

# WIND GENERATION APPEALS UPDATE

April 2015



Please find below a resume of decisions made between 12 March 2015 and 2 April 2015

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@sqpirepb.com](mailto:richard.glover@sqpirepb.com) or direct dial 0113 284 7023.

### Bower Hill Plantation

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/X4725/A/14/2221519
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 12/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land south west of Bower Hill Plantation, Bretton, Wakefield, WF4 4JL
<b>Inspector</b>	P J Asquith
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr Mark Smith
<b>LPA</b>	City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height up to 61m. The main issues were the effects on the openness of the Green Belt and effect on character and appearance of the area including heritage assets. The Inspector noted that the proposal would result in a reduction in the openness of the Green Belt. With regards to the character and appearance of the area, the Inspector considered that due to the lack of other substantial man-made features, together with the proximity to Bretton Hall registered park and garden, the proposed turbine would bring about considerable change. The Inspector found that there would be a high magnitude of visual impact within the immediate locality due to the dominating presence of the proposed turbine. In conclusion the Inspector held that the harm to Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, as well as the harms identified could not be outweighed by the benefits of the development.

### Birkland Barrow

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/A2335/A/14/2214859
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 12/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Birkland Barrow, Over Kellet, Carnforth, LA6 1DX
<b>Inspector</b>	B Hellier
<b>Appellant</b>	Mrs Margaret Mason
<b>LPA</b>	Lancaster City Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 79.6m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; the living conditions of nearby occupiers; and aviation safety. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would be completely out of scale with the local setting, resulting in it becoming a dominant and discordant feature against the skyline, causing substantial harm to the landscape character. It was noted that 8 dwellings would be located within 600m of the appeal site, all which would suffer varying degrees of harms. At worst the effect was found to be significant adverse, but not unacceptably oppressive. With regards to aviation safety, the appellant was not willing to pay for the mitigation required for the air traffic control radar at Prestwick, the Inspector therefore found that there would be a significant adverse effect on aviation safety. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms.

## Mickley Grange Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/P2935/A/14/2218146
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 18/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Mickley Grange Farm, Stocksfield, Northumberland, NE43 7TB
<b>Inspector</b>	B Hellier
<b>Appellant</b>	George Charlton
<b>LPA</b>	Northumberland County Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 46.5m. 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 the effect on aviation safety. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be situated within a relatively enclosed local setting, where the scale of the proposal would not significantly harm the character of the surrounding landscape. With regards to aviation safety, the Inspector noted that it was only the top 13m of the turbine that would be in line of sight of the radar at Newcastle Airport. The Inspector therefore found that although the proposal as it stood would be unacceptable, if the height of the turbine were reduced (subject to confirmation of the height at which the proposed turbine would become invisible to the radar) the proposal would be acceptable in aviation terms. The Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal amounted to the very special circumstances required to outweigh inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that subject to the height of the turbine being amended, the proposal should be allowed.</p>

## Buttock Laithe Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/E2340/A/14/2215665
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 18/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Buttock Laithe Farm, Coal Pit Lane, Colne, Lancashire
<b>Inspector</b>	Andrew Hammond
<b>Appellant</b>	DC21 Ltd
<b>LPA</b>	Pendle Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Dismissed 48.6m
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of up to 35m. The main issue was whether the development constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt and if so, whether the harm could be justified on the basis of very special circumstances. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that there would also be harm, albeit limited, to the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal did not amount to the very special circumstances required to overcome inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p>

## Englands Head Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/T2350/A/14/2217074
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 18/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Englands Head Farm, Paythorne, Clitheroe, BB7 4BJ
<b>Inspector</b>	B Hellier
<b>Appellant</b>	Future Energy Partnership LLP
<b>LPA</b>	Ribble Valley Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 67.9m. The main issues were the effects on the landscape and character of the area, heritage assets and wildlife. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would jar with the domestic scale of the settled countryside, as well it creating an adverse impact on the outlook of residents of Halton West. Two listed buildings, one 825m from the appeal site, the other 1.5km from the appeal site were found to suffer harm, albeit it less than substantial harm. The Inspector held that subject to conditions, there would be no material detriment to wildlife. In conclusion, the Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of being outweighed by the harm.

