cumulative effects	Need to ensure that cumulative effects are considered to protect from over - development	The policy requires that cumulative effects and other criteria such as the effect on townscape and heritage assets and residential amenity are taken into account.
Susan Love	ANON-BHRP-4HZP-J	Object	Wind turbines are not acceptable in the Vale of Belvoir. Solar energy panels on new homes should be mandatory.		As above.	The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 considered that the Vale of Belvoir is of low-moderate sensitivity to small clusters of turbines of up to 25m. This does not mean that <i>any</i> such proposal would be permitted as the policy requires that cumulative effects and other criteria such as the effect on townscape and heritage assets and residential amenity are taken into account. In addition, the supporting text to the policy requires that the layout and design of proposals should be informed by detailed guidance contained in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. Planning regulations do not allow for the mandatory installation of solar panels and planning policy can only encourage this.

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

Mark & Kathryn Chapman	ANON-BHRP-4HFJ-R	Support		<p>We support low carbon energy generation using small wind turbines <50m or using solar farms. Each application should be considered on its own merits however, no turbines taller than 50m should be allowed within the Borough. They have too large an impact on the rural landscape. An alternative use for Dalby Airfield site would be as a solar farm.</p>	<p>The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 supports turbines of up to 75m in LCU6 Kesteven Uplands.</p>	
John Moore	ANON-BHRP-4HZS-N	Object	<p>The comments below relate to the specific paragraphs in the supporting text of the published Emerging Options (Draft Plan) Section 7.20, Decentralised Renewable Energy and Large Scale Renewable Energy: 7.20.02 In Policy EN10 the element that relates to community-owned decentralised schemes should be made clearer. At present it is rather lost and comes after the list of LCUs identified as suitable for wind energy development. THIS ELEMENT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE MAIN BODY OF THE POLICY. 7.20.03 What has Shale Gas Fracking to do with renewable energy? 7.20.04 What evidence is there that, during the plan period, there will be large-scale renewable energy proposals in the Borough? Given the Government's determination to reduce financial support for renewable energy schemes and the changes to planning practice guidance introduced in 2015, it is doubtful whether such proposals will be forthcoming in the foreseeable future. 7.20.07 Confirms that it is not a requirement to identify suitable areas for low carbon energy. Further, Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy makes it clear (paragraph 003) that there is no quota against which the local plan should deliver. So why does the draft Melton Local</p>	<p>Rewrite policy EN10 as: Sensitive located renewable energy proposals appropriate for the area, including biomass power generation, combined heat and power, hydro, wind, solar and micro generation systems, will be supported and considered in the context of sustainable development and climate change. In developing proposals for new thermal generating stations, developers should consider opportunities for CHP and district heating from the very earliest point and it should be adopted as a criterion when considering locations for a project. Renewable energy proposals which will directly benefit a local community in the medium and long term and/or are targeted at residents experiencing fuel poverty will be particularly supported. Proposals for renewable energy technology, associated infrastructure and integration of renewable technology on existing or proposed structures will be assessed both individually and cumulatively on their merits taking account of the</p>	<p>The guidance in Para 7.20.7 has been superseded by that in Para 7.20.8 and it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development. The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section. This policy will be subject to review as part of Local Plan Review after 5 years of adoption of the Plan.</p>	<p>Amend 7.20.3 to: “However, it is unlikely that decentralized <u>renewable</u> energy alone will meet our energy demand.... “ Amend Para 7.20.4 to: “To meet the national requirements for renewable energy production, it is likely that, <u>subject to funding availability</u>, that there will be continues demand for large scale renewable proposals...” Amend Para 7.20.7: “The Local Plan sets out an approach to supporting and managing these types of development to ensure that adverse impacts are addressed, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts. To do this the NPPF suggests that it might be appropriate to identify <u>suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and supporting infrastructure, where this would help their development.”</u> Insert Para after 7.20.13: <u>“The table in Policy EN10, which identifies areas which</u></p>

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>Plan seek to identify areas as suitable for wind energy development? 7.20.08 The draft Melton Local Plan has incorrectly used The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 to determine that Landscape Character Assessment Units judged as being of low or low-medium sensitivity ARE suitable for wind energy development for identified turbine heights and cluster sizes. The authors of the Study made it clear (paragraph 4.19) that it provides an initial indication only of relative landscape sensitivities and it should not be interpreted as a definitive statement on the sensitivity of a particular location for a particular development. Yet this is exactly what draft policy EN10 does when in paragraph 7.20.12 it states that the identified LCUs ARE suitable for wind energy development for the identified turbine heights and cluster sizes (throughout the 20 years of the Plan until 2036). The authors had prefaced their Study by stating that it will assist by identifying areas of greater or lesser sensitivity (paragraph 1.4). They do not claim to identify areas which ARE suitable for wind energy development but to identify areas which might be less sensitive than others. They also make it clear (paragraph 1.9) that judgements about the acceptability of landscape change can alter over time, not only in terms of attributes to a particular landscape but also in terms of our attitudes towards a particular type of change (as can be witnessed in the marked change of Government policy on the matter within just 10 months of the Study's publication). In practice, as the authors acknowledged (paragraph 1.3), the</p>	<p>following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Siting so as to gain maximum effect from wind/solar/water sources; * The surrounding landscape, townscape and heritage assets; * Residential and visual amenity; * Noise impacts; * Odour impacts; * Designated nature conservation, geo-diversity or biodiversity considerations; * Ecology; * Aircraft movements and associated activities, including effects on radar, communications and navigational systems; * Electromagnetic transmissions; * High quality agricultural land; * Access for construction, maintenance and de-commissioning; * Not creating demand for bio-energy fuels known to result in net carbon emissions through production methods, transport requirements and/or loss of carbon sinks; * General safety in terms of highways, power lines, icing, visual distraction; * Transport movements for importation of biomass fuel. <p>In the case of proposals for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, planning</p>		<p><u>are suitable for wind energy development, must be interpreted in the context of the entire policy and criteria A-N.”</u></p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>Study provides an evidence base, albeit not definitive, upon which decisions can be more readily made. Indeed, recent appeals locally (Hazeltongue Farm, Hall Farm and Park Farm) have led to the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State concluding that The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study has only limited planning weight.</p> <p>In his decision letter for the Hall Farm appeal the Secretary of State disagreed with the assessment derived from The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study of a low-moderate landscape sensitivity for a proposed 46.1 metre high turbine. He considered that the turbine was incompatible with its rural location in LCU8 and would cause moderate harm to the fabric of the landscape, a matter to which he attributed considerable weight in the planning balance.</p> <p>The draft Melton Local Plan is therefore wrong to consider in paragraph 7.20.12 that “Landscape Character Assessment Units judged as being of Low or Low-Moderate sensitivity [in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014] ARE suitable for wind energy development”. At the very least “are” should be replaced by “may be” or, better, “may offer locations for wind energy development”.</p> <p>IN POLICY EN10 THE BULLET POINT WHICH REFERS TO THE MELTON AND RUSHCLIFFE LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY STUDY NEEDS TO BE RE-CONSIDERED.</p> <p>GIVEN THE CONCLUSION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPECT OF A SINGLE 46.1m TURBINE IN THE HALL FARM APPEAL (DECISION LETTER DATED 11 NOVEMBER 2015) IT IS WRONG TO ASSERT IN POLICY EN10 THAT LCU8 WOULD HAVE A LOW OR LOW-MODERATE</p>	<p>permission will only be granted if, following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>SENSITIVITY TO WIND TURBINE DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 50M WHETHER SINGLY OR IN CLUSTERS. LCU8 SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE LIST.</p> <p>FURTHER, AS THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT TO IDENTIFY AREAS WHICH WOULD BE SUITABLE FOR WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT, IT WOULD BE BETTER TO REMOVE THE LIST OF LCUs FROM POLICY EN10 ALTOGETHER. GIVEN THE WRITTEN MINISTERIAL STATEMENT OF 18 JUNE 2015 IT MIGHT BE CONSTRUED THAT THE MELTON LOCAL PLAN WAS ALLOCATING THESE AREAS AS SUITABLE.</p> <p>A CRITERION-BASED POLICY SHOULD SUFFICE. IF, HOWEVER, THE COUNCIL WISHES THE MELTON LOCAL PLAN TO ALLOCATE ONE OR MORE SITES FOR WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT SUCH AN ALLOCATION WOULD NEED TO HAVE BEEN SUBJECT TO PRIOR CONSULTATION AND HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE AFFECTED LOCAL COMMUNITY.</p>			
Elizabeth Anne Taylor	ANON-BHRP-4HMD-S	Object	<p>Melton Borough Council is not required to allocate land for wind energy generation in the local plan. Each application should be considered on its own merits, along with appropriate community engagement.</p> <p>However this is contradicted in policy EN10 which states that the LCU’s listed are suitable for wind energy development of the turbine heights and cluster sizes identified. This in effect allocates a large proportion of the borough as wind energy suitable sites. In some areas this is in direct contradiction to recent appeal decisions.</p> <p>e.g. - Secretary of State judgement over the Hall Farm turbine being ‘incompatible with its rural location’ and ‘would cause moderate harm to the fabric of the landscape’ He</p>	The list of LCU’s should be removed from the policy.	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>attributed considerable weight to this in the planning balance. It would be wrong to identify LCU8 to site wind turbine development of up to 50 meters whether singly or in clusters, in the local plan. The list of LCU’s should therefore be removed from the policy.</p>			
Julie Moss	ANON-BHRP-4HM5-A	Object	<p>Turbines located inland have very little effect compared to those located out at sea or on high ground. They are an eyesore, noisy and have no place in the countryside.</p>	No wind turbines allowed.		
Nick Farrow	ANON-BHRP-4HUD-1	Support with observations	<p>Make sure we do not lose our biggest asset of free space and views at the expense of renewable energy.</p>	Sensible developments.	Policy EN10 seeks to ensure that only appropriate wind energy development is delivered.	
Dr Ian Chappell	ANON-BHRP-4HUA-X	Object	<p>There is no requirement for the local authority to allocate land in the Local Plan for wind energy generation. Each application should be considered on its merits, with community engagement. However, Policy EN10 states that the Landscape Character Units listed in the policy ARE suitable for wind energy development of the turbine heights and cluster sizes identified. This has the effect of allocating a large proportion of the borough as wind energy sites. In some areas this is in direct contradiction to recent appeal decisions, for instance the inclusion of LCU8. The Secretary of State, in his judgement about a single 46.1m turbine at Hall Farm, near Thorpe Satchville, considered that the turbine ‘was incompatible with its rural location in LCU8 and would cause moderate harm to the fabric of the landscape’. He attributed considerable weight to this in the planning balance. It would therefore be wrong to identify LCU8 as suitable to site wind turbine development of up to 50m whether singly or in clusters in the Local Plan. Policy EN10 is in direct contradiction to a recent judgement made by the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>The list of LCUs should be removed from the policy.</p> <p>It is not required and time/resources would be better spent on more critical issues.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

