



WIND GENERATION APPEALS UPDATE

March 2014



Please find below a resume of decisions made between 4 February 2014 and 12 March 2014

If you have any queries in relation to any of the decisions listed below, or other renewable schemes please contact Richard Glover. Email richard.glover@squiresanders.com or direct dial 0113 284 7023.

Reperry Manor Farm

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2198144
Decision and date	Dismissed 04/02/14
Location	Reperry Manor Farm, Lanivet, Bodmin, Cornwall, PL30 5JD
Inspector	Elizabeth C Ord
Appellant	Chase Milton Energy
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 79m. The main issues were the effects on the landscape character, visual impact and the effects on Helman Tor SAM. The vicinity of the site was considered by the Inspector to be generally open and natural, with few manmade structures. The Inspector found that given the scale and height of the proposed turbine it would be visually dominant in the landscape. Helman Tor lies 2km from the site. The maximum height of Helman Tor is 209m AOD, whereas the proposed turbine would be sited at 185m AOD, reaching a total height of 264m AOD. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would therefore compete with Helman Tor for dominance within the landscape. The Inspector found that the level of impact would be significant. The benefits of the proposal were not considered sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Wood Barn Farm

PINs No.	APP/W3520/A/13/2194412
Decision and date	Dismissed 05/02/14
Location	Wood Barn Farm, Dennington Road, Laxfield, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP13 8HJ
Inspector	Ava Wood
Appellant	Nick Garrard
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for three turbines each with a blade tip height of 20.5m. The main issues were the effects on the character of the landscape, nearby listed buildings and the potential harm to bats and newts. The site lies within a gently rolling landscape, with views across the landscape extensive and largely uninterrupted. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbines would become by far the most prominent structures in close and middle range views. The Inspector found that the proposed turbines would be unacceptable on their own, and in combination with the permitted solar array of 40 panel, which would intensify development on land currently free from development. The Inspector considered the impact on nearby listed buildings (Mills Farmhouse and Laxfield House) would be less than substantial, but ultimately the impact was still required to be considered in the planning balance. With regard to bats and newts, the Inspector concluded that in the absence of a properly informed survey it could not be argued that all material considerations had been addressed. The benefits of the proposed were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Linskeldfield Farm

PINs No.	APP/Q9495/A/12/218858
Decision and date	Dismissed 11/02/14
Location	Linskeldfield Farm, Isel, Cockermouth, Cumbria
Inspector	J P Watson (Recovered by Secretary of State)
Appellant	TGC Renewables
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 47m. The main issue was the effect on the character and quality of the local landscape. The site lies within the National Park on relatively low land. The Inspector found that the position of the turbine would be such that it would be prominent in some local views, as well as in some longer views. Overall, the Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be harmful to the character and quality of the local landscape to a significant degree. In conclusion the Inspector found that benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm. The Secretary of State agreed with the recommendation of the Inspector.

Shepley

PINs No.	APP/Z4718/A/13/2192361
Decision and date	Allowed 11/02/14
Location	Land adjacent to 159 Lane Head Road, Shepley, Huddersfield HD8 8BW
Inspector	A D Robinson
Appellant	Mr D Woodhead
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposed single turbine with a blade tip height of 18.5m. The main issues in the appeal were whether the proposal represented inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the effect on the rural landscape, including the public enjoyment of it. The Inspector found that the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Inspector also noted that the proposed development would have some effect on the openness of the Green Belt, but that that effect was of a very low order. In terms of the landscape effect, the Inspector noted that although the turbine would occupy an elevated position in the landscape, it would appear as a small element within a wider landscape which contained many different elements. Although the Inspector noted that public footpaths would pass close to the proposed turbine, the views of the turbine would be transient. The effect on the landscape was therefore deemed to be acceptable. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the benefits of the scheme were sufficient to outweigh the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Rockwood Farm

PINs No.	APP/Z4718/A/13/2202153
Decision and date	Allowed 11/02/14
Location	Rockwood Farm, 54 Westfield Lane, Emley, Huddersfield, HD8 9TD
Inspector	Paul Griffiths
Appellant	Mrs Jayne Hinchliffe
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a hub height of 24m. The main issue was whether the development constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the effects on the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector confirmed that the proposed turbine would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would reduce the openness of it. The Inspector also found that there would be a moderately harmful effect on the surrounding landscape. However, the benefits of the proposal were considered sufficient to amount to the very special circumstances that were required to outweigh inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

