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__________________________________________________________

Agenda prepared by Julie Pickles, Democratic Services Officer – Telephone: (01925) 443212, Fax: (01925) 656278, E-mail: jpickles@warrington.gov.uk

A G E N D A

Part 1

Items during the consideration of which the meeting is expected to be open to members of the public (including the press) subject to any statutory right of exclusion.

Item 1. Apologies for Absence

To record any apologies received.
2. **Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any personal or prejudicial interest that they have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when the item is reached.

3. **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2011 as correct records.

4. **Planning Applications (Main Plans List)**


Part 2

Items of a "confidential or other special nature" during which it is likely that the meeting will not be open to the public and press as there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972.

NIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

30 June 2011

Present: Councillor J Richards (Chair)
Councillors B Axcell, B Barr, D Earl, G Friend,
T Higgins, L Hoyle, C Jordan, F Rashid, and Settle

DM 7 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T McCarthy and
Councillor L Ladbury.

DM 8 Code of Conduct – Declarations of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Committee Members</td>
<td>DM 11</td>
<td>It was noted that Mr Houghton had hand delivered documents to all</td>
<td>All Members remained on the Committee and took part in the discussion and decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Members earlier in the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DM 9 Minutes

Resolved,

That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2011 were agreed as a
correct record and signed by the Chair - subject to the addition of
apologies from Councillor C Jordan.

DM 10 Planning Applications

Resolved,

That -

1. pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 the
applications for permission to develop land be considered and dealt with in the manner agreed and entered into the Planning Register;

2. the following applications be site visit, the site visits to take place on
Friday, 8 July 2011. The applications would be brought before the
Development Manage Committee meeting on 14 July 2011:

2011/18130 - Land to the rear of, Tesco Extra, Manchester Road, Warrington, WA1 3NJ - Proposed application for Four, one bedroom
Apartments. Four, one bedroomed duplex apartments. Four, two bedroom duplex apartments with associated parking & cycle store.

**2011/18014 - Walnut Tree Farm Northwich Road Warrington** - Proposed installation of one 25m high wind turbine to the west of Walnut Tree Farm to generate and supply Walnut Tree Farm with renewable energy.

**2011/18004 – Lowes Farm, Kenyon Lane, Warrington, WA3 4AY** - Proposed 20.35m high 10kW wind turbine - hub height 15m, blade height 4.8m (resubmission of application 2010/16810).

**2011/17711 - Land adjacent to the M62, Causeway Bridges Farm, Alder Lane, Burtonwood, Warrington, WA5 4BN** - Proposed installation and operation of one 50m high wind turbine (77m total height with blades) and associated infrastructure (including switchgear house, access track, temporary construction compound and hardstanding).

**DM 11 Development of Land opposite 24 Twiss Green Lane, Culcheth**

The Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration submitted the report to advise and update Members over enforcement matters relating to access to the Development at Twiss Green Lane and the scale of the construction at 22 Twiss Green Lane.

Mr A Farrall, Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration, summarised the report for Members and attendees, Mr Farrall stated that there was 3 key issues for consideration:-

- The Marton Close Access
- The Twiss Green Lane Access
- Enforcement with respect to the construction of Twiss Green Lane Property

These issues and the report was discussed at much length, it was noted that Mrs J Heaton and Mr P Houghton were also invited to address the Committee.

Resolved,

That the Committee noted the report and approve the enforcements as recommended in the report

(1) The Marton Close Access – Decision - to take enforcement action over the creation of the access between Marton Close and the Twiss Green Lane property (Enforcement Action - Closing of the vehicular access between 2 Marton Close and the Twiss Green Lane property and the reinstatement of the curtilage by removal of that part of the hard standing at 2 Marton Close which facilitated access to 22, Twiss Green Lane);
(2) The Twiss Green Lane Access – Decision - that no action be taken in respect of the Twiss Green Lane Access – for the reasons stated in the report and;

(3) Enforcement with respect to the construction of the Twiss Green Lane Property – Decision - that no further action be taken with regard to the form and design of the new dwelling – for the reasons stated in the report.

**DM 12 Results of Appeals**

A report of the Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration set out the result of recent appeals along with the Inspector’s findings and the Director’s subsequent comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application / Appeal Reference</th>
<th>Location and Description</th>
<th>Committee / Delegated Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/16193 M0655/D/10/2136871</td>
<td>Fir Tree Farm, Fir Tree Lane, Stretton – Proposed variation of conditions – ‘Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA, the existing farm buildings indicated on the approved drawing shall have been demolished before either of the two new dwellings is first occupied and domestic curtilages of the residential units hereby approved shall not extend beyond the area indicated on that plan’</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/17152 M0655/D/11/2147477</td>
<td>11 Crosby Avenue, Warrington – Two storey side extension; demolition of section of existing damaged brick wall to boundary of property prior to installation of new 1800mm close boarded fence; drop kerb access for new internal garage; removal of tree to rear of garden</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/17657 M0655/D/11/2149906</td>
<td>77 Brownhill, Padgate – Rear conservatory</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/17257 M0655/D/11/2148077</td>
<td>Byreworth, Windmill Hill, Appleton – Two storey side extension and rear extension plus loft conversion</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismiss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolved,

That the report be noted.

Signed…………………………

Dated .. ……………………
### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Thursday 14th July 2011**

**Start 6.30pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>App number</th>
<th>App Location/Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/17711</td>
<td>Land adjacent to the M62, Causeway Bridges Farm, Alder Lane, Burtonwood, Warrington, WA5 4BN</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed installation and operation of one 50m high wind turbine (77m total height with blades) and associated infrastructure (including switchgear house, access track, temporary construction compound and hardstanding).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2011/18004</td>
<td>Lowes Farm, Kenyon Lane, Warrington, WA3 4AY</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed 20.35m high 10kW wind turbine - hub height 15m, blade height 4.8m (resubmission of application 2010/16810).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2011/18014</td>
<td>Walnut Tree Farm, Northwich Road, Warrington, WA4 4PG</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed installation of one 25m high wind turbine to the west of Walnut Tree Farm to generate and supply Walnut Tree Farm with renewable energy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2011/18130</td>
<td>Land to the rear of, Tesco Extra, Manchester Road, Warrington, WA1 3NJ</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed application for Four, one bedroom apartments. Four, one bedoomed duplex apartments. Four, two bedroom duplex apartments with associated parking &amp; cycle store.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This application was deferred at 1st June 2011 meeting of Planning Application Sub-Committee for clarification of submitted technical information. Members visited the site on 27th May 2011.

Description
- A single wind turbine with access to it via the A49, Hollins Lane and Alder Lane along a new approx 400 metre length of new track
- A new crossing point over a minor watercourse, with a short length of culvert, would be required
- Includes a 7 m by 4m by 5.6 m switchgear house
- No overhead lines are proposed
- The turbine would be capable of contributing approx 750 kilowatts (ie 0.75 mega watts) to the national electricity grid. There is some prospect that the power generated would also be used by some local businesses
- The exact model of turbine to be used would be decided following a tendering process, but it would be no larger or higher than that shown in this application
- The nacelle and rotor blades would rotate to face the wind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>2011/17711</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to the M62, Causeway Bridges Farm, Alder Lane, Burtonwood, WARRINGTON, WA5 4BN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Burtonwood &amp; Winwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development:</td>
<td>Proposed installation and operation of one 50m high wind turbine (77m total height with blades) and associated infrastructure (including switchgear house, access track, temporary construction compound and hardstanding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Mr M Fairclough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td>Approve subject to Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conditions:          | • Standard Time limit -full 3 years  
                      • Measures to prevent/mitigate TV interference.  
                      • To be de-commissioned/removed if/when redundant.  
                      • Water vole protection plan to be agreed & implemented  
                      • No development until radar systems are modified  
                      • Noise not to exceed 35dB (A) (LAEq,10Min) at boundary of nearest residential property.  
                      • Turbine to be maintained - any faults to be corrected  
                      • Applicant to correct any fault which causes noise  
                      • Hours/days of construction; Mon-Fri 0800-1800; Sats 0830-1330 only |
The column would be made of tubular steel, the blades of fibre glass and the whole structure would have a low reflectivity finish.

Although the applicant has not conducted public consultation as part of the current application, this was done in advance of their proposals in this vicinity in 2008.

Location
- Relatively flat agricultural land to the north of Gemini (virtually 200 metres due north of the IKEA store) and the M62, to the east of Burtonwood Motorway Service Area.
- Nearest dwellings are over 600 metres away, on the other side of the M62 and Gemini development.

Relevant History
An application for two 80 metre high wind turbines (126 metre total height with blades) and associated infrastructure was withdrawn by the applicant in May 2008 (2008/12807).

Main Issues and Constraints
Principle/Green Belt
Other material considerations

Key policy/guidance checklist
- PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development & Supplement
- PPG2 – Green Belts
- PPS9 – Biodiversity & Geological Conservation
- PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control
- PPG24 – Planning and Noise

Policies DP1; DP9; EM15; EM17 and RDF4 of the RSS for the North West

Adopted Warrington UDP policies:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRN1</th>
<th>Principle/ Green Belt</th>
<th>Whether inappropriate in green belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no dispute that the development as a whole would be inappropriate in green belt – by definition – according to national planning advice on the matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on openness, on visual amenity of green belt and the purposes of including land in it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although obviously a very high feature, the impact on the visual openness of green belt would be mitigated by its visual isolation in the landscape – and new development would be confined to a relatively small area of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The height of the turbine and the span of the blades would be prominent in the landscape – which is generally quite flat for many miles around. The turbine would be visible from many vantage points, including footpaths, local main roads, the M62, Burtonwood and the west coast main line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However the turbine would be relatively slender and visually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
isolated and would not detract from any sense of space within the flat landscape – nor would any long distance views be blocked or significantly obstructed. The turbine would be visible from a number of local dwellings, but the nearest is over 600 metres away. Longer distance views from the north would set the turbine against the backdrop of the built up area of Gemini, north Warrington and the M62 motorway.

Overall, it is considered that the turbine itself would result in only a moderate impact on the openness of green belt.

Whether harm by way of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by very special circumstances
It is acknowledged that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

The expected yield of 750 kilowatts would be small in relation to total national electricity generation – but would be an important contribution. The environmental and economic benefits of the proposal weigh substantially in its favour. The significant potential contribution to meeting targets for renewable energy generation, and the consequential effect in tackling the challenge of climate change is a compelling argument in favour of the proposed turbine. On this basis, it is considered that the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the limited harm to openness and any other harm - so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GRN1; GRN3; GRN20; REP1; REP2; REP4; REP10; REP16; REP17; DCS1</strong></th>
<th>Other material considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>It is considered that serious harm by way of noise impact could be prevented, subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Flicker</strong></td>
<td>An assessment of possible flicker effects has been conducted in accordance with recognised methodology, with the conclusion that given the distance between the proposed turbine and the nearest sensitive receptor – such as housing – serious harm would not result. It is estimated that the nearest dwellings may be affected by flicker for between 3 and 15 hours per year – which is well below a 30 hour per year figure which has featured in some recent European caselaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Conservation</strong></td>
<td>Additional information has been submitted to enable assessment of any ecological impact. The Council’s ecologist has confirmed no objection. The potential for bird – especially raptor – strikes is considered to be very low – certainly compared to those known to occur with – for example – large buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aircraft Safety</strong></td>
<td>The Civil Aviation Authority were involved in the design of the scheme and make no objection to the proposal now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
- There is strong, general support for wind turbines from international, national and regional governments and legislation
- The proposed turbine would contribute 0.75MW of generating capacity to the North West RSS target of 648MW, of which 371MW is currently installed. Warrington and Halton have a sub-target of two large turbines to be installed by 2010
• At present it is understood that there are no existing or consented single large scale turbines within the Warrington and Halton area and, therefore, the 2010 target has been missed. It is also understood that no such large turbines are the subject of firm proposals - or have been scoped - which may contribute to this target.

