

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable Energy (Commercial Scale)

Consultation period –17th April to 30th May 2014

Statement of Representations

CONTACT: Forward Planning Team

Tel. 01353 665555

Email: ldf@eastcambs.gov.uk

Website www.eastcambs.gov.uk/local-development-framework/supplementary-planning-documents

CONTENTS

	Page number
1. Overview of consultation	2
2. Summary of main issues raised	3
3. General comments relating to whole document	6
4. Specific comments on the Introduction section	11
5. Specific comments on the Overview section	13
6. Specific comments on landscape matters	21
7. Specific comments on heritage matters	29
8. Specific comments on biodiversity matters	37
9. Specific comments on residential amenity matters	49
10. Specific comments on safeguarding areas	60
11. Specific comments on access issues	63
12. Specific comments on site restoration	67
13. Specific comments on electromagnetic interference	71

1. Overview of consultation

This document sets out the results of consultation on the Draft SPD on Developer Contributions, held between 17th April and 30th May 2014. Publicity on the document involved:

- Notifying approximately 2,800 key stakeholders via email (including developers, agents, landowners, Parish and Town Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and neighbouring local planning authorities)
- Consultation documents published on homepage of the Council's website

A total of 40 people/organisations commented on the Draft SPD – making approximately 180 comments. A summary of the main issues raised is set out in section 2 below. A summary of the responses made on each part of the SPD is set out in section 3 below. Details of proposed amendments to the Draft SPD are also shown in the tables. Deleted text is shown with ~~strikethrough~~ and new text as **bold**.

Responses were received from the following people/organisations:

1. Barton Willmore on behalf of RES UK and Ireland Ltd (Nichola Traverse-Healey)	21. Middle Level Commissioners (Graham Moore)
2. Cambridgeshire County Council (James Tipping)	22. Gill Monk
3. Steve Cheetham	23. Simon Monk
4. CPRE Cambridgeshire (Sheila Fieldhouse)	24. Alan and Dawn Mustill
5. Martin Colthrope	25. National Trust (Peter Crofts)
6. English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Woolridge)	26. Natural England (Janet Nutall)
7. F C Palmer & Sons (Kier Petherick)	27. Mrs P Norman
8. Alison Finn	28. Marilyn Parkes
9. Barbara Grafton	29. Richard Parkes
10. Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	30. Julie Parr
11. Grant Hayes	31. RSPB (Amy Crossley)
12. Valerie Horspool	32. Jonathan Sanford
13. Mrs Jane Howell	33. Cllr Robert Stevens (ECDC member)
14. Cllr Bill Hunt (ECDC member)	34. Simon Stirrup
15. Donald Igoe	35. Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group
16. Alan James	36. Andrew Taylor
17. David Jordan	37. Connie Vincent
18. Steve Jones	38. Cllr Gareth Wilson (ECDC member)
19. Sally MacEachern	39. Cllr Pauline A Wilson (ECDC member)
20. Paul Mason	40. Kevin Woolstenholmes

2. Summary of main issues raised

Overall purpose	
Lack of sufficient detail to provide developers or local residents and groups with a clear indication of what ECDC is looking for from a planning application.	Steve Cheetham, Haddenham Parish Council and Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group

Benefits of renewable energy	
Concerned that paragraph 2.2 is an unbalanced statement in favour of renewable energy	Steve Cheetham, Haddenham Parish Council, Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group
Concerned that a number of the identified environmental, economic or social benefits have disadvantages	Jane Howell

Community engagement	
Community engagement should take place at the screening opinion stage	Grant Hayes
Reference should be made to the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure and Section 62A Applications) England Amendment Order 2013 and the requirement for pre-application consultation.	Haddenham Parish Council, Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group
A requirement to consult with the local community regarding the selection of representative viewpoints and noise monitoring locations	Haddenham Parish Council, Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group
Consultation should be with all parishes within sight of applications.	Cllr Bill Hunt (ECDC member)
Applicants should be advised to undertake pre-application discussions with Middle Level Commissioners before any screening/scoping opinions are sought or planning applications submitted.	Middle Level Commissioners (Graham Moore)
When determining renewable energy schemes ECDC should take into consideration the views of affected local communities	Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Respondents
Applicants are required to consider visual impacts which may not be of any relevance to the planning application.	Barton Willmore on behalf of RES UK and Ireland Ltd (Nichola Traverse-Healey)
The visual impact of proposals for connected to the electricity network does not normally form of the planning application for renewable energy proposals.	
Inclusion of reference to Landscape Institute Guidelines for Visual and Landscape Impact Assessment	Haddenham Parish Council, Natural England, Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group

Separation from residential/commercial properties	Respondents
Should include a specified distance of 2km from wind turbines to the nearest	Martin Colthrope, Mrs V J Horspool, David Jordan, Stop Berry

residential property.	Wind Farm Action Group, Andrew Taylor, Cllr Pauline Wilson (ECDC Councillor) Kevin Woolstenholmes
Minimum distance should be specified between a turbine and a domestic residence.	Paul Mason, Simon Stirrup
Ensure that any future development of wind turbines is sited well away from any village or town	Julie Parr
The council has an obligation to guarantee that there are no unacceptable noise or visual impacts is to maintain an adequate separation distance between a turbine and the surrounding dwellings and businesses	Jonathan Sanford
If wind turbines are located at least twenty rotor diameters from settlements, they will be more acceptable.	Cllr Robert Stevens (ECDC Councillor)
Consider inclusion of a separation distance from residential properties which is based upon both distance from properties and the height of the turbine.	Cllr Gareth Wilson (ECDC Councillor)

Heritage Assets	Respondents
The guidance in section 4.4 is ambiguous and inconsistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF.	Barton Willmore on behalf of RES UK and Ireland Ltd (Nichola Traverse-Healey)
Include reference to relevant English Heritage guidance relating to onshore wind farms	Steve Cheetham, English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Woolridge), Haddenham Parish Council, Natural England, Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group
Include reference to nationally significant archaeological sites	English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Woolridge)
Lack of reference to renewable energy schemes avoiding harm to listed building and conservation areas and their settings.	English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Woolridge)
Greater protection should be given to Ely Cathedral	Mrs V J Horspool, Gill Monk, Simon Monk and Mrs P Norman
Include reference to the need to protect conservation areas	Marilyn Parkes, Kevin Woolstenholmes
Renewable energy schemes should avoid historic parks and gardens	English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Woolridge)
The SPD should allow for the development of small scale biomass plants in historic park and gardens.	National Trust (Peter Crofts)

Biodiversity	Respondents
District Council should develop a wildlife sensitive map of Cambridgeshire with other organisations including neighbouring local authorities.	Cambridgeshire County Council (James Tipping)
Renewable energy schemes should not be within 5 miles of a SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest)	Gill Monk, Simon Monk
Include reference to relevant biodiversity guidance relating to onshore wind farms	Haddenham Parish Council, Natural England, RSPB, Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group
Include additional text relating to the requirements of the Habitats Directive and the need for project level appropriate assessment.	Natural England, RSPB
SSSIs and the Ouse Washes project being led by the Environment Agency should be protected from renewable energy development.	Connie Vincent

Residential amenity	Respondents
Include reference to Institute of Acoustics Guidance relating to noise impact assessments	Steve Cheetham, Haddenham Parish Council, Mrs Horspool, Mrs Howell and Stop Berry Fen Wind Farm Action Group
Include reference to 'shadow flicker' as an issue to be considered	Steve Cheetham, Haddenham Parish Council
Concerned about use of ESTU-R-97 guidance as the methodology for noise impact assessments	Alan James and Mrs Jane Howell
Solar panels are made with anti reflective materials therefore solar glare is not a real problem.	F. C. Palmer & Sons (Kier Petherick)

Access and Public Rights of Way	Respondents
Strengthen wording to protect and enhance rights of way	Natural England (Janet Nutall)
New section should be included relating to anaerobic digestion plants including restrictions on operating hours and ensuring material is not deposited on public roads.	Cllr Pauline A Wilson (E CDC member)

Agricultural land	Respondents
Solar farms should not be permitted on agricultural land of grades 1, 2 and 3a.	CPRE (Cambridgeshire)
The SPD is contrary to Solar Trade Association Best Practice Guidance, NPPF, Town and Country Planning Act and Government policy	Alison Finn
Consider how the SPD relates to paragraph 112 of the NPPF.	Natural England (Janet Nutall)

Economic/social impacts	Respondents
Include consideration of negative economic impact on residents where wind farms are located close to residential areas	Donald Igoe

3. General comments relating to the whole document

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Barton Willmore on behalf of RES UK (Nichola Traverse-Healey)	1	RES is generally supportive of the approach set out in the SPD in relation to issues including heritage, biodiversity and residential amenity.	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
Cambridgeshire County Council (James Tipping/Graham Thomas)	2	Cambridgeshire County Council welcomes the draft Renewable Energy SPD and is generally supportive of its contents.	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
CPRE Cambridgeshire (Sheila Fieldhouse)	4	We welcome the draft SPD and the sections on visual landscape impact and key views.	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge)	6	We broadly welcome the various references to the historic environment throughout the document.	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
F. C. Palmer & Sons (Kier Petherick)	7	Well put together document and a very useful guide for anyone submitting a planning application.	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
Barbara Grafton	9	<p>Concerned about the ineffectiveness of wind energy. The current government clearly recognises this and has committed to phasing out subsidies to the industry.</p> <p>Solar energy: concerned about the amount of high grade farmland which is being lost to food production.</p> <p>Anaerobic Digestion: Biomass is not a green energy. I refer you to the biomass factsheet</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is agreed that the SPD should emphasise the need avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land within the district as a result of development of solar farms. Therefore it is proposed to amend the wording of paragraph 9.3 of the SPD.</p> <p>The Government's definition of renewable and low carbon energy as set out in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes reference to biomass. It is therefore considered appropriate to refer to biomass plants as part of this SPD.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.3 as follows:</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance states that renewable energy proposals should allow for continued agricultural use. In the case of solar farms there is potential for land to remain in agricultural use following development e.g. grazing. Applicants will be expected to provide details of the amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed and to what extent this will remain in agricultural use. Applicants should also explain how the site is intended to be restored to agricultural use.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guide emphasises the need to focus the development of large scale solar farms on previously developed land (which is not of</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				<p>high environmental value) or non agricultural land. The aim is to ensure that solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are located on buildings or on previously developed land to avoid the need to develop greenfield land.</p> <p>Where it is proposed to develop a solar farm on a greenfield site applicants will be expected to provide the following information as part of the planning application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed as part of the application; • Alternative sites which have been considered including the agricultural or environmental value of these sites and why these have been discounted; • To what extent the proposed site will remain in agricultural use and be restored; and • How the site is intended to be restored to
Cllr Bill Hunt (ECDC member)	13	Large scale wind turbines should only be considered where there is substantial local benefit, support by residents and branches of local democracy. (Elected Parish Councillors, District Councillors, County Councillors, Members of Parliament and European Parliament) and after extensive consultation. Consultation should be with all parishes within sight of applications.	Agree (in part): It is proposed to amend the SPD to refer to the requirement for engagement will all affected local communities, and for wide and effective consultation.	Amend paragraph 2.5.1 as follows: 'The District Council will expect applicants to demonstrate that they have fully engaged with all local communities affected by the presence of the proposal , residents and community groups in the development of renewable energy proposals. The exact details of consultation are not prescribed as this should be proportionate to the scale of development and issues involved. However, applicants will be expected to make use of public events and exhibitions in locations which will be affected by the proposed development (including any areas outside of the district). '

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Mrs P Norman	26	I have several reservations about this document not least that it is far too generic and in no way tailored either to local needs or landscape or the wishes of the local population.	Agree (in part): It is accepted that further detail should be provided in the Draft SPD to clarify the type of information that applicants will be required to provide (dependent upon the proposed technology) and in what circumstances planning permission is likely to be refused.	Additional wording is proposed to be included in the following sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact assessment and key views • Heritage assets • Biodiversity and geology • Residential amenity • Safeguarding areas • Site restoration and continuation of agricultural use
Steve Cheetham	3	A new chapter should be added to the SPD entitled 'Grid Connection'.	Disagree: Reference is already made to the need to consider the visual impacts of infrastructure associated with renewable energy proposals. Therefore it is not considered necessary to have a separate chapter relating to the connection of renewable schemes to the National Grid.	No change to the SPD.
Mrs V J Horspool	12	The renewable energy source should provide the maximum output possible in order to justify the disturbance associated with construction and to meet the promised level of energy to be provided. Applications for future expansion, once the original size has been agreed, should only be allowed after further extensive public consultation and comprehensive study of the impact already experienced in the local community		No change to the SPD.
Alan and Dawn Mustill	23	Anaerobic digestion – we think that is a good way for producing reliable renewable energy. The only negative impact we are aware of is the mud carried on to the roads when the crop is harvested in wet conditions. Biomass (dry) – is also a reliable way of producing energy, local employment and causes no harm to wildlife. However we	Support noted. Agree in (part): It is proposed to refer to the type of planning conditions which could be required to anaerobic digestion plants relating to hours of operation, wheel cleaning and the covering of loads which are to be transported.	Amend paragraph 8.2 (point 4) as follows: Catchment and vehicle restrictions: The District Council will also consider the need to impose restrictions on the distance travelled by vehicles to provide suitable biodegradable materials to be used in anaerobic digestion plants in the district. Planning conditions may also be applied to ensure the use of wheel washing equipment to ensure that

