

WIND GENERATION APPEALS UPDATE

July 2014



Please find below a resume of decisions made between 16 June 2014 and 2 July 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@squirepb.com or direct dial 0113 284 7023.

Shaw Park

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | PPA-140-2049 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 16/06/14 |
| Location | Shaw Park, Allanshaws Farm House, Scottish Borders, TD1 2QB |
| Inspector | R W Maslin |
| Appellant | J G Shanks and Son |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | Proposal for 9 turbines with a blade tip height of 100m. The main issues were the landscape and visual effects. The proposed development is envisaged to be community owned. The Reporter found that the proposed turbines would be seen from many places in the landscape setting of Stow. Given the distance (1.9km-3km) the Reporter considered that the proposed turbines would create a significant impact. The Reporter also found that the proposed turbines would have an overwhelming effect on the nearby Sell Moor, as well as a profound adverse effect on Lauder Common. All of these findings lead the Reporter to conclude that the proposed turbines would have a detrimental effect on the landscape. The benefits of the proposal were not sufficient to outweigh the harms. |

Brunta Hill

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | PPA-140-2047 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 18/06/14 |
| Location | Land north-east of Blythe Farm (Brunta Hill), Lauder, TD3 6NH |
| Inspector | Philip G Hutchinson |
| Appellant | PNE Wind UK Limited |
| Determination process: | Hearing |
| Summary of decision | Proposal for 8 turbines with a blade tip height of 100m. The main issues were the landscape and visual impacts and the effects on residential amenity. The Reporter noted that the Fallago Rig wind farm was 7.9km from the appeal site and considered that the cumulative effects would start to undermine the integrity of the nearby SLA. In terms of visual impacts, the Reporter considered that the proposed turbines would occupy an attractive arc or panorama (being the Eildon Hills) which is currently free of commercial wind farms. For the Reporter, this raised very serious concerns. The Reporter also found that the proposed turbines would result in a number of properties (at around 911-989m from the proposed wind farm) becoming unattractive and unpleasant places to live, due to lack of screening and orientation of the dwellings. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harms. |

Beley Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | PPA-250-2185 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 19/06/14 |
| Location | Beley Farm, Dunino, St Andrews, KY16 8LU |
| Inspector | R Guilford |
| Appellant | Ian Stevens |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 27.1m. The main issues were the landscape and visual effects, as well as noise impacts. The Reporter noted that the farmland surrounding the appeal site constituted attractive and unspoilt countryside. Although the Reporter found that that proposed turbines would be locally quite prominent in the landscape, the impact would generally be restricted to a distance of about 1km. Due to the size of the proposed turbines and the location, the Reporter was of the view that they would not be dominant features and would not have a significant adverse impact on the landscape. The Reporter also considered that the visual impact would be localised in nature and would not result in a significant adverse impact. The Reporter noted that as the ETSU level of 35dB(A) would not be exceeded at any of the nearby properties. Overall, the Reporter found that the benefits of the development outweighed the limited harms.</p> |

Minnogap

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | PPA-170-2055 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 19/06/14 |
| Location | Minnogap, Annandale Estates, At Ann's, Lockerbie |
| Inspector | Michael J P Cunliffe |
| Appellant | RES UK & Ireland Limited |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for 10 turbines with a blade tip height of 125m. The main issues were the landscape and visual effects, effects on tourism and on residential amenity. The Reporter noted that the proposal had been designed to appear as an extension to the existing Harestanes wind farm. The Reporter found that the impact on the landscape character, when considered in the context of Harestanes, would be significant only within a limited and localised part of the surrounding area. The Reporter also found that although the proposal would be visible from parts of nearby towns (Lockerbie 15km, Lochmaben 15km and Moffatt 10km) it would generally be seen in the context of Harestanes and the visual impact would not be significant. In terms of cumulative landscape and visual effects, the Reporter was of the opinion that the additional effect of Minnogap would not be significant. It was also the view of the Reporter that the proposal would not have any significant effects on tourist numbers. With regard to effects on residential amenity, the Reporter noted 2 dwellings located within 1.3km of the appeal site. He considered the impact on the dwellings would be significant in terms of visual amenity, but that would not make the dwellings unattractive places to live. The benefits of the proposal were considered sufficient to outweigh the harms identified.</p> |