• Although the government intends to revoke RSS, it is clear that a substantial and growing emphasis on the use of renewable energy will remain within the government’s agenda - and that the evidence base which heavily informed the policies with RSS will remain as material considerations.

• The proposed turbine would also contribute to the aim of improving the security of national energy supply, avoiding over-reliance on imported fossil fuels.

• The turbine would be more likely to most productive during the daytime – according to the wind monitoring which has been conducted on site - when demand is at its highest.

• Previous anemometer tests at the site show that the wind resource would be sufficient to make the proposed turbine viable.

• Previous proposals for 3 turbines were scaled back following detailed assessment and feedback from public consultation.

Responses to consultation (Full details on file)

Planning Policy:
No objection subject to conditions (Appendix 1 below)

Highways:
No objection.

Environmental Protection:
No objection, subject to conditions (Appendix 2 below)

Nature Conservation:
No objection – subject to reasonable avoidance measures (RAMs) with respect to protected species.

Archaeology:
No objection.

United Utilities:
No objection.

Highways Agency:
No objection.

National Air Traffic Control:
Comments awaited.

Civil Aviation Authority:
No objection.

Ministry of Defence:
No objection.

Liverpool John Lennon Airport (LJLA):
No objection – subject to condition.
Comment:
- The condition recommended by LJLA would prevent development commencing unless suitable technical provision to identify the turbine on radar systems is first agreed and implemented.

Manchester Airport:
No objection.

Wigan Council:
Confirm “no comment”.

Joint Radio Company (JRC):
Object. (The JRC assesses potential for interference to radio systems operated by Energy Industry companies in support of their operational requirements for safety management of critical national energy infrastructure.)

Comment:
- The nearest telemetry radio link to the site is approx 422m from the site. Subject to condition – requiring any impact on the link to be mitigated – it is considered that the JRC objection is addressed.

Responses to Notification

Parish Council:
Object:
- Residential Amenity - Visual and Environmental
- Lies within a Greenbelt Area
- Sited next to motorway
- Noise - studies only been done in Burtonwood
- Impact on the amenity of the countryside
- Intrusion into Low Flight Path
- Possible Television Interference
- Possible Mobile Phone Interference
- Vibration could be felt up to 2 miles into earth - concerns about disused local mine shafts

Comment:
Residential Amenity
- Comprehensive landscape and visual impact assessment has been undertaken. Local visual effects will be experienced by residents of Burtonwood as the scheme will be visible in the local landscape, particularly from the isolated dwellings immediately on the periphery of the site boundary, and the route between Burtonwood and Winwick. To reduce visual effects, and following consultation with the local residents, the applicant has reduced the scheme from three turbines to one. Given the 600m separation distance from the nearest dwelling, the proposal would not have an overbearing impact on any residential property

Greenbelt
- There are many examples nationally of wind turbines located in green belt. The very special circumstances – referred to above – are considered sufficient to justify the proposal

Sited next to a Motorway
It is assumed the Parish Council are concerned about driver distraction due to the proximity to the motorway. The Companion Guide to PPS22 recognises that “Drivers are faced with a number of varied and competing distractions during any normal journey, including advertising hoardings, which are deliberately designed to attract attention. At all times drivers are required to take reasonable care to ensure their own and others’ safety. Wind turbines should therefore not be treated any differently from other distractions a driver must face and should not be considered particularly hazardous. There are now a large number of wind farms adjoining or close to road networks and there has been no history of accidents at any of them.” In addition the Highways Agency have not raised any objection to the proposed development as in their view it is set back at an acceptable distance from the highway.

**Noise**

A noise survey was carried out based on relevant government guidance (ETSU-R-97 Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms) to assess potential noise impacts on the nearest residential receptors. Baseline noise levels were measured on site and assessed against operational turbine noise over a range of wind speeds. During operation of the wind turbine, noise levels will readily comply with the guidelines, with noise generated from the scheme falling below the noise generated from traffic movements associated with the M62, under all modelled wind speeds, and during all modelled times of day.

**Impact on the amenity of the countryside**

The location of the proposed wind turbine will not prevent access to the countryside. The Trans Pennine Trail passes approximately 4km south of the site at its nearest point. The built up nature of the intervening landscape results in a negligible magnitude of change. Local footpaths in the vicinity of the proposed development will experience a substantial-moderate visual change within 2km of the turbine, however this is set in a context of existing large scale infrastructure – including pylons. The tranquillity of the countryside will not be effected by the wind turbine due to the presence of the M62 which is a dominant noise source in the area.

**Intrusion into the Low Flight Path**

The turbine has been situated approximately 100m outside the low flight corridor. The Civil Aviation Authority has been fully consulted, were involved in the design of the scheme and have raised no objection to the proposed development.

**Possible Television/Mobile Phone interference**

The impact of the turbine on electromagnetic interference has been comprehensively covered in the supporting documents which accompany the planning application. In terms of electromagnetic signals, the applicant is prepared to commit to investigate and mitigate any interference to signals caused by the proposed wind turbines, should it occur. This matter is covered by condition

**Vibration/Mine Shafts**

Vibrations can occur from wind turbines - however at this level and in this frequency range vibrations will also be available from all kinds of sources such as traffic and background noise – they are not confined to wind turbines. To put the level of vibration into context, they are ground vibrations with amplitudes of about one millionth of a millimetre. There is no possibility of humans sensing the vibration and absolutely no risk to human health. The reports undertaken as part of the environmental report identified historic mining in the area. If planning permission is given prior to construction commencing, a geotechnical investigation of the turbine location will be carried out. This will determine the geotechnical parameters to facilitate the detailed specification and design of the turbine foundation and infrastructure. If voids were present then these would be grouted prior to installation of the turbine foundation. Grouting would involve drilling of boreholes on a grid and then pumping the voids full of a cement/ pulverised fuel ash (PFA) slurry.

Councillor Dr B Axcell: Initial comments:-

- The output from a wind turbine is highly variable due to wind speed variation.
• For very low wind speeds below a value known as the cut-in velocity, in the region of 4 m/s (about 9 mph), the turbine does not generate any power. As the wind speed increases above the cut-in velocity, the turbine begins to generate power in proportion to the cube of the wind speed. When the wind speed reaches the design value, normally about 13 m/s (29 mph), the turbine output is at the rated value. As the wind speed increases further, the power remains at the rated value up to the shut-down velocity, in the region of 25 m/s (90 km/h or 56 mph), when the turbine is shut down to prevent structural damage.

• The cubic relationship between power and wind speed is highly significant. If the wind speed drops by a half from the design value, the power output decreases to just one eighth of the rated value. The wind speed is frequently less than the design velocity (and occasionally greater than the shut-down velocity). As a result, the turbine output on average is very much less than the rated value. The average output is represented by a load factor, which is calculated from the electricity generated by the turbine in a year divided by what would have been generated with the output at maximum power for the whole year.

• In order to get accurate estimates of likely output and load factor it is necessary to make extensive measurements of wind speed and conduct a statistical analysis. The figures have not been provided for the site at Burtonwood.

• The British Wind Energy Association, which promotes wind power, usually assumes a load factor of 30%. This is what the applicants for the site at Burtonwood appear to have done. The predicted output of 1971 MWh represents a load factor of 30.00% ±0.01%, which is unlikely to have come from a statistical analysis! In order to achieve this load factor typical wind speeds would have to be of the order of 8 to 9 m/s (approaching 20 mph).

• Although the load factor on average for wind turbines in the UK is something like 30%, the figure includes the output from offshore wind turbines with a larger load factor than on shore wind turbines and from onshore turbines which are on elevated windy sites.

• The site at Burtonwood is neither elevated nor in an area with a high wind energy resource. I would expect the load factor on such a site to be no better than 15%, which would still require typical wind speeds of 7 m/s or 15 mph, and the load factor could in fact be significantly less than 15%.

• The question then has to be posed: is it worth putting a 750 kW wind turbine, which is 77 m tall, on a site in the green belt, when the average output will probably be of the order of 100 kW or less?

Councillor Dr B Axcell: Further comments:-

• I have just received the attached from the applicants, who are persisting with their belief that they will get a load factor of 30%. This is not based on their measurements, it is just a belief.

• My judgement of a load factor of 15% or thereabouts is based on:
  a) what wind turbines achieve in locations which are not ideal,
  b) the fact that the average load factor for onshore wind turbines in the UK was 27% in 2009, 21% in 2010, and the location of this site is neither elevated nor at the sea shore, where load factors would be higher,
c) a map of wind energy resources at a height of 50 m published in a standard text.

- It is possible to calculate the likely power output (which depends on wind speed cubed) either from the raw data or from a suitable statistical description of the wind speed variation. Neither has been done.
- There is also nothing on mitigation measures.
- I don't think the document provides the information requested at the last PASC meeting.

Comment:
- Following deferral of this application at the 1st June meeting of PASC, the applicant and Cllr Axcell have exchanged information – pursuant to Cllr Axcell’s initial comments set out above – but remain in dispute – primarily as to whether the turbine would achieve a “load factor” of 30 per cent
- Load factor is the ratio between what the capacity of the wind turbine is (at full output in ideal conditions) and what it is likely to produce – it is the ratio of the average electric load to the peak load over a period of time
- Cllr Axcell assesses that the load factor would be approx 15 per cent – rather than the 30 per cent set out by the applicant
- The applicants state that a load factor of 30 per cent is a commonly applied industry average – and is expected to generally improve year on year, as turbine technology improves
- Load factors are generally estimated for a particular topographical area - but usually tested with a wind speed monitor (i.e. anemometer) for a period of months. It is accepted that such monitoring is more accurate than relying wholly on any published load factor figures
- In this case, anemometer readings were taken at 40, 50 and 60 metre heights – although the data has not been provided with the application as very little – if any – weight should be attached to the commercial and technical feasibility of the project in the determination of this application
- Such testing has allowed the applicant to confirm that the project is commercially and technically feasible in this location – as far as they are concerned. It is accepted that it would not be in the applicant’s interest to invest in a project that was not
- Load factor is frequently equated with efficiency – but it is not correct to do so, and gives a misleading picture of wind turbines “being inefficient” - compared to more traditional sources of power. Onshore wind power generation has a load capacity of around 27%, but this is not an indication that something is wrong with the functioning of the turbines, and is certainly not unfavourable when compared to the approx 38% average load factor of conventional thermal power stations
- Cllr Axcell's view could support the position that a turbine with a low output would not provide sufficient wider environmental benefits to justify the development in the green belt
- Strictly, PPS 22 does not support turbine development regardless of how low its output is – but rather states that an application should not be refused simply because it has a low output.
- PPS22 is also clear that LPAs should consider the benefits of wind turbine proposals – irrespective of their efficiency or output
- However, the argument that “low output from turbines does not does justify visual harm” tends not to convince Planning Inspectors at appeal – including cases in green belt - where there are no other special landscape designations
- Mitigation measures are proposed either as part of the application – or are required by condition – including the requirements to de-commission and remove the turbine if it ceases to generate electricity – to check for any interference to TV reception etc

Neighbours:
Eight objections:
- Visual impact; eyesore in green belt
- Noise – especially at night
- Driver distraction on M62
- Would open floodgates for more, similar turbines
- In flight path for Liverpool airport
- Site is at a low point – should be at higher altitude
- Shadow flicker
- Presence of buzzards

2 letters/Emails of support:
- Scheme not as ambitious as previous scheme
- Near M62 – which should negate noise argument
- The small diameter tower would not harm long distance views
- Turbine would add to the view
- Wind energy is essential to reduce CO2 emissions

Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision
It is considered that very special circumstances - to outweigh visual harm to the openness of green belt - have been shown in this case. The application is considered to be in accordance with policies DCS1, GRN1, GRN2, HOU7, REP10, REP17 and REP18 of the adopted Warrington UDP.