Linda Moore	ANON-BHRP-4HM6-B	Object	<p>It is my understanding that there is no requirement for local authorities to allocate land in the Local Plan for wind energy generation. Each application should be judged on its merits, with community engagement.</p> <p>I think it is misleading to identify areas based on a study (Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014) which has never been out for public consultation and which the authors themselves attest is "merely a tool " to assist with planning decisions. By including the list of LCUs in the Plan credence is given to the findings of the study which are meant to be an "indication" of the relative sensitivities of LCUs, not the definitive answer.</p>	The list of LCUs should be removed.	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p>
Moira Hart	ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M	Support with observations	The Wolds escarpment area behind Long Clawson is a very sensitive landscape and proposals for wind turbines there have already been refused. The preservation of sensitive landscape and the backing of the local population, as stated in this policy is essential.		The Belvoir Escarpment in not identified as an area suitable for wind energy development in Policy EN10.
sarah mant	ANON-BHRP-4HUE-2	Support with observations	Siting of wind turbines on the wolds/ uplands needs to be carefully considered and take into account the wildlife, including the red kite population		Policy EN10 requires that consideration is given to ecology in the determination of applications.
CHRISTINE LARSON	ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J	Support with observations	<p>The wolds escarpment and Vale of Belvoir should be protected from wind turbine development except for single up to 25m turbines that support farms directly. eg Waltham crossroads. They should not be allowed in multiples.</p> <p>Last year on Appeal the Inspector rejected an application to erect a 79M turbine on top of the wolds ridge - supported by MBC.</p> <p>The Inspector wrote “In the absence of a specific development plan policy relating to renewable energy it is unsurprising that the proposal would conflict with a general development management policy. Nevertheless, I have also found that the proposal would conflict with LP policy C2.</p> <p>Whilst conflict with the development plan and harm to the setting of a listed building are capable of being</p>	Change the Vale of Belvoir to read - <25m as a single turbine to support farm	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>outweighed by the benefits of a proposal, given the extent of the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area and to the setting of the listed windmill, the benefits of the appeal scheme are insufficient to outweigh the totality of the harm. In this instance, notwithstanding the provisions of the above noted ‘other documents’, the adverse impacts of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This in turn leads me to find that the proposal would fail to satisfy the environmental dimension to sustainable development. It would conflict with the provisions of the Framework when read as a whole and the provisions of the 2015 WMS”.</p> <p>I hope we will respect the assets that we have been blessed with that make our landscape unique and tranquil so that others can share it and it is kept for future generations.</p>			
Clawson in Action - residents' group set up to Keep Clawson Long and Rural and working to support the production of a Long Clawson Neighbourhood Plan	ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q	Support with observations	<p>The Wolds escarpment area behind Long Clawson is a very sensitive landscape and proposals for wind turbines there have already been refused by the Planning Inspectorate. The preservation of sensitive landscape and the backing of the local population, as stated in this policy is essential. In this regard fracking in the Vale of Belvoir and around Long Clawson would NOT be supported</p>		The Belvoir Escarpment is not identified as an area suitable for wind energy development in Policy EN10.	
Kenneth Bray	ANON-BHRP-4HBX-2	Support with observations	<p>This is reasonable as a policy to control wind turbines etc given the central government directives, but in truth there are no appropriate sites for wind turbines inland and they are a costly mistake.</p>			
Susan Herlihy	ANON-BHRP-4HE3-Z	Support		Ban people and their drones		
Elaine, Pete, Luke and Joe Etherington	BHLF-BHRP-4HBQ-U	Object	<p>This policy is in direct contradiction to a recent judgement by the Secretary of State. LCU8 should not be considered as suitable for wind turbine development. There is no requirement for the local authority to</p>	<p>The list of LCUs should be removed from the policy with each application considered on its merits with full community engagement</p>	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			allocate land in the Local Plan for wind energy generation.		areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Deborah Caroline Adams	ANON- BHRP- 4H38-K	Object	I object to turbines. They are costly and are run inefficiently as part of some scam. Clusters of two or three 50m turbines will ruin the character of the countryside round the edge of Melton Mowbray.	The building of wind turbines should be halted. No further planning permission should be given for wind turbines.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Anthony Paphiti	ANON- BHRP- 4HBV-Z	Object	Turbines of up to 50m high (as high as Nelson's Column) will absolutely have an impact on the surrounding countryside and will be visible for some considerable distance. They are large turbines. The view otherwise is disingenuous and is exacerbated by the stance taken in the Landscape Sensitivity Study which purports to categorise any turbine under 50m high as a "small turbine". As I mention elsewhere, words have different meanings to different people, which is why some of the superficially reasonable statements made in the plan are open to multiple interpretations including, like this proposal, an utterly unreasonable one. Defining a 50 m turbine as "small" will mean every application will be for a 50 m turbine. No one will apply for a smaller one. They will take it to the limit applicable. The notion that allowing "clusters of" up to five turbines is acceptable is the complete opposite of the case. It is also laying down a test which conflicts with the statutory duties under the Localism Act and the planning guidance issued by the Gvt concerning local opinion. I cannot give my support to this proposal which is harmful to the local area, landscape and potentially damaging to heritage.	Wind turbines are intrusive to the landscape and heritage assets. It inexorably follows that the bigger they are the more intrusive they become over a wider area. A fortiori, the more numerous they are. There should be no policy to permit developments of large-scale (over 35m) turbines; Turbines of up to 20m in height, which are commensurate with sustainable development for farms and businesses, should be permissible, subject to community acceptance, and subject to no more than a "cluster" of 2. It is difficult to envisage why more than 2 turbines would be required by any business to provide its electricity needs: when the turbines are operating, they will be more than adequate for the needs of the business. When they stand idle (about 70% of the time) no electricity will be generated. The only difference in the latter case is the possibility of constraint payments. But I do not see why the taxpayer should be concerned about lining the pockets of those who seek to earn subsidies for selling electricity to the grid.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Voices Campaign Group (wind	ANON- BHRP- 4H63-H	Support with observations	I am submitting brief comments on behalf of Voices, a campaign group established in 2015 to explore the	I am aware that concerns have been expressed about the legality of adopting the Joint LCSS as a	Noted	

energy)			<p>issue of wind energy projects across the Vale of Belvoir and surrounding areas. http://www.voicesagainstturbines.co.uk/ I am aware that the SMART Group have submitted detailed comments to the Local Plan consultation and wish to offer our full support to the points they raise. Particularly, we support: - the adoption of the Joint LCSS as the basis for wind energy planning (see below). - recognition that the landscape and culture of our area is very valuable; both economically and in terms of the health and wellbeing of residents. - consultation is effective and far-reaching and not just a 'tick box' process; it is very important that concerns raised by the local community are addressed effectively. We are pleased to see recognition of noise and electromagnetic/infrasound issues in the Plan; research is fast-moving in this area and it would be good to see planning conditions built in to respond to any issues which might emerge following the erection of wind turbines.</p>	<p>basis for the Local Plan because it wasn't subjected to full consultation before publication and would like to add the following comments on the subject: The Joint Melton & Rushcliffe Landscape Capacity & Sensitivity Study was a specially commissioned study, commissioned by the 2 Councils, and was written by experts in the field. The whole point of it was that it was an objective analysis of the situation across these 2 areas - it would have been highly inappropriate to consult on its content. The study simply brings together the various local factors which should be considered and offers a 'sensitivity' rating which can be applied as part of the overall 'weighing up process' when deciding if the green benefits outweigh the negative impacts. The aim was to put an evidence-based study in place that was public and could be applied consistently against all future applications instead of the previously rather haphazard approach (and, perhaps, the somewhat biased landscape assessments that the applicants sometimes provide ...) •All Parish Councils and Borough Councillors were asked to contribute to the Study which means they were aware of it and able to comment on the process as well as making their own clearly identified submissions •The study cannot be viewed as objective if everyone has been allowed to tinker with its contents - that would be inappropriate and would have undermined its credibility •I would say that the appropriate time for consultation is at this stage; in other words, whether this Study should be used as an</p>		
---------	--	--	---	---	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