Leffinwyne

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | PPA-370-2035 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 20/06/14 |
| Location | Leffinwyne Farm, Kirkoswald, Maybole, KA19 8HH |
| Inspector | Gerry Farrington |
| Appellant | Mr James Caldwell |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for 2 turbines with a blade tip height of 47m. The main issues were the landscape and visual impacts, effects on residential amenity and heritage assets. The Reporter noted that there were no convincing landscape and visual amenity reasons for refusing permission. In terms of the residential amenity of nearby dwellings, the Reporter found that the nearest non-associated dwelling was 480m from the appeal site, with other dwellings a little further away. The Reporter was of the view the screening and the orientation of the main aspects of the dwellings was such that the proposal would not result in undue harm to the visual amenity of the dwellings. The Reporter was satisfied that the noise conditions would safeguard the nearby dwellings from unacceptable noise impacts. Crossraguel Abbey and Baltersan Castle are category "A" listed buildings. The Reporter considered that the proposed turbines would introduce a pair of conspicuous turbines breaching the skyline of the valley would have a harmful impact on the setting of both monuments. Overall, the Reporter concluded that the harm to the heritage assets could not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.</p> |

Coleorton

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/G2435/A/13/2207948 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 23/06/14 |
| Location | Land at Ashby Road, Coleorton, Coalville, Leicestershire |
| Inspector | Andrew Hammond |
| Appellant | Harworth Estates Investments Limited |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 90m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector noted that although the proposal would be located in a predominantly rural area, the immediate area is screened by high embankments and vegetation. It was also noted that the nature of the surroundings change on the opposite side of the A42 where the landscape is dominated by bulky commercial buildings. The Inspector found that from most viewpoints the proposed turbine would be substantially screened and at viewpoints further afield the impact would be minimal. Overall the Inspector was of the view that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.</p> |

Higher Churchtown Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/D0840/A/13/2200806 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 23/06/14 |
| Location | Higher Churchtown Farm, Tresmeer, Launceston, Cornwall, PL15 8QT |
| Inspector | Neil Pope |
| Appellant | Mr Graham Bate |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issues in this appeal were the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape and heritage assets. The Inspector noted that the appeal site lies within an area of attractive countryside which includes some existing turbines. The Inspector considered that although the turbine would extend considerably above the ridge of the landscape, it would not be out of scale with the gently rolling hills and undulating plateau. However, he also noted that the proposed turbine would be in close proximity to high sensitive receptors on nearby walking trails and would be at odds with the unspoilt natural qualities of the countryside. The proposed turbine would be located 800m from the church of St. Winwalo (Grade I). The Inspector found that the proposed turbine, due to its height and location, would be a distracting and harmful element in some local views, therefore affecting the setting and diminishing the significance of the church. The Inspector considered the effect on other heritage assets and found that the harm to the other assets was less than substantial, but still to be taken into account in the overall planning balance. Overall, the benefits of the scheme were not sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p> |

Friesland Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/N1025/A/13/2201978 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 23/06/14 |
| Location | Friesland Farm, Rushy Lane, Sandiacre, Nottingham NG10 5NP |
| Inspector | Philip J G Ware |
| Appellant | Mr Garry Peacock |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine on a 30m mast. The main issue was the effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector was of the view that the proposed turbine would be widely visible, often moving, development in the countryside and would clearly reduce the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector also considered the location for the proposed turbine to be a prominent location, on a ridge. Overall, the Inspector found that the character and appearance of the area would be harmed. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal did not amount to the very special circumstances required to outweigh the harm by means of inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> |

Manor House Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/C2708/A/13/2204127 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 25/06/14 |
| Location | Manor House Farm, Gluburn Moor, Glusburn, Keighley, BD20 8JB |
| Inspector | Louise Crosby |
| Appellant | Mr Matthew Tidmarsh |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for 9 turbines with a blade tip height of 34.2m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the area and heritage assets. The Inspector noted that the appellant's description of the character area was not accurate. The Inspector held that the appeal site was located on an exposed hilltop. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would introduce a strident vertical structure and that she was not convinced that landscape could accommodate the proposal without impinging on general and specific views. The Inspector found the effect would be both on long distance views and from closer to the appeal site. The proposed turbine would also be sited 500m from Cononley Lead Mine, which comprised 6 grade II listed buildings and structures. The Inspector held that the setting of the assets extended to the appeal site and that the proposed turbine would in some views dominate the heritage asset. The Inspector stated that this would lead to less than substantial harm, but nonetheless it needed to be considered in the planning balance. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p> |

