



**Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses**

---

<b>1</b>	Responses to Wind Power SPD	4
<b>2</b>	Responses to Sustainability Appraisal	26

---



## Contents

### **Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses**



# Responses to Wind Power SPD 1

Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Summary of Responses

Nature	Number
Support	11
Support with conditions	2
Object	9
Observations	40
Other	1



## Summary of Comments to the Wind Power SPD and Council Response

### 1.1 Whole Document

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Whole Doc	<b>156</b> Mr Andrew Pritchard (East Midlands Regional Assembly)	<b>827</b> Observations	Would like to draw attention to Policy 41 of the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy which covers regional priorities for renewable energy.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>162</b> P Leary (Hemingford Grey Preservation Association)	<b>849</b> Observations	Concern production of the SPD is inviting developers of wind farms by smoothing their way and potentially increasing the scale of any application. Believe the democratic process could be short-circuited.	No change required. All applications will still need to go through the Development Control process and decisions will be informed by a detailed site analysis. This SPD provides guidance on one of the considerations, all other factors will still need to be considered.
Whole Doc	<b>162</b> P Leary (Hemingford Grey Preservation Association)	<b>850</b> Observations	If the Council can propose areas for development of wind farms will it have conducted exhaustive environmental impact statements on each and everyone?	No change required. The document does not propose areas for wind turbine development it identifies the capacity of landscapes to accommodate wind turbine developments. When proposals for sites come forward for wind turbine developments detailed site specific analysis will be carried out.
Whole Doc	<b>162</b> P Leary (Hemingford Grey Preservation Association)	<b>851</b> Observations	It is difficult to understand how the Council can select areas for development of wind farms without detailed up-to-date technical knowledge of the effects and impacts of wind turbines on the surrounding countryside and neighbouring public.	No change required. The SPD does not select areas for development of wind turbines it identifies the capacity of landscapes to accommodate wind turbine development. When proposals for wind



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
				turbine development come forward detailed site-specific analysis will be carried out.
Whole Doc	<b>162</b> P Leary (Hemingford Grey Preservation Association)	<b>852</b> Observations	Concern over the viability of wind turbines and the level of subsidy provided for this type of development. Electricity generated by wind farms is the most expensive form of electricity and it would be of greater environmental benefit if the Council embarked on a vigorous campaign of education to seek to reduce energy consumption.	No change required. The SPD has not been produced to debate the merits of wind turbine development, it has been produced from the starting point that wind turbine applications will continue to come forward in the district and to provide guidance on the landscape impacts of this type of development.
Whole Doc	<b>8</b> Sandra Mitcham (Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council)	<b>854</b> Observations	The Council think all the guidance is adequate. Could a different colour for the turbines be considered, e.g. green, which should help them blend in with the landscape.	Noted. Colour of turbines is something that would need to be considered at a site-specific level rather than in this SPD.
Whole Doc	<b>172</b> Mr Gareth Ridewood (CPRE Cambridgeshire )	<b>871</b> Support	Support the SPD, each proposal should be assessed individually for its impact on the landscape.	Noted. As set out in the SPD every proposal will be informed by a detailed site specific analysis.
Whole Doc	<b>174</b> Mr Ewan Rayner (Ellington Parish council)  <b>173</b> <i>Mr Ewan Rayner</i> <i>(Ellington Parish council)</i>	<b>880</b> Object	We believe that this area of natural beauty would be spoilt by the addition of wind turbines. In particular the area either side of Ellington Brook including the ridge to the north is already cluttered with pylons, telephone masts etc. The visual impact of wind turbines in addition would be horrific.	No change required. The guidance already comments on the sensitivity of the ridge between the Kym and the Ellington Brooks, and specifically mentions the avoidance of additional vertical elements in this character area.



Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Whole Doc	<b>175</b> A Akers (Colne Parish Council)	<b>936</b> Observations	Agree in general principle to the Wind Power SPD	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>180</b> Mr Brian Smith (Hunts Green Party)	<b>938</b> Support	Generally support the strategy but realise, given some larger wind turbines have been turned down, that the size and numbers matter in planning applications despite larger turbines being more efficient than smaller ones.	Noted. The SPD does not discuss the merits of different sizes of wind turbine it assumes that commercial turbines of up to 120m in height (to the top blade) will be the most efficient.
Whole Doc	<b>28</b> Mr Colin Bambury (Highways Agency)	<b>939</b> Observations	Request the document includes guidance on distance from wind turbines to trunk roads.	No change required. This document is purely concerned with landscape character and the location of renewable energy schemes it does not include other factors that would need to be considered when assessing wind turbine applications.
Whole Doc	<b>74</b> Hannah Watson for RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds)	<b>941</b> Observations	There is potential for the document to impart greater weight to the importance of the District's biodiversity and, through the document, afford greater protection to Huntingdonshire's wildlife and environment. Nature conservation areas should be geographically defined within the SPD and their potential for hosting wind turbines evaluated.	No change required. This document is purely concerned with landscape character and the location of renewable energy schemes it does not include other factors that would need to be considered when assessing wind turbine applications. The impact of wind turbines development on areas of nature conservation will be addressed by policies in the emerging Core Strategy.



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Whole Doc	<b>181</b> Katie Adderley (The British Wind Energy Association)	<b>942</b> Observations	Support the Council in the provision of the SPD as a starting point for decision-making.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>181</b> Katie Adderley (The British Wind Energy Association)	<b>943</b> Object	The SPD has too much emphasis on single turbine/ small-scale groups (2-3) turbines. BWEA appreciates that numerous single turbine developments could play a valuable role in meeting regional and national renewable energy targets, though it appears that development on this scale is unlikely to be permitted in some areas. There are only four areas identified as having potential to accommodate a medium scale group and in two of these the detailed guidance suggests this would be unlikely.	No change required. The differing capacities outlined in the report are a consequence of the differing character areas within the district, and are purely a recognition of the principle that some landscapes can accommodate wind power developments more successfully than others, i.e they can accommodate them without losing that character which distinguishes them in the first place. The summary of landscape capacity contained in section 2 of the SPD is not a deliberate emphasis on certain scales of development, but purely a consequence of the different landscape character areas that make up the district of Huntingdonshire.
Whole Doc	<b>181</b> Katie Adderley (The British Wind Energy Association)	<b>944</b> Object	There is a lack of clarity and consistency in the approach towards cumulative development. Guidance is given in some areas to avoid locations with a large number of vertical elements and for other areas to avoid introducing vertical elements in areas where there is an absence of built structures.	No change required. The guidance is given for different character areas and addresses the characteristics of those particular landscapes, the guidance is therefore not conflicting.





Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Whole Doc	<b>183</b> Mr John Broth (Hargrave Conservation Society)	<b>946</b> Observations	In addition to causing great damage to the visual landscape and creating various nuisances for nearby residents the science of wind turbines is deeply flawed. The energy produced is minimal, intermittent and unreliable for use in our national grid. Impact on carbon emissions is also limited. Wind power is inefficient and expensive.	No change required. The SPD has not been produced to debate the merits of wind turbine development, it has been produced from the starting point that wind turbine applications will continue to come forward in the district and to provide guidance on the landscape impacts of this type of development.
Whole Doc	<b>166</b> Mr Dennis Jackson (Ramsey Town Centre Partnership)	<b>949</b> Support	RTCP is happy to approve in principle the content of the document.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>66</b> Chantal Hagen for English Nature (English Nature)	<b>952</b> Support with conditions	Disappointed there is not more emphasis on nature conservation/biodiversity impacts but support comments for individual character areas which relate to nature conservation. Also support indications that "in-combination affects" of turbine developments should be investigated	Noted. Impacts of wind turbine development on nature conservation/biodiversity are addressed by policies in the emerging Core Strategy.
Whole Doc	<b>188</b> Helen Nettleship (GO-East)	<b>955</b> Object	Any changes to the draft RSS and emerging Huntingdonshire Core Strategy which might have a bearing on this SPD once they are adopted, will need to be reflected in relevant revisions to the SPD.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>188</b> Helen Nettleship (GO-East)	<b>956</b> Observations	Support purpose of the SPD. However capacity judgements should not be used to discourage development coming forward. Only through site-specific assessments can proper judgement of appropriateness be made. For example, some rather	No change required. The document will not discourage development coming forward but will help to guide its location. With respect to site-specific assessments section 1.4 strongly emphasises that the