North Birks

PINs No.	APP/W4705/A/13/2194446
Decision and date	Allowed 12/02/14
Location	North Birks, Black Moor Road, Oxenhope, Keighley BD22 9TD
Inspector	Paul Griffiths
Appellant	Mr and Mrs Ecclestone
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a hub height of 15m. The main issue was whether the development constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the effects on the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector confirmed that the proposed turbine would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would reduce the openness of it. The Inspector also found that there would be a moderately harmful effect on the surrounding landscape. The Inspector also considered the impact on the setting and significance of North Birks Farmhouse. In conclusion, the benefits of the proposal were considered sufficient to amount to the very special circumstances that were required to outweigh inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p>

Turncole

PINs No.	APP/X1545/A/12/2174985 & 2179484 & 2179225
Decision and date	Allowed 13/02/14
Location	Turncole Farm, The Marshes, Dengie, Southminster
Inspector	John Woolcock (Recovered by Secretary of State)
Appellant	RES UK & Ireland Ltd
Determination process:	Inquiry
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for seven turbines each with a blade tip height of 125.5m. The main issues were the effects on the landscape character and appearance of the area, the effects on living conditions of local residents and the effects on heritage assets. The Inspector found that the proposed turbines would have little effect on the fabric of the landscape and that they would not be out of scale with the vast skies and openness of the area. In terms of cumulative impacts, the Inspector noted the nearby Middlewick wind farm and considered that due to the presence of Middlewick, the change to the landscape character baseline would not be as substantial. The Inspector noted that there were 13 dwellings within 1km of the proposed development. In the Inspector's judgement, the proposal would not result in overwhelming and oppressive impacts on the residential amenity of those living near to the proposal. In terms of heritage assets, the Inspector found that the proposed turbines would not significantly affect views that were important to the setting of heritage assets. The benefits of the scheme were considered sufficient to outweigh the harms of the proposed development. The Secretary of State agreed with the recommendation of the Inspector.</p>

Burnt Edge Lane

PINs No.	APP/A4710/A/13/2192427
Decision and date	Dismissed 13/02/14
Location	Land West of Burnt Edge Lane, Blackshaw Head, Hebden Bridge HX7 7JA
Inspector	Paul Griffiths
Appellant	Glen Gaunt
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a hub height of 31.5m. The main issues were the effects on landscape, living conditions, heritage assets and ecology. The appeal site lies within an open, exposed plateau. The Inspector found that, taken in isolation, the proposed turbine would not appear particularly incongruous or out of scale. However, in terms of cumulative impact, the proposal would extend the influence of wind turbines on the landscape, exacerbating the degree of landscape harm, to the point that it would become significant. No site-based noise assessment had been carried out, therefore the Inspector was unable to conclude that the living conditions of local residents would be adequately protected from noise emissions. In terms of effects on heritage assets, the Inspector considered that there would be no harmful effect to Moorhall Farm and barn. No survey works had been carried out in terms of birds and their habitats. Again, the Inspector was unable to gauge the likely effects. The benefits of the scheme were not found to be sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Mynydd Branar

PINs No.	APP/T6905/A/13/2201014
Decision and date	Dismissed 14/02/14
Location	Land at Mynydd Branar, Coed Coch, Dolwen, Abergele LL22 8AY
Inspector	Emyr Jones
Appellant	Coed Coch Enterprises
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a hub height of 34m. The main issue was the effect on the landscape and character of the area. The appeal site lies close to the summit of Mynydd Branar and would result in it also appearing exposed and set against an open sky. The Inspector therefore found that the proposed turbine would have a significant adverse visual impact and significant harm to the rural area. The benefits of the proposal were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harm.</p>