Wigsley Airfield

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/B3030/A/13/2207822 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 25/06/14 |
| Location | Land at Wigsley Airfield, 1.2km southwest of Wigsley |
| Inspector | Susan Heywood |
| Appellant | Arcus Consultancy Services Ltd |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>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 surrounding area. The appeal site lies within a landscape character area which is mainly made up of flat arable land, characterised by the presence of blocks of woodland, belts of trees, hedgerows, scattered villages and isolated farms. The Inspector noted that in many views the proposed turbine would be seen in the context of the man-made structures of the former airfield, including the control tower. However, the Inspector did find that the proposed turbine would cause some visual intrusion and harm to the localised area. The benefits of the proposal were considered sufficient to outweigh the limited harm.</p> |

Southwaite Motorway Services

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/H0928/A/14/2213910 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 25/06/14 |
| Location | Land to the north west of Southwaite Motorway Services, Southwaite, Carlisle, CA4 0NS |
| Inspector | B Hellier |
| Appellant | OwnPower Renewables Ltd |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and living conditions of occupiers of Stone Faulds and Burble Farm. The appeal site lies in a field that slopes down to the M6, about 500m from Southwaite Services. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would have a significant effect within about 1.5km of the appeal site. Beyond the local level, the Inspector found that the turbine would generally be assimilated well into the relatively large scale setting. In terms of the living conditions of the closest properties, the Inspector was of the view that although the proposed turbine would have an adverse effect on the outlook from these properties, it would not result in the impact being so overbearing or oppressive as to create unacceptable living conditions. In conclusion, the Inspector held that the effects on the local landscape could not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.</p> |

Longhedge Lane

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/P3040/A/13/2200603 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 25/06/2014 |
| Location | Land at OS Field 0004 (partial), Longhedge Lane, Sibthorpe, Nottinghamshire |
| Inspector | S R G Baird |
| Appellant | Mr R Burton |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 45m. The main issue is the effect on the settings and significance of (a) the Parish Church of St. Peter, a Grade 1 Listed Building and (b) the Dovecote, a Grade 1 Listed Building and Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). In relation to the effect on the settings and significance of the Listed Buildings and the SAM, the Inspector concluded that the effect on the Parish Church would be minor because views are obscured by trees. As for Dovecote, the Inspector held that the slim nature and limited height of the turbines would only have a minor impact. In terms of the wider area, the movement of the blades would draw attention away from the Listed Buildings and the SAM. This would have a moderately adverse effect. Overall, the harm would be less than substantial. The Inspector held that considerable weight should be attached to the desirability of preserving the setting of Listed Buildings and the presumption against such development. In conclusion, the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm to the setting and historical significance of the Grade 1 Listed Buildings and SAM and the adverse impact to the appearance of the area.</p> |

Ryecroft Road

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/W4705/A/13/2204760 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 27/06/2014 |
| Location | Ryecroft Road, Nr Harden, Keighley, West Yorkshire |
| Inspector | Louise Crosby |
| Appellant | Mrs S Preston |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | Proposal for a single turbine, 24.6m to hub. The main issues were whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the landscape; The Inspector determined that the development would be an inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The effect on the openness of the Green Belt would be modest, but greater weight was attached to such harm in accordance with paragraph 88 of the Framework. The proposal would cause undue damage to the character of the landscape. Ultimately, the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and other identified harm, and the very special circumstances necessary to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt did not exist. |

Follions Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/P2935/A/13/2204271 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 27/06/2014 |
| Location | Land associated with Follions Farm, Thropton, Northumberland, NE65 7JT |
| Inspector | Louise Crosby |
| Appellant | Mr Mark Wisniewski |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 78m. The main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character of the landscape and the effect on the visual amenity of the area. The Inspector determined that the introduction of a tall and imposing 'man made' structure would be at odds with key characteristics of the landscape, most notably its tranquillity and unspoilt nature with few vertical features. In conclusion, the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area and conflict with CS policy S21, in so far as it would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the people in the community. The benefits of the proposal were not considered sufficient to outweigh the harms. |