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
			difinitive statements are made in respect of a number of character areas, such as the area 'could not accommodate more than one small-scale development'. It would be preferable if these statements were moderated e.g. it is unlikely that the area could accommodate.. but this would depend on the nature of the proposals involved.	SPD should not be interpreted as a definitive statement of area based judgments.
Whole Doc	<b>189</b> Mrs Gail Stoehr (Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum)	<b>957</b> Observations	Concerned that the location of wind turbines has the potential to affect the use of Rights of Way. Although the document is limited to landscape character in places it goes beyond this and addresses nature conservation and recreation interests. It would be practical to extend this to include protection and enhancement of access opportunities either in this document or seperate guidance. The guidance also fails to address routes from which the public are able to view the landscape, this ommission must be rectified.	No change required. This document is purely concerned with landscape character and the location of renewable energy schemes it does not include other factors that would need to be considered when assessing wind turbine applications. Rights of Way are dealt with by policies in the emerging Core Strategy.
Whole Doc	<b>75</b> Mr Graham King for Countryside Agency (Countryside Agency)	<b>958</b> Observations	Welcome the proposed production of the supplementary guidance on Wind Power and the general approach taken in the Draft document. We particularly welcome the use of the Landscape Character Assessment to underpin the SPD.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>962</b> Support	Welcome the SPD. It will be useful for developers and the Local Planning Authority in the production and assessment of wind turbine proposals.	Noted



Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>963</b> Observations	There is no reference to anemometer masts, these need to be properly recognised as a necessary preliminary to an application for a wind turbine development. The Local Authority will no doubt be more comfortable in approving such masts if it is able formally, through the SPD, to make clear that approval for an anemometer mast in no way prejudices the outcome of any subsequent wind-farm application. We consider that such a position could helpfully be set out in the SPD.	Accept that the erection of an anemometer mast in no way prejudices an application for a wind turbine. National guidance allows for the erection of anemometer masts for temporary periods, it is therefore not necessary to repeat this in the SPD.
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>964</b> Observations	In para 1.6 “believed to be” really is unnecessarily tentative given the scientific evidence.	Point accepted, the wording of this paragraph will be changed.
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>965</b> Observations	Potential capacity. We welcome the approach taken to the capacity of areas such as the Fens and Fen Margin and Central Claylands for a range of wind developments up to 24 turbines, although suspect that the “no more than one” position taken with regard to medium scale 13-24 turbine developments may not be a defensible one in these landscapes. Also, whilst recognising the high settlement density of the Northern Wolds, the sizeable extent of this area suggests that restricting its capacity to “no more than one” in the small scale 2-3 turbine category is also inappropriate.	No change required. The SPD gives guidance only, and emphasises that each case will be informed by a site-specific analysis. It is not meant to be a definitive statement with respect to location, and each application will need to go through the Development Control process and will be assessed on its own merits.



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>966</b> Observations	Visual impact in relation to vertical elements. The guidance in places urges that areas with a large number of vertical elements should be avoided to prevent clutter, and elsewhere to avoid areas which have an absence of built structures. There is ambiguity here, and the attitude towards vertical elements needs to be clear.	No change required. The guidance is given for different character areas and addresses the characteristics of those particular landscapes, the guidance is therefore not conflicting.
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>967</b> Observations	As a minor point, picture 5.2 should be altered as the turbines are within topple distance of the road and this would be poor practice.	No change required. This picture is indicative and purely illustrates how wind turbines could relate to the roads.
Whole Doc	<b>190</b> Mr Peter Lee (Renewables East)	<b>968</b> Observations	Finally, we would urge that for those who consider the SPD to be too generous in its provision for wind farms, every opportunity be taken to stress that such are the constraints imposed by other factors such as aviation, wind speed, grid connection and residential amenity and wildlife considerations that the actual capacity of Huntingdonshire will be substantially less than the theoretical capacity suggested in the SPD.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>168</b> Zoe Gallin (Defence Estates Operations)	<b>969</b> Observations	The MOD wish to be consulted specifically on any proposed schemes/ developments in its safeguarded zones that meet the criteria on the relevant plans.	Noted
Whole Doc	<b>168</b> Zoe Gallin (Defence Estates Operations)	<b>970</b> Observations	Would like to draw your attention to s25 of PPS22. This requires that LPAs should satisfy themselves that MOD issues are satisfied before considering applications for wind turbines in the planning authority area. A pre-planning consultation procedure exists	Noted



Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
			for developers to engage with MOD to determine if we are likely to have any concerns with their proposals.	



