

**Evidence provided to the Inquiry by Prof Peter Fentem on behalf of Great Chesterford Parish Council, 16 February 2010.**

• **DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE:**

The application site is an agricultural field surrounded by hedgerows and trees located approximately 3km to the north east of Great Chesterford. The villages of Great and Little Chesterford are set within a valley and are both located at approximately 40m AOD (Above Ordnance Datum). The land rises to the north-east, being approximately 100m AOD. The sites of T7 and T8 are in an elevated position, with turbine blades at 135m, they rise about 190m above the village, 6 of the turbines would be visible from the village on the skyline. The land also rises to the south west of the village.

The site lies north east of Cow Lane and a dwelling known as Crave Hall, is approximately 700m from the position of the nearest proposed turbine.

The single turbine proposed in Uttlesford, Turbine 8 (T8) would be located approximately 3km from the outer edge (adjacent to the B184) of Great Chesterford; 2.2km from Chesterford Park; 3.8km from the outer edge (adjacent to the B184) of Little Chesterford; The B184 lies approximately 3km away and the B1383 is approximately 3.8km where it runs through Great Chesterford (London Road).

Distances between T8 and individual properties (buildings and not property boundaries) are approximately: Crave Hall Farm – 700m; Grumble Hall – 1km, Burtonwood Farm – 1.1km; Pen Farm – 1.1km, Park Farm – 1.4km;. (Abington Park Farm, is the nearest property located in South Cambridgeshire to T8 and is approximately 2km from the site).

• **THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL AND RESIDENTS BY ENERTRAG**

A copy of the 'Information and consultation' document was received from Enertrag UK in June 2007. The full application submitted by the company was received and was available to the Parish Council and residents. When the issues were discussed at the Annual Village Meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2009 Enertrag was not present. The Company were not invited but were made aware of the meeting, it was decided that their written application described their case in full.

The Parish Clerk had several telephone conversations with Enertrag regarding the possibility of an exhibition in Great Chesterford and also a weekend visit to the North Pickenham site. Neither came about.

Three GC Parish Councillors were present when a representative of Enertrag made a presentation to the meeting of UDC committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2009.

• **COMMENTS, REGARDING THIS APPLICATION - DISCUSSION IN THE COUNCIL:**

The Council considered the following carefully and in detail:

- i) the consultation paper received from Enertrag (June 2007),
- ii) the views expressed at the Annual Village Meeting when the application was a major item on the agenda (17<sup>th</sup> March 2009),
- iii) the application submitted by Enertrag to South Cambridgeshire District Council and Uttlesford District Council
- iv) the various letters submitted by residents including "Key Reasons For Refusal of Linton Wind Farm Planning Application" from the local action group.

The Council, whilst mindful of the pressing need for more renewable energy sources, considers that the visual impact of the turbines would be significant and that because insufficient regard has been given to the separation between the turbines and residences the possibility of a health risk to some residents cannot be excluded. For these reasons and for those set out below the Council opposes this application.

1. The visual impact of these structures would dominate the surrounding countryside and would have a detrimental affect and exert a high level of intrusion on the attractive rural setting of Great Chesterford and its many listed buildings. Since the blades are rotating this motion will only increase the apparent effect of the overwhelming size of the turbines.
2. The proposed site is one of the last open spaces available to local residents who use its footpath/bridleway network extensively for its tranquillity and rural vistas. There are many paths and bridleways through and close to the site. The building of the wind farm would have a detrimental effect on the enjoyment of these facilities and would be a loss of amenity. The proximity of the turbines to the bridleways raises concerns over safety as guidelines issued by the British Horse Society have not been adhered to.
3. Some of the turbines would be closer to dwellings than the recommended separation distance of 1.5km. The possibility that turbines so close to dwellings might cause health problems attributable to the noise, and amplitude modulation, cannot be excluded on the evidence available. Being told by Enertrag that there is no problem is nowhere near adequate.
4. Due to the low level of ambient noise there is particular concern residents living on the outskirts of the village would be affected by the potential noise of the turbines. Indeed the developer had failed to carry out adequate background noise readings. As noted in (3) above the separation from habitations is less than 1.5km.
5. The proposal is in contravention to the Uttlesford Local Plan which states that the district is only capable of accepting small scale renewable energy schemes.

• **OTHER ISSUES NOTED:**

6. There is no evidence that there is sufficient wind resource to make these turbines efficient. There appears to be a policy of put up the biggest type and hope that they work. This area is known as being an area of low wind speed by the renewable energy community. Having been specifically asked for wind speed data, so far as we are aware, Enertrag have left this out of their ES or have not even bothered to collect the required data.
7. In the ES it seems to state that although one of the turbines is right next to a SSSI that this is acceptable. How and why?
8. The effect on the television signal, which is already poor in this area, has not been addressed adequately.
9. There appears to be no mention of the effect that construction would have on Essex roads, which was specifically asked for.