Clegyrog Uchaf

PINs No.	APP/L6805/A/13/2199544
Decision and date	Dismissed 18/02/14
Location	Clegyrog Uchaf, Carreglefn, Amlwch, LL68 0PE
Inspector	Emyr Jones
Appellant	Dei Owen
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 27.1m. The main issues in this appeal were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and the effect on protected species. The Council had not raised an issue in terms of the proposal in isolation, but with the cumulative effects. The Inspector noted that there were a number of industrial scale turbines, pylons and timber poles prominent in a number of viewpoints in the area, but did not feel that the cumulative effect would be significant. Natural Resources Wales objected to the proposal and stated that additional surveys and assessments on bats needed to be carried out. The survey work that the appellant had undertaken identified that bats were present across the site. An off-site mitigation package was recommended, however this was not part of the proposal for the appeal. Accordingly, the Inspector was unable to conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on bats. The benefits of the scheme were not sufficient to outweigh the harm.</p>

Corwar

PINs No.	PPA-370-2034
Decision and date	Dismissed 19/02/14
Location	Land to the east of Barrhill
Inspector	Michael J P Cunliffe
Appellant	WilloWind Developments (Jersey) Limited
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for 8 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 126.5m. The main issues were the landscape and visual effects and the effects on the living conditions of nearby residents. The Reporter noted that the appeal site was a relatively small patch of moorland, framed by woodland. The Reporter considered that the proposed turbines would loom above the forest and dominate the immediately surrounding landscape. In terms of cumulative impacts, the Reporter found that significant cumulative effects would be experienced within about 12km of the site. 10 residential properties are within 1km of the site and the Reporter was of the view that the proposal would result in an oppressive presence for the surrounding residential properties. With regards to noise emissions, the proposal would not meet the 35dB(A) limit at 8 properties. The appellant suggested a limited of 40dB(A) instead, but the Reporter found this was not justified. The proposal was therefore found to have an unacceptable noise impact. The benefits of the scheme were not sufficient to outweigh the harms identified.</p>

Sproat Ghyll

PINs No.	APP/H0928/A/13/2204259
Decision and date	Dismissed 19/02/14
Location	Land ay Sproat Ghyll, Orton, Penrith, CA10 3SA
Inspector	B Hellier
Appellant	JA and ME Mawson
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of approx. 40m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings. The Inspector noted that the countryside surrounding the appeal site was generally peaceful. The main visual impact was considered to be in views up to a distance of 2.5km. The Inspector considered that there would be a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area due to the scale of the proposal and the visual impact on views from public rights of way. The Inspector noted that the appellant had relied on noise emission data from the wind turbine manufacturer and the levels were well below the ETSU limits. The benefits of the scheme were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harm to the landscape and character of the area.

Brawdy Farm

PINs No.	APP/L9503/A/13/2197327
Decision and date	Dismissed 19/02/14
Location	Brawdy Farm, Brawdy, Pen-Y-Cwn, Haverfordwest, SA62 6LA
Inspector	Ian Osbourne
Appellant	Peter Gwyther
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the National Park. The Inspector noted that the turbine would be in an elevated position, making it prominent on the skyline. Due to the elevated and isolated position, the Inspector found that the proposal would have a visually harmful effect on the character and appearance of the National Park. The benefits of the scheme were not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the nationally important, visually sensitive location.

Cwmbettws Farm

PINs No.	APP/N6845/A/13/2203373
Decision and date	Allowed 19/02/14
Location	Cwmbettws Farm, Eglwysrwrw, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA41 3PL
Inspector	Ian Osborne
Appellant	Mr John Davies
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a hub height of 21.5m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. The appeal site lies at a height of 220m, near the top of the north-west facing slope. Although the blades of the proposed turbine (as well as that of a permitted turbine) would be seen over the ridge, the Inspector noted that the appearance of the turbine would be softened by a substantial ridge-top wood. From views further away from the site, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would only have a minimal impact. The benefits of renewable energy were considered sufficient to outweigh the limited harms that would result from the proposal.