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>no straw litter from lorries causes annoyance to residents at Haddenham at times.</p> <p>We strongly object to on-shore wind turbines in inappropriate locations such as those proposed at Berry Fen near Aldreth.</p> <p>Solar power – we think this is a good way of producing renewable energy and is well suited to the area. As long as solar farms are located at a reasonable distance from the houses they do not stand out. There is also the possibility to reduce their visual impact further by screening with hedges. We are told that the land below panels can be used for grazing sheep and that there are no significant adverse effects on wildlife.</p>		<p>material is not deposited on the public highway.</p>
Mrs P Norman	26	<p>The production of biomass fuels also takes prime farmland out of production Perhaps any development should be accompanied by a bond from developers to fund clearing of highways.</p> <p>We have no waves to harness so our waste water treatment plants should be put to work at least on a very local basis.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): It is proposed to refer to the type of planning conditions which could be required to anaerobic digestion plants relating to hours of operation, wheel cleaning and the covering of loads which are to be transported.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 8.2 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>'Catchment and vehicle restrictions: The District Council will also consider the need to impose restrictions on the distance travelled by vehicles to provide suitable biodegradable materials to be used in anaerobic digestion plants in the district. Planning conditions may also be applied to ensure the use of wheel washing equipment to ensure that material is not deposited on the public highway.'</p>
Cllr Robert Stevens (ECDC member)	33	<p>People may become more accepting of the idea of producing energy locally. There are now some parishes actively establishing their own schemes.</p> <p>Energy crops take much more land than solar farms perhaps 10 times more for the same amount of energy produced.</p> <p>Wind turbines take very little space and the area around may be farmed. Local</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through the</p>	<p>No change to the SPD.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>authorities need to allocate land for energy schemes or steer potential applicants to better locations. If wind turbines are located at least twenty rotor diameters from settlements, they will be more acceptable in terms of visual impact and noise.</p> <p>There is plenty of scope for renewable energy schemes in East Cambridgeshire. The District Council has an area of 650km².. Current solar farms occupy less than 3km²</p>	<p>inflexible rules on separation distances.</p> <p>It is therefore not considered appropriate to include a specific separation distance from residential properties.</p>	

4. Specific comments on the Introduction section

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Steve Cheetham	3	Draft SPD does not include sufficient detail to provide developers or local residents with a clear indication of what ECDC is looking for. It is a general statement of the process.	Agree (in part): It is accepted that further detail should be provided in the Draft SPD to clarify the type of information that applicants will be required to provide (dependent upon the proposed technology) and in what circumstances planning permission is likely to be granted or refused.	Additional wording is proposed to be included in the following sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact assessment and key views • Heritage assets • Biodiversity and geology • Residential amenity • Safeguarding areas • Site restoration and continuation of agricultural use
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	As above.	Agree (in part): As above.	As above.
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	34	As above.	Agree (in part): As above	As above.
Alison Hayes	11	Section 1.1.4 is not objective and suggests the default is to support all proposals for renewable energy schemes regardless of impact. The benefits outlined in the second sentence are not specific, and are not justified and the sentence should be omitted. Significant environmental and social disadvantages are not alluded to.	Agree (in part): The proposed wording in paragraph 1.1.4 is consistent with that set out in the Local Plan. However it is accepted that there is a need to include more reference to potential adverse effects on renewable energy development.	Amend the final sentence of paragraph 1.1.4 as follows (amended text in bold): ' This draft SPD relates to Policy EN 4 in the Council's Core Strategy (2009). The Council's emerging policies on renewable energy development, as set out in the Draft East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (as proposed to be modified in the Council's schedule of changes dated April October 2014). The draft Local Plan recognises that renewable energy development can have wider environmental, social and environmental benefits and that proposals will be supported wherever possible. The policies set criteria against which planning applications for renewable energy development will be assessed'
Cllr Robert Stevens (ECDC member)	32	Although the document is aimed at commercial schemes, perhaps more mention of community-led schemes	Agree: It would be helpful to refer to community led renewable energy schemes in paragraph	Amend paragraph 1.1.3 as follows: 'This SPD focuses on larger stand alone

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		should be made, such as in paragraph 1.1.3?	1.1.3.	renewable energy schemes of a commercial scale. It is also intended to cover larger renewable energy schemes which are proposed by local communities and community organisations'

5. Specific comments on overview section

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Cambridgeshire County Council (James Tipping)	2	<p>The Draft SPD makes clear reference to the Cambridgeshire Renewable Infrastructure Framework (CRIF). CRIF identifies East Cambridgeshire as having the potential to deliver 20% of the estimated renewable energy capacity within Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan Policy ENV 6 is sufficiently supportive of renewable energy development and feeds well into the SPD.</p>	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>Section 2.2 Section 2.2 talks about the benefits of renewable energy but there is no counter balance, e.g. potential harm. Section 2.2 should be removed.</p> <p>Other Government policies should be referred to, including Climate Change Act, NPPF, NPPG and National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy.</p> <p>Should include the following statement:</p> <p><i>'The NPPF is clear in paragraphs 97 and 98 whilst local authorities should design policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development, they should ensure that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily'.</i></p> <p>Policy ENV 6 should include recreational amenity and highways as factors that should be made acceptable and protected species should be changed to biodiversity generally.</p>	<p>Section 2.2 - Disagree: The purpose of paragraph 2.2 is to summarise the wider social, economic and environment benefits of renewable energy generation. The potential for adverse impacts as a result of renewable energy development and how this should be considered by applicants is outlined in sections 3,4,5,6 7 and 8 of the SPD.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector who has been appointed to examine the Council's Local Plan will recommend any changes which are required to Policy ENV 6 to make the Local Plan 'sound' so that it can be adopted. Applications for renewable energy will also be considered against policies ENV 7 (Biodiversity and geology) and COM 7 (Transport Impact) of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Section 2.4.8 - Agree (in part): It</p>	<p>Add new text to follow paragraph 2.4.7 as follows:</p> <p>Applicants will be expected to provide the following information when proposing a renewable energy scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of community consultation undertaken and the outcomes of this work (see section 2.5 for further details). • Design and Access Statement including the justification of the proposed design of turbines, photovoltaic panels, plant and security fencing and lighting etc. • Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (see Section 3 for further details) • Heritage Statement outlining any adverse impacts on the significance of heritage assets and their setting (see section 4 for further details). • Sufficient information relating to any adverse impacts upon biodiversity including ecological assessments,

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p><u>Section 2.4.8</u> There should be a statement defining when a full EIA assessment will be needed, and a list of information required when submitting a wind turbine application.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure and Section 62A Applications) England Amendment Order 2013 and the requirement for pre-application consultation.</p> <p>Developers should be required to provide evidence to validate any claims for the estimated amount of electricity produced. This will require publication of any wind data specific to the site.</p> <p>The word remediate should replace ameliorate as the original proposed change softens the requirements for developers.</p> <p>A new chapter should be added entitled 'Dwelling Distance'.</p>	<p>would be helpful to make it clear that applicants will be required to provide an Environmental Statement where required to do so by the EIA regulations.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5.1 of the SPD and the related footnote refer to the requirement for pre-application consultation where two or more wind turbines are proposed or a wind turbine is greater than 15m in height. Therefore it is not considered necessary to include reference to this requirement in paragraph 2.5.2 of the SPD.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable energy. However it is accepted that the electricity generating capacity of proposed renewable energy schemes would be useful background information which should be provided with planning applications.</p>	<p>surveys and ecological management plans and proposed mitigation measures (see section 5 for further details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise impact assessment (see section 6 for further details) • Air quality impact assessment (see section 6 for further details) • Transport Statement (see section 8 for further details) • Information relating to the potential loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a). • The expected electricity generating capacity of the proposal. <p>Amend paragraph 2.4.8 as follows:</p> <p>'Applicants maywill be required to provide an Environmental Statement with a planning application in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment as required by the EIA Regulations 2011. The District Council is required to provideadvise to applicants regarding the need for an Environmental Statement to be prepared (known as a Screening Opinion).</p> <p>Where two or more wind turbines are proposed or the hub height of any wind turbine exceeds 15 metres as outlined in Schedule 2 of the Regulations it will need to be screened to determine whether significant effects are likely and a Environmental Statement should be prepared. Wind turbine development which does not exceed these thresholds is unlikely to require an Environmental Statement. In relation to other types of renewable energy development these are</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				not specifically listed in Schedule 2 of the Regulations. Therefore the District Council will determine whether a development will require an Environment Statement dependent upon whether it will have significant effects on the environment. Where an Environmental Statement is required the District Council can also provide advice to applicants on the content and matters which should be included in the Statement (known as a Scoping Opinion).'
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	As above, except last two comments. [In addition:] A requirement to consult with the local community regarding the selection of representative viewpoints and noise monitoring locations. The following restrictions should be placed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biomass plants should have restricted opening hours for deliveries and the Council would suggest between 7am and 7pm on weekdays and between 7am and 12 noon on Saturdays/weekends. • Wheel cleaning equipment should be always be used when leaving a field and also on site at the plants. • Loads should be covered at all times when being transported. 	See above. [In addition:] Agreed (in part): It is proposed to refer to the type of planning conditions which could be required to anaerobic digestion plants relating to hours of operation, wheel cleaning and the covering of loads which are to be transported.	See proposed changes in text box above. New text to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 4) as follows: 'Use of planning conditions: The District Council will apply appropriate planning conditions (dependent upon the proposed renewable technology) in relation to hours of operation and acceptable levels of noise etc.' Amend paragraph 8.2 (point 4) as follows: 'Catchment and vehicle restrictions: The District Council will also consider the need to impose restrictions on the distance travelled by vehicles to provide suitable biodegradable materials to be used in anaerobic digestion plants in the district. Planning conditions may also be applied to require the use of wheel washing equipment to ensure that material is not deposited on the public highway.'
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	33	As above, except last two comments (Steve Cheetham).	As above.	See proposed changes in response to Steve Cheetham text box above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>[In addition:]</p> <p>A requirement to consult with the local community regarding the selection of representative viewpoints and noise monitoring locations.</p> <p>ECDC should take into consideration the views of affected local communities as expressed by a poll or census especially where overwhelming in their opinions.</p>		
CPRE Cambridgeshire (Sheila Fieldhouse)	4	<p>Paragraph 2.2 sets out the environmental, economic and social benefits. It would be more balanced if it included a list of the disadvantages, e.g. loss of best agricultural land and the displacement of food production.</p> <p>Para. 2.3.2: The list of potential renewables sites should include reference to the anaerobic digester between Mepal and Chatteris</p> <p>Para. 2.4.5 Concerned that the issues in 2.4.5 do not include the loss of agricultural land. The only mention of agricultural land appears in section 9.</p>	<p>Para. 2.2 - Disagree: The purpose of paragraph 2.2 is to summarise the wider social, economic and environment benefits of renewable energy generation. The potential for adverse impacts as a result of renewable energy development and how this should be considered by applicants is outlined in sections 3,4,5,6 7 and 8 of the Draft SPD.</p> <p>Para. 2.3.2 - Disagree: The list of potential renewable sites is proposed to be removed from the revised final SPD, as it is not necessary and subject to change.</p> <p>Para. 2.4.5 - Agree (in part): It is accepted that the SPD should emphasise the need to avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land as a result of solar farms Therefore it is proposed to amend the wording of paragraph 9.3 of the SPD.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.3 as follows:</p> <p>'The Planning Practice Guidance states that renewable energy proposals should allow for continued agricultural use. In the case of solar farms there is potential for land to remain in agricultural use following development e.g. grazing. Applicants will be expected to provide details of the amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed and to what extent this will remain in agricultural use. Applicants should also explain how the site is intended to be restored to agricultural use.'</p> <p>'The National Planning Practice Guide emphasises the need to focus the development of large scale solar farms on previously developed land (which is not of high environmental value) or non agricultural land. The aim is to ensure that solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are located on buildings or on previously developed land to avoid the need to develop greenfield land.'</p> <p>Where it is proposed to develop a solar farm on a greenfield site applicants will be expected to provide the following information as part of the planning</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				<p>application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed as part of the application; • Alternative sites which have been considered including the agricultural or environmental value of these sites and why these have been discounted; • To what extent the proposed site will remain in agricultural use and be restored; and • How the site is intended to be restored to agricultural use.'
Alison Finn	8	<p>2.1.2 – Geothermal is missing from the list. 'Mounted into the ground' is incorrect grammar it should be 'ground-mounted'.</p> <p>2.2.1 – shareholding could be in any technology</p> <p>2.3.2 – DECC has made it clear in the Solar Strategy (published 4th April 2014), that the only solar PV that should be encouraged is on rooftops, especially those of commercial scale (factories, schools, hospitals and other public buildings).</p> <p>2.4.3 – Policy ENV 6 doesn't mention Best and Most Valuable Land and needs to be added in accordance with the NPPF, Planning Act, NPPG and Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (July 2013).</p> <p>2.4.4. – Para 109 of the NPPF should be referenced.</p> <p>2.4.5 – see comments on section 9.</p> <p>2.4.8 – the loophole, where projects were</p>	<p>Agree (in part): There is a need to amend the wording of paragraph 2.1.2 to make it clear that photovoltaic cells are mounted on frames which are set into the ground.</p> <p>It is also accepted that the SPD should emphasise the need to avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land as a result of development of solar farms. Therefore it is proposed to amend the wording of paragraph 9.3 of the SPD.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector who has been appointed to examine the Council's Local Plan will recommend any changes which are required to Policy ENV 6 to make the Local Plan 'sound' so that it can be adopted.</p>	<p>Amend the first and fourth bullet points of paragraph 2.1.2 as follows (amended text in bold):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar power: sunlight can be converted into electricity through the use of photovoltaic cells located on buildings or mounted on frames set into the ground. <p>Amend paragraph 2.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>'Shareholding (where investment is made in wind turbines or solar farms)'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.5.1 as follows:</p> <p>However wWhere two or more wind turbines or a wind turbine greater than 15 in height are proposed applicants will also required to undertake pre-application consultation as set out in current legislation'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.3, as set out in text box above.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>subdivided to avoid this has now been closed.</p> <p>2.5.1 – the grammar in the last sentence needs correcting</p> <p>2.5.3 – an attendance list should be used at all exhibitions</p>		
Martin Colthrope	5	The SPD describes a number of issues in 2.4.5, it does not consider the impact on social mobility which can result from the development of schemes such as Wind Turbines.	Disagree: The purpose of paragraph 2.4.5 is to identify potential adverse impacts as a result of proposals for renewable energy generation. It is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all potential adverse impacts.	No change to the SPD.
Grant Hayes	11	<p>2.4.3 Local heritage assets should be listed in an appendix.</p> <p>2.5 Community engagement should be performed prior to any screening opinion, rather than just at planning application stage</p>	<p>Agree (in part): It is not considered necessary to include a full list of heritage assets within the district in the SPD as these will be updated in the future e.g. inclusion of new assets.</p> <p>However it is proposed to include reference to where information relating to heritage assets within the district can be found in the SPD.</p>	<p>Add additional text to follow paragraph 4.4 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>‘A current list of listed buildings and Conservation Areas within the District is available to view on the District Council’s website at the following address: http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/conservation/conservation-listed-buildings’</p>
Mrs Jane Howell	13	<p>Environmental benefits: Creating new habitats for rare species (relevant to biomass schemes), this advantage is countered by increase in traffic.</p> <p>Economic benefits: Seriously query ‘cheaper fuel bills’ as taxes are used to support renewable industry and ‘farm diversification/revitalisation’ increases the value of agricultural land.</p> <p>Social benefits: Retention of population</p>	Disagree: The purpose of paragraph 2.2 is to summarise the wider social, economic and environment benefits of renewable energy generation. The potential for adverse impacts as a result of renewable energy development and how this should be considered by applicants is outlined in sections 3,4,5,6 7 and 8 of the Draft SPD.	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>(by providing more direct employment), will be very limited, the population is more likely to stay due to the inability to sell their homes if they live near a wind farm.</p> <p>Longer term health and quality of life benefits will only be achievable if the Council actively try to balance the increase in lorry movement against the push for renewable growth. None of the social benefits are real benefits.</p>		
Donald Igoe	14	I believe that paragraph 2.4.8 should be worded as the Applicant will be required.	Agree: it would be helpful to make it clear that applicants will be required to provide an Environmental Statement where required to do so by the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.	Amend paragraph 2.4.8 as follows: 'Applicants may will be required to provide an Environmental Statement with a planning application in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment as required by the EIA Regulations 2011. '
Middle Level Commissioners (Graham Moore)	20	We would encourage the Council to advise developers to undertake pre-application discussions with Middle Level Commissioners before any screening/scoping opinions are sought or planning applications submitted.	Agree: it would be helpful to refer to the involvement of other bodies including the Middle Level Commissioners as part of the planning application process in the SPD.	Add additional wording to follow paragraph 2.4.7: ' Applicants should also consult relevant bodies including Cambridgeshire County Council, English Heritage, Environment Agency, Highways Agency, MOD, Natural England, and Internal Drainage Boards (where relevant) as part of the pre-application process to seek agreement on issues relevant to proposals at an early stage. '
Cllr Robert Stevens (ECDC member)	32	<p>Suggest the following wording changes:</p> <p>2.1.1 - the combustion of waste that is not capable of being recycled.</p> <p>2.1.2 - Anaerobic digestion is a method of treatment of organic materials when they decompose under the action of bacteria in a closed vessel and produce methane</p>	Agree: the suggested amendments to the SPD would provide clarity.	<p>Amend the final sentence of paragraph 2.1.1 as follows (amended text in bold):</p> <p>'It can also include the combustion of waste that is not capable of being recycled.'</p> <p>Amend the first and fourth bullet points of paragraph 2.1.2 as follows (amended text in bold):</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>dry biomassgenerate electricity and heat.....</p> <p>sunlight.....or mounted on frames set into the ground.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Anaerobic digestion</u>: is a method of waste treatment which can be used to produce gas from of organic materials with a high methane content when they decompose under the action of bacteria in a closed vessel and produce methane which can be used to produce heat, electricity or a combination of the two. • <u>Biomass (dry)</u>: dry biomass fuels including straw and wood can be used to generate electricity and heat through combustion of these materials. • <u>Solar power</u>: sunlight can be converted into electricity through the use of photovoltaic cells located on buildings or mounted on frames set into the ground.

