

WIND GENERATION APPEALS UPDATE

October 2014



Please find below a resume of decisions made between 10 September 2014 and 1 October 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.

Bosley

PINs No.	APP/R0660/A/14/2211894
Decision and date	Allowed 08/09/2014
Location	Land east of Dawson Farm, Bosley, Cheshire SK11 0PX
Inspector	Anthony Thickett
Appellant	Hallmark Power Ltd
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a height to the tip of the blade of 34.2m. The main issue was the impact on the character and appearance of the area. The site lies within the Peak Park Fringe Area of Special County Value and it was initially thought the proposed turbine would have an adverse impact on approach to the Peak District. The Inspector considered that visitors from the south and west are greeted with a large telecommunications mast and a small turbine to the east of the proposed site at Dollards Farm. It was considered that the proposed turbine did not impact on the landscape so significantly that it warranted the refusal of planning permission. The additional energy created would provide an additional income stream for the farm. The benefits were found to be capable of outweighing the harms.

Benenden

PINs No.	APP/M2270/A/13/2192675
Decision and date	Dismissed 08/08/2014
Location	Beacon Farm, Rolvenden Road, Benenden, Kent TN17 4BT
Inspector	Alan D Robinson
Appellant	Mr E Barham
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine mounted on a freestanding 18m high mast. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the countryside, the effects of the proposal on bats. It was noted that the proposed site was near a well-established hedgerow enclosing a field in its immediate vicinity which is used to grow arable crops. From a distance most of the turbine would be obscured by trees and changing topography. However, from close range the Inspector found that the visual impact was much more significant and would be at odds with the visual gentleness and tranquillity of the countryside. The Inspector considered that in order to correctly assess the impact on bats a bat survey would need to be performed. However, it was noted that if the proposed turbine was moved away from the adjacent hedgerow the risk to bats could be reduced. On balance it was considered that the harm to the countryside and risk to bats outweighed the benefits that would be associated with the development.

Bratton Fleming

PINs No.	APP/X1118/A/14/2216365
Decision and date	Dismissed 08/08/2014
Location	Friendship Farm, Bratton Fleming, Barnstaple, Devon EX31 4SQ
Inspector	Brian Cook
Appellant	Ms Sarah Judge
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	<p>Proposed turbine with a height to the blade tip of 34.2m. This would replace the existing micro scale Vawt wind turbine which was half the height of the proposed turbine. The main issues were the effect on the character and appearance of the area with regard to landscape and visual impact in the setting of Exmoor National Park. The site is within the Moorland Edge Slopes Landscape Character Type. The Inspector noted that the site offered long distance views from the moorland summits across north Devon to the coast. The Inspector considered that the blades tips would be seen 5km away which would include land and footpaths within the National Park. As a result of this the proposed turbine would bring about change in the landscape and would be intrusive on the character of the landscape. On balance the contribution that the proposed turbine would make was not found to outweigh the harms.</p>

Troon

PINs No.	PPA-370-2037
Decision and date	Allowed 8/09/14
Location	15 Collennan, Loans, Troon, South Ayrshire, KA10 7HR
Inspector	J Alasdair Edwards
Appellant	Ore Valley Housing Association
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 33m. The main issue was the effect on aviation safety. The Reporter noted that there was over-whelming evidence in relation to the terrain shielding the proposed turbine. Such shielding was considered to result in very little likelihood of the proposed turbine appearing as clutter on the Glasgow Prestwick Airport Primary Surveillance Radar. The Reporter therefore found that the proposal accorded with the provisions of the Development Plan and the appeal should be allowed.</p>

New Bayview Stadium

PINs No.	PPA-250-2184
Decision and date	Allowed 8/09/14
Location	Land to the South-East of New Bayview Stadium, Harbour View, Methil, Fife, KY8 3RW
Inspector	Douglas G Hope
Appellant	Fine Energy Ltd
Determination process:	Inquiry
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 81m. The main issues were the landscape and visual impact, harm to the regeneration of the former Methil Power Station site and whether the proposal would pose an unsatisfactory threat to public safety. The Reporter noted that due to the appeal site's urban context, the proposed turbine would not have a significant adverse landscape impact. The cumulative effect together with the offshore turbine (0.3km away) was also considered and the Reporter found that the 2 turbines would appear as a coherent pair. The Reporter found that there would be no serious impediment to the redevelopment of the nearby former power station as the design of any new development could accommodate the proposed turbine. With regard to public safety, the Reporter was of the view that with design, correct installation and regular maintenance together with the low usage of the area around the proposed turbine, that there was no overall risk to public safety. Overall, the Reporter found that the proposal was in accordance with the development plan and that no material considerations existed to justify refusing planning permission.</p>