Although obviously a very high feature, the impact on the visual openness of green belt would be mitigated by its visual isolation in the landscape – and new development would be confined to a relatively small area of land. The height of the turbine and the span of the blades would be prominent in the landscape – which is generally quite flat for many miles around. The turbine would be visible from many vantage points, including footpaths, local main roads, the M62, Burtonwood and the west coast main line. However the turbine would be relatively slender and visually isolated and would not detract from any sense of space within the flat landscape – nor would any long distance views be blocked or significantly obstructed. The turbine would be visible from a number of local dwellings, but the nearest is over 600 metres away. Longer distance views from the north would set the turbine against the backdrop of the built up area of Gemini, north Warrington and the M62 motorway. Overall, it is considered that the turbine itself would result in only a moderate impact on the openness of green belt.

It is acknowledged that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources. The expected yield of 750 kilowatts would be small in relation to total national electricity generation – but would be an important contribution. The environmental and economic benefits of the proposal weigh substantially in its favour. The significant contribution to meeting targets for renewable energy generation and the consequential effect in tackling the challenge of climate change is a compelling argument in favour of the proposed turbine. The matter of potential noise impact on the nearest residential occupiers is considered capable of adequate mitigate and controls
via conditions. The benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm by
due of inappropriateness, the limited harm to openness and any other
harm - so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special
circumstances.

Appendix 1 – Comments from WBC Planning Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The above planning application proposes the erection of a single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large scale wind turbine on agricultural land at Causeway Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm together with associated concrete plinth, cabling, switch gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing and access track. The turbine has a power rating of 0.75MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and is intended to generate and supply renewable electricity to local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses or to be exported to the local distribution network. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turbine would have a hub height of 50 metres (max blade height 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site for the proposed development lies in open countryside in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>north of the borough on the north side of the M62 Motorway. It is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently Grade 2 agricultural land that forms part of a holding and is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presently designated as Green Belt in the Warrington Unitary Development Plan. In addition part of the application site lies in Flood Zone 3 and in close proximity to Sankey Valley Linear Park and the Greenway network that runs through it. The application must therefore be assessed against national guidance in the form of PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development); Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS1; PPG2 (Green Belts), PPS22 (Renewable Energy) and its Companion Guide – Planning for Renewable Energy; Policies DP1, DP9, EM15, EM17 and RDF4 of the North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Policies GRN1, GRN2, REP1, REP2, REP4, DCS1, GRN3, GRN20, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the adopted Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Relevant National and Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on assessing development within the Green Belt is contained in PPG2. Paragraph 1.5 specifies the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2, advise that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that it is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, inappropriate development should not be approved unless very special circumstances, to outweigh the harm can be demonstrated and that they clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. Paragraph 3.12 advises that the making of a material change in the use of land and engineering operations are inappropriate development unless they maintain openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the key principles of PPS1 is to ensure that Regional planning bodies and LPA’s contribute to global sustainability by addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change. Paragraph 20 advises that Development plan policies should take account of environmental issues such as mitigation of the effects of, and adaptation to, climate change through amongst other things the use of renewable energy. Whilst, paragraph 22 encourages the prudent use of resources by promoting and encouraging, rather than restricting, the use of renewable resources such as renewable energy, including small scale renewable and low carbon energy schemes in developments.
Paragraph 20 of the Supplement to PPS1, in referring to LPA’s developing their core strategy and supporting local development documents, indicates that LPA’s should not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location.

PPS22 sets out the Government’s policy on renewable energy as part of its commitment on climate change and cutting carbon dioxide emissions. Paragraph 1 spells out the key principles that LPA’s should adhere to in their approach to renewable energy and amongst other things, advises that:

- Renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic, and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily.
- Regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, locational requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.
- The wider environmental and economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy projects, whatever their scale, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be granted planning permission.
- Small-scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy and to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally. Planning authorities should not therefore reject planning applications simply because the level of output is small (Paragraph 18 further encourages the development of small scale renewable energy schemes).
- Development proposals should demonstrate any environmental, economic and social benefits as well as how any environmental and social impacts have been minimised through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures.

Paragraph 13 advises that policy on development in the Green Belt is set out in PPG2 and recognises that when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development, which may impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It goes on to advise that careful consideration will therefore need to be given to the visual impact of projects, and developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm if projects are to proceed. However, it suggests that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

The Companion Guide to PPS22 outlines the issues to be covered in a renewable energy application and provides advice on evaluating an application (paragraphs 5.8 to 5.9) and on assessing the visual effects of a proposal (paragraphs 5.14 to 5.24).
Regional Policy:
The RSS seeks to promote all forms of sustainable development. Policies DP1 and DP9 are general policies that seek to reduce the Region's carbon dioxide emissions and facilitate adapting to climate change. Increasing the region's renewable energy capacity is cited as one way of achieving this. Policies EM15 and EM17 promote sustainable energy production generally and set targets for the proportion of the region's electricity that should be provided from renewable energy sources by 2010, 2015 and 2020 (respectively) in order to achieve these broad objectives. Policy EM17 states that “plans and strategies should seek to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the use of renewable energy resources” and indicates that LPA's should give “significant weight to the wider environmental, community and economic benefits of proposals for renewable energy schemes”. Policy RDF4 seeks to protect the Green Belt within Warrington until 2021. It should be noted, however, that there is still an intention from Government to revoke the RRS and so full weight cannot be attributed to these policies.

UDP Policies:
The key UDP policies are GRN1, REP10, REP16 and REP17. Policy GRN1 seeks to protect the Green Belt and reflects the guidance in PPG2. Policy REP10 seeks to protect the Borough’s residents, wildlife and countryside from significant increases in ambient noise levels, whilst Policies REP16 and REP17 indicate that planning permission for renewable energy generally and wind turbines specifically will be allowed provided that certain criteria are met. These criteria include general development control issues, such as preserving the character and appearance of the area, safeguarding nature conservation interests, maintaining highway safety and protecting residential amenity, which are common to Polices DCS1, GRN2 and GRN3 as well. Other policies that need to be considered include Policies LUT15, GRN20, REP1, REP2 and REP4, which seek to prevent harm to the enjoyment of the designated greenway network, protect identified major wildlife corridors, promote sustainable development, the conservation of resources, the use of renewable energy, the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land and prevent development from flooding and increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Assessment of Proposals:
The application is supported by extensive documentation that provides a comprehensive assessment of the relevant issues that includes technical information about the turbine including access arrangements; the need for the development; how the site was selected; an assessment of planning policy; a visual impact appraisal, an assessment of ground conditions/flooding; an assessment of cultural and natural heritage issues; a noise survey; a shadow flicker assessment; an assessment of the impacts on telecommunications and aviation and an assessment of socioeconomic and amenity effects.

The policy assessment is inaccurate in that page 35 of the statement refers to the Energy White Paper (2007) committing the UK to reducing CO₂ emissions by 60% in relation to 1990 levels by 2050. This is not correct. It was the draft Climate Change Bill that was introduced into Parliament on 14th November 2007 that proposed these levels. However, by the time the bill became law on 26th November 2008 the target had been increased to 80%. Thus, the UK is committed, through the Climate Change Act 2008 to reducing CO₂ levels by 80% by 2050 (over 1990 baseline) not 60%. With this exception I consider that the supporting statement makes reference to all the relevant national, regional and local plan policies. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assessment of the current situation in respect of regional policy is considered to be an accurate interpretation of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application site is located in the Green Belt and therefore it is necessary in the first instance to consider if the proposal is inappropriate development or not. The development clearly constitutes an engineering operation. The test of appropriateness therefore is whether or not the development will maintain the openness of the Green Belt and whether or not it will conflict with the purposes of including land within it. A 50 metre high structure will be a prominent feature in the landscape and will impact on the openness of the countryside. Consequently, the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development. This is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and thus the principal issue is whether or not there are any very special circumstances that outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the harm to the openness and any other harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The statement correctly identifies the development as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and cites several special circumstances to outweigh this harm. In addition, it suggests that the harm to the openness of the Green belt will be limited and that the development will not conflict with the purposes of including the land within it (Pages 41 to 44 of Supporting Document Vol.1 – NTS and Main Text). Whilst I would not necessarily agree with the farm diversification argument put forward by the applicant the wider environmental and economic benefits of renewable energy are a recognised material consideration. Consequently, there is a need to consider these arguments in addition to all the other issues in order to assess if the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm by virtue of inappropriate development, the harm to the openness of the Green Belt and any other harm so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special circumstances. To help with this assessment you should consider the appeal decision at South Staffordshire College, Rodbaston, Staffordshire (APP/C3430/A/10/2132289) referred to by the applicant and also that for the application in 2009 at Oakleigh Lodge Farm, Barleycastle Lane, Appleton, Warrington (APP/M0655/A/10/2123665). For comparison purposes the amount of energy generated by the current application is estimated at 1,971 MWh’s per year (Support Document Volume 3, Appendix 3) as compared to 10,444 MWh’s in the Staffordshire case (ie. Approx 20%). Overall it is considered that the scheme amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt but that there is a strong presumption in favour of encouraging the production of energy from renewable sources and that this amounts to a very special circumstance to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness that needs to be balanced against the harm to the openness of the Green Belt and any other harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It the application is to be approved you should consider whether a condition can be applied to cover restoration of the site should operations cease (Companion Guide to PPS22, Paragraph 5.11). I would also draw your attention to the conditions imposed by the Inspector in the South Staffordshire College appeal case referred to by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Comments from Environmental Protection

Assessment

The main concern from Environmental Protection on wind turbines is the potential impact of noise on the amenity of nearby residential properties. Generally, as the windspeed increases, the level of noise created by the passage of wind past the turbine and blades increases. This is usually offset to a degree by the increased ambient noise due to the wind noise itself. In this particular location, ambient noise levels are artificially higher due to the close proximity of the nearby M62 motorway.

There is limited guidance and advice available on wind turbines. The commonly referred to reference document is ETSU – The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms. This was published in 1996 and was the result of a working group reviewing available information at that time. This document however is more specifically related to a wind farm as opposed to a single wind turbine, which is what the proposal in this case is for. As a result, some of the information provided by ETSU is not necessarily pertinent to the assessments required for a single turbine which is under consideration here.

Some of the suggested conditions in the ETSU document have noise limits set at a level that Environmental Protection would consider likely to have an impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties – as such, any noise limits required through the granting of planning permission for this case may have to be reduced from ETSU guideline levels to guarantee minimal impact on amenity through noise. This guidance does however specify a single value noise limit which may be appropriate for use for Single Turbines or for cases where a significant separation distance exists between the proposed turbines and noise sensitive properties.

A recent case in the high court ruled that following advice and guidance under the ETSU guidelines did not automatically guarantee that impacts on residential amenity would not occur through the effects of noise – this again supports the notion that a locally set appropriate noise level may be preferable to generic noise limits set by ETSU.