## Willow Tree Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/E2734/A/14/2219958
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 18/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Willow Tree Farm, Clifton, Otley, LS21 2LZ
<b>Inspector</b>	P J Asquith
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr John Scott
<b>LPA</b>	Harrogate Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34.5m. The main issue was whether the proposed development constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the effect on the openness of the Green Belt, and the impact on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that there was no dispute that the proposed turbine would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Inspector found that there would be a loss of openness to the Green Belt, albeit modest. With regards to the landscape character and appearance, the Inspector noted that given the area's status as an AONB, receptor sensitivity would be high. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would have a dominating presence from nearby roads and footpaths and would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be 250m from the northern boundary of the Clifton Conservation Area, and would result in some harm, albeit less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area. Overall, the Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal did not amount to the very special circumstances required to overcome inappropriate development in the Green Belt or outweigh the harms.

## Bradley Pastures

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/P1045/A/14/2217296
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 19/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Bradley Pastures, Bradley, Ashbourne, Derbyshire, DE6 1LP
<b>Inspector</b>	Michael R Moffoot
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr Jonathan Archer
<b>LPA</b>	Derbyshire Dales District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 99.6m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the area and the effects on living conditions of nearby dwellings. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be a significant feature in the local landscape and would be observed from many local viewpoints. The Inspector also considered that the closest dwelling, at 500m, would have clear views of the proposed turbine which would seriously impose upon the outlook, resulting in unacceptable harm. The effects on other properties were also considered, but these were not found to be unacceptable. In conclusion, the Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms identified.

## Bishopthorpe

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/D25100/A/14/2213150
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 20/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land at Bishopthorpe Farm, Tetney, Grimsby
<b>Inspector</b>	Philip Major
<b>Appellant</b>	ASC Renewables Ltd
<b>LPA</b>	East Lindsey District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Inquiry – Recovered
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for eight turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 115m. The main issues were the impacts on the character and visual qualities of the landscape, impact on heritage assets, impact on living conditions, impact on tourism, and the impact on nearby SPA and Ramsar sites. The Inspector found that there would be a major adverse impact on landscape character when close to the turbines, but that this effect would reduce once further away. The Inspector also found that the effects on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB would be minor. Cumulative effects with existing and consented schemes were also noted. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would result in harm on Tetney Church, but that this harm would be less than substantial. There was no harm identified to any other heritage assets. In terms of living conditions, the Inspector found that at various properties including Thorpe Park chalets, that the view of the proposed turbines, albeit prominent, would not be unduly disruptive. It was considered by the Inspector that the effects on the SPA and Ramsar sites were capable of being dealt with by mitigation measures within the planning conditions. Overall, the Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal were sufficient to outweigh the harms, and recommended to the Secretary of State that the appeal be allowed. The Secretary of State agreed with this recommendation.

## Hallcliffe Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/R1038/A/14/2218036
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 20/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Hallcliffe Farm, Hallcliffe Lane, Wadshelf, Chesterfield S42 7BS
<b>Inspector</b>	Michael R Moffoot
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr C Bacon
<b>LPA</b>	North East Derbyshire District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 45m. The main issues were the effect on the openness of the Green Belt; on the character and appearance of the area and on the significance of heritage assets. The Inspector noted that while the loss of openness would be relatively modest, it would still be harmful to the Green Belt. It was noted that the proposed turbine would be located in an exposed and elevated location in open countryside. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would appear as a prominent feature due to its height and movement and would be visible from the National Park. As such it would harmfully impact on the enjoyment of the National Park. With regards to heritage assets, the Inspector considered that there would be harm, albeit less than substantial, to the Wadshelf Conservation Area and a listed outbuilding at Hallcliffe Farm. Overall, the Inspector was of the view that the benefits of the proposal did not amount to the very special circumstances required to overcome inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p>