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

#### 1.2 Chapter 1

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 1	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>907</b> Observations	Agree with chapter 1 especially paragraph 1.3 and 1.4 and note the difficulties in 1.9	Noted
Para 1.3	<b>172</b> Mr Gareth Ridewood (CPRE Cambridgeshire )	<b>872</b> Other	Add tranquility - support 1.4	Point accepted. The word tranquility will be added.
Para 1.10	<b>75</b> Mr Graham King for Countryside Agency (Countryside Agency)	<b>959</b> Support	The Countryside Agency warmly welcomes the use of Landscape Character Assessment to underpin this SPD. We consider that, taken together with the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment, the document provides a thorough and logical assessment of the landscape character of the District and the capacity of the various identified landscape types to accommodate particular types of wind turbine development.	Noted
Para 1.12	<b>75</b> Mr Graham King for Countryside Agency (Countryside Agency)	<b>960</b> Support	Endorse the final two bullet points of this paragraph and the importance of detailed site investigation for each particular proposal.	Noted

## 1.3 Chapter 2

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 2	<b>19</b> Miss Susan Jeggo (British Horse Society (Cambs))	<b>855</b> Object	The effect on Public Rights of Way is omitted in the SPD. There needs to be a safety margin between PROW and turbines to reduce; the risk of ice/snow falling during starting up, the startling effect upon horses, the flicker and whirl of blades.	No change required. This document is purely concerned with landscape character and the location of renewable energy schemes it does not include other factors that would need to be considered when assessing wind turbine applications.
Chapter 2	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>909</b> Observations	Catworth Parish Council wants clarification on how the classification of High/ Moderate/ Low was reached as this criteria is not shown in the document.	The SPD is based on a report 'Wind Turbine Development in Huntingdonshire' produced by Land Use Consultants. This report includes detail on how the classifications were reached.
Para 2.11	<b>172</b> Mr Gareth Ridewood (CPRE Cambridgeshire )	<b>873</b> Support	Support	Noted
Para 2.13	<b>75</b> Mr Graham King for Countryside Agency (Countryside Agency)	<b>961</b> Support	The Countryside Agency endorses the qualification noted here and welcomes the guidance given on the evaluation of cumulative impacts for each of the landscape character areas which is pragmatic and reasonable.	Noted
Table 2.1	<b>13</b> Mr Martin Baker (The WildlifeTrust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough)	<b>870</b> Support	Support the approach taken. Generally support efforts to increase renewable energy supply but wish to see maximum efforts on reducing the need and demand for energy in the first place.	Noted. The issue of energy efficiency is addressed in the emerging Core Strategy.



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Table 2.1	<b>182</b> Mr P.J. Ward	<b>945</b> Observations	Wind Turbines make no contribution to the reduction of greenhouse gases.	No change required. The SPD has not been produced to debate the merits of wind turbine development, it has been produced from the starting point that wind turbine applications will continue to come forward in the district and to provide guidance on the landscape impacts of this type of development.

### 1.4 Chapter 3

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 3	<b>13</b> Mr Martin Baker (The WildlifeTrust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough)	<b>869</b> Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the explicit recognition given to the Great Fen Project throughout this chapter and the approach proposed by Huntingdonshire District Council.	Noted
Chapter 3	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>919</b> Observations	Agree chapter 3	Noted





**1.5 Chapter 4**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 4	<b>169</b> Jackie Stanbridge (Sawtry Parish Council)	<b>860</b> Observations	Should turbines be placed in or around Sawtry they should be restricted to a maximum of three.	Noted
Chapter 4	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>923</b> Observations	Agree chapter 4	Noted

**1.6 Chapter 5**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 5	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>925</b> Observations	Agree chapter 5	Noted

**1.7 Chapter 6**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 6	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>926</b> Observations	Agree chapter 6	Noted



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

#### 1.8 Chapter 7

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 7	<b>167</b> Kirstin Rayner (Gamlingay Parish Council)	<b>857</b> Object	Paragraphs 7.1 and 7.3 (a). Concern over consideration of the area surrounding Waresley for accommodation of a wind turbine site. Gamlingay Parish Council object to inclusion of this landscape as it undulates and is enclosed. Further objections relate to visual impact of wind turbines and the proximity to local airports at Little Gransden.	No change required. The guidance identifies the need to consider carefully the southern undulating area and for small-scale and medium groups states that this area should be avoided. The proximity of local areas is not considered as part of this SPD but would be considered when proposals for wind turbine developments come forward and have a detailed site-specific assessment.
Chapter 7	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>927</b> Observations	Agree chapter 7	Noted