The submitted noise assessment for the proposed turbine however suggests predicted noise levels are significantly below ETSU model guideline limits according to different wind speeds and tonal noise.

This noise assessment has calculated impacts at the nearest residential properties. The report summarises that background noise levels in the area are typically between 45 and 55dBA daytime and 41 and 55dBA night time at different residential properties around the proposed site, the motorway being the significant contributor to these elevated noise levels.

Noise levels from the proposed turbine have been calculated at these same locations using noise prediction software, the noise levels typically being between 25-32dBA.

The predictions show that noise will be at worst 14dBA below the ambient background noise levels, typically it will be 17-20dBA below background noise levels.

This difference is a positive indicator that nuisance or impact on amenity from noise is highly unlikely to occur.

The acoustic report suggests a fixed noise limit of 35dBA in all wind speeds up to 10 metres per second at the nearest residential property at a measured height of 10m. Comparing this proposed level to the ambient background noise level, the proposed limit is in a worst case scenario at least 6dB below the quietest background noise level and in the best case scenario is approximately 20dB below the ambient background noise level.
In either case, it is highly unlikely that noise from the turbine would be perceived at the nearest residential property.

It is considered that this proposed limit, based on the ETSU single value limit, is acceptable for this situation due to the high ambient background noise levels experienced at this site due to the proximity of the M62 Motorway.

Based upon this information, I do not feel that it would be unreasonable to recommend approval of this application with conditions to limit the maximum noise emitted from the proposed wind turbine.

Conditions

Noise from Wind Turbine Operation

Noise emitted from the wind turbine shall not exceed 35dB(A) \( L_{Aeq,10Min} \) at any time (day or night) at the boundary of the nearest residential property. The nearest residential property refers to any property either permitted for build or built as of the date permission is granted. The measurement position shall refer to a measurement point 10m above the boundary of any nearby residential property at any windspeed up to 10ms\(^{-1}\).

Maintenance of Wind Turbine

The turbine shall be maintained and serviced in accordance with manufacturers specifications for the duration of it’s operational life. Any faults or breakdowns with any aspect of the turbine including gearbox and driveshafts, nacelle assembly or turbine blades which may give rise to increased noise levels shall be reported to the Local Authority within 48hrs of discovery. Remedial action to correct any noise emitting faults shall be taken as soon as practicable, any faults which will result in an increase in noise over the permitted noise level at the boundary of any nearby residential property shall result in the turbine being shut down until such time that repairs are completed.

Receipt of Complaints

Following the receipt of any ‘justified noise complaint’ notified from either the Local Planning Authority or Environmental Health Official, the Applicant shall take all necessary steps shall to investigate the source of the noise complained of and take steps, as needed, to correct any fault found in accordance with the requirements of the Maintenance of Wind Turbine condition.

Working Hours For Construction Sites Informativ

Construction works audible at the boundary of the nearest residential property will not exceed the following times unless with the written permission of the LPA or Environmental Health & Protection. Monday to Friday 08.00 to 18.00 hrs, Saturday 08.30 to 13.30 and at no time whatsoever on Sundays or Public/Bank Holidays. This includes deliveries to the site and any work undertaken by contractors and sub contractors. Where permission is sought for works to be carried out outside the hours stated, applications in writing must be made with at least seven days notice to Environmental Health & Protection, Warrington Borough Council, New Town House, Buttermarket Street, Warrington, WA1 2HN. Local residents that may be affected by the work shall also be notified in writing, after approval is received from the LPA or Environmental Health & Protection.

(Works audible at the site boundary outside these hours may result in the service of a Notice restricting the hours as above. Breach of the notice may result in prosecution and fines of up to £5000 plus £50 for each further breach and/or six months imprisonment.)
This application was deferred at 11th May meeting of PASC to enable a site visit. Members visited the site on 8th July 2011.

Description
- The turbine would generate and supply electricity to Lowes Farm – with any excess sold to the national grid
- The turbine would have a hub height of 15.55 m and a maximum height of 20.35 metres
- Details of any transformer or other plant housing would need a further planning permission
- The application has been submitted with – amongst others – a landscape assessment; an assessment of shadow flicker; and ecology
- Since PASC on 11th May additional noise information has been provided by the applicant and assessed by WBC Environmental Protection

Location
- Open countryside to the east of Kenyon Lane in green belt
- The turbine would be on a slight rise in local land levels approx 20 metres from a bank of young oak/sycamore trees which are approx 8-10 metres high
- Nearest dwellings are over 300 metres away
- The turbine would be approx 350 metres from the main buildings at Lowes Farm
- A public footpath passes within a few metres of the proposed site

Relevant History
Application 2010/16810 for a similar turbine was withdrawn in September 2010.

Main Issues and Constraints
Principle/Green Belt
Impact on residential living conditions
Key policy/guidance checklist
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development & Supplement
PPG2 – Green Belts
PPS9 – Biodiversity & Geological Conservation
PPS22 – Renewable Energy & Companion Guide
PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control
PPG24 – Planning and Noise

Adopted Warrington UDP policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRN1</th>
<th>Principle/ Green Belt</th>
<th>Whether inappropriate in green belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no dispute that the development as a whole would be inappropriate in green belt – by definition – according to national planning advice on the matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on openness, on visual amenity of green belt and the purposes of including land in it**

Although obviously a high feature, the impact on the visual openness of green belt would be mitigated by its visual isolation in the landscape – and new physical development would be confined to a relatively small area of land. The nearby bank of trees would either screen or form a backdrop to the bottom 8-10 metres of the turbine column.

The height of the turbine and the span of the blades would be prominent in the landscape – which is generally quite flat for many miles around. The turbine would be visible from many vantage points, including footpaths, and the two local roads which bound the site. However the turbine would be relatively slender and visually isolated and would not detract from any sense of space within the flat landscape – nor would any long distance views be seriously blocked or significantly obstructed. The turbine would be visible from a number of local dwellings, but the nearest is over 300 metres away.

Overall, it is considered that the turbine itself would result in only a slight impact on the openness of green belt.

**Whether harm by way of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by very special circumstances**

It is acknowledged that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

The expected yield of 10 kilowatts would be very small in relation to total national electricity generation – but would contribute to the government’s aims to increase generation from such sources. The environmental and economic benefits of this type of proposal weigh substantially in its favour. The potential benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the limited harm to openness and any other harm - so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRN2 REP1 DCS1</th>
<th>Impact on residential living conditions</th>
<th>The potential impact of the proposal on residential living conditions is generally considered to be acceptable. The exception to this is the potential impact of noise – which has</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Responses to consultation (Full details on file)

Planning Policy:
No objection subject to conditions (Appendix 1 below)

Highways:
No objection.

Environmental Protection:
Insufficient information has been provided to confirm what the potential impact on residential living conditions would be. In the absence of such information approval – including approval subject to conditions – is not recommended (Appendix 2 – below).

Nature Conservation:
No objection. The proposal fits with Natural England’s guidance regarding distance from features which may be used by bats.

Liverpool John Lennon Airport (LJLA):
No objection.

Manchester Airport:
No objection.

Aircraft Owners and Pilot’s Association:
No objection.

Joint Radio Company (JRC):
No objection.

Ministry of Defence:
Expects to have no concerns – would need to comment afresh if any changes from submitted scheme are proposed.

Civil Aviation Authority:
Comment - Although the development is within the bounds of the Manchester Low Level Route, we do not believe this to be a consideration for a turbine of this height in this particular location.

Responses to Notification

Ward Councillor:
Cllr K Bland – requests referral to PASC - comments – insufficient consultation by applicant with neighbours.

Parish Council:
Object -
Site is in green belt  
No very special circumstances  
Visually unacceptable  
Would harm wildlife  
Would set a precedent for other, similar proposals

**Neighbours:**  
58 objections -  
Visual impact; eyesore in green belt  
Loss of countryside view  
Many walkers use footpath and the turbine would harm natural beauty  
Noise – especially at night  
Harm to wildlife  
Motivation for proposal is financial gain  
Would lead to more, similar turbines

One Email of support:  
I have no vested interest in this project, and I would be able to see the turbine from my garden  
Objections from others are “NIMBY” complaints – not from the silent majority  
Wind turbines are a viable and sustainable source of renewable energy  
Would be privately funded, would provide applicant and national grid with renewable energy and reduce its carbon footprint  
Site could possibly take three more turbines without negative visual impact  
I use footpath regularly – it is an exposed and windy spot – I would look forward to seeing the turbine in the landscape

Comment:  
The argument that low output from turbines does not does justify visual harm tends not to convince Planning Inspectors at appeal – including case in green belt - where there are no other special landscape designations  
National planning advice (PPS22) sets out that LPAs should consider the benefits of wind turbine proposals – irrespective of their efficiency or output  
PPS22 is also clear that permission for wind turbines should not be refused merely because their output is small

**Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision**  
It is considered that very special circumstances - to outweigh visual harm to the openness of green belt - have been shown in this case. The application is considered to be in accordance with policies DCS1, GRN1, GRN2, REP17 and REP18 of the adopted Warrington UDP.

Although obviously a high feature, the impact on the visual openness of green belt would be mitigated by its visual isolation in the landscape – and physical new development would be confined to a relatively small area of land. The height of the turbine and the span of the blades would be prominent in the landscape – which is generally quite flat. The turbine would be visible from many vantage points, including footpaths, and local roads. However the turbine would be relatively slender and visually isolated and would not detract
from any sense of space within the flat landscape – nor would any long
distance views be seriously blocked or significantly obstructed. The turbine
would be visible from a number of local dwellings, but the nearest is over 300
metres away. Overall, it is considered that the turbine itself would result in
only a slight impact on the openness of green belt.

It is acknowledged that very special circumstances may include the wider
environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from
renewable sources. The expected yield of 10 kilowatts would be very small in
relation to total national electricity generation – but would be an important
contribution to the aim of increasing generation from such sources. The
environmental and economic benefits of this type of proposal weigh
substantially in its favour. The potential benefits of the scheme clearly
outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the limited harm to
openness and any other harm - so as to justify the proposed scheme on the
basis of very special circumstances.

In terms of the potential impact of noise from the turbine however, it is
concluded that insufficient information has been provided to confirm what the
potential impact on residential living conditions would be. In the absence of
such information approval – including approval subject to conditions – is not
recommended that planning permission is granted. In this context, it is not
possible to conclude that the potential impact on the living conditions of
occupiers of residential property would be acceptable – or could be made
acceptable by conditions – and therefore comply with policies GRN2 (criterion
9); REP1 (criterion 10); DCS1 (criterion 1); HOU7 (criterion 2) or REP10 of the
adopted Warrington UDP.