## The Hills

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/L3245/A/14/2218544
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 23/03/15
<b>Location</b>	The Hills, The Down, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 6UB
<b>Inspector</b>	Kay Sheffield
<b>Appellant</b>	David Mottershead
<b>LPA</b>	Shropshire Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 76.5m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and leisure and tourism interests. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would create a significant new feature within the local landscape, unacceptably affecting the landscape quality of the area, but would not appear unduly dominant in longer distance views. In terms of leisure and tourism impacts, the Inspector was unconvinced that a single turbine would have a significant effect. However, the benefits of the proposal were held to be incapable of outweighing the harm to the landscape and the appeal was dismissed.</p>

## Kingerby

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/N2535/A/14/2216163
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 23/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land to the north of Kingerby Wood, Kingerby
<b>Inspector</b>	David C Pinner
<b>Appellant</b>	Happy Days Farming Co.
<b>LPA</b>	West Lindsey District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Recovered
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 67m. The main issues were the effects on aviation safety, wildlife and the local landscape. The Inspector noted that DIO had provided a detailed statement explaining the problems that the proposed turbine would cause to the ATC radar at RAF Waddington. The Appellant did not produce any technical evidence to counteract this. Nor was any mitigation offered. The Inspector commented that RSPB and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust still maintained their objections to the proposal on the basis that it would be located 200m from Kingerby Wood within which is one of Lincolnshire largest heronries. However, the Appellant had submitted evidence that the risk of collision would be negligible. The Inspector considered that the risk to wildlife was not sufficient to warrant dismissal of the appeal. In terms of landscape effects, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would tower above Kingerby Wood and would diminish the contribution the woodland makes to the quality of the local landscape. Overall, the Inspector considered that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms in regard to aviation safety and the landscape. He therefore recommended that the appeal be dismissed. The Secretary of State agreed with this recommendation.</p>

## Cornabo

<b>PINs No.</b>	PPA-110-2241
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 23/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Alnd to the south west of Cornabo, Monymusk, Aberdeenshire, AB51 7JL
<b>Inspector</b>	Dannie Onn
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr and Mrs Clark
<b>LPA</b>	Aberdeenshire Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for three turbines with a blade tip height of 74m. The main issues were landscape and visual impacts and aviation safety. The Reporter noted that the proposed turbines would result in a significant change to the landscape, which currently contains no structures at the scale of the turbines proposed. However, he was of the view that the proposal would appear appropriate to the scale of its setting, and that the landscape could accommodate the proposal without significant loss of character. In terms of aviation safety, the Reporter was content that as an upgrade to the radar installation was programmed for completion by mid-2015, with the proposed turbines within the capacity for the upgraded system. The Reporter held that a condition would be sufficient to deal with this issue. Overall, the Reporter found that the proposal would not conflict with the development plan.</p>

## Rotten Row

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/D2510/A/14/2217972
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 24/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land to the south of Rotten Row, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, LN12 1NX
<b>Inspector</b>	John Braithwaite
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr Richard Walker
<b>LPA</b>	East Lindsey District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 68m. The main issue was the cumulative effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be of medium scale and its impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, would be slight. The proposed turbine would be seen in some views with permitted and existing turbines, but the Inspector felt that the cumulative effect on the character and appearance of the landscape would be no more than limited. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal were capable of outweighing this harm.

## Legbourne

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/D2510/A/14/2219509
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 24/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Site at Station Road, Legbourne, Louth
<b>Inspector</b>	John Braithwaite
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr M Casswell
<b>LPA</b>	East Lindsey District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 46.3m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and heritage assets. The Inspector considered that the introduction of the proposed turbine into the tranquil landscape would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. The Inspector also found that the proposal would result in a visual intrusion into the views eastwards from the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. No harm was found to the setting or significance of Legbourne Priory SAM or St James Church. The Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harm to the landscape character, including the views from the AONB.