				<p>effective basis for on-going policy in the Local Plan. The question isn't whether consultation should have been attached to the Joint LCSS but to find out, via the current consultation, whether everyone is happy for it be used as a basis for future decisions.</p> <p>Rushcliffe published their Local Plan last Summer & they have used the Joint Study as an evidence-based reference tool for planners and applicants to refer to during the planning process - it is proving to be a useful tool and certainly adds clarity.</p>		
Shelagh Woollard	ANON-BHRP-4HB5-Y	Other	More support for solar panels - and sheep can graze amongst the panels on a solar farm so land is not wasted.	No wind turbines - they are expensive and inefficient - and are only any use when there is a little, but not too much wind.		
Anthony Woollard	ANON-BHRP-4H6F-4	Object	Wind turbines are NOT efficient and should be discouraged.			
Clair Ingham	ANON-BHRP-4HMZ-F	Support	We need to consider other energy sources but need to be mindful of the merits for turbines to ensure they do not damage the local area	None		
Melanie Steadman	ANON-BHRP-4HFE-K	Support with observations	The ones on the A46 are in the middle of nowhere, obstructing no one, and well placed out the way. This kind of site is ideal.	Above		
Martin smith	ANON-BHRP-4H6A-Y	Support with observations	Must not put wind turbines within 500m of homes due to power generation low frequency sound. Plus good solar power is recognised as important (much more than wind turbines.)	As above		
HSSP Architects	ANON-BHRP-4HMV-B	Support with observations	No objection to consultation process but do not see how anyone will get local community backing- there are such anti turbine views in the borough.	remove wording "and therefore the proposal has their backing."	Noted. All planning proposals are consulted on and any impacts identified are addressed by the Local Planning Authority in its decision making. The ministerial statement of June 2015 states that "Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgment for the local planning authority."	Remove last bullet: <u>"Following consultation it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing."</u>
Russell Pride	ANON-BHRP-4H6H-6	Object	Policy EN10 - Energy Generation from Renewable Sources Policy EN10 provides a presumption in favour of permission if a wind energy proposal falls within an area that has	There is no longer a requirement for local authorities to specifically identify suitable sites for wind energy development. The planning authority may decide each	Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>been identified as low or low/moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development by the Melton & Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study (2014). The study uses LCUs that cover large geographical areas. These are too general to constitute identified sites for wind development, yet within these areas there would be a presumption that any wind energy proposal of the scale identified would automatically be suitable, whether or not such a development has the support of the local affected community.</p>	<p>proposal on its merits. Therefore the text of Policy EN10 should not continue beyond the words: “Transport movements for the importation of biomass fuel” two thirds of the way down page 136.</p>	<p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p>	
Linda Pride	ANON-BHRP-4H6P-E	Object	<p>Policy EN10 - Energy Generation from Renewable Sources Here are six reasons why there is no need at all for the District Council to identify areas for wind turbines in local planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First. The EU 2020 target for renewable energy has been reached already. • Second. For every £100 paid to turbine owners around £65 is subsidy. This is added to every person’s electricity bill. By their very nature, only the already rich can afford to buy turbines. This means that communities are compelled by councils to make the rich, richer. • Third. The subsidies for wind turbines permitted so far in Leicestershire represent the greatest transfer of wealth from ordinary people to the rich in modern local government history. • Fourth. If the motive of turbine owners was to produce electricity at the market rate they would have the overwhelming support of the community. However, most if not all turbine planning applications are motivated by a greed for subsidy at community expense. Look at the fracas caused by Wind Ventures, a company clearly with no moral responsibilities. A responsible District 	<p>By removing all references to wind turbine electricity generation, which has no place in the Local Plan, it is trusted that the District Council will stand up and be counted on these issues, place all its effort to support the people of Melton Borough District and withdraw all support, in whatever guise, for subsidised wind turbines.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>Council would not support this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifth. A high percentage of wind farms, in particular in Leicestershire, are owned by overseas speculators, including foreign governments, who take advantage of the naivety of the UK government. For example, the owner of the eleven turbines at Swinford, via a Special Purpose Vehicle, is the Swedish government. This means that the British public subsidises the Swedish public. • and Sixth. A greater priority for the Council is its Duty of Care for the people of the district. At a time when DECC statistics show that approaching 2.2 million UK households endure fuel poverty and government’s Economic and Social Research Centre reveal that 2.5 million children live in damp houses, 1.5 million children live in households which cannot afford heat and 5.5 million adults go without essential clothing, the District Council should care for the district’s people rather than making the rich, richer. 			
Robert Anthony Fionda	ANON-BHRP-4H13-C	Object	LCU 6,13 or 15 should not allow 50m turbines		The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Wayne Hickling	ANON-BHRP-4H1R-B	Object	<p>I strongly object to the development of Wind Turbines generally, but in particular to LCU8 High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland, which is being considered suitable for turbines up to 50m as clusters of four/five. This would be a travesty for the local landscape and provide minimal benefits to the local community. This type of development has been thrown out on a number of recent occasions both locally and around the country as it just doesn't stack up!</p>	A complete reversal of proposals on Wind turbines, based on recent evidence / decisions.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering	ANON-BHRP-4HUB-Y	Support with observations	<p>Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that –</p> <p>-73% of respondents are against</p>	<p>Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that –</p> <p>-73% of respondents are against</p>	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

Group			Fracking, -78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines -50% of respondents are against Solar Farms LCU1 Vale of Belvoir - Turbines up to 25 metres in height, up to 3 in a cluster. Past applications in the area have been rejected on the basis that the effectiveness of wind turbines in the Vale of Belvoir is limited along with the landscape damage that they would cause. 7.20.8 (p133) Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014	Fracking, -78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines -50% of respondents are against Solar Farms LCU1 Vale of Belvoir - Turbines up to 25 metres in height, up to 3 in a cluster. Past applications in the area have been rejected on the basis that the effectiveness of wind turbines in the Vale of Belvoir is limited along with the landscape damage that they would cause. 7.20.8 (p133) Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014	the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
James & Amanda Sparrow	ANON-BHRP-4H6U-K	Support with observations	The energy recommendations seem to be out of line with current government policy. “High Leicestershire”, the attractive countryside surrounding Melton is well known as good draining farmland and particularly scenic, which is one of the principal attractions that draws tourists to Melton. Scarring this area with wind farms and the like will dramatically and adversely affect tourism. We disagree with the inclusion of the landscape character assessment and acceptable height cluster and size appraisal. LCU8 and LC15 would both have a detrimental impact on local heritage assets and the rural landscape. Too much of the Borough is included as being for wind turbines.	We believe that each application should be judged on its own merit and local acceptance. There are too many and too big turbines proposed in the LCUs, if Melton Mowbray is going to stay rural. The list of LCUs should be removed from the Plan.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4HZC-5	Support with observations		Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that – -73% of respondents are against Fracking, -78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines -50% of respondents are against Solar Farms LCU1 Vale of Belvoir - Turbines up to 25 metres in height, up to 3 in a cluster Past applications in the area have been rejected on the basis that the effectiveness of wind turbines in the Vale of Belvoir is	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

				limited along with the landscape damage that they would cause.		
Bottesford Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4H1W-G	Support with observations		<p>Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -73% of respondents are against Fracking, -78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines -50% of respondents are against Solar Farms <p>LCU1 Vale of Belvoir - Turbines up to 25 metres in height, up to 3 in a cluster Past applications in the area have been rejected on the basis that the effectiveness of wind turbines in the Vale of Belvoir is limited along with the landscape damage that they would cause.</p> <p>7.20.8 (p133) Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014</p>	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
JOHN RUST	ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K	Support with observations	<p>The Wolds escarpment area behind Long Clawson is a very sensitive landscape and proposals for wind turbines there have already been refused. The preservation of sensitive landscape and the backing of the local population, as stated in this policy is essential.</p> <p>The wolds escarpment and Vale of Belvoir should be protected from wind turbine development except for single up to 15m turbines that support farms directly. eg Waltham crossroads. They should not be allowed in multiples.</p> <p>Last year on Appeal the Inspector rejected an application to erect a 79M turbine on top of the wolds ridge. The Inspector wrote “In the absence of a specific development plan policy relating to renewable energy it is unsurprising that the proposal would conflict with a general development management policy. Nevertheless, I have also found that the proposal would conflict with LP policy C2. Whilst conflict with the development plan and harm to the setting of a listed building are capable of being outweighed by the benefits of a</p>	<p>The wolds escarpment and Vale of Belvoir should be protected from wind turbine development except for single up to 15m turbines that support farms directly. eg Waltham crossroads. They should not be allowed in multiples.</p> <p>Change Policy to read Change the Vale of Belvoir to read - <15m as a single turbine to support farm</p>	<p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>The Belvoir Escarpment in not identified as an area suitable for wind energy development in Policy EN10.</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			proposal, given the extent of the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area and to the setting of the listed windmill, the benefits of the appeal scheme are insufficient to outweigh the totality of the harm. In this instance, notwithstanding the provisions of the above noted ‘other documents’, the adverse impacts of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This in turn leads me to find that the proposal would fail to satisfy the environmental dimension to sustainable development. It would conflict with the provisions of the Framework when read as a whole and the provisions of the 2015 WMS”.			
G.E.Digby	ANON-BHRP-4H1A-T	Object	This is a blanket allocation of turbines which, if completed, will seriously, visually, damage the whole area. Surely this contravenes current national policy which has changed significantly, placing emphasis on offshore major installations.	A complete re-think of this whole policy.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Wymondham and Edmondthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Committee	ANON-BHRP-4HBD-E	Object	LCU13 - the open rolling nature of this landscape does not seem suited to clusters of this scale. Based on local evidence collected from Working Groups smaller scale renewable energy projects where these are not detrimental to the local setting and character are likely to be supported. Policy covering this for the Neighbourhood Plan is being drafted and will be subject to further local consultation and assessment.	Delete LCU13 as an area where wind turbines/ wind farms would be acceptable	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Colin Love	ANON-BHRP-4HBR-V	Object	I have to object because of the statement re 'directly benefiting a local community...' etc. This could provide a major problem in the attempt to keep a landscape policy in place. Also, the wording is unclear in its intent. Relatively recently there was a proposal for a large scale wind farm close to Bottesford. The applicant was promising sums of money to the Bottesford community - for	See above	This section of the policy needs to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			community benefit. So this could have been construed as 'directly benefiting the community'. As will be known by Melton BC and South Kesteven, in the event, the application was turned down on Appeal. Nonetheless, in the words presently used in this section, it could have been relied upon by the applicant - or any similar applicant in the future. I suggest that this requires re-visiting by the Melton Plan			
Alan and Heather Woodhouse	ANON-BHRP-4HMQ-6	Object	Unconvinced by anything except off shore large cluster wind turbine solutions.	No further comment		
Anthony Edward Maher	ANON-BHRP-4HUS-G	Support with observations	The factors mentioned above cover most points but I cannot see anything that dictates the distance between clusters of turbines, if this distance is small clusters can appear as larger groups.		Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”	
Alastair P J Smith and Eleonore S Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H1U-E	Object	<p>Both my wife and I object to this latest Plan for reasons that we have given many times in the past. It would appear that the Powers that be are not taking any notice of our oft stated objections. As a result it looks as though we shall be lumbered with many turbines that we definitely do not agree with. WE DO NOT WANT TURBINES IN THE BEAUTIFUL LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTRYSIDE. THEY ARE UNNECESSARY, INEFFICIENT AND AN EYESORE.</p> <p>We also agree with the objection sent in by others in this area as follow:- There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted.</p> <p>I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in</p>	<p>We should like to see our objections stated in the past to carry the weight that they should carry. ONCE AGAIN WE DO NOT WANT OUR COUNTRYSIDE BESMIRCHED BY THESE UNNECESSARY, INEFFICIENT, STRUCTURES. We understood that the Government ruled that the views of the local community should be treated seriously in these inquiries/surveys and it would appear that this is not the case.</p> <p>We also support the following communication of objections as submitted by Thorpe Wind :- There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted.</p> <p>I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its</p>	<p>The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014.</p> <p>The justification to Policy EN10 at 7.20.13 states that the assessment of both areas should be considered for proposals which are sited near the boundary of two LCUs and as such it is considered not necessary to re-draw boundaries.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p>	