Bromfield

PINs No.	APP/G0908/A/13/2203520
Decision and date	Allowed 09/09/2014
Location	Bromfield Farm, Bromfield, Wigton, Cumbria CA7 3NB
Inspector	Richard McCoy
Appellant	Mr Harold Armstrong
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	<p>Proposed turbine 48.5m to the blade tip. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and the effect on nearby heritage assets. It was noted that the area was characterised by undulating farmland with hedgerow boundaries which included isolated trees. Other tall man made structures were noted in the area including electricity poles and agricultural buildings/structures. The Inspector found that the visual impact would not create an overbearing presence or be visually prominent. It was found that the presence of the proposed turbine would not become a defining characteristic of the area. There were 9 listed buildings within 2.5km of the proposed site including the Church of St Mango. The Inspector also noted that English Heritage and the County Archaeologist had not raise any objections. On balance the Inspector decided that the proposed turbine had more benefits than adverse impacts.</p>

Bodmin

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2208456
Decision and date	Dismissed 10/09/2014
Location	Kernick Farm, Luxulyan, Bodmin, Cornwall PL30 5DX
Inspector	Mike Robins
Appellant	Mr Cliff Fox
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	<p>Proposed turbine with a blade tip of up to 74m. The main issues were the effects the proposed turbine would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the setting of the Helman Tor Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM), and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential dwellings. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape as either side of the proposed site were clearly marked routes, including footpaths up to Helman Tor. The Inspector noted that Helman Tor is regarded as a skyline feature of significance. Although the Inspector noted that from Helman Tor other turbines could be seen, due to the separation distances involved these did not impede on the setting of Tor. Additionally, the proposed height of the turbine would be the same as the height of Tor itself and was described as overly modern and intrusive. Assessments had not been carried out adequately to consider the risk of harm of living conditions of nearby residents. It was concluded that the adverse impacts outweighed the benefits of the proposal.</p>

Liskeard

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/13/2204574
Decision and date	Dismissed 10/09/2014
Location	Luna, Two Waters Foot, Liskeard, Cornwall PL14 6HX
Inspector	Mike Robins
Appellant	Mr Ian Strang
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with an overall height of 35m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. The proposed site was in the Mid Fowey Area of Great Landscape Value. It was noted that there was an existing turbine approximately 730m southwest of the site which was larger in size at 47m. It was decided that the impact on nearby residential property 240m away from the proposed site, had been underestimated and the proposed turbine would be an intrusive element to immediate local viewpoints and the valued landscape. On balance the adverse impacts of granting permission outweighed the benefits.</p>

Wingates

PINs No.	APP/P2935/A/13/2210380
Decision and date	Allowed 12/09/14
Location	East Wingates Farm, Wingates, Morpeth, NE65 8RW
Inspector	Michael R Moffoot
Appellant	Mr Bell
Determination process:	Written Representation
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 28.5m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the area. It was noted that the landscape had no formal designation. The Inspector found that due to the open nature of the appeal site the turbine would be prominent from localised viewpoints. As such it would be out of keeping with the rural character of the area. However, the Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be sited sufficiently close to the farmhouse and its outbuildings for it to be recognised as serving the property. From views in the wider landscape, the Inspector noted that there were other vertical elements, therefore in this context the proposed turbine would have a limited material impact. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were found to outweigh the limited harms.</p>