**Appendix 1 – Comments from WBC Planning Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>The above planning application proposes the erection of a single small scale wind turbine on land to the east of Lowes Farm together with an associated plinth. The turbine is to generate and supply renewable electricity to the farm with any excess being sold to the national grid. The turbine would have a hub height of 15.55 metres (max blade height 20.35 metres).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Relevant National and Local Policy</td>
<td>The site for the proposed development lies in the north of the borough. It is in open countryside on the east side of Kenyon Lane. It is currently Grade 3 agricultural land that forms part of a holding and is presently designated as Green Belt in the Warrington Unitary Development Plan. The application must therefore be assessed against national guidance in the form of PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development); Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS1; PPG2 (Green Belts), PPS22 (Renewable Energy) and its Companion Guide – Planning for Renewable Energy; Policies DP1, DP9, EM15, EM17 and RDF4 of the North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Policies GRN1, GRN2, REP1, REP2, DCS1, GRN3, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the adopted Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guidance</td>
<td>Guidance on assessing development within the Green Belt is contained in PPG2. Paragraph 1.5 specifies the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2, advise that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that it is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, inappropriate development should not be approved unless very special circumstances, to outweigh the harm can be demonstrated and that they clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. Paragraph 3.12 advises that the making of a material change in the use of land and engineering operations are inappropriate development unless they maintain openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

One of the key principles of PPS1 is to ensure that Regional planning bodies and LPA’s contribute to global sustainability by addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change. Paragraph 20 advises that Development plan policies should take account of environmental issues such as mitigation of the effects of, and adaptation to, climate change through amongst other things the use of renewable energy. Whilst, paragraph 22 encourages the prudent use of resources by promoting and encouraging, rather than restricting, the use of renewable resources such as renewable energy, including small scale renewable and low carbon energy schemes in developments.

Paragraph 20 of the Supplement to PPS1, in referring to LPA’s developing their core strategy and supporting local development documents, indicates that LPA’s should not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location.

PPS22 sets out the Government’s policy on renewable energy as part of its commitment on climate change and cutting carbon dioxide emissions. Paragraph 1 spells out the key principles that LPA’s should adhere to in their approach to renewable energy and amongst other things, advises that;

- Renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic, and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily.
- Regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, locational requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.
- The wider environmental and economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy projects, whatever their scale, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be granted planning permission.
- Small-scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy and to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally. Planning authorities should not therefore reject planning applications simply because the level of output is small (Paragraph 18 further encourages the development of small scale renewable energy schemes).
- Development proposals should demonstrate any environmental, economic and social benefits as well as how any environmental and social impacts have been minimised through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures.

Paragraph 13 advises that policy on development in the Green Belt is set out in PPG2 and recognises that when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development, which may impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It goes on to advise that careful consideration will therefore need to be given to the visual impact of projects, and developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm if projects are to proceed. However, it suggests that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

Whilst, paragraph 21 indicates that LPA’s should take account of the cumulative impact of wind generation projects and that such impacts should be assessed at the planning application stage.

The Companion Guide to PPS22 outlines the issues to be covered in a renewable energy application and provides advice on evaluating an application (Paragraphs 5.8 to 5.11).

The RSS seeks to promote all forms of sustainable development. Policies DP1 and DP9 are general policies that seek to reduce the Region’s carbon dioxide emissions and facilitate adapting to climate change. Increasing the region’s renewable energy capacity is cited as one way of achieving this. Policies EM15 and EM17 promote sustainable energy production generally and set targets for the proportion of the region’s electricity that should be provided from renewable energy sources by 2010, 2015 and 2020 (respectively) in order to achieve these broad objectives. Policy EM17 states that “plans and strategies should seek to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the use of renewable energy resources” and indicates that LPA’s should give “significant weight to the wider environmental, community and economic benefits of proposals for renewable energy schemes”. Policy RDF4 seeks to protect the Green Belt within Warrington until 2021. It should be noted, however, that there is still an intention from Government to revoke the RRS and so full weight cannot be attributed to these policies.

The key UDP policies are GRN1, REP10, REP16 and REP17. Policy GRN1 seeks to protect the Green Belt and reflects the guidance in PPG2. Policy REP10 seeks to protect the Borough’s residents, wildlife and countryside from significant increases in ambient noise levels, whilst Policies REP16 and REP17 indicate that planning permission for renewable energy generally and wind turbines specifically will be allowed provided that certain criteria are met. These criteria include general development control issues, such as preserving the character and appearance of the area, safeguarding nature conservation interests, maintaining highway safety and protecting residential amenity, which are common to Polices DCS1, GRN2 and GRN3 as well. Other policies that need to be considered include Policies REP1 and REP2, which seek to promote sustainable development, the conservation of resources, the use of renewable energy and the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land.
Conclusions

The applicant has submitted a combined Design and Access and Planning Statement with supporting documentation. The assessment is far more comprehensive than the statement submitted with the previous application (2010/16810), however, it still does not contain any information about how the facility would be connected to the grid or farm power supply. Details of any cable routes to connect the turbine to the grid and/or the farm power supply and the location of any transformer or other equipment housing should be provided in order that the impact of these can be assessed and to avoid the need for a further application.

Notwithstanding this the statement refers to all of the relevant policy and guidance and whilst indicating that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt considers that the loss of openness and the encroachment of development into the Green Belt, though harmful, is outweighed by the wider environmental benefits that a renewable energy installation brings and that this amounts to very special circumstances.

Whilst, I have not had the benefit of visiting the site I am inclined to broadly agree with this assessment. I believe that the proposed turbine is relatively slim; would not be significantly higher that the telegraph poles that cross the surrounding farmland; would be set against the backdrop of scattered trees or woodland in many instances and its effect on the openness of the Green Belt would, therefore, be limited. I also considered that the strong presumption in favour of encouraging renewable resources amounts to very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and the limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

Consequently, if you agree with this view and you cannot identify any other harm, either yourself or through any consultation responses, then it is considered that the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of renewable energy, albeit on a small scale, should be regarded as a very special circumstance sufficient to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As suggested in previous consultation responses to help with this assessment you should consider the appeal decision at South Staffordshire College, Rodbaston, Staffordshire (APP/C3430/A/10/2132289) referred to in application 2011/17711 and also that for the application in 2009 at Oakleigh Lodge Farm, Barleycastle Lane, Appleton, Warrington (APP/M0655/A/10/2123665), along with those referred to be the applicant in Section 6 of their statement.

Overall it is considered that the scheme amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt but that there is a strong presumption in favour of encouraging the production of energy from renewable sources and that this amounts to a very special circumstance to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt provided that the other relevant criteria specified in Policies REP1, REP2, DCS1, GRN2, GRN3, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the UDP can be satisfied.

If the application is to be approved you should consider whether a condition can be applied to cover restoration of the site should operations cease (Companion Guide to PPS22 – Planning for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant has submitted a combined Design and Access and Planning Statement with supporting documentation. The assessment is far more comprehensive than the statement submitted with the previous application (2010/16810), however, it still does not contain any information about how the facility would be connected to the grid or farm power supply. Details of any cable routes to connect the turbine to the grid and/or the farm power supply and the location of any transformer or other equipment housing should be provided in order that the impact of these can be assessed and to avoid the need for a further application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notwithstanding this the statement refers to all of the relevant policy and guidance and whilst indicating that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt considers that the loss of openness and the encroachment of development into the Green Belt, though harmful, is outweighed by the wider environmental benefits that a renewable energy installation brings and that this amounts to very special circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst, I have not had the benefit of visiting the site I am inclined to broadly agree with this assessment. I believe that the proposed turbine is relatively slim; would not be significantly higher that the telegraph poles that cross the surrounding farmland; would be set against the backdrop of scattered trees or woodland in many instances and its effect on the openness of the Green Belt would, therefore, be limited. I also considered that the strong presumption in favour of encouraging renewable resources amounts to very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and the limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequently, if you agree with this view and you cannot identify any other harm, either yourself or through any consultation responses, then it is considered that the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of renewable energy, albeit on a small scale, should be regarded as a very special circumstance sufficient to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As suggested in previous consultation responses to help with this assessment you should consider the appeal decision at South Staffordshire College, Rodbaston, Staffordshire (APP/C3430/A/10/2132289) referred to in application 2011/17711 and also that for the application in 2009 at Oakleigh Lodge Farm, Barleycastle Lane, Appleton, Warrington (APP/M0655/A/10/2123665), along with those referred to be the applicant in Section 6 of their statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall it is considered that the scheme amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt but that there is a strong presumption in favour of encouraging the production of energy from renewable sources and that this amounts to a very special circumstance to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt provided that the other relevant criteria specified in Policies REP1, REP2, DCS1, GRN2, GRN3, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the UDP can be satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It the application is to be approved you should consider whether a condition can be applied to cover restoration of the site should operations cease (Companion Guide to PPS22 – Planning for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renewable Energy, Paragraph 5.11). I would also draw your attention to the conditions imposed by the Inspector in the South Staffordshire College appeal case referred to above.

Appendix 2 – Comments from WBC Environmental Protection

| Assessment | Since my last memo on 19 May 2011, I received a phone call from Mr Mike Potts – Acoustician, on 1 June 2011 to discuss the reasoning why more noise monitoring data was considered necessary. After some detailed discussion on the matter, it was agreed reluctantly by Mr Potts that further monitoring would be needed in order to satisfy my requirements for detailed background noise readings to allow a full assessment of impact on amenity to be carried out.

Since those initial discussions, apart from a couple of e-mails between the client and the acoustician, which I have been copied in, I have not received any further information on the background noise levels at this site.

At this point in time I only have the original noise calculations which suggested the noise from the wind turbine would contribute a noise level of 34.2dB(A) at the nearest residential property some 510m distant from the turbine.

As the background noise level has not been provided, it is impossible to gauge precisely what impact will result. It is expected that the background noise level may reach this level at some point in time in this area, but for what percentage of time I cannot state. From the applicants point of view, they would like the background noise level to be higher than 34dB(A) for a significant majority of the time which will reduce the impact on amenity, however, if the background noise level is close to or is lower than the calculated turbine noise level, then it is possible an impact on amenity will result.

Without this background noise data I cannot even determine whether or not the turbine is likely to be audible at the nearest residential property. As such, at this stage, I cannot assess the impact on amenity from noise due to a lack of supporting information provided by the applicant.

I am of the opinion that the turbine itself is probably going to be acceptable in this location however without the actual background noise data to compare against the calculated noise levels, I cannot have any certainty on this assumption and cannot make any positive recommendation to the Planning Committee on the acceptability or otherwise of this application on grounds of noise impact.

| Conclusion | At this point in time, due to lack of supporting acoustic information, I cannot make a recommendation to the Planning Committee that this application could be granted without there being any impacts on amenity to local residents arising from noise from the operation of the wind turbine. |
This application was deferred from 11th May meeting of PASC to enable a site visit. Members visited the site on 8th July 2011.

Description
- The proposed turbine would generate and supply electricity to the agricultural enterprise at Walnut Tree Farm and to the document storage business which also operates from the site
- Any excess electricity would be available for sale to the National Grid
- This is a small scale, “microgeneration” scheme – the capacity of the turbine would be 11 kilowatts (KW)
- The turbine would have a hub height of 18.4 metres and a blade span of 13 metres
- The application has been submitted with the following:
  - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
  - Impact on amenities of local residents
  - Noise impact
  - Biodiversity and wildlife
  - Bats and birds
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Physical Impacts (soil & hydrology)
  - Potential adverse impacts on local development
  - Cultural heritage
  - Community

Application Number: 2011/18014

Location:  Walnut Tree Farm, Northwich Road, Warrington, WA4 4PG

Ward:  Hatton, Stretton & Walton

Development: Proposed installation of one 25m high wind turbine to the west of Walnut Tree Farm to generate and supply Walnut Tree Farm with renewable energy.

Applicant:  Mr Tim Blackshaw

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to Conditions

Conditions:
- Standard Time limit -full 3 years
- To be removed if redundant for over six months
- Noise from turbine operation
- Maintenance of wind turbine
- Receipt of noise complaints
- Receipt of complaints - shadow flicker
- Telecommunications Interference
- Aircraft and Radar
- Pollution report
- Economic statements

**Location**
- Site in open countryside approx 800 metres south of the M56 motorway and 200 metres or so from the buildings at Walnut Tree Farm
- Members will see the number and disposition of the nearest dwellings on the site plan, reproduced in this Agenda. For example, there are four properties on School Lane – to the south of the site – within 250 metres of the site
- The nearest residential property to the site would be over 220 metres from the turbine

**Relevant History**
This scheme is a re-submission of 2010/16867, which was previously withdrawn by the applicant in September 2010.