			<p>LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity Study states: ‘... making these edges more sensitive than the centre’ (Table 7.8) ‘This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines’ – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the ‘edges [are] more sensitive than the centre’. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being it forms a ‘prominent skyline’ but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by: Either Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows: Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge < 25 m L-M 25 – 50m M</p>	<p>neighbour LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity Study states: ‘... making these edges more sensitive than the centre’ (Table 7.8) ‘This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines’ – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the ‘edges [are] more sensitive than the centre’. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being is forms a ‘prominent skyline’ but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by: Either Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>51 – 75 m M-H</p> <p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state: Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? 	<p>Or</p> <p>Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows:</p> <p>Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge</p> <p>< 25 m L-M</p> <p>25 – 50m M</p> <p>51 – 75 m M-H</p> <p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state: Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high.</p> <p>3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed.</p> <p>In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’</p> <p>In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines.</p>	<p>four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high. 3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed. <p>In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’</p> <p>In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

<p>Anna Freij</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4H17-G</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted as I think the Study is deficient in a number of ways. I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity Study states: '... making these edges more sensitive than the centre' (Table 7.8) 'This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines' – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the 'edges [are] more sensitive than the centre'. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being is forms a 'prominent skyline' but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the</p>	<p>There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted as I consider the Study to be deficient in a number of ways. I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity Study states: '... making these edges more sensitive than the centre' (Table 7.8) 'This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines' – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the 'edges [are] more sensitive than the centre'. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being is forms a 'prominent skyline' but also because of its proximity to</p>	<p>The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. The justification to Policy EN10 at 7.20.13 states that the assessment of both areas should be considered for proposals which are sited near the boundary of two LCUs and as such it is considered not necessary to re-draw boundaries. The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section. Refer to Para 7.20.15: "In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed."</p>	
-------------------	-------------------------	---------------	--	---	---	--

			<p>greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by: Either Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows: Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge</p> <p>< 25 m L-M</p> <p>25 – 50m M</p> <p>51 – 75 m M-H</p> <p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state: Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be</p>	<p>Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by:</p> <p>Either</p> <p>Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows:</p> <p>Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge</p> <p>< 25 m L-M</p> <p>25 – 50m M</p> <p>51 – 75 m M-H</p> <p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state:</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high. 3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed. <p>In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads:</p> <p>The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’</p> <p>In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines.</p>	<p>Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high. 3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed. <p>In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>NB If the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 cannot be amended, then policy EN10 needs to be amended to include the following points: Either Redraw the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Specifically exclude the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area from the comments about Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8 and note an addendum / amendment to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 for the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area as follows: Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area < 25 m L-M 25 – 50m M 51 – 75 m M-H 76 – 100m H 11 – 150 m H Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H? Or State under Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8, ‘In the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area, <25m as a single turbine; no clusters.’</p>	<p>consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’ In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines. NB If the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 cannot be amended, then policy EN10 needs to be amended to include the following points: Either Redraw the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Specifically exclude the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area from the comments about Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8 and note an addendum / amendment to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 for the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area as follows: Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area < 25 m L-M 25 – 50m M 51 – 75 m M-H</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

				<p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Or</p> <p>State under Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8, 'In the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area, <25m as a single turbine; no clusters.'</p>		
Thorpe Says No	ANON-BHRP-4H1E-X	Object	<p>There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted as I consider the Study to be deficient in a number of ways.</p> <p>I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity</p>	<p>There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted as I consider the Study to be deficient in a number of ways.</p> <p>I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and</p>	<p>The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014.</p> <p>The justification to Policy EN10 at 7.20.13 states that the assessment of both areas should be considered for proposals which are sited near the boundary of two LCUs and as such it is considered not necessary to re-draw boundaries.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p>	

		<p>Study states: ‘... making these edges more sensitive than the centre’ (Table 7.8) ‘This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines’ – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the ‘edges [are] more sensitive than the centre’. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being is forms a ‘prominent skyline’ but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by: Either Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows: Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge</p> <p>< 25 m L-M 25 – 50m M 51 – 75 m M-H 76 – 100m H 11 – 150 m H It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of</p>	<p>sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity Study states: ‘... making these edges more sensitive than the centre’ (Table 7.8) ‘This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines’ – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the ‘edges [are] more sensitive than the centre’. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being is forms a ‘prominent skyline’ but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by:</p> <p>Either Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows:</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state: Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high. 3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed. <p>In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The</p>	<p>Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge</p> <p>< 25 m L-M</p> <p>25 – 50m M</p> <p>51 – 75 m M-H</p> <p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state:</p> <p>Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	--	--

			<p>Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’ In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines. NB If the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 cannot be amended, then policy EN10 needs to be amended to include the following points: Either Redraw the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Specifically exclude the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area from the comments about Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8 and note an addendum / amendment to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 for the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area as follows: Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area < 25 m L-M 25 – 50m M 51 – 75 m M-H 76 – 100m H</p>	<p>clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons: 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high. 3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed. In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’ In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>11 – 150 m H Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H? Or State under Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8, 'In the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area, <25m as a single turbine; no clusters.'</p>	<p>need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines. NB If the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 cannot be amended, then policy EN10 needs to be amended to include the following points: Either Redraw the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Specifically exclude the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area from the comments about Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8 and note an addendum / amendment to the 'Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights' table for LCU8 for the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area as follows: Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area < 25 m L-M 25 – 50m M 51 – 75 m M-H 76 – 100m H 11 – 150 m H Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H? Or State under Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size in LCU 8, 'In the Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby area, <25m as a single turbine; no clusters.'</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

Mick Jones	ANON-BHRP-4H6N-C	Object	Strongly object to the clustering of turbines where they despoil the landscape. Those that can be viewed high on hill tops across valleys should be turned down.	Cluster turbines around industrial areas, allow single turbines limited in height and size to farms and other rural businesses.	Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”	
Burton & Dalby Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4HU6-K	Object	The inclusion of listed Landscape Character Units has the effect of allocating a large proportion of the borough as wind energy sites. In some areas this is in direct contradiction to recent appeal decisions, for instance the inclusion of LCU8. The Secretary of State, in his judgement about a single 46.1m turbine at Hall Farm, near Thorpe Satchville, considered that the turbine ‘was incompatible with its rural location in LCU8 and would cause moderate harm to the fabric of the landscape’. He attributed considerable weight to this in the planning balance. It would therefore be wrong to identify LCU8 as suitable to site wind turbine development of up to 50m whether singly or in clusters in the Local Plan. Policy EN10 is in direct contradiction to a recent judgement made by the Secretary of State. Each application should be considered on its merits, with community engagement. However, Policy EN10 states that the Landscape Character Units listed in the policy ARE suitable for wind energy development of the turbine heights and cluster sizes identified.	The table on page 137 should be removed since its inclusion implies that whole areas are designated without identifying particular sites.	Identification of suitable areas is not the same as allocating sites. The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
CAROLINE BAKER	ANON-BHRP-4HG3-2	Object	There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted. I object to policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU 8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour	MBC to encourage the adoption of better respected internationally recognised smaller scale technology with much lower landscape impact and significantly lower carbon footprint free from high transportation impacts and not reliant upon government subsidies.	The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. The justification to Policy EN10 at 7.20.13 states that the assessment of both areas should be considered for proposals which are sited near the boundary of two LCUs and as such it is considered not necessary to re-draw boundaries.	