Castlemorris

PINs No.	APP/N6845/A/13/2209831 and 2209836
Decision and date	Dismissed 15/9/14
Location	Melin Penbanc and Pen y Banc, Castlemorris, Haverfordwest, SA62 5EL
Inspector	Key Sheffield
Appellant	Mr James Richards and Mr Jon Watson-Miller
Determination process:	Inquiry
Summary of decision	<p>Two proposals, both for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 79m. The main issues were the effects on the landscape and visual amenity of the area and on the setting of nearby SAMs. It was noted that the appeal sites were situated within a rural landscape across which there are scattered settlements, agricultural buildings and isolated residential properties. The Inspector was concerned that the introduction of the proposed turbines would make a significant addition to the landscape. The Inspector also noted that as the appeal site was located at a high point in the local landscape, they would create dominant features and would result in a significant adverse effect on the character of the landscape. The Inspector considered that there would be a significant adverse effect on the visual amenity in closer viewpoints and from the National Park. With regard to the effect on the setting of the nearby SAMs, the Inspector concluded that the proposed turbines would fail to protect or enhance the setting of the SAMs. The Inspector held that the benefits of the proposals were not sufficient to outweigh the harms.</p>

Scammonden

PINs No.	APP/A4710/A/13/2205212
Decision and date	Allowed 16/09/14
Location	Edgerton Farm, Hey lane, Scammonden, Huddersfield, HD3 3FR
Inspector	B Hellier
Appellant	Mr Richard Lee
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 23.5m. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt and the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would result in some loss of openness to the Green Belt, although this would be modest. The Inspector noted that although the appeal site is locally elevated, it is surrounded by higher land. The wider landscape also contains a radio mast, other individual turbines, electricity pylons and the M62, so the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would not be out of place. The Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the limited effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area.

Hedley

PINs No.	APP/P2935/A/14/2211439
Decision and date	Allowed 16/09/14
Location	Land NW of Hedley North Farm, Hedley, Stocksfield, NE43 7SS
Inspector	B Hellier
Appellant	Mr and Mrs P Stonehouse
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34.2m. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt and the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would result in a moderate loss of openness to the Green Belt. With regards to the effect on the landscape, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would be a large and incongruous feature at close quarters, but beyond 2km it would be easily assimilated into the landform. Cumulative effects were also considered by the Inspector, mainly in relation to the Whittonstall wind farm 4km from the appeal site and Kiln Pit Hill wind farm 6km from the appeal site. The Inspector found that due to separation distances involved, there would be little cumulative impact on the landscape or visual receptors. Overall, the Inspector did not consider that there would be a significant detrimental effect on the landscape. In conclusion, the Inspector was of the view that the benefits of the proposal consisted of the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Hademore

PINs No.	APP/K3415/A/13/2205360
Decision and date	Allowed 16/09/14
Location	Land South of Hademore House Bridge, Fisherwick Road, Lichfield, WS14 9JN
Inspector	Alan Noitzky
Appellant	JF & BM Gray
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 86.5m. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt, the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on local residents. The Inspector found that the harm to the openness of the Green Belt would be quite limited. The Inspector noted that the landscape is characterised by the presence of engineering structures, so much so that the proposed turbine would not feel exceptional or particularly alien. The Inspector was of the opinion that the proposed turbine would fall into place in the broad panoramic sweep of the landscape without appearing discordant. With regards to the living conditions, the Inspector found that there would be no unacceptable effects. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were considered to amount to the very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Upper Soil Hill

PINs No.	APP/A4710/A/13/2209108
Decision and date	Dismissed 18/09/14
Location	Land at upper Soil Hill, Ned Hill Lane, Halifax, HX2 9NT
Inspector	B Hellier
Appellant	RNK Renewables Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34.2m. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt and the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would result in some loss of openness to the Green Belt, which would be modest. However, the proposed turbine would add to and extend an existing cluster of turbines on Soil Hill. The cumulative effect on openness was therefore found to be significant. With regard to landscape effects, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would be a step towards creating a landscape which would be overwhelmed by turbines, causing significant cumulative harm to the landscape character. Similarly, the Inspector considered that the cumulative visual impact would also be significantly adverse. The Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal did not amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt and outweigh the cumulative harms to the character and appearance of the landscape.