6. Specific comments on landscape issues

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Barton Willmore on behalf of RES UK and Ireland Ltd (Nichola Traverse-Healey)	1	<p>As currently drafted applicants are expected to consider the impact of proposals on receptors even where this may not be of any relevance to the application.</p> <p>As currently worded applicants are required to consider the visual impact of works required to connect a renewable energy scheme to the existing electricity network. The works required to connect to existing electricity grid are undertaken by the Distribution Network Operator or National Grid and do not form part of the planning application for a renewable energy scheme.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The text in the first paragraph of section 3.3 is intended to refer to potential receptors which may be of relevance to a planning application. It is accepted that not all of these will be relevant dependent upon the location of proposed renewable energy schemes and the technology proposed.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.3 (point 1) as follows:</p> <p>‘Applicants will be expected to consider the following issues (where relevant) when making an application for renewable energy development:</p> <p>In doing so applicants should have regard to views that are currently available....Historic Parks and Gardens). Applicants will be expected to undertake a desktop review which identifies sensitive receptors relevant to the proposed development.’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.3 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>‘For example connections to the electricity supply have a significant visual impact dependent upon the location and scale of such infrastructure and will need to be considered by the applicant where these form part of the planning application.’</p>
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	34	<p>We recommend that this section should include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd edition (2013) Scottish Natural Heritage, Siting and Designing Windfarms in the Landscape (2009) Highland Council, Visualisation standards for Wind energy developments (2010) SNH – Visual representation of wind 	<p>Agree (in part): The inclusion of reference to good practice guidance relating to landscape impact assessments in Section 3 would be useful. However it is not considered necessary to refer to guidance produced by Scottish Natural Heritage and Highland Council given that it is intended to apply to Scotland.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.3 (point 8) as follows:</p> <p>‘A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required for renewable energy proposals....sensitivity of the landscape. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of renewable energy proposals provided should be consistent with the methodology set out in ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (2013). Applicants should also have regard to the Landscape Institute’s published</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>farms, good practice guidance Version 2 (2014)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Newcastle (2002) Visual Assessment of Wind Farms Best Practice Scottish Natural Heritage commissioned report • Landscape Institute, Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment Advice Note 01/11 • Scottish Natural Heritage, Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Farm developments (2012) • Natural England, Making space for renewable energy: assessing on-shore wind energy development (2010) 		advice relating to the use of photomontages (Advice Note 01/11).'
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	As above.	As above.	See above.
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>As above.</p> <p>[In addition:] Proposed wind turbine development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not result in development which would be a visually intrusive and predominant feature of the skyline from public view points, except in instances whereby the proposal would be an extension, or visually read as an extension, to an existing wind turbine site. • Not wholly dominate and detract from the important views* identified in Conservation Area Appraisals 	As above.	See above.
Natural England (Janet Nutall)	25	We welcome this and the requirement for applicants to consider impacts on key local landscapes and strategic green infrastructure such as the Wicken Vision area.	Support noted.	See above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>Reference could be made to the requirement for landscape impact assessments to be undertaken in accordance with best practice Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (Landscape Institute, 2013).</p> <p>We are pleased that the guidance advises reference to Natural England's National Character Areas.</p>	<p>Agree: The inclusion of reference to good practice guidance produced by the Landscape Institute in Section 3 of the SPD would be useful.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	
Barbara Grafton	9	<p>SPD does not include sufficient controls on developers which are highly adept at circumnavigating poorly constructed guidance.</p> <p>As a general principle, planning permission should not be given unless all developers can prove they will undertake effective mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): It is accepted that there is a need to ensure that visual impact of proposed renewable energy developments is fully considered as part of planning application process.</p> <p>A number of modifications proposed to Section 3 of the SPD to strengthen the existing wording.</p>	See above.
Steve Jones	17	<p>I would urge ECDC to stop all commercial wind turbines to save Cambridgeshire losing part of it endearing quality – big skies.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local Planning Authorities have 'a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources' (paragraph 97 of the NPPF). Therefore the District Council is not able to seek to prevent the development of any commercial scale wind turbines which may be proposed in the district. The purpose of the SPD is to assist in the determination of renewable energy schemes of a commercial scale including considering adverse impacts upon the landscape and existing views.</p> <p>However a number of changes are proposed to the wording of Section 3 (Visual landscape impact and key</p>	See above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			views) to strengthen the existing wording as set out in the table below.	
Natural England (Janet Nutall)	25	<p>We welcome this and the requirement for applicants to consider impacts on key local landscapes and strategic green infrastructure such as the Wicken Vision area.</p> <p>Reference could be made to the requirement for landscape impact assessments to be undertaken in accordance with best practice Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (Landscape Institute, 2013).</p> <p>We are pleased that the guidance advises reference to Natural England's National Character Areas.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agree: The inclusion of reference to good practice guidance produced by the Landscape Institute in Section 3 of the SPD would be useful.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	See above.
Martin Colthroe	5	The council should consider guidelines which prevent the development of wind turbines in areas less than 2km from settlements (as exists in Scotland).	<p>Scottish Planning Policy published in June 2014 states that an area not exceeding 2km around cities, towns and villages should be identified on the local development plan. The extent of the area is to be defined by the planning authority based on landform and other features which restrict views out from the district.</p> <p>There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through the inflexible rules on separation distances. The guidance also emphasises that distance of itself (with the exception of setback distances required for safety) does</p>	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			not determine whether the impact of a renewable energy proposal is unacceptable.	
CPRE Cambridgeshire (Sheila Fieldhouse)	4	We welcome the draft SPD and what it states in respect of para. 3. Visual landscape impact and key views.	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
Alison Finn	8	<p>3.2 – a scant list</p> <p>3.3.1 – assertions that have no basis in fact, have not been challenged to date. Mingay Farm is a prime example of this.</p> <p>3.3.5 – Locally grown hedging is unlikely unless S106/CIL money is used to set up a Community Tree Nursery.</p> <p>3.3.8 – this should be paid for, but not supplied by the developer.</p>	<p>Disagree: The list in paragraph 3.2 is not intended to be an exhaustive list of potential adverse impacts on the landscape as result of renewable energy developments.</p> <p>Applicants will be required to provide a robust landscape and visual impact assessment as part of the planning application. The applicant(s) will determine who will undertake this technical work. The District Council will consider the merits of the planning application in accordance with national and local planning policy. As part of which the findings of the Landscape Assessment which has been provided will be considered.</p>	No change to the SPD.
Grant Hayes	11	The visual landscape impact should specifically state the hilly areas where environmental impact will be most visually affected by commercial scale developments	Disagree: It is accepted that the visual impact of a renewable energy development will vary depending upon the topography of the site.	No change to the SPD.
Mrs P Norman	26	<p>Haddenham and Aldreth share a sweep of the most spectacular open countryside from a horseshoe of land on the south and west of the Isle of Ely.</p> <p>Any large structure put up in this area would not only impact on the residents of those villages, but be visible from many</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The purpose of the SPD is to assist in the determination of renewable energy schemes of a commercial scale including considering adverse impacts upon the landscape and existing views.</p> <p>The proposed wind turbines at Berry</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.3 (point 2) as follows:</p> <p>‘Ely Cathedral: The potential impact that development may have views on the ‘quintessential’ views and wider landscape setting of Ely Cathedral should be fully considered, given its wider national/international importance.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>miles around.</p> <p>It is already possible to see 53 wind turbines on the horizon from North Hill, Haddenham. This is where they should remain and not in the forefront of the uninterrupted views mentioned above.</p> <p>As East Cambridgeshire is home to our unique Ely Cathedral we should be doing our utmost to maintain the views to and from that magnificent edifice.</p>	<p>Fen, Haddenham will be considered against the policies in the Core Strategy, Local Plan, the NPPF and other relevant material considerations.</p> <p>However a number of changes are proposed to the wording of Section 3 (Visual landscape impact and key views) to strengthen the existing wording as set out in the table below.</p> <p>The SPD refers to the need to protect key views associated with Ely Cathedral. However, it would be useful to include reference to the wider landscape setting.</p>	<p>Proposals which are visually dominant and have an adverse impact on the key views of Ely Cathedral; and its landscape setting, including those as outlined in the Council's Ely Environmental Capacity Study or successor document, are unlikely to be acceptable. '</p>
English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Wooldrige)	6	<p>Chapter 3 makes helpful reference to views to/from heritage assets as well as quintessential views of Ely Cathedral.</p> <p>We are aware that the District Council intends to update the Ely Environmental Capacity Study in the coming year. Therefore it might be prudent for the reference to the capacity study on page 8 to read "...Ely Environmental Capacity Study or successor document..."</p> <p>We welcome the reference to cumulative impacts in Chapter 3 - highly relevant to the historic environment and specific heritage assets.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agree: the inclusion of the reference to the update of the Ely Environmental Capacity Study would be consistent with the wording of the Council's proposed modifications to the Local Plan (April 2014).</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
Gill Monk	21	<p>Turbines should not exceed the height of any existing farm where these are situated within 10 miles of each other.</p> <p>There needs to be inclusion for a full impact assessment of every SSSI and project already in the pipeline (Ouse wash project for just south of Sutton) to be included in all proposals for assessment</p>	<p>Agree (in part): It is not considered practical to limit the height of wind turbines to the height of existing farm buildings.</p> <p>The scope of an Environmental Impact Assessment will be dependent upon the location of the site. Where a site is located within</p>	<p>See above.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>of the environmental impact of any such renewable scheme.</p> <p>An exclusion zone is needed or, due to proximity to Ely Cathedral, turbines should not be higher than the height of the Cathedral,</p>	<p>close proximity to a designated nature conservation site (including SSSIs) this will need to be considered as part of the planning application and Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The SPD as drafted states that development which are visually dominant and have an adverse impact on the key views of the Ely Cathedral are unlikely to be acceptable. However, wider reference to the landscape setting of the cathedral could be useful.</p>	
Simon Monk	22	As above.	As above.	See above.
Alan James	15	<p>Should include a clear statement that if there will be negative impacts on any views which are currently available from and to settlements, roads, railway lines, publicly accessible land, public planning permission will not normally be granted.</p> <p>Landscape impact should consider the effect of structures built within East Cambs on those living and working in Surrounding districts and vice versa.</p> <p>Include a clear statement that if Cumulative impacts are judged to be unacceptable planning permission will not normally be granted.</p> <p>Local evidence should be taken into account in landscape assessments as well as guidance listed in the Draft SPD.</p>	<p>Disagree: Section 3 of the Draft SPD deals with the visual impact of renewable energy schemes and emphasises its importance.</p>	No further changes to the SPD.
Middle Level Commissioners (Graham Moore)	20	<p>We note that you encourage the developer to consider other related issues, such as the uprating of existing or provision of new cable routes, transport routes and remedial works is required. The inclusion of this is to be applauded.</p>	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Kevin Woolstenholmes	39	<p>Section 3, the council should have a policy or guidelines in place that takes into account the impact on the local community, I believe for example that in Scotland turbines cannot be built in areas less than 2 kilometres from settlements.</p> <p>It should also uphold its commitment to the conservation area status to prevent wind turbines visually impacting on the area.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through the inflexible rules on separation distances.</p> <p>The SPD as drafted referred to conservation areas which are heritage assets. However it is agreed that it would be helpful to have explicit reference to potential impacts on designated conservation areas within the district.</p> <p>It is proposed to include an additional section in Section 4 of the SPD setting out how conservation areas within the district should be considered as part of renewable energy planning applications.</p>	<p>Add additional text to follow paragraph 4.4 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>'Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas: Applicants will be expected to demonstrate that they have considered the potential for adverse impacts of renewable energy development on listed buildings and conservation areas within the district. Renewable energy schemes should avoid harming Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and their settings. Applicants should also have regard to the adopted Conservation Areas Appraisals where relevant.'</p>