Higher Whitley Farm

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2195330
Decision and date	Dismissed 19/02/14
Location	Higher Whitley Farm, Helland Road, Bodmin, PL31 2NT
Inspector	D C Pinner
Appellant	Empowering Wind Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>A proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issue in this appeal was the effect on the character and appearance of the local area and nearby heritage assets. The appeal site lies within a generally undulating landscape, which the Inspector found to be attractive countryside. The local dominant feature is the Bodmin Beacon and Gilbert Monument (Grade II listed obelisk). The Beacon lies just less than 2km from the appeal site. The Gilbert Monument is 44m tall. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine, being 77m, would be a very much more obvious and prominent feature of the landscape than the Monument. Overall the Inspector considered that the proposed scheme would be out of keeping with the local landscape. The benefits were not found to outweigh the harm.</p>

Pencoose Farm

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2200420
Decision and date	Dismissed 19/02/14
Location	Pencoose Farm, Stithians, Truro, TR3 7DN
Inspector	D C Pinner
Appellant	Windberry Energy Limited
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>A proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 62m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and nearby heritage assets. The appeal site is located in an elevated position within a generally undulating landscape. The Inspector noted that the appeal site was in attractive countryside. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would provide the nearby village of Stithians with an unwanted and highly prominent landmark, competing with the existing landmark of the Church of St Stedean. Overall, it was found that the proposed turbine would be seriously harmful to the landscape setting of Stithians and to the wider setting of the grade II church. The benefits of the scheme were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Harmeston Farm

PINs No.	APP/N6845/A/13/2200228
Decision and date	Allowed 20/02/14
Location	Harmeston Farm, Steynton, Milford Haven, Pembrokeshire
Inspector	Ian Osborne
Appellant	Messrs Morris
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 79m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The appeal site lies within open, gently rolling countryside. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be prominent at short range within the visual corridor of the main road between the 2 nearest settlements. In wider views, the proposed turbine would be seen against the background of many tall structures (many associated with oil refineries). The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of its rural surroundings.</p>

Muirburn

PINs No.	PPA-380-2037
Decision and date	Allowed 21/02/14
Location	Muirburn, Glassford, ML10 6TR
Inspector	David Liddell
Appellant	Intelligent Land Investments
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 45.9m. The main issue in this appeal was the landscape and visual impacts. The Reporter noted, that although a turbine at this location would be substantially higher than any other landscape feature in the immediate area, he did not think it would be so dominant as to significantly alter the landscape character. The most significant visual impacts were considered by the Reporter to be those experienced from the village of Glassford. However, the impact of the proposed turbine on the countryside around the village was found to be more of an issue. But the Reporter concluded that it would not give rise to a significant adverse visual impact. Although other matters were reviewed by the Reporter, it was found that there were no significant impacts that would be caused by the proposed development. The benefits of the scheme were considered sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Tralorg Hill

PINs No.	PPA-370-2032
Decision and date	Allowed 21/02/14
Location	Tralorg Hill, north from Pinmore, Girvan, South Ayrshire
Inspector	Trevor A Croft
Appellant	PNE Wind UK
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for 8 turbines with a blade tip height of 100m. The main issue was the landscape and visual effects. The Reporter noted that the steeply incised valley bottoms in between the appeal site generally had a restrictive view of the site. It was also found that from more distant views, although the proposed turbines would be seen, they would not appear significant. Cumulative effects were also considered given the relatively high number of turbines operational or consented in the area. The Reporter acknowledged that the proposal would have an additional impact, which from some viewpoints would be significant. However, this was not considered to be to such an extent which was unacceptable. With regard to visual impact, the Reporter noted that there are 8 properties within 1.5km of the proposal, but none were deemed to be affected in an overbearing or overwhelming sense. The benefits of the scheme were considered to outweigh the harms identified.</p>

Black Ditch

PINs No.	APP/V3310/A/12/2186162
Decision and date	Dismissed 25/02/14
Location	Land to the South of Poplar Farm, Puriton Road, West Huntspill, Somerset
Inspector	S R G Baird (Recovered by Secretary of State)
Appellant	Next Generation Limited
Determination process:	Inquiry
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for four turbines with a blade tip height of 120m. The main issues were the effects on the character of the landscape and wildlife interests. The Inspector found that in particular viewpoints, the proposed development would result in a wind farm landscape, with the impact being significant. However, beyond 2km, it was acknowledged that the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development would decrease. Overall, the Inspector found that the landscape would be able to accommodate the proposed development. With regards to wildlife the Inspector noted that a Habitats Regulation Assessment had been carried out and that it concluded that there would be impacts of low significance which could be dealt with by mitigation. The Inspector also found that there was no evidence to suggest the proposed development should be refused because of an adverse impact on bats. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the harm. However, the Secretary of State disagreed with this recommendation and dismissed the appeal due to the adverse impact to the landscape.</p>