Fillongley

PINs No.	APP/R3705/A/14/2212022
Decision and date	Dismissed 22/09/14
Location	Green End Poultry Site, Gorsey Green Lane, Fillongley, Coventry, CV7 8PH
Inspector	Andrew Hammond
Appellant	Mr J Potter
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 23.5m. The main issue was whether the proposal constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the effect on the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector held that the proposed turbine would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that the openness of the Green Belt would be harmed. The Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal were not sufficient to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Legbourne

PINs No.	APP/D251/A/14/2215935
Decision and date	Dismissed 22/09/14
Location	Legbourne Grange, Furze Lane, Legbourne, Louth, LN11 8LR
Inspector	Paul Jackson
Appellant	Mr Michael Clarke
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 74m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character area, as well as the nearby Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. The Inspector also found that the proposed turbine would fill in the gap between existing turbine developments, creating an impression of uninterrupted wind development. In conclusion, the Inspector found that the benefits were not sufficient to outweigh the harms.

Allfornoughhill

PINs No.	PPA-170-2091
Decision and date	Allowed 23/09/14
Location	Solwaybank, Allfornoughhill, Langholm, Dumfries and Galloway
Inspector	Richard Dent
Appellant	RES UK & Ireland Limited
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for 15 turbines with a blade tip height of 126.5m. The main issues were the landscape and visual impacts. The Reporter noted that the proposed turbine would not be located within any area designated as being of international, national or regional importance. There are currently two existing wind farm and two consented wind farms within 10km of the proposed turbines. The Reporter found that the number of turbines would increase within this area, but the proposed turbines would not represent a new feature. The Reporter noted that SNH had not objected to the proposal. Overall, the Reporter considered that the level of impact on landscape character and visually would be within acceptable limits. In conclusion, the Reporter found that the proposal was in accordance with the development plan and no other material considerations existed which required refusal of planning permission.

Dalbury Lees

PINs No.	APP/P1045/A/14/2215040
Decision and date	Dismissed 23/09/14
Location	Brookley Meadows Farm, Dalbury Lees, Ashbourne, DE6 5BL
Inspector	Victoria Lucas-Gosnold
Appellant	Mr Dutton
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 46.3m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector was of the opinion that there was very little evidence of built development visible from the appeal site. The Inspector therefore found that the proposed turbine would be a prominent and defining addition when viewed in the context of the intimate character of the landscape. Overall, the Inspector considered that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character of the landscape and the visual appearance of the LCA. The benefits of the proposal were not considered to be sufficient to outweigh these harms.

Strath Brora

PINs No.	PPA-270-2106
Decision and date	Dismissed 24/09/14
Location	Balnacoil Lodge, Strath Brora, Sutherland, KW9 6LX
Inspector	R W Maslin
Appellant	Vento Ludens Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for 15 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 121m. The main issues were the effects on the setting of Caisteal na Coille and landscape and visual effects. The Reporter found that the setting of Caisteal na Coille SAM included the immediately adjacent land up to about 1km upstream and downstream and up the valley side to 150m contour. The Reporter considered that the proposed turbines would have a direct, physical effect on part of the setting as a result of the widening and reconstruction of an existing track. But the Reporter felt that the proposed turbines would have no other effect on the setting of the SAM. In terms of landscape and visual effects, the Reporter found that the proposed turbines would have a significant effect on the landscape of part of Strath Brora and was of significant seriousness as to outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

East Redhill

PINs No.	PPA-110-2219
Decision and date	Dismissed 25/09/14
Location	South-west of East Redhill, Rothienorman, Aberdeenshire
Inspector	Richard Dent
Appellant	ClearWinds Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for three turbines with a blade tip height of 100m. The main issue was the landscape and visual impacts. The Reporter noted that the appeal site lies within a small plateau area, enclosed by hills to the east, south and west. He considered that given the topography of the land in the vicinity of the appeal site, the adverse landscape impact would be experienced over the plateau and that the impact would be more extensive than if the landscape was wider. The Reporter also found that cumulatively with a proposed development at Tillymorgan Hill, the proposed turbines would have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenity in the vicinity of Fisherford village. Overall, the Reporter found that the proposal was contrary to the development plan and in taking account of all material considerations, planning permission should not be granted.