7. Specific comments on heritage matters

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Barton Willmore on behalf of RES (Nichola Traverse-Healey)	1	<p>As currently drafted the wording of paragraph 4.4 point 4 is consider to be ambiguous and not consistent with the paragraph 133 of the NPPF:</p> <p>To be considered effective the wording should be revised as follows: ‘Given the limited extent of scheduled ancient monuments, it should be possible to avoid having a direct impact on these assets locating these renewable energy proposals in these locations’</p> <p>Direct impact on archaeological sites of both regional and local significance as identified in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record, should be avoided where possible.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): it is accepted that the wording in paragraph 4.4 (point 4) should be amended to provide clearer guidance to applicants on how they should consider adverse impacts on designated heritage assets. However the NPPF emphasises the need to consider the setting of heritage assets it is therefore considered that the suggested wording could limit the consideration of the setting of heritage assets.</p>	<p>It is proposed to amend the wording of para 4.4 point 4 as follows (text underlined):</p> <p>‘Given the limited extent of scheduled In relation to ancient Scheduled monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens applicants it should be possible to avoid locating renewable energy proposals in these locations on or within these heritage assets. Care should also be taken to avoid negative impacts on their setting which could be extensive. Similarly, proposals such as biomass plants (and related planting) should be avoided within Historic Parks and Gardens or where it would adversely affect the setting of a Historic Park and Garden. The locating of renewable energy proposals on or near Archaeological sites of local, and regional and national significance, as identified in the Historic Environment Record, should also be avoided where possible.’</p>
Cambridgeshire County Council (James Tipping)	2	<p>The weblinks to the County Council’s website should be checked, as our new system has broken all previous links.</p> <p>Page 11, para 4.1 – please add (50) after the words ‘Scheduled Ancient Monuments’ and delete the word “Ancient”</p> <p>Page 12, point 4 – “were possible” should read “where possible”.</p> <p>The County Council suggest adding a further point setting out the need for appropriate mitigation strategies following pre-submission field evaluation.</p>	<p>Agree: the weblink on page 11 should be updated for consistency with the County Council’s website.</p> <p>Agree: It would be helpful to use the same terminology in the SPD as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (Ancient Monuments). The inclusion of the number of Ancient Monuments within the district would also be helpful.</p> <p>Agree: This is a grammatical error which should be corrected in the final SPD.</p>	<p>Footnote on page 11 to be updated for consistency with County Council website.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.1 (as follows):</p> <p>‘East Cambridgeshire also has a rich and varied archaeological heritage which includes 50 both Scheduled Ancient Monuments and sites of local, and regional and national significance as identified in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record”</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.4 (point 4) (as follows):</p> <p>‘.....The locating of renewable energy proposals on or near to Archaeological</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				sites of local, and regional and national significance, as identified in the Historic Environment Record, should also be avoided where possible. Where a pre-submission evaluation identifies newly discovered significant archaeological evidence a mitigation strategy will be required to avoid these areas. The excavation of archaeological remains will be necessary where avoidance strategies cannot be implemented.'
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>Where wind turbines will significantly adversely impact the setting of a Grade I/II* Listed Building, Registered Park or Garden, Scheduled Ancient Monument or Registered Battlefield then the minimum distance should be 2km.</p> <p>Where significant adverse impacts are likely, a distance up to 5km must be considered and a detailed assessment undertaken.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The purpose of section 4 is to set out the heritage assets which should be considered by applicants who are intending to submit renewable energy proposals.</p> <p>It is proposed to include additional text relating to listed buildings and buildings of local interest within the district which should also be considered by applicants who are proposing renewable energy schemes.</p>	<p>Add additional text to follow paragraph 4.4 (point 5) as follows:</p> <p>'Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas: Applicants will be expected to demonstrate that they have considered the potential for adverse impacts of renewable energy development on listed buildings and conservation areas within the district. Renewable energy schemes should avoid harming Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and their settings. Applicants should also have regard to the adopted Conservation Areas Appraisals where relevant.</p> <p>Locally register of buildings and structures: The District Council is intending to introduce a local register of buildings and structures of historic importance by 2015. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate that they have considered the impacts of renewable energy development on designated buildings/structures which appear on the local register.'</p>
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	<p>There should be an indication in which individual assessments must be made:</p> <p>All Grade I and II* Listed Building, Registered Park or Garden, Scheduled</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The purpose of section 4 is to set out the heritage assets which should be considered by applicants who are intending to submit renewable</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.4 (point 2) as follows:</p> <p>'Applicants will be expected to seek advice, at an early stage in their proposals, from the District Council's Conservation Officer and/or</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>Ancient Monument or Registered Battlefield within 5km</p> <p>All Grade II listed buildings within 2km.</p> <p>Where significant adverse impacts are likely, a distance up to 5km must be considered and a detailed assessment undertaken.</p> <p>Under the Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, the Council has a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. What constitutes the setting is not universally defined and may vary on a case by case basis (English Heritage has produced on 'The Setting of Heritage Assets')</p> <p>English Heritage has also issued guidance on 'Wind energy and the Historic Environment'. This includes guidance on how to assess the impact of wind turbines on the setting and visual amenity of historic sites.</p>	<p>energy proposals.</p> <p>It is accepted that there is a need to ensure that adverse impact of proposed renewable energy developments on (designated and non designated) heritage assets is fully considered as part of planning application process.</p> <p>A number of modifications are proposed to Section 4 of the SPD to strengthen the existing wording</p> <p>The SPD as drafted does not refer to the need to avoid harm to listed buildings, conservation areas and their settings.</p> <p>It is proposed to include additional text relating to listed buildings and buildings of local interest within the district which should also be considered by applicants who are proposing renewable energy schemes.</p> <p>It would be helpful to included reference to English Heritage's published guidance relating to wind farms.</p>	<p>where appropriate the Historic Environment Team at Cambridgeshire County Council and English Heritage. Reference should also be made to English Heritage's current guidance relating to the setting of heritage assets and renewable energy development.'</p> <p>See changes to wording of para 4.4 point 4 and point 5 in text boxes above.</p>
Alan James	15	<p>There is no statement concerning the potential impact on heritage assets which are not immediately visible to the untrained eye.</p> <p>There is no statement concerning the impact on heritage assets which may lie outside the boundaries of the district but which may be affected.</p> <p>Other fenland Councils have much</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The Draft SPD as drafted refers to the need to consider the potential impact renewable developments may have on heritage assets including archaeological sites and their settings. However it accepted that there is a need to strengthen the existing wording relating to the setting of heritage assets and how this should be considered by</p>	<p>See changes to wording of para 4.4 point 4 and point 5 in text boxes above.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>stronger policies to protect heritage assets.</p> <p>Fenland District Council – wind turbines within a 2km of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings will need to be carefully assessed to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on the settings of these features.</p> <p>South Holland – turbines demonstrated to have a significant adverse effect upon the views of church towers or spires (within conservation areas) within a 2km radius will be considered unacceptable.</p> <p>The SPD requires more clarity in the areas of landscape impact and heritage assets in order to reduce the risk of legal challenge.</p>	<p>applicants as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>It is also proposed to include additional text relating to listed buildings, conservation areas and buildings/structures of local interest within the district which should also be considered by applicants who are proposing renewable energy schemes.</p>	
Marilyn Parkes	28	<p>Please look into the Haddenham vision report and the Haddenham Conservation Association Conservation Area I quote “The views south from Hillrow are magnificent out from the ridge across the fens; any proposals that would block these views should be resisted”.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The District Council has produced a series of Conservation Area appraisals including one for Haddenham. It is proposed to include additional text to refer to the need to consider impacts on conservation areas (where relevant) as a result of renewable energy development.</p>	<p>See changes to wording of para 4.4 point 4 in text boxes above.</p>
Mrs P Norman	26	<p>Intangible heritage assets e.g. Aldreth Causeway – route taken by Hereward the Great.</p> <p>The number of listed buildings within the ECDC area is limited so it becomes even more important to conserve the environment of the few there are.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The SPD as drafted does not refer to the need to avoid harm to listed buildings, conservation areas and their settings.</p> <p>It is proposed to include additional text relating to listed buildings which should also be considered by applicants who are proposing</p>	<p>See changes to wording of para 4.4 point 4 in text boxes above.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			renewable energy schemes.	
English Heritage (Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge)	6	<p>Chapter 4 on heritage assets is very helpful, but would benefit from some minor changes.</p> <p>It would be useful to refer to English Heritage's guidance on the setting of heritage assets, which set out a clear approach to dealing with setting issues.</p> <p>We also have additional guidance relating to climate change beyond the guidance relating to biomass which is referenced on page 12. This includes guidance on wind energy matters.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4 relating to "nationally and locally designated heritage assets" on page 12 needs some revision.</p> <p>The first sentence should be amended to read:</p> <p>"Given the limited geographical extent of scheduled monuments, it should avoid locating renewable energy proposals on such heritage assets; however care should be taken to avoid negative impacts on their setting, which could be extensive."</p> <p>The next sentence refers to historic parks and gardens, but only in relation to biomass proposals. Any renewable energy scheme should be avoided with a historic park and garden as well as within its setting.</p> <p>The last sentence refers to unscheduled archaeological sites of regional and local significance but there may also be sites of</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agree (in part): The wording of the SPD should be amended to include reference to the setting of Ancient Monuments.</p> <p>Agree (in part): The development of renewable energy proposals within historic parks and gardens should be avoided. However there may be circumstances where a biomass scheme could be developed where it does not have an adverse effect on the park or garden and other heritage assets which are located nearby.</p> <p>Agree: There may be unscheduled archaeological sites</p>	<p>Amend the wording of para 2.4.5 (bullet point)</p> <p>'Heritage Assets of national, regional or local significance (policies ENV 12—15 (see section 4 below)'</p> <p>Amend the wording of paragraph 4.4 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>'Given the limited extent of scheduled In relation to ancient Scheduled Monuments, and Historic Parks and Gardens it should be possible to for applicants should avoid locating renewable energy proposals in these locations on or near such heritage assets. Care should also be taken to avoid negative impacts on their setting which could be extensive.'</p> <p>Amend the wording of 3rd sentence of para 4.1 as follows (amended text in bold):</p> <p>'East Cambridgeshire also has a rich and varied archaeological heritage which includes both Scheduled 50 Ancient Monuments and sites of local, and regional and national significance as identified in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record'.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>national significance. The last sentence should be revised to refer to national as well as regional and local significance, and refer to avoiding impact on the setting of archaeological sites as well as direct impacts.</p> <p>Clarification should be provided that renewable energy schemes should avoid harming listed buildings and conservation areas and their settings.</p>	<p>of national significance within the district. Therefore the wording</p> <p>Agree: The SPD as drafted does not refer to the need to avoid harm to listed buildings, conservation areas and their settings. It is proposed to include additional wording relating to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and historically significant buildings and structures which are included on the Council's local register (currently under preparation).</p>	
Barbara Grafton	9	<p>I am concerned that the Draft SPD does not contain sufficient watertight statements relating to the impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>Please refer to those written by other local authorities as a template e.g. Fenland Council Wind Turbine Guidance 2009 and South Holland District Council's supplementary planning guidance on wind energy.</p>	<p>Agree: It is accepted that there is a need to ensure that adverse impact of proposed renewable energy developments on (designated and non designated) heritage assets is fully considered as part of planning application process.</p> <p>The SPD as drafted does not refer to the need to avoid harm to listed buildings, conservation areas and their settings.</p> <p>A number of modifications are proposed to Section 4 of the SPD to strengthen the existing wording.</p> <p>It is also proposed to include additional wording relating to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and historically significant buildings and structures which are included on the Council's local register (currently under preparation).</p>	Additional wording is proposed to be included in Section 4 as set out in this table.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Richard Parkes	29	<p>While you mention Ely Cathedral you fail to mention Aldeth Castle and Aldreth Causeway which is an important part of our heritage from the Norman conquest.</p> <p>Again you mention Wicken Fen but you fail to mention the Ouse Washes.</p>	<p>Disagree: Aldreth Castle and causeway are designated as scheduled monuments and are considered as part of Section 4 (para 4.4) of the SPD.</p> <p>Agree (in part): The Ouse Washes has been designated for its importance for nature conservation and is referred to in Section 5.4 (point 1) of the SPD. However it would be helpful to refer to landscape character assessment prepared by the Ouse Washes Partnership.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.3 (point 8) as follows:</p> <p>'Reference should also be made to the guidance relating to the landscape character within the district provided in the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines (1994) • Natural England's National Character Area Profiles (currently under review) • Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines (1991) (Cambridgeshire County Council) • Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (Cambridgeshire County Council) • Ouse Washes Landscape Character Assessment (Ouse Washes Landscape Partnership) (2014)'
National Trust (Peter Crofts)	24	<p>Heritage Assets:- Section 4, page 11. This section states that (inter alia) .."proposals such as biomass plants(and related planting) should be avoided within historic parks and gardens"... The National Trust is committed to sensitively designed and appropriately located renewable energy provision, particularly biomass schemes, when they can be accommodated within its estate. Small scale biomass schemes are being developed by the Trust at various locations including historic parks and gardens in the eastern region. They have significant potential to reduce CO2 emissions and energy costs without leading to the kind of impacts to which this draft policy refers. The policy should be re- worded to recognise that small scale biomass schemes need not have harmful implications for such sites.</p>	<p>Disagree: The development of renewable energy proposals within historic parks and gardens should be avoided.</p>	<p>No change to the SPD.</p>
Stop Berry Wind	34	<p>We recommend that there should be a</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The purpose of</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.4 (point 2) as follows:</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Farm Action Group		<p>clear of the areas in which heritage assessments must be made:</p> <p>All Grade I and II* Listed Building, Registered Park or Garden, Scheduled Ancient Monument or Registered Battlefield within 5km</p> <p>All Grade II listed buildings and Buildings of Interest within 2km.</p> <p>We recommend that when considering impacts on heritage assets applicants should be instructed to refer to English Heritage has also issued guidance on 'Wind energy and the Historic Environment (2005)'.</p>	<p>section 4 is to set out the heritage assets which should be considered by applicants who are intending to submit renewable energy proposals.</p> <p>The SPD as drafted does not refer to the need to avoid harm to listed buildings, conservation areas and their settings. It is proposed to include reference to listed buildings/structures and buildings of local interest within the district which should also be considered by applicants.</p> <p>It is agreed that it would be helpful to included reference to English Heritage's published guidance relating to wind farms.</p>	<p>'Applicants will be expected to seek advice, at an early stage in their proposals, from the District Council's Conservation Officer and/or where appropriate where appropriate the Historic Environment Team at Cambridgeshire County Council and English Heritage. Reference should also be made to English Heritage's current guidance relating to the setting of heritage assets and renewable energy development.'</p> <p>See changes to wording of para 4.4 point 4 in text boxes above.</p>