Hare Ghyll Cottage

PINs No.	APP/M0933/A/13/2204149
Decision and date	Allowed 25/02/14
Location	Land near Hare Ghyll Cottage, Dalton-in-Furness, Cumbria
Inspector	B Hellier
Appellant	Mr P Buck
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 45m. The main issue was the effect on the character of the landscape. The appeal site lies within open, rolling countryside. The Inspector commented that the proposed turbine would be a prominent skyline feature, which would nonetheless be in scale with the sweeping arc of the hill in the vicinity of the site. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the wider landscape had the capacity to accommodate an additional single turbine in this location, with little harm arising. The benefits of the proposed development outweighed the limited harm.</p>

Somerfield Court Farm

PINs No.	APP/L2250/A/13/2191109
Decision and date	Allowed 26/02/14
Location	Somerfield Court Farm, Barrow Hill, Sellindge, Ashford TN25 6JZ
Inspector	Stephen Roscoe
Appellant	Windberry Energy Operations Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with blade tip height of 61m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. It was noted that there were a number of manmade features in the vicinity of the appeal site (HS1 and local railway lines, M20, pylon routes and telecommunications masts). The Inspector was therefore of the view that the proposal would not result in a significant loss to the existing character of the area. The Inspector also considered the impact on the AONB (approx. 4km away) and concluded that the proposed development would not be sufficiently close to affect the setting of the AONB, with only minor visual impacts. The benefits of the proposal, although small, were deemed sufficient by the Inspector to outweigh the very limited harms.</p>

Overmoor

PINs No.	APP/B3438/A/13/2199950
Decision and date	Allowed 26/02/14
Location	Land off Little Blakeley Lane, Overmoor, Cellarhead, Stoke on Trent, Staffs
Inspector	K Nield
Appellant	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34.2m. The main issues were whether the development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the effect on the rural landscape. Although the Inspector noted that the development would constitute inappropriate development, the effect on the openness of the Green Belt was considered to be of a low order. The Inspector found that the appeal site was contained to an extent by rising land to the west and south so the proposed turbine would not appear unduly prominent in the wider landscape. In carrying out the balance, the Inspector was of the opinion that the benefits of the proposal amounted to the very special circumstances required to overcome inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Pleasant View Farm

PINs No.	APP/M2372/A/13/2197202
Decision and date	Dismissed 27/02/14
Location	Pleasant View Farm, Bolton Road, Darwen, BB3 2TT
Inspector	John Braithwaite
Appellant	Elizabeth Gott
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for two single turbines with a hub height of 67m. The main issues were the effect on the character of the landscape and on the living conditions of nearby residents. The Inspector found that the height and turning blades of the proposed turbine would make it prominent above the skyline. Thus, making it a visually intrusive feature that would have a significant adverse effect on the character of the landscape. In terms of the effects on the living conditions of local residents, the Inspector considered that there would be significant adverse effects on the visual amenity of three properties all of which were 460m-520m from the proposed development. The Inspector acknowledged the benefits of the proposal, but did not find that these benefits were sufficient to outweigh the harms.

Moorgate Farm

PINs No.	APP/W4705/A/13/2196404
Decision and date	Allowed 4/03/14
Location	Moorgate Farm, Kiln Hill Lane, Silsden, Keighley, BD20 9HT
Inspector	Paul Griffiths
Appellant	Mr F Throup
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	A proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34.2m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The appeal site lies within a gently rolling, exposed, upland character area which the Inspector noted possessed a sense of remoteness. However, the Inspector also considered that the proposed turbine would be read as a functional adjunct to the farm complex, therefore not appearing particularly incongruous. There would be limited harm to the appearance of the landscape and the Inspector found that this would be outweighed by benefits of the proposal.