**Main Issues and Constraints**
**Principle/Green Belt**
Noise

**Key policy/guidance checklist**
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development & Supplement
PPG2 – Green Belts
PPS9 – Biodiversity & Geological Conservation
PPS22 – Renewable Energy & Companion Guide
PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control
PPG24 – Planning and Noise

Adopted Warrington UDP policies:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRN</th>
<th>Principle/ Green Belt</th>
<th>Whether inappropriate in green belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no dispute that the development as a whole would be inappropriate in green belt – by definition – according to national planning advice on the matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Impact on openness, on visual amenity of green belt and the purposes of including land in it</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although obviously a noticeably high feature – which would rise well above most trees in the near landscape - the impact on the visual openness of green belt would tend to be mitigated by its visual isolation in the landscape – and because new physical development would be confined to a relatively small area of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The height of the turbine and the span of the blades would be prominent in the landscape – which is generally quite flat for many miles around. The turbine would be visible from many vantage points, including footpaths, and local main roads. However the turbine would be relatively slender and visually isolated and would not detract from any sense of space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within the flat landscape – nor would any long distance views be seriously blocked or significantly obstructed. The turbine would be visible from a number of local dwellings, but the nearest is over 220 metres away.

Overall, it is considered that the turbine itself would result in only a sight impact on the openness of green belt.

Whether harm by way of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by very special circumstances it is acknowledged that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

The expected maximum yield of 11 kilowatts would be miniscule in relation to total national electricity generation – but would be in line with government aspirations to encourage energy from micro-generation. The environmental and economic benefits of this sort of proposal weigh substantially in its favour. The significant contribution to meeting targets for renewable energy generation, and the consequential effect in tackling climate change is a compelling argument in favour of the proposed turbine. The potential benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the limited harm to openness and any other harm - so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special circumstances.

Comment:
• The argument that low output from turbines does not does justify visual harm tends not to convince Planning Inspectors at appeal – including case in green belt - where there are no other special landscape designations
• National planning advice (PPS22) sets out that LPAs should consider the benefits of wind turbine proposals – irrespective of their efficiency or output
• PPS22 is also clear that permission for wind turbines should not be refused merely because their output is small

Responses to consultation (Full details on file)

Planning Policy:
No objection subject to conditions (Appendix 1 below)

Highways:
No objection.

Environmental Protection:
No objection subject to conditions (Appendix 2 below).

**Nature Conservation:**
No objection. The proposal fits with Natural England’s guidelines regarding distance from features suitable for use by bats. Satisfied that there are no further ecological issues with this application.

**Tree Officer:**
No objection.

**National Air Traffic Control:**
No response.

**Civil Aviation Authority:**
Comment – although the turbine would be within the Manchester Low Level Route, this would not be a consideration for a turbine of this height in this location.

**Ministry of Defence:**
No objection.

**Liverpool John Lennon Airport (LJLA):**
No objection.

**Manchester Airport:**
No objection.

**Joint Radio Company (JRC):**
No objection.

**British Telecom:**
No objection.

**Responses to Notification**

**Cheshire West and Chester Council:**
Comment:
- should be assessed in line with relevant local and national policies
- there are properties within Cheshire West and Chester Council close to the site
- noise impact should be assessed
- the site is within a low-moderate sensitivity area – according to our SPD “Landscape Sensitivity and Wind Turbine Development”

**Stretton Parish Council:**
Object.
- national guidance (PPS22) seeks to avoid visual injury from turbines
- would harm character of area for visitors and for residents
- Stretton Hall – a grade 2* LB is in a clear line of vision of the turbine
• a recent govt report says that only 20% of installed wind power is actually delivered
• scheme is for financial benefit – but such a small amount of power generation will not make the business efficient
• need for electricity arises from the expansion of a small farm into a small industrial estate
• would produce more noise than that requiring hearing protection in an industrial area
• no detailed acoustic survey has been undertaken
• little existing background noise – so noise from turbine would be more noticeable
• submitted photos are taken with a wide angle lens and are mis-leading
• impact on wildlife – including birds & bats

**Whitley Parish Council** (full details on file):
Object.
• Repeat objections to previous proposal for wind turbines at Walnut Tree Farm
• Less than 100 metres of our parish boundary
• Residents most affected would be in our parish on School Lane
• Harmful to green belt and landscape
• Photos with application are misleading
• No scientific study has been made as to the suitability of the site for wind energy
• Application is wrong in terms of figures given for electricity generation and carbon saving
• No public gain sufficient to outweigh harm – scheme benefits applicant only
• No independent report on birdlife and bat activities
• No proper acoustic report/survey – Whitley residents downwind of the structure would be those most affected

**Neighbours** (full details on file):
32 letters/e-mails of objection:
• Would urge Members to visit the site, prior to any decision being made
• Farm has already been allowed to over-develop
• Visual impact; eyesore in green belt
• Impact on Higher Whitley conservation area and from the listed building at Stretton Hall
• No noise or bat surveys
• Driven by financial rewards to applicant, rather than by any serious environmental concerns
• Would open floodgates for more, similar turbines
• Better than previous scheme for two turbines, but there are still serious concerns
• Shadow flicker
• Health concerns
• impact of construction & de-commissioning
would reduce property values
applicant should consider energy from solar panels or bio-gas instead
impact on birdlife
carbon saving has been over estimated
submitted photos are mis-leading
model aircraft and micro-lights may collide with the turbine
the blades may throw ice – or the blades or tower may collapse

Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision
It is considered that very special circumstances - to outweigh visual harm to the openness of green belt - have been shown in this case. The application is considered to be in accordance with policies DCS1, GRN1, GRN2, REP17 and REP18 of the adopted Warrington UDP.

Although obviously a high feature, the impact on the visual openness of green belt would be mitigated by its visual isolation in the landscape – and new development would be confined to a relatively small area of land. The height of the turbine and the span of the blades would be prominent in the landscape – which is generally quite flat. The turbine would be visible from many vantage points, including footpaths, and local main roads. However the turbine would be relatively slender and visually isolated and would not detract from any sense of space within the flat landscape – nor would any long distance views be blocked or significantly obstructed. The turbine would be visible from a number of local dwellings, but the nearest is over 220 metres away. Overall, it is considered that the turbine itself would result in only a moderate impact on the openness of green belt.

It is acknowledged that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources. The expected yield of 11 kilowatts would be very small in relation to total national electricity generation – but would accord with government aspiration to increase generation from renewable sources. The environmental and economic benefits of the proposal weigh substantially in its favour. The significant contribution to meeting targets for renewable energy generation, and the consequential effect in tackling the challenge of climate change is a compelling argument in favour of this type of turbine. The benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the limited harm to openness and any other harm - so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special circumstances.

Appendix 1 – Comments from WBC Planning Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The above planning application proposes the erection of a single micro scale wind turbine on land to the rear of Walnut Tree Farm together with associated concrete plinths and cabling. The turbine is to generate and supply renewable electricity to the farm and file document storage business that operates from the farm with any excess being sold to the national grid. The turbine would have a hub height of 18.4 metres; a blade span of 13 metres and a capacity of 11Kw. It is a resubmission of a previous application (2010/16867) that was withdrawn on 6th September 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site for the proposed development lies in open countryside in the south of the borough and south of the M56 Motorway. It is currently Grade 3 agricultural land that forms part of a holding and is presently designated as Green Belt in the Warrington Unitary Development Plan. The application must therefore be assessed against national guidance in the form of PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development); Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS1; PPG2 (Green Belts), PPS22 (Renewable Energy) and its Companion Guide – Planning for Renewable Energy; Policies DP1, DP9, EM15, EM17 and RDF4 of the North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Policies GRN1, GRN2, REP1, REP2, DCS1, GRN3, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the adopted Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance on assessing development within the Green Belt is contained in PPG2. Paragraph 1.5 specifies the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2, advise that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that it is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, inappropriate development should not be approved unless very special circumstances, to outweigh the harm can be demonstrated and that they clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. Paragraph 3.12 advises that the making of a material change in the use of land and engineering operations are inappropriate development unless they maintain openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

One of the key principles of PPS1 is to ensure that Regional planning bodies and LPA’s contribute to global sustainability by addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change. Paragraph 20 advises that Development plan policies should take account of environmental issues such as mitigation of the effects of, and adaptation to, climate change through amongst other things the use of renewable energy. Whilst, paragraph 22 encourages the prudent use of resources by promoting and encouraging, rather than restricting, the use of renewable resources such as renewable energy, including small scale renewable and low carbon energy schemes in developments.

Paragraph 20 of the Supplement to PPS1, in referring to LPA’s developing their core strategy and supporting local development documents, indicates that LPA’s should not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location.

PPS22 sets out the Government’s policy on renewable energy as part of its commitment on climate change and cutting carbon dioxide emissions. Paragraph 1 spells out the key principles that LPA’s should adhere to in their approach to renewable energy and amongst other things, advises that:

- Renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic, and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily.
- Regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote and encourage,
rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, locational requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.

- The wider environmental and economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy projects, whatever their scale, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be granted planning permission.
- Small-scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy and to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally. Planning authorities should not therefore reject planning applications simply because the level of output is small (Paragraph 18 further encourages the development of small scale renewable energy schemes).
- Development proposals should demonstrate any environmental, economic and social benefits as well as how any environmental and social impacts have been minimised through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures.

Paragraph 13 advises that policy on development in the Green Belt is set out in PPG2 and recognises that when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development, which may impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It goes on to advise that careful consideration will therefore need to be given to the visual impact of projects, and developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm if projects are to proceed. However, it suggest that very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

The Companion Guide to PPS22 outlines the issues to be covered in a renewable energy application and provides advice on evaluating an application (Paragraphs 5.8 to 5.11).

The RSS seeks to promote all forms of sustainable development. Policies DP1 and DP9 are general policies that seek to reduce the Region’s carbon dioxide emissions and facilitate adapting to climate change. Increasing the region’s renewable energy capacity is cited as one way of achieving this. Policies EM15 and EM17 promote sustainable energy production generally and set targets for the proportion of the region’s electricity that should be provided from renewable energy sources by 2010, 2015 and 2020 (respectively) in order to achieve these broad objectives. Policy EM17 states that “plans and strategies should seek to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the use of renewable energy resources” and indicates that LPA’s should give “significant weight to the wider environmental, community and economic benefits of proposals for renewable energy schemes”. Policy RDF4 seeks to protect the Green Belt within Warrington until 2021. It should be noted, however, that there is still an intention from Government to revoke the RRS and so full weight cannot be attributed to these policies.