## Old Hill Lane

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/P3040/A/14/2223091
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 24/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land at Old Hill Lane, Off Kneeton Road, East Bridgford, Nottinghamshire
<b>Inspector</b>	K D Barton
<b>Appellant</b>	East Bridgford Community Energy IPS
<b>LPA</b>	Rushcliffe Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 87.4m. The main issues were the effects on: the openness of the Green Belt; the character and appearance of the area; heritage assets; and residential amenity. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that it would also reduce, to a limited extent, the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would dominate the view of East Bridgford Conservation Area, as well as detracting from the Mill Farm windmill causing harm to this asset, being less than substantial harm. The properties nearest to the proposal ranged from 500m to 800m in distance and the Inspector found that due to screening and separation there would be no unacceptable impacts on residential amenity. The Inspector found overall 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.</p>

## Land off Spa Lane

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/P3040/A/14/2214337
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 24/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land off Spa Lane, Orston, Nottinghamshire
<b>Inspector</b>	K D Barton
<b>Appellant</b>	RESense
<b>LPA</b>	Rushcliffe Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 74m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and living conditions of nearby occupiers in terms of outlook. The Inspector found that in local views, the turbine would draw the eye and appear as an alien element in the rural area. Resulting in a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area which forms the setting of the Orston Conservation Area. The Inspector noted that the nearest residential properties would be Lodge Farm, some 540-545m from the appeal site. However, these properties have dense hedging and trees that would prevent the outlook being altered. The benefits of the proposal were not considered by the Inspector to be capable of outweighing the harm to the landscape character.</p>

## Woodford Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/D0840/A/14/2218228
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 24/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land at Woodford Farm, Pelynt, Cornwall
<b>Inspector</b>	David M H Rose
<b>Appellant</b>	Murex Energy Limited
<b>LPA</b>	Cornwall Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and heritage assets. The Inspector found that the proposed turbine would introduce a man-made feature of uncharacteristic scale for the field that it would be situated in. He also found that the proposal would cause serious harm locally and in views from the edge of the AONB. With regards to heritage assets, the Inspector found harm, albeit less than substantial to a number of nearby heritage assets. In conclusion, the Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms.

## Shop

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/D0840/A/14/2216560
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 24/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land at Marsborough Farm and Milton Farm, Shop, Morwenstow
<b>Inspector</b>	David M H Rose
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr and Mrs Cleave
<b>LPA</b>	Cornwall Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Two separate proposals for single turbines, one with a blade tip height of 45.5m and the other 34.5m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and the sufficiency of the noise assessment. The Inspector noted that both of the proposal turbines would be well related, locally, to the undulating wind-swept topography and the field pattern. The Inspector found that the proposed turbines would not stand out as unduly conspicuous in the local landscape. However, the Inspector considered that the proposals would be seen in the context of other wind energy development in the immediate vicinity and wider locality, which would cause serious harm to the appearance of the landscape in cumulative terms. With regards to the noise assessments, those submitted with the applications and the appeals were found to be deficient. However further reports had been submitted during the appeal process which dealt adequately with the issues raised by the Council. Overall, the Inspector held that the benefits of the proposals were not sufficient to outweigh the cumulative harm to the landscape.

## Aire View Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/W4705/A/14/2223234
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 25/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Aire View Farm, Harden Road, Keighley, West Yorkshire, BD21 4TP
<b>Inspector</b>	Clive Nield
<b>Appellant</b>	Aire View Equestrian Centre
<b>LPA</b>	City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	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 on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that it was common ground that a wind turbine is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. With regards to the effect on the openness of the Green Belt, the Inspector found that there would only be limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be of modest scale, comparable to many of the pylons in the area, causing limited harm to the character and appearance of the area. Overall, the Inspector found that the benefits of the proposal would amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

## Manns Newton Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/Y1138/A/13/2210883
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 25/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land at Manns Newton Farm, Zeal Monachorum, Devon, EX17 6LL
<b>Inspector</b>	Alwyn B Nixon
<b>Appellant</b>	Murex Energy Limited
<b>LPA</b>	Mid Devon District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and heritage assets. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would occupy a prominent skyline position, and would be excessive in scale in relation to its surroundings and unduly prominent in the landscape. With regard to the effects on heritage assets, the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would harm the setting of a significant number of listed buildings, with the level of harm varying, but not reaching the level of substantial harm. The benefits of the proposal were not found to be capable of outweighing the harms identified.