8. Specific comments on biodiversity matters

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Barton Willmore on behalf of RES (Nichola Traverse-Healey)	1	<p>RES is disappointed with the wording of paragraph 5.1 of the SPD in particular the inference that only 'wind turbine development will result in habitat and species disturbance and loss'.</p> <p>Most developments have the potential to result in habitat loss. To ensure a positive strategy for renewable energy the first bullet point of paragraph 5.1 should be deleted.</p>	Agree (in part) – The list of potential impacts in paragraph 5.2 of the SPD is not intended to be an exhaustive list of potential impacts as a result of renewable energy development. However it is accepted that the impacts of renewable energy schemes on biodiversity is not limited to wind turbine developments.	<p>Amend the wording of paragraph 5.2 as follows:</p> <p>The following is a (non-exhaustive) list of potential impacts as a result of renewable energy development:</p> <p>'Wind energy turbine and track construction can result in habitat and species disturbance and loss.'</p>
Cambridgeshire County Council (James Tipping)	2	<p>We welcome the inclusion of biodiversity issues, particularly the work undertaken by the RSPB in 2004 to identify bird sensitive areas in the fens.</p> <p>Strongly suggest that ECDC with neighbouring authorities, the RSPB and other wildlife organisations (including Cambridge Bat Group) develop a wildlife sensitive map for Cambridgeshire.</p>	Support noted.	No change to the SPD.
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>Include the NPPF requirements as set out in para. 118.</p> <p>Ecological surveys should be carried out under the relevant national guidance, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - Assessing the effects of onshore wind farms on birds • SNH Survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore wind farms (2014) • Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition Bat Conservation Trust (2012) • Natural England, Bat and onshore wind turbines Interim Guidance Technical Information Note TIN051 	Agree (in part): it would be useful to include reference to Natural England's guidance notes which related to onshore wind farms in the SPD. However it is not considered necessary to refer to the guidance produced by Scottish Natural Heritage that it is intended to apply to Scotland only.	<p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>'Biodiversity mitigation: The potential for biodiversity mitigation relating should be considered on a site by site basis as part of renewable energy development. Where it is proposed to develop wind turbines applicants should have regard to Natural England's Technical Information Notes (TIN051 and TIN069) relating to effects on onshore wind farms on birds and bats. This guidance identifies the potential impacts on birds and bats resulting from wind farm developments and appropriate survey methodologies which should be employed by applicants.'</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	As above.	As above.	As above.
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	34	As above	As above.	As above.
Alison Finn	8	<p>5.2 – there is bias in this paragraph wind turbines are noted twice. Problems to wildlife caused by solar glare have been ignored in this SPD.</p> <p>Solar (on land) has the potential to harm during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>In addition, soil can be irreparably damaged by compaction – see response to 2.4.3 above.</p> <p>5.4.1 – typo in second sentence. Mention should be also be made of the Wetland habitat being created at Coveney/Witcham.</p> <p>5.4.2. – Surveys provided by the developer cannot be considered unbiased.</p> <p>5.4.5 – Undue focus on solar....this would apply to all renewable energy sites.</p> <p>5.4.6 – In relation to wind power generation, Natural England produce advice on bats (TIN051) as well as birds (TIN008)</p> <p>5.4.7 – This is inadequate and not being followed up on sites that already have been given planning permission.</p>	<p>Agree (in part) – The list in Section 5 of the SPD is not intended to be an exhaustive list of potential impacts as a result of renewable energy development. However it is accepted that the impacts of renewable energy schemes on biodiversity is not limited to wind turbine developments.</p> <p>There is a typographical error in para 5.4.1 which will need to be corrected.</p>	<p>Amend the wording of paragraph 5.2 as follows:</p> <p>'The following is a (non-exhaustive) list of potential impacts as a result of renewable energy development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind energy turbine and track construction can result in habitat and species disturbance and loss; • Wind turbines have the potential to can cause harm birds through disturbance, habitat loss (both direct and/or indirect), disturbance and displacement from feeding, nesting and migration and the potential for collision. Turbines can also adversely affect bats resulting in death or injury; • Wind turbines can also have adverse impacts on bat habitat including foraging and flight paths; • Solar farms have the potential to harm natural habitats during construction, operation or when being decommissioned; and e.g. the loss of foraging/nesting sites for birds; • Air pollution and noise disturbance associated with energy from waste proposals; and • The removal of trees, scrub or hedgerows to enable renewable energy development can affect protected and priority Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan species.'

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				See also amendments to paragraph 5.4 (point 4) as set out in the above text box.
Barbara Grafton	9	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 118) makes it clear that when determining planning applications local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Please can the SPD refer to this requirement applies to all renewable energy developments.</p>	Agree: It would be helpful to include reference to paragraph 118 of the NPPF.	<p>Amend paragraph 5.1 as follows:</p> <p>'Biodiversity can be described as the 'wealth of wildlife around us'. It includes flora and fauna and is not limited to designated sites but include environmental features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, wetland and ponds. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 118) requires that Local Planning Authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity when determining planning applications.'</p>
Mrs V J Horspool	12	Greater consideration should be given to the erection of wind turbines in areas known to be in the path of migratory birds or areas where protected species are known to live or feed.	Agree (in part): It is proposed to strengthen the guidance in the SPD relating to the protection of designated sites which are of importance to birds and protected species.	Please see changes to Section 5.
Alan James	15	<p>The introduction to the SPD should include reference to paragraph 118 of the NPPF.</p> <p>International, national and locally designated sites: It is not only solar farms that should avoid such sites, it is all wind energy developments.</p> <p>There should be clear guidelines on separation distances from designated nature conservation sites according to the type of proposal and nature of the site.</p> <p>Developers should be requested to seek the advice of designating authorities or their legal enforcement body in the UK.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): it would be useful to include reference to Natural England's guidance notes which related to onshore wind farms in the SPD. However it is not considered necessary to refer to the guidance produced by Scottish Natural Heritage that it is intended to apply to Scotland only.</p> <p>The Draft SPD as written refers to the need for a survey to be undertaken where there may be an adverse impact on protected species. However the SPD does not set out the methodologies which should be used by</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 2) as follows:</p> <p>'Protected species: The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a renewable energy proposal is being considered which could cause harm to the species or its habitat (including the movement of species). Applicants should have regard to Natural England's current Standing Advice¹ for Protected Species which outlines the potential impacts of development on individual species, survey requirements and recommended mitigation and compensatory measures. A survey or surveys (if there is more than one species in the vicinity of the site) will be required to establish to what extent these species would be affected by the proposed</p>

¹ <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningdevelopment/spatialplanning/standingadvice/specieslinks.aspx>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>Developers should be instructed to consider the effects on designated sites in other districts e.g. Berry Fen SSSI between Earith and Bluntisham. This section should include a list of all known designated and potentially designated sites requiring consideration by potential developers.</p> <p>Protected species: this section should include a list of suitable survey methods which are to be used by developers when assessing protected species and habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing the effects of onshore wind farms on birds, (2010) Natural England • Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore wind farms, (2014) Scottish Natural Heritage • Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2012) Bat Conservation Trust • Natural England, Technical Information Note TIN051 <p>Ecology survey: there should be clear guidance as to the acceptable ecological survey methods to be used. For example: Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management</p> <p>It is not sufficient to say that 'Where impacts have been identified there will be a need to demonstrate that effective mitigation measures can be provided'</p> <p>A stronger statement should be made such as 'Where impacts have been identified unless effective mitigation measures can be provided, planning</p>	<p>applicants.</p> <p>It is proposed to include reference to Natural England's Standing Advice on Protected Species which provide advice on appropriate survey methods.</p>	<p>development.'</p> <p>Also see proposed amendments to paragraph 5.4 (point 4) in the above text boxes.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 6) as follows:</p> <p>'Ecology survey: Where renewable energy development is proposed within or close to international, national or locally designated sites or the proposed site area is 0.5ha or more an ecological survey and Ecological Impact Assessment will be required. The assessment provided should be consistent with the methodology set out in 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK', (2006).'</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		permission will not normally be given'		
Paul Mason	19	<p>A minimum distance must be specified between a turbine and the breeding and hunting range of rare breeding raptors which are given special protection under schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>There must be a buffer zone around the Ouse Washes which is designated as a SPA, SAC and SSSI, to exclude the construction of wind turbines.</p>	<p>Disagree: The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that local authorities should avoid the use of inflexible rules on separation distances or buffer zones.</p> <p>However it is therefore proposed to strengthen the guidance in the SPD relating to the protection of SPAs, SACs, and SSSIs and species rather than introduced a specific separation distance from wind turbines.</p>	<p>Amend the wording of paragraph 5.4 (point 1) as follows:</p> <p>'International, national and locally designated nature conservation sites: Solar farm proposals should avoid sites of international and national importance for biodiversity as set out in Natural England's published advice². As any development proposed within or adjacent to these sites is likely to have an adverse effect on the environmental features for which the site was designated. Renewable energy proposals which have an adverse impact on an international nature conservation site will not normally be permitted unless there are exceptional overriding reasons of public interest. Proposals likely to have a significant effect on European sites will be assessed through the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010 (as amended). Applicants will be required to submit sufficient information to enable the District Council to undertake an Appropriate Assessment. Proposals for renewable energy development will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of the international and national designations SSSIs will not be compromised by the development, and any significant adverse effects are clearly outweighed by the environmental, social and economic benefits. Similarly renewable energy proposals which cause harm to locally designated sites, ancient woodland, veteran trees, habitats or important species will not be permitted.'</p>

² Solar Parks: Maximising environmental benefits, Natural England (September 2011)

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Gill Monk	21	Renewable energy schemes should not be within 5 miles of a SSSI (Site of a Special Scientific Interest)	<p>Disagree: The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that local authorities should avoid the use of inflexible rules on separation distances or buffer zones.</p> <p>However it is therefore proposed to strengthen the guidance in the SPD relating to the protection of SSSIs rather than introduce a specific separation distance from wind turbines.</p>	Please see above.
Simon Monk	22	As above.	As above.	Please see above.
Mrs P Norman	26	<p>Just how near are we prepared to let wind turbines to protected nesting species?</p> <p>Damage potentially caused to wildlife corridors may well occur if massive vehicles access very small roads and soft dyke banks.</p>	<p>Disagree: The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that local planning authorities should avoid the use of inflexible rules on separation distances or buffer zones.</p> <p>However it is proposed to strengthen the guidance in the SPD relating to the protection of SPAs, SACs, and SSSIs and species rather than introduce a specific separation distance from wind turbines.</p>	Please see above.
Simon Stirrup	32	<p>A minimum distance must be specified between a turbine and the breeding and hunting range of rare breeding raptors which are given special protection under schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>There must be a buffer zone around the Ouse Washes which is designated as a SPA, SAC and SSSI, to exclude the construction of wind turbines.</p>	<p>Disagree: The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that local authorities should avoid the use of inflexible rules on separation distances or buffer zones.</p> <p>However it is proposed to strengthen the guidance in the SPD relating to the protection of SPAs, SACs, and SSSIs and species rather than introduce a specific separation distance from wind turbines.</p>	Please see above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Natural England (Janet Nutall)	25	<p>We recommend the guidance includes reference to the following impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displacement of species, particularly birds, through wind turbine development; • Loss of foraging/roosting sites for birds through solar farm development; • Impact on bat habitat including foraging and flight paths through wind turbine development; • Air pollution and noise disturbance associated with energy from waste proposals. <p>Reference to the following guidance is also recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Information Note TIN069: Assessing the effects of onshore wind farms on birds (we note this is partly referenced). • Technical Information Note TIN051: Bat and onshore wind turbines Interim Guidance <p>Section 5.3: We recommend that additional wording be included to state that ‘applicants will need to consider the impacts of renewable energy development on designated nature conservation and geodiversity sites <u>and any supporting or functionally linked habitat</u>, protected and priority species’</p> <p>Section 5.4: We would suggest the following wording in line with the NPPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals likely to have a significant effect on European sites will be assessed through the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010 (as amended); sufficient information will need to be submitted to enable the LPA to undertake an 	<p>Agree (in part): Paragraph 5.2 of the SPD is not intended to be an exhaustive list of impacts but it would be helpful to refer to other potential adverse impacts arising from renewable energy development as suggested.</p> <p>It would be useful to include reference to Natural England’s notes which relate to onshore wind farms in the SPD.</p> <p>It would be helpful to clarify the level of protection available to international and nationally designated sites including the requirements for an Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>It would be useful to emphasise that renewable energy schemes should providing a net biodiversity gain consistent with the objectives of the NPPF.</p> <p>It would be useful to include reference to Natural England’s standing advice which relates to appropriate survey methods and mitigation measures for species which may be affected by renewable energy development.</p> <p>It would be helpful to refer to habitats which are linked to designated nature conservation sites as these may be indirectly or directly affected by renewable energy development.</p> <p>It would be useful to refer to</p>	<p>Amend the wording of para 5.2 as set out above (see Alison Finn).</p> <p>Amend the wording of paragraph 5.4 (point 1) as set out above (see Paul Mason).</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 2) as set out above (see Alan James).</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 4) as set out above (see Steve Cheetham).</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 6) as set out above (see Alan James).</p> <p>Amend para 5.3 as follows: ‘Applicants will need to consider the impacts of renewable energy development on designated nature conservation and geodiversity sites, and any functionally linked or supporting habitat, protected and priority species and habitats of local importance to fulfill the requirements outlined in Policy EN 6 in the Core Strategy and ENV 6 and ENV 7 of in the emerging the Local Plan.’</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>Appropriate Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals which would result in significant harm to biodiversity, having appropriate regard to the 'mitigation hierarchy' should not be permitted. Proposed development likely to result in significant harm to the SSSI should not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs. <p>Natural England advises that all applications should be accompanied by sufficient evidence regarding the potential effects of the proposal on biodiversity.</p> <p>With regard to protected species we recommend reference to Natural England's Standing Advice.</p> <p>An ecological assessment should be undertaken in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Environmental Management Best Practice Guidelines and will need to identify impacts and any mitigation measures.</p> <p>In some cases an Ecological Management Plan may be required to specify details of mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>With regard to enhancements the guidance should encourage proposals to deliver net biodiversity gain in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>applicants providing an ecological management plan to ensure long term management of the site (where required by the District Council).</p>	
RSPB (Amy Crossley)	29	The RSPB recommends that a reference to current guidance that expands on the	Agree (in part): it would be useful to include reference to Natural	Amend the wording of paragraph 5.4 (point 1) as follows:

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>potential impacts of renewable energy schemes on biodiversity interests is added to section 5.2. For example Natural England Technical Information Note 069 or the recent European Commission Review.</p> <p>The RSPB recommends that the wording is clearer about the rigour of the tests of the Habitats Regulations. Plans or projects which may have a likely significant effect on a European site will require appropriate assessment under Reg. 61 of the Habitats Regulations</p> <p>Accordingly, local authorities can only consent plans or projects where it can be ascertained that they will have no adverse effect on the integrity of a European Site. In exceptional circumstances, where there are no alternative solutions, a plan or project may meet the tests of Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI), which then requires demonstration that appropriate compensation will be provided to ensure the integrity of the Natura 2000 network is not compromised. Given the rigour of these tests, the presumption is that plans or projects that could adversely affect Natura 2000 sites will not be approved. In practice, schemes which qualify for IROPI are extremely rare and are very unlikely to fall under the Council's remit for decision making.</p> <p>The RSPB welcomes inclusion of reference to 'Wind Turbines and Sensitive Bird Populations: Spatial Planning for Wind Turbines in the Fens Natural Area</p>	<p>England's notes which related to onshore wind farms in the SPD.</p> <p>It would be helpful to provide additional text to clarify the status of the RSPB report and how it should be used by applicants when bringing forward renewable energy proposals.</p> <p>It would be helpful to clarify the level of protection available to international and nationally designated sites including the requirements for an Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>It would be useful to include reference to best practice guidance relating to biodiversity enhancement relevant to renewable energy proposals.</p> <p>The focus of the SPD is on 'commercial scale' renewable energy schemes it is not considered necessary to refer to the survey requirements for smaller scale renewable development.</p>	<p>'International, national and locally designated nature conservation sites: Solar farm proposals should avoid sites of international and national importance for biodiversity as set out in Natural England's published advice³. As any development proposed within or adjacent to these sites is likely to have an adverse effect on the on the environmental features for which the site was designated. Renewable energy proposals which have an adverse impact on an international nature conservation site will not normally be permitted unless there are exceptional overriding reasons of public interest. Proposals likely to have a significant effect on European sites will be assessed through the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010 (as amended). Applicants will be required to submit sufficient information to enable the District Council to undertake an Appropriate Assessment. Proposals for renewable energy development will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of the international and national designations SSSIs will not be compromised by the development, and any significant adverse effects are clearly outweighed by the environmental, social and economic benefits. Similarly renewable energy proposals which cause harm to locally designated sites, ancient woodland, veteran trees, habitats or important species will not be permitted.'</p> <p>When identifying potential sites for wind farms reference should be made to the RSPB's spatial guidance entitled 'Wind Turbines and Sensitive Bird Populations:</p>

³ Solar Parks: Maximising environmental benefits, Natural England (September 2011)

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>(2004) and more recent evidence relating to foraging of bird species associated with the Ouse Washes’.</p> <p>Additional text should be added to aid in the interpretation and use of this study.</p> <p>Include the word ‘spatial’ before guidance to distinguish between the text of the report which is somewhat out of date and the map of zones of relative sensitivity of bird populations.</p> <p>That the zones of relative sensitivity for wind energy development are intended to present a guide only as to the likely intensity of survey and assessment required to assess potential impacts, rather than ‘hard lines’ to delineate different areas</p> <p>The maps presented are based on best available data and expert knowledge that was available of the time of preparation of the report. Further data (and renewable energy schemes) have come forward since its publication and that updates the situation reflected in the map.</p> <p>Section 5.4 (4): The RSPB welcomes the inclusion of biodiversity enhancement.</p> <p>The RSPB recommends references to other sources of information about the type of measures that may be suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England’s advice on maximising environmental potential of solar schemes. • Recent guidance from the Solar Trade Association • RSPB’s recent advice on solar 		<p>Spatial Planning for Wind Turbines in the Fens Natural Area (2004)’ and any more recent evidence relating to foraging of bird species associated with the Ouse Washes.</p> <p>The zones of relative sensitivity for wind energy development are intended to present a guide only as to the likely intensity of survey and assessment required to assess potential impacts, rather than ‘hard lines’ to delineate different areas. The maps set out in this report are based on the best available data and expert knowledge available at the time of the preparation of the report. Further data and renewable energy schemes have come forward since its publication which updates the situation reflected in the map. Therefore applicants should also consider any more recent evidence relating to foraging of bird species associated with the Ouse Washes.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.4 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>‘Biodiversity mitigation: The potential for biodiversity mitigation relating should be considered on a site by site basis as part of renewable energy development. Where it is proposed to develop wind turbines applicants should have regard to Natural England’s Technical Information Notes (TIN051 and TIN069) relating to effects on onshore wind farms on birds and bats. This guidance identifies the potential impacts on birds and bats resulting from wind farm developments and appropriate survey methodologies which should be employed by applicants.’</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>schemes.</p> <p>The habitat enhancement measures recommended in these sources of guidance are also applicable to the areas around wind farm schemes.</p> <p>The RSPB agrees that it is useful to outline criteria for when an ecological survey will be required.</p> <p>The RSPB therefore recommends consideration be given to the following alternative wording: "Where renewable energy development has potential to affect (alone or cumulatively, directly or indirectly) international, national or locally designated sites or the area that may be affected is 0.5ha or more, an appropriately targeted ecological survey programme, and related ecological impact assessment will be required".</p> <p>The SPD could usefully describe that ecological surveys and/or assessments of small scale and non-commercial scale applications that may affect birds and other wildlife may be needed, as well as commercial scale schemes.</p>		
Connie Vincent	36	<p>There is no mention of the effect of these developments on wildlife sites of specific importance.</p> <p>Provision should made in this document to protect the wildlife and birds that the Environment Agency's Ouse Washes project is designed to protect.</p> <p>The current plan for Berry Farm will destroy everything that the Environment Agency is trying to save. Provision should be made in this document to protect SSSI</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The Draft SPD states that renewable energy proposals will only be granted where the objectives of nationally and internationally designated nature conservation sites will not be compromised. However it is accepted that it would be helpful to have further text in the SPD which highlights the significance of these sites and how any impacts will be considered as part of the planning application</p>	<p>See amendment to paragraph 5.4 (point 1) in above text box (see Paul Mason).</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		sites and projects already in the pipeline to protect and encourage birds to the area.	<p>process.</p> <p>A planning application for the development of wind turbines at Berry Farm, Haddenham has yet to be submitted to the District Council. Any planning application which is received will be considered on its merits in accordance with local and national planning policy and any relevant material considerations.</p>	