Willerby Pig Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/Y2736/A/13/2196783 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 27/06/2014 |
| Location | Willerby Pig Farm, Malton Road, Staxton, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO12 4SN |
| Inspector | Louise Crosby |
| Appellant | Willerby Wold Piggeries Ltd |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 78m. The main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character of the landscape and the effect on appearance and visual amenity of the area. The Inspector held that the turbine would detract from the characteristic low lying nature of the landscape. In relation to visual amenity, the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the appearance and visual amenity of the area from a number of nearby paths, roads, dwellings and recreational areas. In conclusion, the potential benefits were not considered sufficient to outweigh the significant detrimental effect the proposal would have on the character of the landscape and the appearance and visual amenity of the area. |

Centre Road

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/C2708/A/13/2205868 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 27/06/2014 |
| Location | Land adjacent to Centre Road, Lothersdale, North Yorkshire |
| Inspector | Louise Crosby |
| Appellant | Mr Geoff Booth |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine 35m to blade tip. The main issues were the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The surrounding area is largely agricultural in character with the main development being sporadic farmsteads. In the wider area there are numerous wind turbines which are visible from the appeal site. Although the Inspector considered that none are particularly close by and, because of their sensitive siting, none appear as strident in the landscape as this one would, despite being taller than the proposed structure. The Inspector was not convinced that the landscape had the capacity to accommodate the proposal without impinging on general or specific views. The Inspector held that the proposal would have a significant impact on the appearance of the landscape, and that it would cause substantial harm. The identified harm far outweighs the benefits.</p> |

Thickbroom Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/K3415/A/13/2201420 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 27/06/2014 |
| Location | Land at Thickbroom Farm, Little Hay Lane, Weeford, Lichfield, WS14 0PU |
| Inspector | D C Pinner |
| Appellant | Mr Charles Wylie |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a turbine with a blade tip height of 71m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the local landscape; its effect on the setting of the listed Church of St. John at Shenstone and whether the development constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Inspector held that the proposal would have some negative effect on the openness of the land. In relation to the Church of St. John, the Inspector held that the setting of the church is confined to a relatively small area around it, which would be unaffected by the proposed turbine. In conclusion, the proposed turbine would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would have limited adverse impact on the local landscape and would cause slight harm to the openness of the Green Belt. It would not harm the setting of the Church of St. John or have an unacceptable impact on birds or wildlife. Very special circumstances were considered by the Inspector to exist and therefore outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness in the Green Belt.</p> |

Hill Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/Y2810/A/13/2204488 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 27/06/2014 |
| Location | Hill Farm, Byfield, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 6YL |
| Inspector | Phillip J G Ware |
| Appellant | Mr Peter Wolf |
| 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 on the character and appearance of the landscape. The turbine would be of limited size but it would be visible from a number of private and public vantage points, including footpaths. However, taken in isolation, the proposal would have a very limited effect on the overall character of the landscape. The effect on residential amenity would be minor and the effect on heritage assets would be imperceptible or none. In conclusion, the Inspector was of the view that the proposal would cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the landscape. Overall, the renewable energy benefits of the proposal significantly outweighed the effect on the landscape.</p> |

Wellington Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/G0908/A/13/2195042 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 27/06/14 |
| Location | Wellington Farm, Lamplugh Road, Cockermouth, Cumbria, CA13 0QU |
| Inspector | D C Pinner |
| Appellant | J and M Stamper |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single wind turbine with an overall height to blade tip of 79.6m. The main issue was the impact on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal site lies about a mile from the boundary of the Lake District National Park within undulating agricultural landscape. The Inspector noted that there were a number of wind farms within the area, but the nearest was at least 6km from the proposed turbine. The Inspector was therefore of the view there would be no significant cumulative impact in any views. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be located in an elevated position and would be visible over a wide area. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be a tall, engineered structure which would be much taller than any other structure in the locality. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would be out of scale with the natural and built environment of the locality and would have a major adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape. The benefits of the proposal were not deemed sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p> |

Leesrigg Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/G0908/A/13/2201883 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 27/06/14 |
| Location | Leesrigg Farm, Mealsgate, Wigton, Cumbria, CA7 1BZ |
| Inspector | Richard McCoy |
| Appellant | Mr B Carr |
| Determination process: | Written Representation |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 35m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and heritage assets. The appeal site sits at the bottom of a shallow valley in an area of medium to large fields. The Inspector noted that the area had an expansive, gently undulating agricultural character. The Inspector considered that the modest size of the proposed turbine, together with its siting within an environment containing other man-made structures and expansive nature of the surrounding landscape would serve to ensure that the harm caused by the proposal would be limited. 5 listed buildings and 3 SAMs are located within 1km of the proposed turbine. The Inspector found that inter-visibility between the proposed turbine and the heritage assets would be very limited. The Inspector also noted that no objections were raised by EH, the County Archaeologist or the Council's conservation officer. The benefits of the proposal were considered sufficient to outweigh the limited harm.</p> |