## Rootfield Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	PPA-270-2116
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 25/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Rootfield Farm, Muir of Ord, IV6 7RF
<b>Inspector</b>	Jill Moody
<b>Appellant</b>	Nicholas MacKenzie
<b>LPA</b>	The Highland Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 34.2m. The main issues were the effects on the character and visual amenity of the surrounding landscape and the effects on residential and visual amenity. The Reporter considered that the proposed turbine would not balance well with the lower, more horizontal emphasis and character of the surrounding landscape. The Reporter also noted that due to the distance between the proposed turbine and the farm building, there was no clear physical or functional relationship. In terms of the visual amenity, the Reporter found that from a significant number of homes, mainly within 500m of the appeal site, the proposed turbine would be highly visible. The Reporter considered that the residents of these properties would have their visual amenity dominated and diminished to an unacceptable level. Overall, the Reporter found that the proposal did not accord with the provisions of the development plan and that there were no material considerations raised which might justify granting the proposal.

## Beckwell Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/Q1153/A/14/2217113
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 26/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Beckwell Farm, Meadwell, Kelly, Lifton, Devon, PL16 0HJ
<b>Inspector</b>	Alwyn B Nixon
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr and Mrs Heyward
<b>LPA</b>	West Devon Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 35m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and heritage assets. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be located within enclosed farmland and found that it would sit reasonably comfortably within its landscape context. The appeal site would be located 5km from Dartmoor National Park and the Inspector found that the proposed turbine would only have a marginal visual effect on the panoramic vistas. With regards to the effects on heritage assets, a number of nearby assets were considered by the Inspector ranging from 650m to 5km from the appeal site, but found no harm to the setting or significance of these assets. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were found to outweigh the limited harms.

## East Lake Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/W1145/A/14/2214375
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 27/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Part of East Lake Farm, Halwill Junction EX21 5XG
<b>Inspector</b>	Graham Dudley
<b>Appellant</b>	Porterledge Renewable Limited
<b>LPA</b>	Torridge District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 77m. The main issues were the effects on landscape character and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The Inspector considered that due to size and modern form, the proposed turbine would have a harmful effect on the appearance and the immediate local character. The Inspector noted that due to the turbines already operating, the character and appearance of the landscape was beginning to change. With regards to the effects on living conditions the Inspector was of the view that the impact would not be so unpleasant, overwhelming or oppressive, although the Inspector did note that there would be still be considerable impact on the two closest properties. Additionally, the Inspector also found that there would be some harm to nearby heritage assets, albeit less than substantial harm. Overall, the benefits of the proposal were not found to be capable of outweighing the harms identified.</p>

## Orby

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/D2510/A/11/2161066
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 27/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land 7km North-West of Skegness and 2km south-west of Orby Village
<b>Inspector</b>	S R G Baird
<b>Appellant</b>	Mark Cauldwell Limited
<b>LPA</b>	East Lindsey District Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Inquiry (Recovered)
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for 9 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 81m. The main issues were the effects on landscape and visual, living conditions and tourism. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would create a wind farm landscape in the local landscape, with the proposed turbines exerting a moderately harmful visual effect further afield. The Inspector was concerned with the noise impact, especially as the background noise levels had been taken during July/August, when it is particular busy with seasonal traffic to Skegness. He was unconvinced that the proposal could meet ETSU year round, when the background levels would be quieter. This resulted in a significant degree of doubt as to the potential harm to residents living conditions. The Inspector recommended that the appeal be dismissed as the harms could not be outweighed by the benefits. The Secretary of State agreed with this recommendation.</p>