9. Specific comments on residential amenity matters

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>Developers should include a detailed assessment of all residential properties within 1km of nearest turbine to determine whether there are significant visual effects and whether these significant effects are serious enough to fail the Lavender test. Other properties at a greater distance should also be included where they have exceptional views.</p> <p>Noise limits should relate to cumulative effect of all wind turbines in the area and any existing wind turbines should not be considered as part of the prevailing background noise. In daytime noise from the wind farm should be limited to 35-40 dBA (A) or 5 dBA (A) above the prevailing background, whichever is greater.</p> <p>The locations to be used for monitoring should be agreed with the Council beforehand. These noise limits will be enforced by attaching an appropriate planning condition to any planning permission for wind turbines.</p> <p>Reference should be made to mitigation measures including those set out in PPG 24.</p> <p>A requirement should be applied in relation to Amplitude modulation as noted in the Den Brook, Devon planning application.</p> <p>In the interests of transparency all raw data associated with the noise impact assessment should be available for scrutiny.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): However, the need for visual impact and noise assessment is already required by policy and referred to in the SPD (see sections 3 and 6). The guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics has recently been endorsed by the Government as being best practice relating to the assessment of wind turbine noise. It is therefore proposed to refer to this guidance in the SPD.</p> <p>The previous guidance in PPG 24 relating to noise was replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework in March 2012. It is therefore considered that the SPD should refer to the NPPF and current best practice guidance (where available).</p> <p>The SPD as drafted refers to 'shadow flicker' as a potential adverse impact but does not include a requirement for this issue to be assessed at the time of the planning application. It is therefore proposed to add additional text to the SPD.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as follows:</p> <p>'Assessments for wind farm proposals should be consistent with the methodology outlined in Assessments for wind farm proposals should be consistent with the methodology outlined in 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms (ESTU-R-97)'.the the Institute of Acoustics (A Good Practice Guide to the application of ESTU-R-97 for the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise, May 2013). Developers are encouraged to enter into discussions with the Environmental Health team at the earliest opportunity.'</p> <p>Additional wording to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 3) as follows:</p> <p>'Shadow flicker: The potential impact of shadow flicker upon residential dwellings, businesses and other buildings (which are regularly occupied) should be considered by applicants. Where impacts are expected applicants should undertake a quantitative analysis of the anticipated impacts.'</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		There needs to be an assessment of shadow flicker. To avoid shadow flicker, wind turbines should be located 10 rotor diameters from dwellings.		
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	As above.	As above.	Please see above.
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	33	<p>Developers should include a detailed assessment of all residential properties (or group of properties within 1km of nearest turbine to determine whether there are significant visual effects and if these significant effects are serious enough to fail the Lavender test. If there are properties at a greater distance which have exceptional views then these should also be included in the assessment.</p> <p>The only guaranteed way on ensuring no unacceptable noise or visual impacts is to maintain an adequate separation distance between a turbine and the surrounding dwellings and businesses.</p> <p>Developer should follow the Institute of Acoustics Guidance – A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ESTU-R-97 for the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise.</p> <p>Developers should be expected to explain his ability to comply with the standards of the WHO document, Night Noise Guidelines for Europe.</p> <p>The Council should look closely at policies and standards already adopted by other Councils e.g. Fenland District Draft Resource Use SPD – visual impact upon dwellings.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through use of the inflexible rules on separation distances.</p> <p>The guidance also emphasises that distance of itself (with the exception of setback distances required for safety) does not determine whether the impact of a renewable energy proposal is unacceptable.</p> <p>However the guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics has recently been endorsed by the Government as being best practice relating to the assessment of wind turbine noise. It is therefore proposed to refer to this guidance in the SPD.</p>	Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as set out in the above text box.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Mrs V J Horspool	12	<p>Developers must ensure that they follow the Institute of Acoustics latest guidance. A requirement must be included to identify and monitor amplitude-modulated wind turbine noise. Night time noise must not exceed the existing ambient noise levels.</p> <p>Shadow flicker should not create a danger to health, either directly or by being hazard to motorists or horse riders.</p> <p>The impact on the local housing market should be given the utmost consideration in order to avoid reduction of property value.</p> <p>Commercial wind turbines should not be constructed within 2km of residential properties.</p>	<p>Agree: The guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics has recently been endorsed by the Government as being best practice relating to the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise. It is therefore proposed to refer to this guidance in the SPD</p> <p>The effect of development on property values is not a material consideration and therefore cannot be considered in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Disagree: There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance (para 9) emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through the inflexible rules on separation distances.</p>	Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as set out in the above text box.
Mrs Jane Howell	13	<p>Wind turbine noise is constant turning day and night.</p> <p>Concerned that you are recommending ESTU-R-97 as the standard measure. There must be more reliable up to date methods of noise assessment.</p>	<p>Agree: The guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics has recently been endorsed by the Government as being best practice relating to the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise.</p>	Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as set out in the above text box.
Sally MacEachern	18	<p>I understand that ETSU-R 97 was drawn up in 1996 when turbines were smaller and that it fails to take AM (amplitude moderation) into account. Any modern plan should include an AM condition based on the Den Brook ruling.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics has recently been endorsed by the Government as being best practice relating to the assessment of wind turbine noise.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as set out in the above text box.</p> <p>New text to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 4) as follows:</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			<p>. It is therefore proposed to refer to this guidance in the SPD.</p> <p>The District Council will consider the application of appropriate planning conditions relating to noise on a case by case basis.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft SPD to refer to use of planning conditions including noise associated with wind turbines.</p>	<p>'Use of planning conditions: The District Council will apply appropriate planning conditions (dependent upon the proposed renewable technology) in relation to hours of operation and acceptable levels of noise etc.'</p>
Alan James	15	<p>Section on residential amenity should include a strongly worded statement that there should be detailed evaluation and that if there any unacceptable negative impacts, planning permission will not normally be given.</p> <p>Developers should be advised to include a detailed assessment of all residential properties within a suitable distance, according to the type of renewable development.</p> <p>The purpose of such assessment is to avoid impacts which are so overwhelming and unavoidable that any property concerned would come to be widely regarded as an unattractive and unsatisfactory place to live. In the case of wind farms this is known as the 'Lavender Test'.</p> <p>Noise impact assessment: Given the lack of clear guidance from the Government on Nuisance Noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHO Environmental Health Criteria 12 – Noise, 1980 • WHO Guidelines for Community Noise, 1999 and • WHO Night Noise Guidelines for 	<p>Agree (in part): the wording in para 6.3 (point 1) could be strengthened to make it clear that the District Council will expect applicants to contact the Council's Environment Health Team as early as possible and the issues which should be discussed and agreed with this team prior to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>The guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics has recently been endorsed by the Government as being best practice relating to the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise. It is therefore proposed to refer to this guidance in the SPD.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as set out in the above text box.</p> <p>Add additional text to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as follows:</p> <p>'Safety: Where wind turbines are proposed the minimum separation distance required for safety purposes from occupied buildings is the fall over distance (i.e. the height of the turbine to the tip of the blade) plus 10%. Applicants should also ensure that sufficient distance is provided between wind turbines to power lines and the strategic highway network having regard to the current standards of the Highways Agency, National Grid or Distribution Network Operator. Please note that the appropriate distance between wind turbines and occupied buildings is likely to be greater than the distance required for safety purposes. It should be noted that these are minimum distances for safety purposes only, and that the actual appropriate distance between wind turbines and occupied buildings will be significantly greater, in order to protect residential amenity. The distance will be determined on a case by case basis</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>Europe, 2009</p> <p>The Draft SPD refers to Guidance ESTU-R-97. This is a non-statutory document drawn up by the wind industry at time when acceptable noise guidance levels were higher than they are now. ESTU-R-97 is a scientifically inaccurate because it claims wrongly that acceptable levels of night time noise are higher than acceptable levels of daytime noise. This claim contradicts common sense as well as other accepted noise guidelines and statutes including the WHO guidance.</p> <p>Strongly recommend that the Council makes it clear that it will demand adoption of the Den Brook AM condition in all wind farm planning permissions.</p> <p>Concerned about greenhouse gas emissions, especially methane emissions over the lifetime of any anaerobic digester plant. Council should request a draft air quality monitoring plan will all proposals for such plant. Adherence to the agreed plan should then become a planning condition.</p> <p>A safety assessment should be carried out which identifies buildings and other high risk installations, such as electricity sub-stations and gas pumping stations.</p> <p>A minimum safe distance from dwellings, employment buildings and other high risk installations for wind turbines should be 800m and preferably 1km.</p>		<p>having regard to the expected noise levels, and visual impacts (please see section 3 for further details on visual impact). Significant weight will be given to adverse impacts upon existing residential amenity and human health as a result of noise, shadow flicker or solar glare as a result of renewable energy developments'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 8.2 as follows:</p> <p>'Trunk roads: The Highways Agency is responsible for trunk roads in East Cambridgeshire. Where wind turbines are proposed applicants should refer to the guidance set out in 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (September 2013)'. The minimum separation distance from the strategic highway network is height of turbine plus 50m or turbine height x 1.5 (whichever is the lesser) from the highway boundary.'</p>
Middle Level Commissioners (Graham Moore)	20	No reference is made in the document to safety. Your Council is encouraged to implement the same principles exhibited by Fenland District Council its policy	Agree: It is agreed that there should be reference made in the SPD to the need for 'set back' distances relating to wind turbines	Add additional text to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 2) as set out in the above text box.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		WT10 which, in respect of safety, includes proximity of wind turbines to navigable watercourses.	which are required for safety purposes.	
Alison Finn	8	Solar glare affects road users as well as nearby properties. Tracking road onto roads during construction is not acceptable.	Agree: The potential adverse impacts of solar glare are not limited to nearby properties.	Amend paragraph 6.2 as follows: 'Solar panels absorb light in order to generate electricity although this can be partially reflected (an effect known as solar glare) which could have a negative impact on nearby properties, and road and aircraft safety '
Cllr Bill Hunt (ECDC member)	13	Large Scale AD Plants should not be allowed to burden local roads. Fuel source and digest use should both be in the immediate vicinity.	The Draft SPD refers to use of catchment restrictions to restrict the movement of vehicles associated with anaerobic digestion plants.	No change considered necessary to the SPD.
Barbara Grafton	9	All potential developments should take into account the impact on the communities on which they are placed. No household should suffer negative impacts on quality of life or property values as a result of proposed developments. Developers should be required to undertake detailed impact assessment of nearby properties and those of a greater distance whose view will also be impacted. Noise is of particular concern. Noise from wind turbine development at Cotton Farm, Graveley has destroyed the quality of life of all local residents. The Council needs to ensure that it has watertight planning conditions to protect our communities from amplitude modulation (in relation to wind farms). That means demanding adoption of the Den Brook AM Condition.	Agree (in part): The purpose of Section 6 is to outline the issues relating to residential amenity including the potential adverse visual, noise and odour impacts on residential properties. However it is proposed to strengthen the wording in the SPD to emphasise the need for applicants to fully consider these issues, provide appropriate information and avoid potential adverse impacts.	Please see changes to Section 6. New text to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 4) as follows: 'Use of planning conditions: The District Council will apply appropriate planning conditions (dependent upon the proposed renewable technology) in relation to hours of operation and acceptable levels of noise etc.'
Grant Hayes	11	The impact should also specifically take account of the impact on the neighbouring properties, at the point of screening	Disagree: The purpose of screening a planning application is to determine whether the	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		application not just at the point of planning application.	applicant should prepare an Environmental Statement as required to so by the EIA regulations.	
Mrs P Norman	26	Residential amenity also includes the impact of social mobility as it can be seriously impaired by the building close by of wind turbines and anaerobic digestors. As it becomes difficult to sell a house at anything like its true market value.	Disagree: The effect of development on property values is not a material consideration and therefore cannot be considered in the determination of planning applications.	No change to the SPD.
F. C. Palmer & Sons (Kier Petherick)	7	My only negative comment is that I am not sure if solar glare is a real problem, all panels are now made with anti reflective materials. I do not think they produce a solar glare.	Agree: it is agreed that solar glare can be reduced by using anti reflective materials. It is therefore proposed to include reference to this mitigation measure in the SPD.	Amend paragraph 6.3 (point 4) as follows: 'Applicants will also be expected to provide sufficient detail for the loss of light or solar glare and any mitigation measures proposed. For example PV panels on solar farms can be manufactured with anti reflective materials which reduces the potential for solar glare'
Richard Parkes	29	For Wind Farms it should cover the issue that Social Mobility will be severely impaired for those living within 2.5km.	Disagree: The effect of development on property values is not a material consideration and therefore cannot be considered in the determination of planning applications.	No change to the SPD.
Cllr Pauline A Wilson (ECDC member)	38	Section 6, Residential Amenity - in view of the potential impacts listed in 6.2 a Requirement for Applicants 6.3 - should include a specified distance for wind turbines from the nearest residential property of 2km.	Disagree: There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through use of the inflexible rules on separation distances.	No change to the SPD.
David Jordan	16	I think the distance from houses has to be considered. At least 2 km from anyone's property. We have plenty of room for these schemes without affecting anyone's privacy and enjoyment. The access to sites has to repaired and put back to	See above.	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		better condition when finished. Anyone directly affected by the building / operating of the schemes should be well compensated. Anyone who lives within 5 km should have a vote to decide if it can go ahead.		
Mrs P Norman	26	I appreciate that current planning law does not state separation distances between turbines and dwellings but surely ECDC should be agreeing preferred distances e.g. 1km between any turbine and any habitation (who have non pecuniary interest). Wind farms should only be approved in large areas of open space away from villages/hamlets and away from areas of sensitive landscape and biodiversity.	See above.	No change to the SPD.
Julie Parr	29	Please ensure that any future development of wind turbines is sited well away from any village or town.	Please see above.	No change to the SPD.
Jonathan Sanford	31	<p>Add a new chapter - dwelling distance</p> <p>The council has an obligation to guarantee that there are no unacceptable noise or visual impacts is to maintain an adequate separation distance between a turbine and the surrounding dwellings and businesses</p> <p>It is recognised that particular circumstances will create variability in the distance at which significant effects may occur and the separation distances quoted here should be considered as an absolute minimum. There may be instances where there will be unacceptable impacts on residential amenity beyond these minimum distances and a full impact assessment must be carried out even if no turbine falls within the minimum distance.</p>	Please see above.	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>Therefore the following criteria should be applied:</p> <p>The minimum distance from wind turbines should be 2km unless it can be demonstrated that there would be acceptable noise levels.</p> <p>The minimum proximity distance is ten times the maximum blade tip height of the turbine.</p> <p>If planning permission is granted the actual height of the turbine must not exceed the maximum height in relation to that minimum distance.</p> <p>Wind farm developments must demonstrate that they have no unacceptable noise, amplitude, low frequency, low frequency sound or vibration on residential amenity.</p> <p>The construction of wind turbines may be allowed which does not meet minimum distance requirements where all owners which fall within minimum distance have agreed in writing.</p> <p>Wind farm developments should not have a negative impact upon the local economy.</p> <p>Large scale renewable developments should demonstrate that they deliver benefits that are directly related to the proposed development and are of a reasonable scale and nature to the area.</p> <p>Where wind turbine will significantly adversely impact the setting of heritage assets the minimum distance should be</p>		

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		2km. Where significant impacts are likely a minimum distance of up to 5km must be considered and a detailed assessment must be undertaken to ensure no harm.		
Simon Stirrup	33	There must be a minimum distance between a turbine and a domestic residence where the resident or residents have no financial interest in the wind farm. This distance must take into consideration the height of turbines, because the height of these structures continues to increase.	See above.	No change to the SPD.
Cllr Gareth Wilson (ECDC member)	39	Wind turbines – consider inclusion of a separation distance from residential properties which is based upon both distance from properties and the height of the turbine.	See above.	No change to the SPD.
Paul Mason	19	There must be a minimum distance between a turbine and a domestic residence where the resident or residents have no financial interest in the wind farm. This distance must take into consideration the height of turbines, because the height of these structures continues to increase in height. The higher they are the further away human habitat must be.	See above.	No change to the SPD.
Richard Parkes	28	It may be sensible to state a specific minimum distance from any dwelling (other than that of an Applicant for a windfarm), please consider that based on evidence gathered in Scotland they are increasing their limit to from 2km to 2.5km.	Disagree: Scottish Planning Policy published in June 2014 states that an area not exceeding 2km around cities, towns and villages should be identified on the local development plan. The extent of the area is to be defined by the planning authority based on landform and other features which restrict views out from the district. There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines	No change to the SPD.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			<p>in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable through the use of inflexible rules on separation distances.</p>	

10. Specific comments on safeguarding areas

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>All local airfields, whether licensed by the CAA or not, within 5km should be consulted.</p> <p>ECDC should expect that all outstanding aviation objections from statutory consultees are satisfactorily addressed before any planning application is submitted.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): There is no formal requirement for applicants to consult local airfields prior to submitting a planning application to the District Council. However applicants should also consider the impact that wind turbines will have on the operation of such facilities.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 7.4 as follows:</p> <p>'Applicants are advised to contact the MOD Safeguarding Team and Cambridge Airport's Duty Manager at an early stage when developing wind farm proposals. To assist with pre-application discussions the MOD has produced a pro-forma which is available to view on the Renewable UK website (www.renewableuk.com). Applicants should also consider whether there will be any potential adverse impacts on smaller aviation sites which are not officially safeguarded by legislation.'</p> <p>Add new text to follow paragraph 7.4 as follows:</p> <p>'The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has also produced guidance to assist applicants proposing wind turbines (CAP 764 CAA Policy and Guidelines on Wind Turbines and CAA Advice for Pre-Planning Guidance). Applicants are advised to have regard to the guidance produced by the CAA and MOD.'</p>
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	See above.	See above.	Please see above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	34	<p>All local airfields, whether licensed by the CAA or not, within 10km should be fully consulted. Also all emergency services involved in low flying in the area should be fully consulted. Recommend that the Royal Air Force, Wittering, Low Flying Operations Squadron should be fully consulted.</p> <p>ECDC should ensure that all outstanding aviation objections are satisfactorily addressed before any planning application is submitted.</p>	See above.	Please see above.
Alan James	15	<p>All airfields within a 30km radius of a proposed wind farm should be consulted in writing by the developer and Council.</p> <p>Police and air ambulance services operate at low level in East Cambridgeshire. Their safety is not considered by the Draft SPD.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the marking requirements of high structures by military low flyers which are set out in 'MOD Specification for IR and Low Intensity Red Vertical Obstruction Lighting (AL 3), 2012'.</p>	See above.	Please see above.
Marilyn Parkes	28	<p>The recent application for a mast in Berry fen seems to have ignored the low flying aircraft in the area. If wind turbines at 125m height were erected in Berry Fen, then I have witnessed a Hercules aircraft, several light aircraft and a hot air balloon that would have been compromised. Please ensure that all relevant Air Authorities and local Airfields are contacted and RESPOND to the contents of your plan.</p>	Agree (in part): There is no formal requirement for applicants to consult local airfields prior to submitting a planning application to the District Council. However applicants should also consider the impact that wind turbines will have on the operation of such facilities.	Please see above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Alison Finn	8	<p>7.3 Last sentence incorrect?</p> <p>Solar glare could also be a problem to be a problem to navigation. In addition ground mounted solar should not be on BMV and since BMV covers a significant percentage of the district, the area that is BMV should get a mention.</p> <p>7.5 cross out 'and cranes'?</p>	<p>Agree: there is a missing word in the last sentence of paragraph 7.3.</p> <p>The wording of paragraph 7.5 should be amended to refer to a crane or cranes to provide greater clarity.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 7.3 (2nd bullet point) as follows;</p> <p>'Wind farms which are proposed within a 30km radius of Cambridge Airport (which includes about two thirds of the district).'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.5 (2nd bullet point) as follows;</p> <p>'During the construction phase of renewable energy schemes the presence of a crane and or cranes has the potential to affect aviation activities.'</p>