			<p>LCU 12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU 8 and LCU 12 appears arbitrary – it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying to be in LCU 12, whilst the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is in LCU 8. For these reasons, the boundary should be redrawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The Landscape Sensitivity Study states: ‘... making these edges more sensitive than the centre’ (Table 7.8) ‘This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines’ – the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed as M-H. (Table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the ‘edges [are] more sensitive than the centre’. The Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being is forms a ‘prominent skyline’ but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint – something which the Study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence, the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by: Either Redrawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU 12. Or Adding another table or column to the ‘Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights’ table for LCU8 as follows: Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby ridge</p>		<p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>< 25 m L-M</p> <p>25 – 50m M</p> <p>51 – 75 m M-H</p> <p>76 – 100m H</p> <p>11 – 150 m H</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25 m or from 50 to 51 m or from 75 to 76 m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8 m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20 cm higher is H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state: Where turbine heights fall close to ends of the bands, particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band eg would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H?</p> <p>Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, but also that ‘clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three’ would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 ‘is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four to five turbines’ (7.129). It does not follow from this that ‘clusters of four/five turbines ... would be acceptable’ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and that sensitivity increases with the 			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of, say, height 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high.</p> <p>3. In the Thorpe Satchville / Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed.</p> <p>In summary, the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters – the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind turbine development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. ie delete ‘These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.’ In addition the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines.</p>			
Michael Barrett	ANON-BHRP-4H1V-F	Other	At our presentation we were told the Energy Generation & Renewable Sources were not considered in the original instruction for the Melton Plan. Why has it suddenly appeared?	Remove Energy Generation & Renewable Sources for the Melton Plan.		
David Johnston	ANON-BHRP-4HGM-V	Object	It is absolutely appalling that this proposed rural vandalism is even being considered. The Borough already has wind turbines that spoil this beautiful and historic landscape, the mere thought of clusters of large	Set a limit of no more than 10 meters for a turbine, but only for the direct use of farms and rural enterprises, with limited numbers and carefully placed low height turbines of a reasonable size would	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>turbines, particularly in the area of Great Dalby (LCU8) being given approval shows how short sighted the borough Council has become. I believe that It is clear that the rural citizens of the Borough are fed up with this monstrous march of these turbines, even where they have been subject to planning refusal, as in the case of Thorpe Satchville, nothing is done to remove the turbine that has been in place now for over two years. The Secretary of State agreed with Thorpe Says No, yet nothing has been done, the strength of feeling on this matter in rural villages is strong, This proposal laughs in the face of objectors. If this is the state of things to come, we will end up with an industrialised landscape that will impact significantly on tourism, with the alleged benefit of turbines being vastly outweighed by the cultural damage it will cause. This is particularly true where they dwarf buildings, visually spoil the landscape, not to mention causing health related problems to nearby residents.</p>	<p>likely not be objected in the same way that large turbines would. It could be argued that small turbines would collectively contribute to the grid, but also offset the power usage of smallholdings. Bringing financial benefit to farmers and other rural enterprises. Turbines of 25 meters are offensive, up to 50 meters is just obscene.</p>	<p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p>	
<p>Susan Hall</p>	<p>ANON- BHRP- 4HGB-H</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I can't believe after all your consultations you could even propose clusters of 5 wind turbines- haven't you just slipped this under the net with an April 4th deadline buried in masses of bureaucracy. I object fully and many others unaware of this policy would also as well you know!</p>	<p>No wind turbines in any area only solar, hydro nothing should be built that changes the character of any rural environment or reduces the enjoyment or its use by people in the community, or wildlife. Greedy people with no conscience for the environment should not even be considered to be helping the community or environment. Surely after the fiasco at Park Farm in thorpe satchville that has run its course for years has still to be removed even though every appeal has agreed it should be. Stop procrastinating and do your duty as duly elected people and have it removed as the company agreed it would if refused permission!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! !!!! or do other communities have to endure this</p>	<p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

				pantomime`!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!~		
Andrew Robert Bickle	ANON-BHRP-4HGA-G	Object	<p>This section of the Plan should place much greater emphasis on protecting our rural environment by not encouraging the spread of large industrial developments where they impact upon our countryside. In my view, wind turbines are particularly detrimental in this regard (whilst bringing very little benefit, except in tax-payer subsidy to the speculators) and our elected members should be endorsing a plan that protects its voters from them as far as possible within legal frameworks. Stronger emphasis should be placed on the views of local communities when considering applications. The guidance, as above, should not be deeming a cluster of turbines as acceptable in any location. A multitude of turbines will always bring greater disbenefit to the local population and a very high burden of proof should be placed on speculators to show these are necessary and acceptable. The above guidance appears to encourage applications for multiple turbine sites, which I do not think it should do.</p> <p>As we have seen in other parts of the country, a rash of turbines leads to an area appearing industrialised, downgraded, less-attractive to live in and less attractive to visit as a tourist (with commensurate damage to the local economy). Let us take pride in Melton Borough and care for the area for future generations, please.</p>	<p>Stronger emphasis should be placed on the views of local communities when considering applications. The above guidance appears to encourage applications for multiple turbine sites, which I do not think it should do.</p>	<p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p> <p>All planning proposals are consulted on and any impacts identified are addressed by the Local Planning Authority in its decision making. The ministerial statement of June 2015 states that “Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgment for the local planning authority.”</p>	
Robert Hobbs	ANON-BHRP-4HGP-Y	Object	<p>This proposal sets a precedent for an increase in applications for wind farm developments and is a not a requirement for a district plan and should be removed from the Melton Local Plan.</p> <p>As a predominately rural farming community renewable energy should be encouraged via anaerobic digestion/bio mass to make use of existing potential before considering</p>	<p>Remove this section completely as it is not a requirement for Government approval of a Local Plan.</p>	<p>Policy EN10 seeks to ensure that only appropriate wind energy development is delivered.</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			wind turbines which have detrimental effect on the countryside asset. Proposed developments should be judged on their individual merits and not protected by a blanket plan. There should be more effort to encourage a reduction in energy usage in parallel with sustainable energy generation.				
Asfordby Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4HGY-8	Object		Asfordby Parish Council has made good progress with the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. It has successfully applied to Melton Borough Council to be designated a Neighbourhood Area, and a Parish Profile and other evidence has been prepared. Local residents and school children have already had a chance to influence the Plan. Consultation on a Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan has recently ended and the plan is due to be submitted very soon. National Planning Practice Guidance gives advice on the relationship between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans (Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 12-013-20140306). The Guidance states that 'where a neighbourhood plan has been made, the local planning authority should take it into account when preparing the Local Plan strategy and policies, and avoid duplicating the policies that are in the neighbourhood plan.' It is very likely that the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan will be 'made' in advance of the adoption of the Melton Local Plan. Accordingly, the Parish Council expects the new Melton Local Plan to do more to recognise the status of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan and ensure that Local Plan Policies are consistent with it and do not duplicate its policies or proposals. 'In particular, we expect Policy EN10 to reflect the approach being	Policy EN10 is in conformity with Policy A3 of the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Version.		

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

				proposed by the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan as far as wind energy is concerned.		
Woodland Trust	ANON-BHRP-4HHX-8	Support with observations	As mentioned in the climate change section, we would like to see the use of wood as an environmentally sustainable fuel source promoted. It is important that, wherever possible, the wood is obtained from trees which are certified as being managed in an environmentally friendly way (eg through one of the certification schemes, for example that of the Forest Stewardship Council). We would like to see use of other forms of renewable energy (eg wind, solar etc) promoted, provide that no damage is caused either directly or indirectly to irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland or ancient/veteran trees.			Amend 7.19.2: “The Planning for Climate Change Study ...suggests that Melton Borough has a strong potential to develop renewable energy; solar, wind and biomass energy from crops and waste. <u>Wood obtained from trees which are certified as being managed in an environmentally sustainable way provides a sustainable source of biomass fuel.</u> Whilst such...” Amend 6 th bullet in policy EN10: “Designated nature conservation, geo-diversity or biodiversity considerations, <u>including direct or indirect impacts on ancient woodland or veteran trees.</u> ”
Elizabeth Ann Johnson	ANON-BHRP-4HGR-1	Object	PPG paragraph 003 states: "Whilst local authorities should design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development, there is no quota which the Local Plan has to deliver." The inclusion of listed Landscape Character Units has the effect of allocating a large proportion of the borough as wind energy sites. In some areas this is in direct contradiction to recent appeal decisions. It would therefore be wrong to identify areas such as LCU8 as suitable to site wind turbine development of up to 50m whether singly or in clusters in the Local Plan. In doing so Policy EN10 contradicts a recent judgement made by the Secretary of State.	The table of LCUs should be omitted since its inclusion implies that whole areas are designated without identifying particular sites. Each application should be considered on its merits, with community engagement.	Identification of suitable areas is not the same as allocating sites. The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
Nicholas John Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HGC-J	Object	Wind turbine proposals have to be rigorously proven as being accepted by residents as the process to object is often time consuming, costly and has	We have to ensure that the delivery of Wind Turbines is a necessity rather than a way to make a quick buck.	All planning proposals are consulted on and any impacts identified are addressed by the Local Planning Authority in its decision making.	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>to be presented with a high degree of skill and professionalism. The process to objection can be very daunting to the normal working family and subsequently have little appetite to fight a planning application. The term "acceptable turbine height and cluster size" may not be the true feeling on the ground.</p>	<p>Why have the MLP document not have any pictures of Wind Turbines does this spoil the "brand" perhaps.</p>		
John William Coleman	ANON-BHRP-4H6C-1	Object	<p>Re the list of areas for wind turbine development, I do not accept that these are 'of low or low-moderate sensitivity'; there should be no blanket presumption of acceptability. Any wind turbine development in these areas would be intrusive and should be resisted.</p>		<p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p>	
Belvoir Estate	ANON-BHRP-4HHZ-A	Other	<p>The cost of fuel for an estate of this scale is very significant, particularly with such a high proportion of listed and other historic buildings which were not built to modern standards of energy efficiency. Renewable energy offers an opportunity for the Belvoir Estate to become less reliant upon traditional fuel sources by exploiting the natural resources available to produce energy. Significant progress has already been made with the construction of a biomass boiler at Belvoir Castle which will provide 99% of the energy required to heat the castle and the Estate is keen to pursue other opportunities. Larger-scale renewable energy generators such as wind turbines are likely to have a detrimental impact on landscape character and historic linkages- the Belvoir Estate has no plans to develop windfarms on its property. However, micro-renewable technologies including wind, solar thermal, photovoltaic, heat pumps and biomass technologies, are likely to be more suitable. Such smaller scale renewable technologies have been approved in important historic environments elsewhere and again relationships with the relevant authorities will be crucial in successfully identifying where opportunities exist.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>	
Mo Caswell	ANON-BHRP-4HH9-9	Object	<p>There is insufficient protection for residents from the deployment of renewable energy generation, especially wind turbines. There are serious doubts with the effectiveness of the planning system where health issues, such as the long term effects of wind turbine noise on the human body are concerned. Once harm has been allowed, such as at nearby Hawton (appeal: APP/B3030/A/12/2183042) with so many homes within the widely accepted "danger zone" of 2km, there is nothing in planning to protect the local population. Once the turbines are built residents will be subjected to harmful noise and no current conditions will prevent this from happening. I "feel" impacts from turbines (0.5MW) located North of Newark, this distance was measured at just over 3km from the turbines. The Melton Plan must not allow a repetition of a similar nightmare scenario within its borough. A newly published Polish scientific study which looked at "The effect of varying distances from the wind turbine on meat quality of growing-finishing pigs" noted; "Avoiding noise-induced stress is important not only for maintaining meat quality but also for animal welfare.....The magnitude of</p>		<p>Bullet 4 of Policy EN10 requires that noise impacts are taken account of in the consideration of proposals. The Council’s Environmental Health Officer is consulted on for all wind energy proposals. The Council is guided through ETSU-R-97, the standard for the assessment and rating of noise from wind energy development.</p>	