The key UDP policies are GRN1, REP10, REP16 and REP17. Policy GRN1 seeks to protect the Green Belt and reflects the guidance in
### Assessment of Proposals

**PPG2.** Policy REP10 seeks to protect the Borough’s residents, wildlife and countryside from significant increases in ambient noise levels, whilst Policies REP16 and REP17 indicate that planning permission for renewable energy generally and wind turbines specifically will be allowed provided that certain criteria are met. These criteria include general development control issues, such as preserving the character and appearance of the area, safeguarding nature conservation interests, maintaining highway safety and protecting residential amenity, which are common to Policies DCS1, GRN2 and GRN3 as well. Other policies that need to be considered include Policies REP1 and REP2, which seek to promote sustainable development, the conservation of resources, the use of renewable energy and the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

The applicant has submitted a combined Supporting Statement and Design & Access Statement that provides; an assessment of the relevant policy considerations (including the Green Belt issue), technical information about the turbines, access arrangements, conservation and biodiversity issues, a noise assessment and an assessment of the visual impact of the turbines. Whilst the statement is more comprehensive than that submitted with the previous application it still contains a few inaccuracies. Page 6 of the statement refers to the Climate Change Act of 2008 committing the UK to reducing CO₂ emissions by 80% in relation to 1990 levels by 2020. This is incorrect the act commits the UK to reducing CO₂ levels by 80% by 2050. Page 9 of the statement refers to regional guidance having been revoked. Again this is not correct, as a legal challenge (Cala Homes South Ltd v SSCLG) was successful and thus the RSS currently still forms part of the development, albeit that its weight could be considered to be limited due to the Secretary of States declared intention to abolish it.

The application site is located in the Green Belt and therefore it is necessary in the first instance to consider if the proposal is inappropriate development or not. The applicant suggests that the proposal will maintain the openness of the Green Belt and due to the nature and scale of the development it will not conflict with the purposes of including the land within this designation and is therefore appropriate development in the Green Belt. I do not agree with this argument put forward by the applicant. The development clearly constitutes an engineering operation. An 18 metre (25 metres to top of blade) high structure will be a prominent feature in the landscape and will impact on the openness of the countryside. Consequently, the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development. This is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and thus the principal issue is whether or not there are any very special circumstances that outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the harm to the openness and any other harm.

In this regard, national and local policies all seek to encourage the use of renewable sources of energy and both PPS1 and PPS22 indicate that small scale schemes can make a valuable contribution to the overall energy needs at a local and national level. In addition, paragraph 1(iv) of PPS22 indicates that one of the key principles to consider with all renewable energy projects, whatever their scale is the wider environmental and economic benefits and that these are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be granted planning permission. In addition, there are the issues of diversification and
Conclusions

Consequently, there is a need to consider these arguments in addition to all the other issues in order to assess if the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm by virtue of inappropriate development, the harm to the openness of the Green Belt and any other harm so as to justify the proposed scheme on the basis of very special circumstances. If it can be concluded that the visual impact of the turbines on the openness of the Green Belt is limited and that any other relevant criteria specified in Polices REP1, REP2, DCS1, GRN2, GRN3, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the UDP are satisfied then it is considered that the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of renewable energy, albeit on a small scale, should be regarded as a very special circumstance sufficient to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any harm to the openness of the Green Belt. To help with this assessment you should consider the appeal decision at South Staffordshire College, Rodbaston, Staffordshire (APP/C3430/A/10/2132289) referred to in application 2011/17711 and also that for the application in 2009 at Oakleigh Lodge Farm, Barleycastle Lane, Appleton, Warrington (APP/M0655/A/10/2123665).

Overall it is considered that the scheme amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt but that there is a strong presumption in favour of encouraging the production of energy from renewable sources and that this amounts to a very special circumstance to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any harm to the openness of the Green Belt provided that the other relevant criteria specified in Polices REP1, REP2, DCS1, GRN2, GRN3, REP10, REP16 and REP17 of the UDP can be satisfied.

It the application is to be approved you should consider whether a condition can be applied to cover restoration of the site should operations cease (Companion Guide to PPS22 – Planning for Renewable Energy, Paragraph 5.11). I would also draw your attention to the conditions imposed by the Inspector in the South Staffordshire College appeal case referred to above.

Appendix 2 – Comments from WBC Environmental Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>No objection subject to the following conditions and/or informatives being applied should consent be given.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The main concern from Environmental Protection on wind turbines is the potential impact of noise on the amenity of nearby residential properties. Generally, as the windspeed increases, the level of noise created by the passage of wind past the turbine and blades increases. This is usually offset to a degree by the increased ambient noise due to the wind noise itself and interestingly the differential is least just above kick in point (where the turbine has just started operating – usually at about 3.5m/s). In this particular location, ambient noise levels are influenced due to the reasonably close proximity of the nearby M56 motorway and also the A49 and A559 feeder roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is limited guidance and advice available on wind turbines. The commonly referred to reference document is ETSU – The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms. This was published in 1996 and was the result of a working group reviewing available information at that time. This document however is more specifically related to a wind farm as opposed to a single wind turbine, which is what the proposal in this case is for. As a result, some of the information provided by ETSU is not necessarily pertinent to the assessments required for a single turbine which is under consideration here.

Some of the suggested conditions in the ETSU document have noise limits set at a level that Environmental Protection would consider likely to have an impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties – as such, any noise limits required through the granting of planning permission for this case may have to be reduced from ETSU guideline levels to guarantee minimal impact on amenity through noise. This guidance does however specify a single value noise limit which may be appropriate for use for Single Turbines or for cases where a significant separation distance exists between the proposed turbines and noise sensitive properties.

A recent case in the high court ruled that following advice and guidance under the ETSU guidelines did not automatically guarantee that impacts on residential amenity would not occur through the effects of noise – this again supports the notion that a locally set appropriate noise level may be preferable to generic noise limits set by ETSU.

The original application was not provided with a background noise survey which was commented upon at the time, the revised application initially did not have a survey submitted either. A specific background noise survey dated 17 June 2011 was submitted late in the application process. This survey has now been reviewed and comparisons have been made against the predicted noise levels from the operation of the turbine and the ambient background noise in the area. The submitted noise survey has identified a range of the ambient background noise levels on any given day based upon a 9 day monitoring period with readings averaged over a 10 minute period, these readings have also been correlated to the ambient windspeed. Calculations have then been made for increased windspeeds following British Wind Energy Association guidelines.

The noise contribution from the turbine has then been assessed at the nearest residential properties – at both the boundary to the property (190m distant) and then the property itself (250m distant).

The report concludes that in the worst case scenario, noise from the turbine should be at least 11dB below the existing ambient background noise levels during the daytime and at least 5dB below the existing ambient background at night time. At higher windspeeds, the wind noise increases in level slightly faster than turbine noise does. Background noise levels have been indicated as 38.5dB daytime and 32.5dB night-time. The turbine noise level operating at 3.5m/s is 27.1dB.

The report also identifies that there are no tonal noise characteristics to the operation of the turbine which should further reduce any impacts on amenity.
This difference is an indicator that nuisance or impact on amenity from noise is unlikely to occur at the nearest residential property.

Based upon this information, I do not feel that it would be unreasonable to recommend approval of this application with conditions to limit the maximum noise emitted from the proposed wind turbine.

Noise from Wind Turbine Operation
Noise emitted from the wind turbine shall not exceed the levels indicated in the attached table at any time (day or night) as measured or calculated at the boundary of the nearest residential property.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing, remedial action to correct any noise emitting faults shall be taken as soon as practicable, any faults which will result in an increase in noise over the permitted noise level at the boundary of any nearby residential property shall result in the turbine being shut down until such time that repairs are completed unless the repairs can be completed within 48hrs. (The nearest residential property refers to any property either permitted for build or built as of the date permission is granted.) (The measurement position shall refer to a measurement point 1.5m above ground level and at least 3.5m from any other reflecting surface at the boundary of any nearby residential property.)

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby noise sensitive dwellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind Speed (ms^{-1})</th>
<th>Maximum Turbine Noise Level at Nearest Sensitive Receptor Boundary (dB, L_{Aeq,t})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance of Wind Turbine
The turbine shall be maintained and serviced in accordance with manufacturers specifications for the duration of its operational life.

Any faults or breakdowns with any aspect of the turbine including gearbox and driveshafts, nacelle assembly or turbine blades which may give rise to increased noise levels shall be reported to the Local Authority within 48hrs of discovery.

Faults include any exceedences of the agreed noise level at the boundary of nearby residential properties.

Remedial action to correct any noise emitting faults shall be taken as soon as practicable, any faults which will result in an increase in noise over the permitted noise level at the boundary of any
nearby residential property shall result in the turbine being shut down until such time that repairs are completed unless the repairs can be completed within 48hrs.

Receipt of Complaints - Noise
Following the receipt of any ‘justified noise complaint’ notified from either the Local Planning Authority or Environmental Health Official, the Applicant shall take all necessary steps shall to investigate the source of the noise complained of and take steps, as needed, to correct any fault found in accordance with the requirements of the Maintenance of Wind Turbine condition. Any Noise Complaint reported by the Local Planning Authority or an Environmental Health Official shall be investigated, monitored and reported back, in writing, within 14 days of the complaint being passed on.

Receipt of Complaints – Shadow Flicker
Following the receipt of any ‘justified complaint of Shadow Flicker’ notified from either the Local Planning Authority or Environmental Health Official, the Applicant shall take all necessary steps shall to investigate the validity of any such complaint and to identify mitigation measures to limit the impact of any identified flicker. The installation of a Shadow Flicker Delimiting Device may be necessary if any justified complaint deems it necessary. Any report of Shadow Flicker reported by the Local Planning Authority or an Environmental Health Official shall be investigated and reported back with recommendations, in writing, within 21 days of the complaint being passed on. Any necessary mitigation measures shall be implemented within a further 14 days of the report being issued.

Works audible at the boundary of the nearest residential property will not exceed the following times unless with the written permission of the LPA or Environmental Health & Protection. Monday to Friday 08.00 to 18.00 hrs, Saturday 08.30 to 13.30 and at no time whatsoever on Sundays or Public/Bank Holidays. This includes deliveries to the site and any work undertaken by contractors and sub contractors.

Works audible at the site boundary outside these hours may result in the service of a Notice restricting the hours as above. Breach of the notice may result in prosecution and fines of up to £5000 plus £50 for each further breach and/or six months imprisonment.

Informative

Contractors and sub contractors must have regard to BS 5228 and the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

Where permission is sought for works to be carried out outside the hours stated, applications in writing must be made with at least seven days notice to Environmental Health & Protection, Warrington Borough Council, New Town House, Buttermarket Street, Warrington, WA1 2HN. Local residents that may be affected by the work shall also be notified in writing, after approval is received from the LPA or Environmental Health & Protection.
Application Number: 2011/18130

Location: Land to the rear of, Tesco Extra, Manchester Road, Warrington, WA1 3NJ

Ward: Fairfield and Howley

Development: Proposed application for Four, one bedroom apartments. Four, one bedroomed duplex apartments. Four, two bedroom duplex apartments with associated parking & cycle store.

Applicant: Square One Lifestyle Homes

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to Conditions

Conditions:
- Development to commence within 3 years
- In accordance with plans
- Minimisation of energy demand / carbon emissions
- Details of pedestrian walkway to be provided & implemented
- Road markings on the access road to be provided & implemented
- Keep Clear markings on Manchester Rd to be in place
- Lighting scheme to be agreed & implemented
- Cycle storage provided & retained
- Levels to be agreed
- Landscaping to be submitted and implemented
- Wildlife Protection Plan to be agreed & implemented
- Details of Japanese Knotweed removal to be agreed & implemented
- Protective fencing and warning signs to be introduced to site & retained during construction
- Features suitable for use by breeding birds and bats to be agreed and implemented
- Land quality investigation & remediation to be undertaken

Description
- Proposed dwellings arranged in two blocks with 6 homes in each.
- There are 4 single storey one bedroom homes, 4 two storey single bedroom homes and 4 two storey two bedroom homes.
- The three storey sides to each block face each other and are linked by an open communal stair and landing. The blocks reduce to two storeys adjacent to the Social Club and to Padgate Brook.
• Access is via the shared private access road to a parking area situated at the front of the building.
• Car parking is provided at one per dwelling and provision is also made for secure cycle storage. There is also a compound for storage of wheelie bins.
• Footpaths provide access to communal areas and independent front doors.
• The applicant, Square One Lifestyle Homes Ltd has it is stated been established to provide a new innovative affordable living experience for First Time Buyers and Key Workers.