Poundstock

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2205250
Decision and date	Dismissed 4/3/14
Location	Land in between Coppathorne and Quiceborough Farm, Poundstock, Bude, Cornwall, EX23 0NA
Inspector	Neil Pope
Appellant	A Rowland and H Smith
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 67m. The main issue was the effect upon the character and appearance of the landscape. The appeal site lies 1.2km from the Cornwall AONB and 1.5km from the coast. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would stand out as a prominent addition to the landscape. It was also the Inspector's opinion that the proposal would intrude into and disrupt views from the AONB. The proposal would also be visible from numerous other roads and public rights of way across the surrounding countryside, where it would break the skyline and would detract from the character and appearance of the countryside. Noise implications for nearby camping and touring parks were also considered. However, the appellant's noise assessment concluded that the noise levels would be ETSU compliant and would not have an unacceptable noise impact on the nearest noise sensitive receptors. The Inspector accepted this view. However, in conclusion, the benefits of the proposal were not considered significant to outweigh the harm to the landscape character of the area.</p>

Buttsbeer Cross Farm

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2199619
Decision and date	Dismissed 4/03/14
Location	Buttsbeer Cross Farm, Bridgerule, Holsworthy, Cornwall EX22 7EZ
Inspector	Neil Pope
Appellant	John Gardener
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 79m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the site lies within an area of attractive open countryside, occupying an elevated position in the landscape. It was considered that the proposed turbine would be a very tall, man-made addition to the landscape. The Inspector considered that within a distance of 2km, the proposed turbine would appear dominant and detract from the appearance of the countryside. At distances of 2-5km it would still break the skyline from some views and detract from the rural scene. In conclusion, the Inspector deemed that the benefits of the scheme were not sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Nook Farm

PINs No.	APP/H0928/A/13/2198846
Decision and date	Dismissed 4/03/14
Location	Nook Farm, Shap, Penrith, CA10 3LZ
Inspector	Richard McCoy
Appellant	W J & R Atkinson
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 34m. The main issues were the effects of the proposal on the landscape character of the area, the living conditions of nearby residents and biodiversity. The appeal site lies within open countryside, around 1.5km to the west of the Lake District National Park. The Inspector noted that the M6, A6 and west coast railway line were all nearby. However, he found that these were all engineered to take advantage of the surrounding landform contours, siting in slips and hollows. In contrast, the Inspector considered that the proposed turbines would be visible over a wide area. The Inspector was of the view that the proposed turbines would be a prominent and striking addition that would be at odds with the inherent nature of the landscape. Issues in terms of noise were raised by the Council, but the Inspector was satisfied the issue could be dealt with adequately by way of condition. The Inspector highlighted that there had been no assessment of the presence of protected species, in particular birds, therefore he could not reach a view on the likely effects of the proposed development on any protected species. Overall, the benefits were not sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Fairladies Farm

PINs No.	APP/Z0923/A/13/2197791
Decision and date	Dismissed 4/03/14
Location	Fairladies Farm, Egremouth, Cumbria, CA22 2TZ
Inspector	Richard McCoy
Appellant	Mr John Clark
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 66m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the landscape around the appeal site contains wide uninterrupted views across to the sea and along the coast, giving the area an isolated, tranquil character. The Inspector's judgement was that the proposed turbine would introduce a prominent vertical structure into an area with strong scenic qualities, leaving it at odds with the inherent characteristics of the landscape. A section 106 agreement had been entered into to remove two existing turbines (31m to blade tip) from the appellant's land. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be larger and more prominent than the existing turbines. The benefits of the proposal were not considered sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Scout Bridge Farm

PINs No.	APP/R4408/A/13/2204285
Decision and date	Dismissed 4/03/14
Location	Scout Bridge Farm, Huddersfield Road, Penistone, Sheffield, S36 7BX
Inspector	Keith Manning
Appellant	Mr Roger Auckland
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine on a 25m mast. The main issues were whether the development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the effects on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Inspector also considered that there would be harm by the loss of the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would appear as an isolated feature that would be incongruous within its local setting. From views within 1km the proposal, the turbine would be intrusive and harmful to the localised appreciation of the landscape. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Asfordby