## Caverswall Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/B3410/A/14/2224200
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 30/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land north of Caverswall Farm, Coppice Lane, Loxley, Uttoxeter ST14 8RZ
<b>Inspector</b>	Brian Cook
<b>Appellant</b>	Hallmark Power Ltd
<b>LPA</b>	East Staffordshire Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 74m. The main issues were the effects on the character and appearance of the area, the effect on protected species and effect on the living conditions of residents. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be located on a ridge and would therefore be visible on the skyline from many directions. The Appellant accepted that further survey work was required following Staffordshire Wildlife Trust information that noctule bats had been recorded 1.6km from the appeal site. The Inspector held that it would not be appropriate to provide a Grampian –style condition and therefore found that there was insufficient information in relation to protected species. The Inspector queried whether the property which was occupied by the landowner’s daughter could be a financially involved property. As there was no evidence to suggest she was a direct beneficiary, the Inspector held that the lower ETSU limits could not apply. In conclusion, the Inspector held that the benefits of the proposal were unable to outweigh the harms.</p>

## Three Birches

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/L3245/A/14/2225890
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 30/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Three Birches, Newcastle, Craven Arms, Shropshire, SY7 8QX
<b>Inspector</b>	Mike Robins
<b>Appellant</b>	Mrs Sandra Davies
<b>LPA</b>	Shropshire Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	<p>Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 20.9m. The main issues were the effects on landscape, visual and heritage assets. The Inspector noted that the proposed turbine would be located within the Shropshire Hills AONB. The proposed turbine would be located some 65m from an existing turbine of the same size. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would reinforce the visual impact of the existing turbine and would result in a material increased presence in the landscape. The Inspector also found that there would be harm to Caer Din-Ring SAM due to the increased visibility of a pair of turbines. However, this harm was found to be less than substantial. The benefits of the proposal were not found to be capable of outweighing the harms identified.</p>

## Bailey Ground Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/Z0923/A/14/2219196
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 30/3/15
<b>Location</b>	Bailey Ground Farm, Santon Way, Seascale CA20 1NG
<b>Inspector</b>	Andrew Hammond
<b>Appellant</b>	Mr Steve Mawson
<b>LPA</b>	Copeland Borough Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 45m. The main issue was the effects on character and appearance of the landscape. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would introduce an isolated prominent vertical structure within an open landscape against the backdrop of the Lake District National Park. Therefore resulting in a substantial detrimental impact on the landscape. It was also found that the proposal would be prominent in views from many properties nearby, introducing an unacceptable visual impact. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the proposal were not capable of outweighing the harms.

## Calliachar

<b>PINs No.</b>	PPA-340-2087
<b>Decision and date</b>	Allowed 30/03/15
<b>Location</b>	Land north of Callichar Wind Farm, Amulree
<b>Inspector</b>	Dan Jackman
<b>Appellant</b>	I&H Brown (NC) Limited
<b>LPA</b>	Perth and Kinross Council
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for 7 turbines. The main issue was the landscape and visual effect. The Reporter found that there would be localised significant effects, but that these would be appreciated by a relatively small number of people, and would be within the context of the existing Calliacher wind farm. Overall, the landscape and visual effects were found to be acceptable. No material considerations were found to justify refusal of the permission

## Yenworthy Farm

<b>PINs No.</b>	APP/F9498/A/14/2229355
<b>Decision and date</b>	Dismissed 02/04/15
<b>Location</b>	Yenworthy Farm, Oare, Lynton, Devon, EX35 6NY
<b>Inspector</b>	Mike Robins
<b>Appellant</b>	M G Halliday
<b>LPA</b>	Exmoor National Park Authority
<b>Determination process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Summary of decision</b>	Proposal for a single turbine with a blade tip height of 19.9m. The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the National Park. The Inspector considered that the proposed turbine would stand isolated and unrelated to the farmhouse, having a significant effect on the immediate landscape. It was found that views of the proposed turbine would be open across much of the local bridleway network. The Inspector held that the proposed turbine would, due to its scale and position, be an intrusion into a tranquil, timeless and undeveloped landscape. The benefits of the proposal were found to be incapable of outweighing the harm to the landscape.