Denby Village

PINs No.	APP/M1005/A/13/2203861
Decision and date	Dismissed 25/09/14
Location	14 Heanor Road, Denby Village, Ripley, DE5 8PN
Inspector	Phillip J G Ware
Appellant	Quiet Revolution
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 32m. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt and the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector noted that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that the openness of the Green Belt would also be reduced. The Inspector noted that due to the slope of the appeal site, it is particularly visible from a number of locations, especially footpaths crossing the site. The Inspector considered that the appellant underestimated the effect on the surrounding countryside. The Inspector found that the character and appearance of the area would be harmed by the proposal. The benefits of the proposal were not found to be sufficient to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Buttermeade Farm

PINs No.	APP/X1118/A/14/2216664
Decision and date	Dismissed 25/09/14
Location	Field OS249957, Buttermeade Farm, Higher Spreacombe, Woolacombe Devon EX34 7HN
Inspector	Brian Cook
Appellant	Mr Mark Wyatt
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 45.5m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector noted that although not at the highest point of the field, the views of the turbine would be extensive in all directions. The Inspector found that the nearby Fullabrook Wind Farm and two turbines at Mullacott were dominant within the landscape. The Inspector considered that in some views the proposed turbine would appear separately from the other wind farm developments and would have its incongruity emphasised. The Inspector was of the opinion that the planting suggested would offer little screening to the proposed turbine. Overall, the Inspector held that the proposal would result in a harmful effect on the landscape character of the area and would unacceptably alter the appreciation of the landscape by residents and visitors alike. The benefits of the proposal were not found to be sufficient to outweigh the harms.

West Lutton

PINs No.	APP/Y2736/A/14/2211925
Decision and date	Allowed 25/09/14
Location	High Barn, West Lutton, Malton, YO17 8TL
Inspector	David C Pinner
Appellant	Mr D Morgan
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a hub height of 30m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector noted that proposed turbine would be a similar height to an existing turbine 1km from the appeal site. The Inspector commented that the landscape was typical of the Yorkshire Wolds, with expansive views over undulating countryside with big skies. The Inspector found that the existing turbines demonstrated that the landscape had the capacity to absorb turbines such as the one proposed without unduly affecting the character or quality of the landscape. The Inspector also considered that turbines such as the proposed are an essential part of a thriving agricultural enterprise. The benefits of the proposal were found to outweigh the limited harm caused to the landscape.

Helperthorpe

PINs No.	APP/Y2736/A/14/2214575
Decision and date	Allowed 25/09/14
Location	Jubilee Farm, Helperthorpe, Malton
Inspector	David C Pinner
Appellant	Ian and Tim Stubbins
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 46m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector commented that the landscape was typical of the Yorkshire Wolds, with expansive views over undulating countryside with big skies. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be likely to be seen from properties in Helperthorpe. On balance, while the Inspector accepted that there would be some harm to the landscape, he was of the view that the proposed turbine could be absorbed into the landscape without causing undue harm to its character or appearance. The benefits of the proposal were found to outweigh the limited harms.

Shipdham

PINs No.	APP/F2605/A/12/2185306
Decision and date	Dismissed 25/09/14
Location	Wood Farm, Church Lane, Shipdham, IP25 7JZ
Inspector	Ecotricity (Next Generation) Ltd
Appellant	J P Watson
Determination process:	Recovered by Secretary of State
Summary of decision	Proposal for two turbines with a blade tip height of 100m. The main issues were the effects on the setting and significance of heritage assets and aviation. The Inspector found that the landscape could accommodate the proposed turbines without being adversely affected. Although the Inspector did not find that the proposed turbines would cause substantial harm to the setting and significance of heritage assets, there would be some harm. This harm was to be placed into the planning balance. Shipdham Flying Club objected to the proposal regarding the risk of collision with the proposed turbines. The Inspector noted that changes to the controlled airspace associated with Norwich International Airport were likely to concentrate low-level aviation directly above Shipdham village and the appeal site. The Inspector found that the proposed turbines would introduce a hazard to flying in that area and would increase the risk to air traffic. The Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harms and recommended the appeal be dismissed. The Secretary of State agreed with this recommendation.

Great Broughton

PINs No.	APP/G0908/A/13/2210439
Decision and date	Allowed 26/09/14
Location	Land at Fox House Farm, Great Broughton, Maryport, Cumbria CA15 7SN
Inspector	S R G Baird
Appellant	Miss F Milligan
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	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 landscape. The Inspector noted that although turbines were no longer unusual or unique features in the rural landscape, they have an adverse effect on landscape character. In relation to cumulative impacts with other existing and consented schemes, the Inspector found that there would be a moderate adverse effect on the local landscape character. The Inspector noted that there were a number of built, consented and proposed turbines in West Cumbria, and although a tipping point may be reached at some stage, he did not consider this to be the case at present. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were found to outweigh the limited harms.

