



**HEATH & REACH PARISH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
June 2016 Minutes**

**Minutes of Meeting held on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2016  
At Heath Village Barn 8pm**

1. Present: Cllrs Beilby, Ellis, Owers. Clerk and six members of the electorate in attendance
2. Apologies for Absence: Cllr Hawes
3. Declarations of Interest: None
4. Review of Planning Applications:

CB/16/01389/FULL Installation of a single wind turbine with a maximum tip height of 149.8m (hub height between 93.5m and 100m; rotor diameter between 87.0m and 112.5m), substation, hardstanding area, access track, underground cabling and associated infrastructure.

This was opened to the public forum. Mrs Green asked the Parish Council to support the action group (SCWT) formed to oppose this application. Mr Roberts estimated that 47 out of over 50 people at the village meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> May were against this application and this should be taken into account in the Parish Council's deliberation. Mr Roberts had previously circulated a summary of points from the larger document that the action group will submit to CBC planning.

Cllr Beilby questioned whether there had been a study on effect of the existing turbine on bio-diversity and who was responsible for monitoring the impact. A report on the impact of bats in the application concluded that there was 'unlikely significant affect' on bats. Mrs Green questioned on what basis 'significant' was measured. Mr Hoare countered that the RSBP had concluded that the impact of global warming is greater than the negative impact of wind turbines.

Mrs Green asked that the impact of a second turbine on the character of the village be considered and in her view this was an 'industrialisation; of the village. Cllr Owers countered that the village was surrounded by quarries and it could be argued that the village was already 'industrialised' to a certain degree. Mr Roberts said that the second turbine would fail the Lavender test. *" ie when turbines are present in such number, size and proximity that they represent an unpleasantly overwhelming and unavoidable presence in main views from a house or garden, there is every likelihood that the property concerned would come to be widely regarded as an unattractive and thus unsatisfactory (but not necessarily uninhabitable) place in which to live. It is not in the public interest to create such living conditions where they did not exist before"*



A Sandhouse Cottage resident's concern was on public health. He said that there was research to prove that turbines can cause stress, anxiety, tinnitus and sleep deprivation. The existing turbine noise has been monitored but this resident maintains the data is flawed and based on 'bad science' He asked that an independent (i.e. not funded by Arnold White Estates) noise study be carried out. Furthermore he was concerned on the saleability of properties and the onus should be on the developer to disprove this.

Mr Hoare asked the Parish Council to consider an alternative form of renewable energy if they chose to oppose this application. He was informed that this was beyond the scope of this meeting.

Cllr Ellis stated that there had been three public meetings on this matter and the vast majority of people present were against the turbine on the grounds of public health and noise. Cllr Ellis said it was clear that this application does not have local support and whilst he was not opposed to renewable energy, he did not consider turbines to be economically viable. Furthermore, on the matter of industrialisation, the local quarries will eventually be infilled but the turbines would be a fixed feature on the landscape. TV reception was also a problem with the first turbine and this has upset some villagers. On the main argument of localism, Cllr Ellis opposes this application. Cllr Beilby also questioned the visual impact of the turbine and whether the environmental benefits exceed the net cost of production and the cost of installation.

Cllr Owers stated that in broad terms he does not object to this application. The existing turbine does not have a significant impact on a significant number of people who will accept and, indeed, welcome a second turbine for renewable energy. There should, however be conditions within the planning that states any issues with TV reception be rectified and an ongoing noise and environmental review be carried out.

Cllr Ellis proposed that the Parish Council oppose the application and support the document prepared by the SCWT group. Cllr Beilby, agreed and Cllr Owers was against.

Mr Hoare requested that Cllr Ellis quantify in broad terms the opposition in the village in the Parish Council's submission to CBC.

5 Update on previous planning applications: None

6 Other Planning Matters: None



7 Environmental Matters

Stone Lane Path/Bridleway. Cllr Ellis attended a meeting where it was agreed by Rick Thompson of CBC that the surface was at present inappropriate but this would be compacted in time and improved with mowing. Also hedgerows will be planted which in time will prevent horses from going on to the playing fields and in the meantime a gate to be installed which will allow pedestrian access but prevent cycles and horses.

Community Woodland, The Planning Committee decided to recommend to the Parish Council that they take on a lease for the community woodland and develop a five year plan. It was felt that this could be maintained on a voluntary basis but there would be legal fees to consider.

- 8 Matters arising from previous meeting. Vic Buljubasic from WS Atkins is arranging a follow up meeting in order for Atkins to show progress on designs for a combined extraction and restoration scheme for the combined quarries on either Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> June, or Thursday (am) 30<sup>th</sup> June.

- 8 Any Other Business None .

Meeting closed at 9pm

Francesca Sheppard Clerk

Email [heathandreachpc@outlook.com](mailto:heathandreachpc@outlook.com) tel 07778 356097