## 1.9 Chapter 8

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Resposne
Chapter 8	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>918</b> Object	Catworth Parish Council thinks the definition of 'plateau' should be clarified. The Parish Council is puzzled about 8.1(a) and 8.3(b) with comments about Kimbolton. It was felt that the references to Kimbolton were inappropriate/ prescriptive.	No change required. The plateau can be seen by looking at the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment topography map. The references to Kimbolton are given as an example of a historic assessment rather than being prescriptive.
Chapter 8	<b>187</b> Mr Stuart Whiting (E.ON UK)	<b>951</b> Observations	The guidance in the final document differs from the LUC. Specifically in relation to the size of a small-scale development in the Northern Wolds	No change required. Within the summary table in the LUC document the Northern Wolds are identified as having a high capacity for accomodating a group of 2-3 turbines but a low capacity of accomodating a group of 4-12 turbines. This conflicts with the guidance given within the Northern Wolds section of the report. We are of the opinion that once a development of wind turbines exceeds 3 there is a significant increase in the impact this can have. It is for these reasons that the final document differs from the original study.
Para 8.3	<b>186</b> Mr Ian Baker (Covington Parish Meeting)	<b>950</b> Observations	Fully Support maximum of 2/3 turbines and the features listed in the guidance paragraphs a-j. We believe other factors of i) effect on wildlife, and ii) effect of construction traffic (when building turbine groups) on villages and rural roads should be considered.	No change required. This document is purely concerned with landscape character and the location of renewable energy schemes it does not include other factors that would need to be considered when assessing wind turbine applications.



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

#### 1.10 Chapter 9

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 9	<b>157</b> Mr P J Howard (Perry Parish Council)	<b>828</b> Object	Concerned that consideration is being given to development of wind turbines in the vicinity of Grafham Water. A turbine would not form a focal point it would be an eyesore, location near the visitor centre would have noise and amenity impacts and turbine development would have serious impacts on the bird population.	No change required. The SPD only provides guidance on the capacity of landscapes to accommodate wind turbine development it is not a definitive statement. Every application for wind turbine development would need to have a detailed site-specific analysis which would consider the merits of that particular proposal. Many of the concerns including impacts on wildlife and amenity will be addressed by policies in the emerging Core Strategy.
Chapter 9	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>929</b> Observations	Agree chapter 9	Noted.
Chapter 9	<b>66</b> Chantal Hagen for English Nature (English Nature)	<b>954</b> Support with conditions	Support statement relating to need to consider potential impacts upon Grafham Water SSSI. English Nature is of the opinion that applications for wind turbines should be accompanied by detail on the impact on both breeding and wintering birds as well as passage migrants. Support paragraph 9.2 that it is unlikely there would be scope for accommodating more than one turbine.	Noted.



**1.11 Chapter 10**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 10	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>930</b> Comments	Agree chapter 10	Noted
Chapter 10	<b>174</b> Mr Ewan Rayner (Ellington Parish council)  <b>173</b> Mr Ewan Rayner (Ellington Parish council)	<b>937</b> Object	We believe that this area of natural beauty would be spoilt by the addition of wind turbines. In particular the area either side of Ellington Brook including the ridge to the north is already cluttered with a number of pylons, telephone masts etc. The visual impact of such development in this area would be horrific.	No change required. The guidance already comments on the sensitivity of the ridge between the Kym and the Ellington Brooks, and specifically mentions the avoidance of additional vertical elements in this character area.