Cairnie

PINs No.	PPA-110-2216
Decision and date	Dismissed 26/09/14
Location	Land to the south of Meikleton of Ardonald, Cairnie, Huntly, Aberdeenshire, AB54 4UB
Inspector	Stephen Hall
Appellant	Burcote Wind Ltd
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for four turbines with a blade tip height of 99.5m. The main issues were the landscape and visual impacts and the effects on residential amenity. The Reporter noted that the appeal site had a larger landscape scale and more remote character than other parts of the landscape character area. The Reporter found that turbines 1-3 would remain subservient to the overall scale of the landscape, although he had some concerns that turbine 4 would have a more dominant effect. Similarly, with regards to visual impacts the Reporter found that turbine 4 would have a more disruptive and dominating impact, especially in views from the A96. With regards to residential amenity, the closest non-involved property would be 450m from the proposed turbines and the Reporter considered that due to the outlook of the property and its proximity to the turbines this would have a significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of this property and would be overbearing. Despite the fact the appellant had come to a contractual agreement with the owner of this closest property, the Reporter deemed that this was not an interest which would make the property an involved property. Overall, it was held that the proposal did not accord with the development plan and that no material considerations justified granting planning permission.

Middle Muir

PINs No.	Middle Muir
Decision and date	Allowed 26/09/14
Location	Middle Muir Wind Farm Electricity Generating Station, South Lanarkshire
Inspector	Banks Renewables Limited
Appellant	Scottish Ministers
Determination process:	S.36
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for 15 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 152m. The main issues were the landscape and visual impacts. Scottish Ministers noted that although they raised concerns, SNH did not object to the proposal. Scottish Ministers also noted that the proposal would be seen in the context of the consented Andershaw wind farm and that schemes would relate well to one another. A revised layout was submitted to ensure the proposal was 2km from the village of Crawfordjon. Overall, Scottish Ministers accepted that landscape and visual impacts would remain but that they would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.</p>

Nantgerdinen

PINs No.	APP/M6825/A/14/2217641
Decision and date	Dismissed 29/09/14
Location	Nantgerdinen, Cynwyl Elfed, Carmarthen, SA33 6UT
Inspector	Sian Worden
Appellant	John Spencer
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 effect on the character and appearance of the landscape and noise impacts. The Inspector noted that the land around the appeal site is characterised by steep wooded valleys and elevated agricultural land. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would not cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape, but held that there was insufficient information to determine the cumulative effect. The Appellant had produced noise measurements for the model of turbine which suggested that ETSU could be exceeded, but no site specific noise data was provided. The Inspector considered that in the absence of such information, she could not be certain that there would not be significant adverse effects. In conclusion, the benefits of the proposal were not found to be sufficient to outweigh the potential harms.</p>

Six Bells

PINs No.	APP/X6910/A/14/2215270
Decision and date	Dismissed 29/09/14
Location	Coed T Gilfach Farm, Six Bells, Abertillery, Blaenau Gwent
Inspector	James Ellis
Appellant	David Hale
Determination process:	Hearing
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 73.5m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector noted that the appeal site had a sense of remoteness with extensive views. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be completely at odds with the existing landscape character, bringing about significant adverse change to the landscape character of the area. The benefits of the proposal were not found to be capable of outweighing the harms.</p>

Hawton

PINs No.	APP/B3030/A/12/2183042
Decision and date	Allowed 29/09/14
Location	Land to the east of Hawton, Newark on Trent
Inspector	Bolsterstone Innovative Energy (Hawton) Ltd
Appellant	Zoe Hill
Determination process:	Recovered by Secretary of State
Summary of decision	Proposal for three turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 126.5m. The main issue was the effect on the setting and significance of heritage assets. The Inspector noted that within 5km of the appeal site there are a significant number of heritage assets, including a Registered Park and Garden, 18 SAMs, 5 conservation areas and 420 listed buildings. However, the Inspector focussed on two buildings which might have been substantially harmed. The Inspector found that when considering the most sensitive of viewpoints in terms of the setting of All Saints Church, Hawton, there would be harm, but that it would not be substantial harm. With regards to the Church of St Mary Magdalene, Newark, the Inspector found that while the proposal would not enhance the overall setting, it would not harm it. The Inspector concluded that although there would be harm to All Saints Church that is to be considered in the balance, the benefits of the proposal outweighed the harm. The Inspector recommended that the appeal be allowed. The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector's recommendation.