		<p>the effect is generally thought to be a function of the type, duration and intensity of the individual stressors and the susceptibility of the animal to stress.” The differences were measurable and “The results obtained during the noise measurement showed that the highest level in the audible and infrasound range was recorded 50m from the wind turbine.” In 2012 Ognik and Sembratowicz noted “intensified and long-lasting stress induces disorders in a daily rhythm of hormones secretion, physiological and morphological changes.” Although this paper clearly demonstrates there is a history of scientific studies on noise impacts on animals, the lack of investigation into what happens to the human population in terms of impacts felt from wind turbine noise must be a cause for concern.</p> <p>When the pigs were slaughtered they were able to demonstrate differences between the three groups (all started at 30 kg) with the group closest to the turbines being significantly smaller than those furthest away. The weight differences between pigs at 50m, 500m and 1000m setback were 80.3kg, 82.5kg and 90.0kg. The differences noted between the groups located at 500m and 1000m should alert us to the human risk potential from what is just a single turbine! There are unique advantages to the use of swine in biomedical research given that they share with humans similar anatomic and physiologic characteristics involving the cardiovascular, urinary, integumentary, and digestive systems.</p> <p>(http://vet.sagepub.com/content/49/2/344.full). Therefore the pig research paper cannot be dismissed as irrelevant for humans.</p> <p>Changes to animals in proximity to wind farms are being reported across the globe (Mikolajczak et al. 2013) where results of their study suggested a negative effect of the immediate vicinity of a wind farm on stress parameters and productivity in geese. The numerous deformities in mink cubs on a Danish farm which were started with to the introduction of wind turbines (The farmer has invested in a cottage away from the turbines in order to sleep) (http://jyllands-posten.dk/opinion/breve/ECE6846968/mink-som-forsoegsdyr/~). The Portuguese foals born with deformed hooves (http://docs.wind-watch.org/Euronoise2015-000602.pdf). At the Senate Inquiry; the Rogersons of Victoria, Australia experienced a decrease in lambing rate of 37% from 85% prior to the wind farm together with an increase in deformed lambs</p> <p>(http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;db=COMMITTEES;id=committees%2Fcommsen%2F87e7d643-d5f3-4db0-8608-a79a3390082b%2F0006;query=Id%3A%22committees%2Fcommsen%2F87e7d643-d5f3-4db0-8608-a79a3390082b%2F0000%22) and the French farmer who sued the windfarm for making his dairy cows sick (http://en.friends-against-wind.org/justice/french-farmer-sues-wind-farm-over-stressed-cows) ; to mention but a few.</p> <p>With the knowledge that the longer the period of exposure the worse the impacts become, Melton must establish a robust system of protection and redress for both residents and rural businesses who could be negatively impacted from exposure to wind turbine noise. Parliament is now addressing widespread “AM” issues, which the wind industry repeatedly downplayed or denied altogether. But they have yet to tackle the lower frequency and infrasound components in wind turbine noise, which is thought to cause many of the health and well-being issues. The longer the true issues are ignored the more likely greater numbers of people and</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>animals will be directly impacted with well-being being significantly reduced. Melton must have something in place which stops this harm and should include the ability to monitor and record all frequencies omitted from wind turbines. They should include conditions which give the ability to have turbines turned off with no penalties incurred. They need to have access to independent noise experts who are able to identify issues and with the ability to do something to protect the public from harm.</p>			
<p>Mary Anne Donovan</p>	<p>ANON- BHRP- 4HUR-F</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I question why the economic sustainability of such proposals does not form a part of this policy, given the levels of fuel poverty in the Borough, growing proof that renewable costs make energy intense industries, such as manufacturing, uncompetitive. As controls on subsidies are now in place, and more will be coming, this seems a serious omission.</p> <p>I can't understand why you would identify sites when it isn't required and use the LSS to inform as it is only one element of assessment. This is making a rod for Melton's own beating and will likely result in large expenditures of money fighting appeals because of specific policy work.</p> <p>The LSS was a useful stop gap but isn't sufficiently robust to be used to assess landscape without having undergone consultation with stakeholders as the writers advise.</p> <p>The heart of the LSS is suggesting a fairly cerebral measurement of landscape capacity to absorb wind turbines, or in fact any development. It is extremely subjective. This is an approach which I don't believe will have public support or confidence. You should have proper landscape designations and protected areas. The point about targeting residents experiencing fuel poverty is uninformed as renewables are significantly more expensive than gas/coal fired energy. Community benefits in terms of contributions from the developer for locating renewables in an area should be eliminated. Melton cannot</p>	<p>Re do this policy, eliminate identifying sites, and move to proper local designations for landscape and heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>Change the LSS Low-moderate as the start point for considering proposals. It is subjective, received no consultation, and does not consider heritage and other issues. Remove community benefits from the Plan, this can be construed as what it is.</p> <p>Get the facts right about costs of renewables and do not think they help fuel poverty when they are deemed to be one of the chief causes.</p> <p>Make a simple statement.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>guarantee that such obligations will be met. Community benefits, if analysed, are the recipients’l. money anyway and it does not build confidence in the government to be involved in a 'shell game'. Community benefits breakdown social cohesion and erode respect for planning law.</p>			
Peter Caswell	ANON-BHRP-4HHT-4	Object	<p>The Plan should explicitly recognise that different renewable technologies can have dis-benefits when considering renewable energy developments, it is not a win-win situation in all cases.</p> <p>There have been high the levels of objections to wind turbine planning applications in Melton Borough, yet there is no acknowledgement of this within the plan. Therefore the en10 does not sit comfortably as a policy for the people of the borough.</p> <p>“Siting so as to gain maximum effect from wind/solar/water sources” This statement is vague and could be interpreted in several ways, what is meant by maximum effect? Aggressive developers could use the statement to justify prominent/dominant locations and sites for wind turbines.</p> <p>“High quality agricultural land” This Statement Is Vague; what is considered high quality land? Grade 3b and above can be ploughed and be productive.</p> <p>“Not creating demand for bio-energy fuels known to result in net carbon emissions through production methods, transport requirements and/or loss of carbon sinks.” There is not enough detail in the above statement How is this to be measured? Where are the benchmarks? The plan should include net carbon emissions for bioenergy fuels. However it should be consistent and include carbon emissions for other technologies as well, such as wind and solar. It is generally accepted that with increased deployment, the benefits</p>	wholesale detail and material changes	<p>Policy EN10 seeks to address objections to wind energy through a specific criteria-based policy which also identifies areas suitable for wind energy development at acceptable turbine heights.</p> <p>High grade agricultural land is classified as Grade 1, 2 and 3a only.</p> <p>The Council’s Environmental Health Officer is consulted on for all wind energy proposals. The Council is guided through ETSU-R-97, the standard for the assessment and rating of noise from wind energy development.</p> <p>Heights refer to turbine tip height.</p> <p>This policy will be subject to review as part of Local Plan Review after 5 years of adoption of the Plan.</p>	<p>Add to the supporting text a paragraph which explains more fully that some bio-energy fuels can result in net carbon emissions.</p> <p>Amend policy to specify that heights refer to blade tip heights.</p>