Coombe Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/Q1153/A/13/2208097 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 30/07/14 |
| Location | Coombe Farm, Iddesleigh, Winkleigh, Devon, EX19 8BN |
| Inspector | J M Trask |
| Appellant | Mr Colin Illman |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 45m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the area; heritage assets; and living conditions of nearby residents. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would introduce a tall man-made addition to a rural landscape which is largely free of vertical features. The Inspector considered that the greater impact would be in close proximity to the appeal site and that the proposed turbine would not unduly affect long distance views of the landscape. However, the harm to the local landscape was to be given significant weight. The Inspector considered the effect on a number of Grade I and Grade II listed buildings in the locality. The Inspector concluded that there would be a moderate level of effect on the setting of listed buildings, comprising less than substantial harm. In terms of living conditions of local residents, the Inspector was of the view that visual impacts would be limited and that a condition could be imposed to provide sufficient protection regarding noise emissions. Overall, the benefits of the scheme were not found by the Inspector to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the landscape.</p> |

Bocaddon Farm

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/D0840/A/13/2201006 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 30/06/14 |
| Location | Bocaddon Farm, Lanreath, Looe, Cornwall, PL13 2PG |
| Inspector | Neil Pope |
| Appellant | Mr Nick Maiklem |
| 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 character and appearance of the area and heritage assets. The appeal site lies within an arable field at 150m AOD. The Inspector noted that there are overhead lines, pylons and telecommunication masts in the surrounding area. The Inspector found that due to the elevated position, the proposed turbine would be visible over a wide area, but that it would form part of a wide rural scene and would not have an overwhelming presence in the landscape. Closer to the site (within approx. 1km) the proposed turbine would appear as a very prominent feature, detracting from the very pleasant rural scene. Two SAMs can be found 950m and 1km from the appeal site. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be prominent in views to and from the SAMs and would detract from the setting of them. The harm to the SAMs was found to be less than substantial by the Inspector, but still required consideration in the planning balance. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal outweighed the harms.</p> |

Green Lane

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| PINs No. | APP/E2530/A/13/2200452 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 1/07/14 |
| Location | Land off Green Lane, Marston, Lincolnshire, NG32 2HU |
| Inspector | Mr A Thickett |
| Appellant | Yew Tree Farms |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 74m. The main issue was the effect on heritage assets. A number of heritage assets were indicated as falling within 5km of the proposed turbine. The Inspector considered the impact on the setting of heritage assets and concluded that although the proposed turbine would be visible from all the heritage assets, none of the resulting impacts would constitute substantial harm. Although, the impacts were still required to be considered in the planning balance. Overall, the Inspector found that the benefits outweighed the limited harm in respect of the effects on nearby heritage assets.</p> |

Bowdler Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/T6850/A/13/2200418 |
| Decision and date | Dismissed 01/07/14 |
| Location | Bowdler Farm, Presteigne Road, Knighton, Powys, LD7 1LN |
| Inspector | Kay Sheffield |
| Appellant | Mr C Bevan |
| Determination process: | Hearing |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 79m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the area and visual amenity. The Inspector noted that although there were various man-made and natural features within the area which already give an element of height to the landscape, the proposed turbine would be significantly taller than any of these existing features. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine, mainly due to its height, would appear unduly dominant and unacceptably affect the landscape quality of the area. In terms of visual amenity, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would have significant effects on closer viewpoints. The Inspector noted that some of the viewpoints would be experienced extensively by recreational users. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms.</p> |

West House Farm

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| PINs No. | APP/G0908/A/13/2199471 |
| Decision and date | Allowed 02/07/14 |
| Location | West House Farm, Dearham, Maryport, Cumbria |
| Inspector | D C Pinner |
| Appellant | Infinergy Limited |
| Determination process: | Written Representations |
| Summary of decision | <p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that although the landscape was attractive, it was not within a designated landscape protection area. The Inspector was of the view that the landscape character within 2km of the appeal site would not be greatly harmed as it was already compromised by existing pylons and turbines. Beyond 2km, the Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would have very little impact on the appearance of the landscape. Given the limited impact, the Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harms.</p> |