**1.12 Chapter 11**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 11	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>931</b> Observations	Agree chapter 11	Noted



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

#### 1.13 Chapter 12

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 12	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>932</b> Observations	Comments noted	Noted
Para 12.6	<b>66</b> Chantal Hagen for English Nature (English Nature)	<b>953</b> Support	English Nature supports statements set out in paragraph j of section 12.6 relating to the need for applicants to "ensure development does not have an adverse effect upon the function of the area in relation to the town, for example in terms of its recreational function, nature conservation function, or open space function".	Noted

#### 1.14 Chapter 13

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 13	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>933</b> Observations	Comments noted	Noted



**1.15 Chapter 14**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 14	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>934</b> Observations	Comments noted	Noted

**1.16 Chapter 15**

Policy Area	Applicant/Organisation	Nature	Summary	Council Response
Chapter 15	<b>92</b> Mrs Joan Meiklejohn for Catworth PC (Catworth Parish Council)	<b>935</b> Observations	Comments noted	Noted



## 1 Responses to Wind Power SPD

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses





# Responses to Sustainability Appraisal 2

Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses



## 2 Responses to Sustainability Appraisal

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

## 2 Responses to Sustainability Appraisal

### Summary of Comments to the Sustainability Appraisal and Council Response

Applicant /Organisation	Page Number	Table Number	Nature	Comment	Council Response
P.R. Leary - Hemingford Grey Preservation Association	10		Observations	In looking at Option 1 (to produce a wind power SPD) we fail to understand how identifying areas for wind turbine development could positively effect objectives 2.2 and 3.2. Such statements appear to argue for wind turbine developments to provide their 'beneficial influences'	No change required. The SPD does not identify areas for wind turbine development it provides guidance on the capacity of landscapes to accommodate wind turbine development. It therefore will help guide wind turbine development to locations where they can be accommodated in the landscape. Therefore by producing the SPD there will be a positive effect on landscape character and reduced risk to damage of wildlife and species in comparison to not producing the SPD.
P.R. Leary - Hemingford Grey Preservation Association	11		Observations	In seeking to 'maintain and enhance the viability of habitats and species' the Council suggests that without guidance on siting there is more risk of damage to habitats and species. Surely not if a comprehensive environmental impact statement is required with the application and before approval. A similar comment applies to the objective of avoiding 'damage to protected sites and historic buildings'.	No change required. This document does not deal with specific sites, it provides guidance on the general capacity of landscapes to accommodate wind turbine development. It will help to guide proposals to the most appropriate locations before the detailed site-specific assessment stage takes place and will therefore have a more positive impact on objective 2.1 than not producing the SPD would have.



Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Applicant /Organisation	Page Number	Table Number	Nature	Comment	Council Response
P.R. Leary - Hemingford Grey Preservation Association			Observations	This association argues that not producing a SPD is the preferred route with the onus being placed on developers to justify an application together with all the necessary environmental impact considerations.	No change required. Producing guidance on the capacity of landscapes to accommodate wind turbines will clearly have a more positive impact on landscape character than not producing the SPD as it will help guide development to the most appropriate locations before the detailed site specific analysis is carried out.
Mrs Joan Meiklejohn - Catworth Parish Council			Observations	Agree with Part A, especially paragraphs 1.2, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4	Noted.
Mrs Joan Meiklejohn - Catworth Parish Council			Observations	Agree with Part B	Noted.
Mrs Joan Meiklejohn - Catworth Parish Council			Observations	Agree with Part C - in paragraph 9.1 and 9.2. The Parish Council note the main difficulties in grouping the potential impact of the SPD as specific locations for development are not defined in the document.	Noted.
Mrs Joan Meiklejohn - Catworth Parish Council			Observations	Agree with Part D - especially paragraphs 11.3, 11.4, 11.5 and Table 1.	Noted.
Mrs Joan Meiklejohn - Catworth Parish Council			Observations	Agree with Table 2A (not the option table 2B)	Noted.
Mrs Joan Meiklejohn - Catworth Parish Council			Observations	Agree with Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.	Noted.



## 2 Responses to Sustainability Appraisal

### Appendix 1 | Wind Power Consultation Responses

Applicant /Organisation	Page Number	Table Number	Nature	Comment	Council Response
Ewan Rayner - Ellington Parish Council	10	2A	Object	We fail to see how item 3.2 - 'Maintain and enhance landscapes and townscapes' can possibly have a potentially significant beneficial effect. Talking parochially to have wind turbines in the valley of Ellington Brook or indeed on the ridge to the north of the brook would have a definite adverse affect on the landscape.	No change required. The guidance comments on the sensitivity of the ridge between the Kym and Ellington Brooke and therefore highlights the need for these to be considered. The provision of detailed guidance clearly has a positive effect on objective 3.2