			<p>associated with wind and solar rapidly decline due to the backup power generation which is essential, and the system costs such as pylons etc. The diesel generation in Melton is a small but important example of the significant carbon emissions caused by poorly executed renewable energy strategy.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the significant opposition to wind turbines and wind farms within the borough stated above, the plan should not produce target areas using the LCUs alone for wind development. There is no requirement to this in any local plan. It would simply encourage speculative development in future with consequences such as significant workload for the planning department.</p> <p>At this stage and time, with the ETSU R 97 been deemed in need of urgent replacement by the Northern Ireland assembly it would be foolhardy of Melton to create windfarm development areas in the plan, when the reality is they cannot provide robust and safe noise controls to protect their own residents.</p> <p>It is abundantly clear that a statistically important percentage of Melton residents are susceptible to the emissions from wind turbines. The borough therefore has a duty of care to protect the citizens in their homes and at their workplaces. The plan must acknowledge the emerging evidence of harm from wind turbines due to amplitude modulation and low frequency/infra-sound emissions. Furthermore the policy as it stands is vague and inadequate as turbine height is not defined as hub or tip or even turbine type such as horizontal axis wind turbine or vertical rotor turbine. Additionally a height restriction could lead to the unintended consequence of large rotor/short tower turbines which have caused noise problems elsewhere.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>Melton should use the plan to ensure wind turbines are correctly coloured for a rural borough such as Melton. There are often colours specified for farm barns such as olive green RAL 6003 in planning applications. Experience shown that the white or off white colours put forward for small and medium turbines would be wholly unacceptable as cladding for barns. Just because turbines have always been supplied in any colour as long as it's white, does not mean that it is correct colour against a green background. Even small turbines can have a disproportionately high adverse impact on the rural scene when painted white or off white. Therefore if turbines are approved they should be colours which properly blend into the landscape and match coherently with colours selected in other areas of planning. Most importantly as this plan is for the future, it is inevitable that renewable technologies will change and the plan must have flexibility to adapt to new conditions. It is unlikely that horizontal axis wind turbines will remain the favourites they have been in the past, not least because they require carbon emissions to allow them to operate in the first place.</p>			
Edward Kitson	ANON-BHRP-4HHS-3	Support with observations		Addition of a policy regarding On-shore drilling	Applications for on-shore drilling are dealt with by the County Council and its Minerals Plan will contain a relevant policy.	
Gavin Simpson	ANON-BHRP-4HHQ-1	Object	<p>The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 is out of date as there are turbines now in some of these areas, which will remain for the lifetime of the plan, and these are not taken into account in the study and therefor give false assumptions. There is no requirement for the local authority to allocate land in the Local Plan for generating wind energy. Each application should be considered on its own merits, with community</p>	The list of LCUs should be removed from the policy altogether.	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Identification of suitable areas is not the</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			engagement and proven overall support by them. I object as this policy states that the Landscape Character Units lists and allocates a large proportion of the borough as wind energy sites. In some areas this is in direct contradiction to recent appeal decisions, eg the inclusion of LCU8 as suitable to site wind turbines of up to 50m. They should not be identified in the Local Plan.		same as allocating sites.	
Lucy Aron	ANON-BHRP-4HHK-U	Object	In my opinion and with respect, this policy provides far too much encouragement to wind farm developments. I am very concerned that the policy appears to encourage the idea that 'clusters' of wind turbines are acceptable. I cannot but imagine that this will encourage further large scale applications. Those residents who are not well-resourced to object to applications submitted by applicants already feel sincerely that there is an 'inequality of arms'. This type policy will surely encourage even larger, better funded developers which have so much might against us. As what used to be said about a certain notorious organisation, 'they only have to get lucky once'. One successful application very much changes the character of an area and the further concern is, of course, that once one application is successful in an area it becomes only more difficult to object to further ones (e.g. how can 'disruption to the landscape' argument be made - and yet this cannot be fair, surely?).	There should be no suggestion that clusters of turbines would be welcomed. I am also concerned that this above seems to suggest that each of these areas should have wind turbines in it. Surely, a noble and worthy aim (for the benefit of future generations if nothing else) should be to try and preserve areas of our borough as properly rural areas and not allow them all to be blighted, industrialised landscapes.	Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”	
Gwynneth Whitehouse	ANON-BHRP-4HH7-7	Object	As was recently found by the Secretary of State large wind turbines are, in many cases, incompatible with rural locations. Each application should be considered on its merits with regard to need, landscape, wildlife, heritage etc.	No suggestion of a 'blanket' policy should be made suggesting 50m turbines are suitable for this area, each application should be considered on individual merits.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.	
The Freeby Estate & Various	ANON-BHRP-	Support with observations	Support subject to the change below:	Existing turbines within the 'areas' (LCU1 - LUC15 inc.) should also be	Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

other Landowners	4HHC-K			taken into account - i.e. cumulative impact.	wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”	
Kerstin Hartmann	ANON-BHRP-4HGW-6	Object	Wind turbines are spoiling the attraction of High Leicestershire for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The Melton Brand would not be in keeping with wind turbines of those sizes. There are a number of other renewable energy options much more suitable for the agricultural area.	reduce the size and cluster number of wind turbines	Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”	
Anthony Barber	ANON-BHRP-4H6R-G	Support with observations	The policy needs to state not only how clusters are to be defined, but what cluster density is to be permitted in each landscape assessment unit.	The policy needs to state not only how clusters are to be defined, but what cluster density is to be permitted in each landscape assessment unit.	Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”	
Stephen Jonathan Taylor	ANON-BHRP-4HHE-N	Support with observations	Melton Borough Council is not required to allocate land for wind energy generation in the local plan. Each application should be considered on its own merits, along with appropriate community engagement. However this is contradicted in policy EN10 which states that the LCU’s listed are suitable for wind energy development of the turbine heights and cluster sizes identified. This in effect allocates a large proportion of the borough as wind energy suitable sites. In some areas this is in direct contradiction to recent appeal decisions. e.g. - Secretary of State judgement over the Hall Farm turbine being ‘incompatible with its rural location’ and ‘would cause moderate harm to the fabric of the landscape’ He attributed considerable weight to the planning balance. It would be wrong to identify LCU8 to site wind turbine development of up to 50 meters whether singly or in clusters, in the local plan. The list of LCU’s should therefore be removed from the policy.		Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development. The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section. Identification of suitable areas is not the same as allocating sites.	
Michelle M Kelly	BHLF-BHRP-4H2F-Z	Object	There has been no consultation on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. I would have liked to have been consulted. I object to Policy EN10 in relation to Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby. LCU8 is very diverse. The Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby ridge area bears little relation to the lower lying land to its north and west. It has far more in common with its neighbour LCU12. Moreover, the boundary between LCU8 and LCU12 appears arbitrary - it makes no sense for Twyford, which is lower lying, to be in LCU12, whilst Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby ridge is in LCU8. For these reasons, the boundary should be re-drawn to include Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU12. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 itself acknowledges the difference in landscape character and sensitivity between the edge (the Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby ridge) and the centre. The		The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. The justification to Policy EN10 at 7.20.13 states that the assessment of both areas should be considered for proposals which are sited near the boundary of two LCUs and as such it is considered not necessary to re-draw boundaries. The table in policy EN10 which identifies	

		<p>Landscape Sensitivity Study states: 'making these edges more sensitive than the centre' (Table 7.8) 'This is a relatively elevated area where hills form prominent skylines' - the sensitivity of this aspect has been assessed M-H' (table 7.8) However, the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 then completely disregard the fact the 'edges[are] more sensitive than the centre'. The Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby ridge is more sensitive not just being as it is forms a 'prominent skyline' but also because of its proximity to Burrough Hill and prominence in the view from the Burrough Hill Viewpoint - something which the study says should be preserved (7.129; 7.134; 7.135). Hence the 2014 Study and EN10 need to be amended to take account of the greater sensitivity of the Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby ridge. This could be done by: Either Re-drawing the boundary to place Thorpe Satchville and Great Dalby in LCU12. Or adding another table or column to the 'Landscape sensitivity to different turbine heights' table for LCU8 as follows: Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby ridge <25m L-M 25-50m M 51-75m M-H 76-100m H 101-150m H It should be acknowledged that the sensitivity to different turbine heights does not suddenly jump from 24 to 25m or from 50 to 51m or from 75 to 76m etc. It is nonsensical to state that sensitivity to a turbine of 50.8m is M whereas sensitivity to a turbine only 20cm higher in H. The 2014 Study and EN10 need to state: Where turbine heights fall close to ends of bands particular consideration should be given to the individual characteristics of the individual site to determine whether the sensitivity would be more accurately assessed by the categorisation of the adjacent band e.g. would landscape sensitivity to a 70m turbine be better categorised as H, rather than M-H? Not only do I object to the statement in EN10 that turbines up to 50m would be acceptable in the Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby area, but also that 'clusters of four/five turbines and in the areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns, clusters of two/three' would be acceptable. The 2014 Study states that LCU8 'is likely to be highly sensitive to clusters of more than four or five turbines' (7.129). It does not follow from this that 'clusters of four/five turbines would be acceptable' for the following reasons: 1. The 2014 Study does not state the height of the turbines that would cause high sensitivity in a cluster of more than four to five. 2. Given that EN10 appears to define L-M as its sensitivity cut-off point and</p>	<p>areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.</p> <p>Refer to Para 7.20.15: “In considering the cumulative effects of wind energy development, the guidance for multiple developments in the Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 should be followed.”</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>that sensitivity increases with cluster size, surely then if sensitivity for a single turbine of say, 25-50m is L-M, then sensitivity to a cluster would be at least M? Therefore, in that case, a cluster should only consist of turbines less than 25m high.</p> <p>3. In the Thorpe Satchville/Great Dalby area, where sensitivity should only be deemed acceptable for a single turbine up to 25m, no clusters should be allowed.</p> <p>In summary the table in EN10 is not worded sufficiently carefully. The Acceptable Turbine Height and Cluster Size column is not consistent with the 2014 Study. It conflates acceptable heights of single turbines with clusters - the two need to be separated to take account of the greater sensitivity to clusters than single turbines. The simplest thing to do would be to delete this table and delete the second sentence of the penultimate bullet so that it reads: The development site is in an area identified as being of low or low-moderate sensitivity to wind development in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 . i.e. delete 'These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the table below.' In addition, the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 and EN10 need to make explicit that sensitivity increases for clusters as opposed to single turbines.</p>		
CPRE Leicestershire	BHLF- BHRP- 4H2J-4	Object	<p>Given the recent Ministerial Statement (attached in full) dated 18 June 2015, the table on page 137 of the Emerging Options Jan 2016, should be deleted since Local Plans are now required to clearly allocate suitable sites for wind energy, not merely Landscape Character Assessment Units. Whilst para 7.20.8 refers to this, nonetheless the implication of the inclusion of the table on page 137 infers that areas only are designated without particular sites.</p>	<p>The ministerial statement states that “Suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan.” It does not refer to <i>sites</i>. Areas are not the same as sites. It is considered that the identification of LCUs in the context of the criteria based policy adequately meets the requirements of the statement.</p>	
Alan Pearson	BHLF- BHRP- 4HDZ-6	Other	<p>The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study is used as a reference in the document in regard to landscape sensitivity. I gather that in 2 recent court decisions this study has been thrown out as deemed to be inadequate and not thorough – is this the case? And if so, why are we referring to it? There seems to be a major focus on wind turbines. Whether you love or hate them cosmetically, recent research has proven they are not economic and actually if it was not for the subsidies they would not be built due to the expense. We should have a policy which focuses on the renewable energy without the need for wind turbines. Please see article below: We have moved from global warming (over the past 19 years there has been no global warming) to the new term climate change. One has to wonder why. The slow-motion train crash of Britain’s energy policy gets nearer to the abyss with every week that passes. Consider a few facts. On the windless afternoon of February 25, the contribution being made to keeping our lights on by our 6,600 absurdly subsidised wind turbines was less than 0.4 per cent – four-thousandths of all the electricity we were using. Nine per cent was coming from abroad, 37 per cent from gas and 26 per cent from coal. But our 11 coal-fired power stations are now vanishing so fast by 2019 only one may survive. Due to the government’s drive to “decarbonise” our entire electricity supply by 2030 – to rely on “renewables” and (non-existent)</p>	<p>The Rushcliffe and Melton Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 was not found to be “inadequate and not thorough” in appeal decisions.</p> <p>The decision made by the Secretary of State to dismiss the appeal was quashed by the High Court on 11 May 2016.</p> <p>Noted that the Asfordby North and South Solar Farms started to export electricity to the grid on 31.03.16</p>	