Nancolleth Farm

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/14/2211119
Decision and date	Dismissed 30/09/14
Location	Nancolleth Farm, Summercourt, Newquay, Cornwall, TR8 4PN
Inspector	Brian Cook
Appellant	Mr Jonathan Luckraft
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 61m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape and setting of heritage assets. The appeal site lies within an extensive area characterised by an open and exposed gently undulating plateau landscape. The Inspector noted that the area had been subject to industrial influence. However, he considered that the proposed turbine would be dominant and uncharacteristic in the open and exposed plateau area. In relation to the effect on the setting of heritage assets, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would interrupt the line of sight between church towers and that this would result in less than substantial harm. Trerice House is a Grade I gentry residence 2km from the proposed turbine, resulting in less than substantial harm to the overall setting tranquil setting of the asset. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal were not sufficient to outweigh the harms.

Chytane Farm

PINs No.	APP/D0840/A/14/2212162
Decision and date	Dismissed 30/09/14
Location	Chytane Farm, Summercourt, Newquay, TR8 5BW
Inspector	Brian Cook
Appellant	J Julian & Son
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a hub tip height of 50m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the landscape, heritage assets and living conditions. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would be a substantial new addition in near views which are otherwise absent of such structures, making the proposed turbine a dominant and uncharacteristic addition to the landscape. The Inspector found that from certain vantage points, the proposed turbine would be an intervening presence in views to and from the Church of St Enoder (Grade I), resulting in less than substantial harm to the asset. With regard to living conditions, the Council refused the application on noise impact. The residents of Chytane Farm considered that they were already subject to unacceptable impact on their living conditions and that the proposed turbine would result in an enhanced and cumulative effect in terms of AM. The Inspector found that there was no prospect of framing a condition which would ensure effective control. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were not found to be capable of outweighing the harms.</p>

Bishops Itchington

PINs No.	APP/J3720/A/13/2193579
Decision and date	Dismissed 01/10/14
Location	Land between Bishops Itchington, Gaydon and Knightcote
Inspector	S R G Baird
Appellant	Broadview Energy Ltd
Determination process:	Recovered by Secretary of State
Summary of decision	<p>Proposal for four turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 125m. The main issues were the effects on the living conditions of nearby occupiers, the effects on heritage assets, the effect on the landscape and public visual impacts. The Inspector considered that three properties would become unacceptable and unattractive places to live due to the visual impact caused by the proposed turbines which would range from 831m to 1.4km from these properties. The Inspector found that there would be some harm to Burton Dassett Tower, due to the impact on its setting caused by the proposed turbines 2.8km away. This harm was found to be less than substantial. The Inspector held that given the broad scale of the landscape, the proposed turbines could be accommodated without significant harm to the landscape character. However, with regard to visual impacts, the Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would unacceptably reduce the amenity value of the area (especially the nearby Country Park) and the public's enjoyment of it. The Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms and recommended that the appeal be dismissed. The Secretary of State agreed.</p>

Bedding Edge Road

PINs No.	APP/Z4718/A/13/2206218
Decision and date	Dismissed 01/10/14
Location	Land to the north west of Bedding Edge Road, Hepworth, Holmfirth, HD9 1TP
Inspector	Michael R Moffoot
Appellant	Ms Wendy Walker
Determination process:	Written Representations
Summary of decision	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 46m as a replacement for an existing turbine on a 15m tower. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt and on the character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and it would diminish the openness of the Green Belt thus being harmful to the Green Belt. The Inspector commented that the landscape was a wild and windswept rural landscape with existing man made features. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would be added to a landscape in which turbines are a fairly significant feature. Although the proposed turbine would be a replacement for the existing turbine, it would be significantly larger and was found to have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector concluded that the very special circumstances to overcome inappropriate development in the Green Belt did not exist