11. Specific comments on access issues

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Steve Cheetham	3	<p>There is no statutory separation distance between a wind turbine and a public right of way but a minimum distance of the overall height of the turbine plus 10% should be employed from public rights of way.</p> <p>A minimum separation distance of three times the overall height from public bridleways should be used in line with the British Horse Society guidance.</p>	<p>Disagree: There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through use of the inflexible rules on separation distances.</p> <p>The guidance also emphasises that distance of itself (with the exception of setback distances required for safety) does not determine whether the impact of a renewable energy proposal is unacceptable.</p> <p>The British Horse Society's current advice states that a separation distance of 200m or three times the overall height will be required between a route use by horses or businesses with horses. However the guidance also states that this minimum separation distance will not be appropriate in all cases.</p>	No change to the SPD.
Haddenham Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Manning)	10	See above.	See above.	No change to the SPD.
Stop Berry Wind Farm Action Group	34	See above.	See above.	No changes to the SPD.
Alison Finn	8	It is not just the County Council agreeing on a diversion of a public right of way – a diversion has to be agreed by the Planning Inspectorate and is a lengthy procedure, potentially costly to the public.	Agree (in part): The expectation is that majority of renewable energy schemes will avoid the need to divert existing public rights of way. It is therefore proposed to amend the SPD to make this clear.	<p>Amend paragraph 8.2 (point 2) as follows:</p> <p>'Public rights of way: The NPPF (para 75), Policy S 6 of the Core Strategy and Policy COM 7 of the Council's emerging Local Plan seek to protect the existing public rights of way network from</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				being adversely affected as a result of development. Most types of Renewable energy development schemes will be expected to can incorporate existing public rights of way without the need for existing routes being diverted.'
Mrs V J Horspool	12	Public footpaths and bridleways should remain open or be re-directed in such a way as to not spoil the experience of the walker or rider by means of noise, views or light disruption/reflection.	Agree (in part): The expectation is that majority of renewable energy schemes will avoid the need to divert existing public rights of way. It is therefore proposed to amend the SPD to make this clear.	Please see above.
Natural England (Janet Nutall)	25	We would suggest strengthening the wording to provide clarity on the requirement for proposals to seek to protect and enhance PROWs and similar access routes, in line with para 75 of the NPPF.	Agree: It is agreed that it would be helpful to make it clear that the assumption is that renewable energy schemes should protect existing public rights of way in accordance with the NPPF and Policy S 6 of the Core Strategy and Policy COM 7 of the Local Plan.	Please see above.
Alan James	15	<p>The potential effects on drivers on all public roads should be evaluated not just Highways Agency roads.</p> <p>A minimum safe distance from public rights of way for wind turbines should be 800m.</p> <p>There should be clear mileage limits on the haulage of these crops by farm tractors and these should be agreed in the Transport Statement.</p> <p>There should be a planning condition which dictates the installation of portable wheel cleaning equipment at harvest sites and its mandatory use prior to any vehicle engaged in energy crop haulage during wet periods commences a journey on the public road.</p>	<p>Agree (in part): There is no minimum separation distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through use of the inflexible rules on separation distances.</p> <p>The guidance also emphasises that distance of itself (with the exception of setback distances required for safety) does not determine whether the impact of a renewable energy proposal is unacceptable.</p> <p>It is proposed to refer to the type of planning conditions which could be required to anaerobic digestion plants relating to hours of operation, wheel cleaning and the covering of loads which are to be transported.</p>	<p>New text to follow paragraph 6.3 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>'Use of planning conditions: The District Council will apply appropriate planning conditions (dependent upon the proposed renewable technology) in relation to hours of operation and acceptable levels of noise etc.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 8.2 (point 4) as follows:</p> <p>'Catchment and vehicle restrictions: The District Council will also consider the need to impose restrictions on the distance travelled by vehicles to provide suitable biodegradable materials to be used in anaerobic digestion plants in the</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
				district. Planning conditions will also be applied were appropriate to ensure the use of wheel washing equipment by vehicles to ensure that material is not deposited on the public highway.'
Cllr Pauline A Wilson (ECDC member)	37	<p>A new section in 8.2 is required to cover Anaerobic Digestion Plants; this should specify the need to clean vehicle wheels before they travel on the public highway with portable wheel cleaning equipment when leaving the field and permanent wheel cleaners when leaving the plant. Deliveries to the plant should be restricted to daytime hours, to prevent night time disturbance to residential areas.</p> <p>Also within Section 8, Anaerobic Digestion and Biomass Plants - should have requirements to keep the Highways clean from mud, straw and other organic materials by covering the container, or ensuring that debris is cleaned up after vehicles have passed.</p>	As above.	Please see above.
Cllr Gareth Wilson (ECDC member)	39	<p>Biomass plants – concerns about the movement of heavy vehicles through villages travelling to and from the plants particularly during unsociable hours. Also concerned about mud etc. left on the road as a result of vehicles and the potential for road accidents.</p> <p>The need for appropriate planning conditions relating to this type of development should be included in the SPD. Examples of which include wheel wash and restricting the movement of vehicles outside of 7am – 7pm.</p>	As above.	Please see above.
Paul Mason	19	There must be a minimum distance	Disagree: There is no minimum separation	No changes proposed to the

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>between any single or multiple wind turbines and a footpath, bridleway or byway. This should be at least 1000 metres.</p>	<p>distance relating to wind turbines in planning law or guidance which applies to England. The National Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the District Council should not rule out otherwise acceptable developments through use of the inflexible rules on separation distances.</p> <p>The guidance also emphasises that distance of itself (with the exception of setback distances required for safety) does not determine whether the impact of a renewable energy proposal is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Draft SPD.</p>
Simon Stirrup	32	<p>There must be a minimum distance between any turbine and a footpath, bridleway or byway.</p>	<p>See above.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the Draft SPD.</p>

12. Site restoration and continuation of agricultural use

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Alison Finn	8	<p>Paragraph 9.2 It is not in the legal gift of ECDC planning to say that land need not be restored to agricultural use.</p> <p>Planning obligations should be imposed to ensure that the equipment is removed from the site at end of life and the land is restored to its previous agricultural use.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.3 is contrary to the Solar Trade Best Practice Guidance, National Planning Policy Framework, Town and Country Planning Act 2010 and Government policy.</p> <p>This paragraph should be deleted as it is not acceptable to use agricultural land in this way.</p> <p>Paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that planning policies should identify and protect areas of tranquillity. Has any work been done in this regard?</p>	<p>Agree: The District Council will require the removal of all structures or equipment to enable the restoration of land to agricultural use. It is therefore proposed to amend the wording of the SPD to make this clear.</p> <p>The District Council will also make use of planning conditions and potentially Section 106 agreements to require the restoration of renewable energy sites in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and ENV 6 of the Local Plan where the proposed use is temporary. Therefore it is proposed to include reference to the use of planning conditions and Section 106 agreements in the SPD.</p> <p>The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should seek to focus development on land which is of lower quality where it is necessary to develop a significant amount of agricultural land (para 112).</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance states that local planning authorities will need to consider a number of factors including encouraging the by focussing large scale solar farms on previously developed land and non agricultural land, provided that it is not of high environmental value.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.2 as follows:</p> <p>‘Applications for wind and solar farms should set out details of what will be decommissioned and removed from the site at the end of the project timescale. Wind turbines typically have an operational life of 25 years although this can vary. The land which is used to develop solar farms can also be restored to its original use e.g. agriculture. Where there is a clear public benefit applicants will not be required to reinststate land to agricultural use where there is a clear public benefit e.g. improved access to the countryside.’</p> <p>Add additional text to follow paragraph 9.2 as follows:</p> <p>‘The District Council will require applicants to restore land to its former use following the decommissioning of wind turbines or solar farms including the removal of structures and associated buildings and new vehicular access routes to the site. Planning conditions will be used to ensure that renewable energy sites are restored to its former use. The District Council may also require developers to enter into a Section 106 agreement to secure a bond for the decommissioning of wind turbines or solar farms.’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.3 as follows:</p> <p>‘The Planning Practice Guidance states that renewable energy proposals should allow for continued agricultural use. In the case of solar farms there is potential for land to remain in agricultural use following development e.g. grazing.’</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			<p>It is therefore proposed to amend the wording of the SPD for consistency with the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	<p>Applicants will be expected to provide details of the amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed and to what extent this will remain in agricultural use. Applicants should also explain how the site is intended to be restored to agricultural use.</p> <p>‘The National Planning Practice Guide emphasises the need to focus the development of large scale solar farms on previously developed land (which is not of high environmental value) or non agricultural land. The aim is to ensure that solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are located on buildings or on previously developed land to avoid the need to develop greenfield land. ‘</p> <p>Where it is proposed to develop a solar farm on a greenfield site applicants will be expected to provide the following information as part of the planning application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed as part of the application; • Alternative sites which have been considered including the agricultural or environmental value of these sites and why these have been discounted; • To what extent the proposed site will remain in agricultural use and be restored; and • How the site is intended to be restored to agricultural use.’
Barbara Grafton	9	<p>In many parts of the UK developers have not been required to undertake remediation and site restoration. The SPD needs watertight requirements that all developers completely restore their sites.</p>	<p>Agree: The District Council will make use of planning conditions to require the restoration of renewable energy sites in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and ENV 6 of the Local Plan where the proposed use is temporary.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.2 as set out in the text box above.</p>

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
			Therefore it is proposed to include reference to the use of planning conditions in the SPD.	
Mrs V J Horspool	12	The construction company should be liable for the removal of all aspects of construction and rendering safe any contamination, making good the site and allowing it to revert to its previous use or the use as the local community decides at the time.	Agree: The District Council will make use of planning conditions to require the restoration of renewable energy sites in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and ENV 6 of the Local Plan where the proposed use is temporary. Therefore it is proposed to include reference to the use of planning conditions in the SPD.	Amend paragraph 9.2 as set out in the text box above.
Alan James	15	<p>Site restoration: The proposed paragraphs on site restoration are far too weak. It is not sufficient to ask the polluter which pollution he proposed to clean up.</p> <p>There should be a clear statement demanding a plan for complete removal of all materials from the site and the return of the whole site to its original condition.</p> <p>The Council should follow the lead of other councils and prior to the start of development, demand the deposit of a bond to be used for clean up.</p> <p>Recycling: Components of wind turbines cannot be recycled by will have to be disposed of in landfills. The Council should request all developers of renewable energy schemes which involve the construction of plan and equipment to include a disposal and recycling plan in their decommissioning proposals.</p> <p>Continuation of agricultural use: It is</p>	<p>Agree (in part): The District Council will require the removal of all structures or equipment to enable the restoration of land to agricultural use. It is therefore proposed to amend the wording of the SPD to make this clear.</p> <p>The District Council will also make use of planning conditions and potentially Section 106 agreements to require the restoration of renewable energy sites in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and ENV 6 of the Local Plan of the Local Plan where the proposed use is temporary. Therefore it is proposed to include reference to the use of planning conditions and Section 106 agreements in the SPD.</p> <p>The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should seek to focus development on land which is of lower quality where it is necessary to develop a significant amount of agricultural land (Para 112).</p>	Amend paragraph 9.2 and paragraph 9.3 as set out in the text boxes above.

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
		<p>an urban myth perpetuated by the solar energy industry that solar farms can continue in agricultural use.</p> <p>Roof and wall space on new and existing buildings could be fitted with solar panels and new solar tiling systems. This should be the preferred location for photovoltaic solar systems.</p> <p>The Council should include a clear policy in the SPD that solar farms located on grades 1,2 and 3a will not normally be granted planning permission.</p>	<p>The National Planning Practice Guidance states that local planning authorities will need to consider a number of factors including encouraging the by focussing large scale solar farms on previously developed land and non agricultural land, provided that it is not of high environmental value;</p> <p>It is therefore proposed to amend the wording of the SPD for consistency with the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	
Natural England (Janet Nutall)	25	<p>The SPD should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. Decisions should take full account of the impact on soils their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver.</p> <p>Your authority should consider how the policy contained within the SPD relates to paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>We would also draw your attention to Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (March 2014) in particular paragraph 13 and advise that you fully consider any best and most versatile land issues in accordance with this guidance.</p>	<p>Agree: The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should seek to focus development on land which is of lower quality where it is necessary to develop a significant amount of agricultural land (para 112).</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance states that local planning authorities will need to consider a number of factors including encouraging the by focussing large scale solar farms on previously developed land and non agricultural land, provided that it is not of high environmental value.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed to amend the wording of the SPD for consistency with NPPF and NPPG.</p>	Amend paragraph 9.3 as set out in the text box above.
Mrs P Norman	27	Solar power applications should be the preferred option on any grade 2 or 3 land. It may prove a problem if too much prime food cropping land is taken out of production.	Agree (in part): It is proposed to amend the wording of the SPD so that emphasises that solar farms should be focused on land which is not of high agricultural quality.	Amend paragraph 9.3 as set out in the text box above.

13. Specific comments on electromagnetic interference

Respondent	Rep. ID	Summary of responses	East Cambs Officer comments	Recommended action
Mrs V J Horspool	12	Existing TV, radio and phone signals should not be disrupted by the construction of the renewable energy source.	Agree: The wording of the SPD should be amended to make it clear that applicants should avoid interference with electromagnetic transmissions.	Amend paragraph 10.1 as follows: 'The operation of wind turbines can potentially affect electromagnetic transmissions (e.g. radio, television and phone signals). OFCOM is responsible for identifying the relevant consultees for a particular site. Applicants for wind turbines will be required to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that they have fully considered the potential interference which may result from development and suitable mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the potential interference. '