Location
• The site was formerly the car park for the Public House ‘The Highwayman’.
• The Public House has subsequently closed and been converted into a convenience store (Tesco Express).
• The site of the new dwellings is currently fenced off and unused.
• The character of the immediate vicinity is mixed use, and the wider area predominantly accommodates private housing.
• Padgate Brook runs alongside the southern boundary.
• The former garden to the converted public house has now been developed as the car park and service area to the convenience store.
• To the north of the site is Alford Sports and Social Club. The bowling green of the Club runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

Planning History
• Several applications relating to the alterations at the former public house and its change of use to a convenience store, none of relevance to the current planning application.

Material Considerations
• Housing Land Supply
• Design
• Highways
• Residential Amenity
• Environmental Impact
Ecological Interests
Flood Defence

Policy Context
- PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPS3 Housing
- PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994
- PPG13 Transport
- PPG24 Planning and Noise
- PPS25 Planning and Flood Risk
- Policy HOU1 Housing Land
- Policy HOU2 Housing Development – Restrictions
- Policy HOU3 Housing Development – Development Control
- Policy HOU13 Privacy and Daylight
- Policy HOU15 Provision of Affordable Housing
- Policy DCS1 Development Control Strategy
- Policy DCS3 Engineering Services
- Policy DCS2 Planning Obligations
- Policy DCS7 Provision and Enhancement of Landscaping in New Development
- Policy LUT1 Transport Strategy
- Policy LUT5 Cycling
- Policy LUT20 Parking
- Policy REP4 Flood Defence
- Policy REP8 Land Contamination
- Policy REP10 Noise
- Policy GRN2 Environmental Protection and Enhancement
- Policy GRN13 Riverside and canal side development
- Policy GRN18 Key Biodiversity Habitats and Priority Species
- Policy GRN19 Protected Species
- Policy GRN21 Protection of the Nature Conservation Resource
- Policy GRN18 Key Biodiversity Habitats and Priority Species
- Policy GRN21 Protection of the Nature Conservation Resource

Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU1</td>
<td>Housing Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU2</td>
<td>Housing Development Restrictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal offers a number of opportunities for first time buyers - the units and the likely sale prices owing to unit sizes constitute intermediate / low cost products.

Based on the proposed dwelling mix it is therefore envisaged that a minimum of 50% of the units (and arguably 100%) will be affordable.

The scheme is considered acceptable as an exception to development plan policies HOU1, HOU2 and the Managing the Housing Supply SPD.

The units will be controlled as affordable by size.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS3</th>
<th>Housing Development Control Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU3</td>
<td>Housing - Development Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS1</td>
<td>Development Control Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is evidence that the proposal reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community in terms of the size and affordability of dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Context of built form traditional semi detached properties of standard proportions - hipped roofs, chimneys, and recessed doorways. Along Manchester Road more variety of built form, but properties immediately on the opposite side of Manchester Road still predominantly consistent with this traditional character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chalet style of proposed development inconsistent with this context, being of a completely different form and appearance. It would nevertheless provide an adequate degree of variety and interest and would enhance the character and appearance of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal aesthetic elements within the existing built form that necessitate replication, and backland nature of site without direct street frontage provides greater flexibility to establish a new and distinctive form of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The front elevation of the building directly overlooks the car park area and would enhance surveillance to the rear of the convenience store. It is also the intention to introduce lighting along the access road to improve safe access to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The only landscape or topological feature of interest is the adjacent brook, however a direct interface with this is restricted by the proximity of the adjacent houses at Bennett Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPG13</th>
<th>Transport Development Control Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU3</td>
<td>Housing Development Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS1</td>
<td>Development Control Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Twelve parking spaces proposed - equates to one space for every apartment – in accordance with standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision for 6 cycle parking spaces – acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian access arrangements have been amended to ensure acceptability, e.g. 1.5m wide block paving pedestrian priority route to be created to Manchester Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Queuing vehicles at the Manchester Road westbound carriageway can extend across the vehicular access to the site – condition recommended ensuring introduction of Keep Clear Markings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No street lighting along access road – condition recommended ensuring installation of lighting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS3</th>
<th>Housing Development Control Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU3</td>
<td>Housing - Development Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU13</td>
<td>Privacy and Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS1</td>
<td>Development Control Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not considered that there would be parking overspill on nearby roads that would harm the living conditions of existing residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Noise or activity generated by the proposal would not be out of character to what would be expected in a residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearest residential properties situated on the opposite side of Padgate Brook to the south of the site (no.s 26 and 28 Bennett Avenue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two storey element of building approximately 24m away from main rear elevations of these properties - 3m in excess of minimum 21m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Three storey element a further 5.5m away (29.5m in total).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Second floor roof windows within the south facing elevation - internal floor such that these windows would not afford direct views from the building.
- Application amended with previously proposed Juliet balconies within south facing elevation being substituted for windows. Internal layout also revised to have a more dominant outlook to the car park rather than the brook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPG24</th>
<th>Planning and Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REP8</td>
<td>Land Contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP11</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS9</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN18</td>
<td>Key Biodiversity Habitats and Priority Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected Species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Acoustic Assessment addresses potential noise climate - concludes that noise from the club would not be a problem - deliveries to the convenience store would create marginally increased noise levels, but not at a perceivable level to future residents.
- Condition is recommended to ensure appropriate land investigation and remediation as necessary.
- Submitted Ecological Assessment Report (Indigo surveys Ltd, March 2011) carried out at a sub-optimal time of year for some species but to nationally recognised standards by suitably qualified persons.
- Padgate Brook known to support a key water vole population - survey carried out as part of the Ecological Assessment - no evidence of this protected species found. As known population close by however a watching brief is recommended.
- Japanese Knotweed present - removal and long-term management/eradication necessary.
- Potential for breeding birds - informative recommended.
The site is within Flood Zone 1.

The new development would have a separate drainage system as well as landscaped areas – surface water runoff rates and volumes would be less than existing.

Consultation Responses

Environment Agency:
No comments received

Environmental Health:
No objections. Comment: Condition suggested addressing land quality investigation.

Highways:
No objections. Comment: Conditions recommended ensuring adequate access arrangements.

Nature Conservation Officer:
No objections. Comment: Need to have regard to presence of water voles and other biodiversity objectives.

Planning Policy:
No objections. Comment: Proposal is an innovative scheme and is acceptable as an exception to restrictive housing land supply policy.

Ward Councillor & Parish Council Comment:
Comments received from Councillor Kevin Bennett, requesting that the application be put to the Development Control Committee and requesting a site visit prior to the meeting.

Comment: Application presented to Committee.

Neighbour/Third Party Comments:
Letter of objections received from 5 neighbouring properties and a petition of 31 signatures:
- Building would overlook house / rear garden of 4 Bennett Avenue. Development is a three storey apartment block that will be immediately overlooking the rear of 26 & 28 Bennett Avenue.
- On the plans it is made to look like there is a great distance between Bennett Avenue and the development but this is untrue. The brook is a small narrow waterway and with few trees to shield from the development. As stated in the plans trees will be cut down to give a good view of the brook for the development but will also include a good view into home and garden of adjacent properties.
- No consultation with neighbours.
• How is it that Councillor Barr without understanding the impact this development will have can confirm his support for this development?

• The convenience store is only one storey which does not impede light or privacy. This development will be three storeys high and Bennett Avenue will be directly overlooked. The balconies severely impede privacy looking directly down into garden of 28 Bennett Avenue also into conservatory, kitchen and daughters bedroom.

• The noise from traffic in and out at all hours will have an impact. At least now the convenience store and the club shut around 11pm, with this development it could be round the clock because these apartments are aimed at first time buyers not families, which would mean young couples. This could result in the balcony doors open in summer, parties and music all hours. It is stated that noise pollution surveys have been taken out to ensure that the owners of the proposed development will not be affected by noise from the club or the convenience store but what about the effects noise pollution will have existing residents. Already disturbed by late night functions at the club and with the added noise from the development, it will have a further detrimental effect on living conditions.

• It also states that the current nature of the site poses a threat to both adjacent businesses. No vandals or other undesirable witness in this as it is fenced off and is difficult for anyone to access.

• Economically this development will not, as stated in the report offer much economic benefit apart from a few extra customers in the convenience store or the club but will greatly affect the value of houses being looked over by a high rise development with balconies so people can sit above previously private gardens and look down.

• Square one lifestyle homes state “our passion is about helping put smiles on people’s faces by helping them achieve the dream of buying and owning their own home”. What about existing residents.

• During the building of this development the increase in noise, traffic and dust will ruin summer. Would be unable to relax in our garden and will be disturbed in a morning by construction which would inevitably spill out into Saturdays and possibly Sundays.

• Proposal could open up opportunity for access to the brook and to the rear of property affecting the security of home.

• Loss of house value.

• Inadequate parking provision. Overspill onto nearby roads.

• Additional traffic. Already problems.

• Loss of light to the houses on Bennett Avenue.

Comment: See policy appraisal

**Conclusions and Reasons For Recommendation**

- Proposal is for an innovative arguably 100% affordable scheme not dependent on any public grant or subsidy.
- Design and appearance of the buildings, and the parking, vehicle and pedestrian access arrangements are all acceptable.
- The proposal would not have an unreasonable impact upon the living conditions of the nearby residential properties. Previously proposed Juliet
balconies omitted and substituted for windows - interface with the adjacent properties at Bennett Avenue but at 24m separation this relationship is not considered significantly harmful.

- Suitable safeguards can be implemented in order to respond to the ecological sensitivity of the site.
- Having regard to the amenity of future occupants, the convenience store and adjacent sports and social club would not cause an excessive amount of disturbance.
- The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the relevant provisions of the development plan.
## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Thursday 14th July 2011**

Start 6.30pm

### DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>App number</th>
<th>App Location/Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | 2    | 2011/17711 | Land adjacent to the M62, Causeway Bridges Farm, Alder Lane, Burtonwood, Warrington, WA5 4BN  
Proposed installation and operation of one 50m high wind turbine (77m total height with blades) and associated infrastructure (including switchgear house, access track, temporary construction compound and hardstanding). | Approve |
| 2    |      | 2011/18004 | Lowes Farm, Kenyon Lane, Warrington, WA3 4AY  
Proposed 20.35m high 10kW wind turbine - hub height 15m, blade height 4.8m (resubmission of application 2010/16810). | Refuse |
| 3    |      | 2011/18014 | Walnut Tree Farm, Northwich Road, Warrington, WA4 4PG  
Proposed installation of one 25m high wind turbine to the west of Walnut Tree Farm to generate and supply Walnut Tree Farm with renewable energy. | Approve |
| 4    |      | 2011/18130 | Land to the rear of, Tesco Extra, Manchester | Approve |
Road, Warrington, WA1 3NJ
Proposed application for Four, one bedroom apartments. Four, one bedroomed duplex apartments. Four, two bedroom duplex apartments with associated parking & cycle store.
APPROVE WITH ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS (DAYS/HOURS OF CONSTRUCTION; REVISED FRA; AMENDED PLANS; DETAILS OF BOUNDARY TREATMENT)