PINs No.	APP/Y2430/A/13/2191290
Decision and date	Dismissed 4/03/14
Location	Former Asfordby mine, existing Asfordby Business Park LE14 3JL
Inspector	R W N Grantham
Appellant	Peel Wind Farms (UKC) Limited
Determination process:	Inquiry (Recovered by Secretary of State)
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for nine turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 125m. The main issues were the effects on the Old Dalby Test Track Facility, the character and appearance of the landscape, living conditions of nearby residents and the effects on nearby heritage assets. The issue in relation to the Old Dalby Test Track was that T9 would be within topple distance of the tracks. The Inspector suggested that the risks could be reduced by omitting T9 or reducing its height and locating it as far from the key infrastructure as possible. The Inspector noted that the proposed scheme would have a significant impact on the landscape character when considered alone, or in combination with other turbines. Again, the Secretary of State agreed with this recommendation. It was noted that 276 properties would be located within 1km of the nearest turbine. Given the number of properties that could be affected, the Secretary of State gave the effects on the living conditions significant weight. The Grade II St Bartholomew's Church is located 400m from the closest turbine. Both the Inspector and the Secretary of State concluded that substantial harm would be caused to the significance of the heritage asset. Although the Inspector found that the benefits would outweigh the harms, the Secretary of State disagreed and dismissed the appeal.</p>

Rigfoot Farm

PINs No.	PPA-380-2039
Decision and date	Dismissed 7/03/14
Location	Rigfoot Farm, Strathaven, ML10 6RP
Inspector	Michael J P Cunliffe
Appellant	Mr Gordon Bavaird
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 49.5m. The main issues were landscape and visual effects and air safety. The Reporter considered that the proposed turbine would dominate the surrounding area and would be significantly out of scale with other landscape features. It was also noted that the proposed turbine would significantly affect the amenity of the residents of nearby properties by means of visual dominance. Strathaven airfield is 1.8km from the site and the Reporter found that the proposed turbine would be likely to exert a significant constraint on the operation of the airfield, by limiting the amount of safe airspace within which aircraft, particularly microlights and aircrafts being used for training, could operate. The benefits of the proposal were not considered sufficient to outweigh the harms identified.</p>

Woodlands Farm

PINs No.	PPA-380-2040
Decision and date	Allowed 7/03/14
Location	Woodlands Farm, Woodlands Farm Road, Lesmahagow, South Lanarkshire, ML11 0QH
Inspector	Sinead Lynch
Appellant	Cape Energy Woodlands Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 69.9m. The main issue was the landscape and visual impact of the proposal. The landscape in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site is relatively enclosed and well settled, with undulating landforms and groups of mature trees. The Reporter noted that the proposed turbine would be substantially higher than any other landscape features in the vicinity, although it was not deemed that it would overwhelm or significantly alter the landscape of its surroundings. The Reporter found that any potential significant effects of the proposal would occur closer to the site. The closest settlement is approx. 2km from the site and the Reporter considered that there would not be a detrimental visual impact arising from the proposed turbine on the settlement. In terms of cumulative effect, the Reporter concluded that the proposed turbine could be satisfactorily accommodated within the landscape. Overall, the benefits of the scheme were sufficient to outweigh the limited harms.</p>

Pen Yr Heol

PINs No.	APP/K6920/A/13/2202980
Decision and date	Dismissed 12/03/14
Location	Land at Pen Yr Heol Las Farm, Heol Las, Energlyn, Caerphilly CF83 2TT
Inspector	Robert Gardener
Appellant	Mr D T Jones
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 64m. The main issues were highway safety during construction, the effect on the character and appearance of the area and noise implications. The Inspector considered that the transportation of the turbine parts could be managed to avoid significantly adverse implications for highway safety. The appeal site does not lie within TAN 8 and therefore the Inspector noted that the landscape character of the area is to be maintained and he therefore found that the proposed turbine would have a significantly harmful implication for the character of the landscape. The Council claimed that the potential for noise had not been adequately addressed. However, the Inspector was happy to rely on the manufacturers guidelines, especially as the nearest non-financially involved property was 660m from the proposal. The benefits of the scheme were not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the landscape.</p>