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			<p>nuclear – our remaining gas-fired plants may well follow, thanks not least to our crippling “carbon tax” on fossil fuels.</p> <p>So grotesquely is the government distorting the electricity market, that by 2020, according to the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR), the cost of “environmental levies” will have more than quadrupled, from £3.1 billion in 2014/15 to £13.6 billion.</p> <p>"Last week Decc was offering to bribe them into building new plants with yet another subsidy, which for a single 2 gigawatt power station might amount to £80 million a year."</p> <p>But now things have got worse. Amber Rudd’s Department of Energy and Climate Change (Decc) realises that, to keep the lights on, we badly need new back-up for all those times when “renewables” (or “unreliables”, as I call them) can’t contribute a bean. But the industry is so aware that Decc wants to drive fossil fuels out of business that plans to build any new gas plants have dried up.</p> <p>So last week Decc was offering to bribe them into building new plants with yet another subsidy, which for a single 2 gigawatt power station might amount to £80 million a year. If the industry responds, this and other costs not included in the OBR’s figures would make its estimated quadrupling of “climate levies” by 2020 look seriously understated.</p> <p>By Christopher Booker 17:50 BST 5 March 2016</p> <p>At Asfordby Business Park they are building a solar panel farm, is this mentioned in the plan?</p>		
John Ireland	BHLF-BHRP-4HCS-X	Object	<p>The designation of huge swathes of land in the Local Plan as suitable for the installation of single or clusters of wind turbines appears to contravene the Secretary of States recent decision that such installations, particularly within areas of LCU8, would cause harm to the rural landscape.</p> <p>In view of this decision, LCU8 in particular should be considered unsuitable for industrial sized wind turbines.</p>	The LCUs should be removed from the Policy	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section.
Mr Stephen Vickers, Managing Director of the Buckminster Estate	BHLF-BHRP-4HCK-P	Support	<p>The Estate is largely supportive of the policy and is of the view that the safeguards which are detailed within the policy are generally appropriate.</p>		Noted
Yvonne Lesleina Rowe	BHLF-BHRP-4HQP-9	Object	<p>There is no necessity for the local Council to identify potential sites for wind energy generation that is generally not supported by local communities. Wind turbines are incompatible with our rural vistas and can cause harm to the landscape, community wellbeing and wildlife</p>	The list of LCUs should be removed from the Local Plan. Any application should be considered on its own merits and in full consultation with the local community.	<p>Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development.</p> <p>The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the</p>

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

					first section.	
Mrs Sally Ireland	BHLF-BHRP-4HQK-4	Object	Regarding LCU8: The area south of Melton (Great Dalby and Thorpe Satchville) has already been rejected by the Secretary of State and the majority of the residents as a potential site for wind turbines.	Regarding above statement: These wind farms should not be considered by the council. Additionally, the use of solar panels on housing and industrial sites would lower the need for these 'monsters'	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section. Solar development is supported by Policy EN10.	
Mary Anne Donovan	BHLF-BHRP-4HKG-T	Not Answered	These comments relate to draft Policy EN10 Renewable Energy of the Emerging Melton Local Plan. Paragraph 97 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should 'consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources.' It is considered that the identification of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources should be an exercise undertaken with extreme caution, given the weight that could be attached to such an adopted policy. Any policy that specifically identifies suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources should be properly informed by an appropriate and robust evidence base. 3.60 The Emerging Melton Local Plan identifies what it considers to be suitable sites for proposed wind turbines using the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study as evidence base. The Study states that it is not definitive, it is subjective and that stakeholders (including local residents), should be consulted. The Study also states that the 'Landmarks/Views of Borough-wide Importance' comprise the 'views of a few people' (para 3.21) and are therefore not necessarily representative of all the valued views of stakeholders. Furthermore, there is no evidence that a public consultation has been undertaken in respect of the Study. As such, it is not considered that the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study provides a robust evidence base for informing a policy such as draft Policy EN10. In addition, planning decisions, including decisions on wind turbines, are made with regard to consideration of historic landscapes, buildings and landmarks. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study does not assess the historic environment at a level of detail appropriate to the importance of the Borough's heritage assets; furthermore, the Conservation Appraisals for the area are not up-to-date and therefore should not be used to inform the Study. Draft Policy EN10 should not identify specific sites, but should make a general statement about how renewables will be considered within the Borough.		Subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015, it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development. The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section. The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. Policy EN10 does not allocate specific sites.	
Somerby Parish Council	BHLF-BHRP-4HKK-U	Object	i) The EN10 Renewable Energy Policy does not state a requirement to identify areas which are suitable for wind turbines yet the Draft Plan goes on to identify suitable sites using the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study as evidence. The writers of this Study state that it is not definitive, it is subjective and that stakeholders (including local residents), should be consulted. The Study also states that the opinions about Melton Borough were informed by a few Borough councillors and therefore not		The guidance in Para 7.20.7 has been superseded by that in Para 7.20.8 and it is now a requirement for Local Plans to identify areas suitable for wind energy development subsequent to the ministerial statement in June 2015.	Amend Para 7.20.7: "The Local Plan sets out an approach to supporting and managing these types of development to ensure that adverse impacts are addressed, including

Chapter 7 – Melton’s Environment – Protected and Enhanced – **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Resources**

			necessarily representative of all the valued views of stakeholders. We can find no evidence as yet that a public consultation has been done, and question if the Supplementary Planning Document is a robust tool to identify suitable sites without consultation, particularly in areas where a number of turbine appeals have been refused. In addition, turbine decisions are made with regard to historic landscape, buildings and landmarks, with which the Burrough Hills is rich. The Study does not assess the historic environment at the level of importance of its heritage assets, and the Conservation Appraisals for the area are not up-to- date and therefore should not be used as a guide. 72% of consultation respondents have asked for specific landscape designations, even if local. Given the number of houses Melton targets to build, this seems a necessary policy area to be added to fulfil Planning’s duty to protect and enhance our historic environment while undertaking housing growth. This policy should not identify specific sites, but make a general statement about how renewables will be considered.	The table in policy EN10 which identifies areas suitable for wind energy development and acceptable turbine heights has to be read in the context of the entire policy and the criteria in the first section. The Emerging Options consultation has been an opportunity to make comments on the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014. Policy EN10 does not allocate specific sites.	cumulative landscape and visual impacts. To do this the NPPF suggests that it might be appropriate to identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and supporting infrastructure, where this would help their development.”
LCC Strategic Property Services Asset Management	BHLF- BHRP- 4H7J-9	Support	Supportive of the policies EN9 and EN10 relating to energy efficiency, renewable energy and energy use. In particular the emphasises given to renewable energy and decentralised heat networks. Support the inclusion of paragraph 7.20.2 on page 131 and the accompanying text in policy EN10 – “Renewable energy proposals which will directly benefit a local community in the medium and long and/or are targeted at residents experiencing fuel poverty will be particularly supported.” Would welcome the example of community owned renewables energy projects being given as an example as this supports objective 4 in the Council’s Carbon Reduction Strategy for Leicestershire – “Support communities to develop small-scale community owned renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.”	Noted.	Amend supporting text to include an example of a community owned project.