



House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

Private Secretary
Tel 01379 643728 or 642769
Fax 01379 642220

Ms Helen Mellors
Planning Services
South Norfolk Council
Long Stratton
NORWICH NR15 2XE

18 June 2010

Dear Ms Mellors

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE: 2010/0861
WIND TURBINE SITE, TIVETSHALL ST MARY

I am writing in order to register my strong objections to the above planning application for three wind turbines to be sited in the vicinity of New Road and Patten Lane, Tivetshall St Mary.

As the local Member of Parliament for the affected area, I have received representations from many local residents who are very worried about these proposals. I am also concerned that these proposals would be in breach of South Norfolk Council's planning policies ENV1 (Protection of Landscape), ENV8 (Development in the Open Countryside) and UTL13 (Renewable energy). I also believe there to be substantial, unanswered concerns over aviation safety and cumulative impact.

Planning policy ENV1 states that: "Development will not be permitted where it would significantly harm the identified assets important to the character of the landscape". Local residents have identified some 120 Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings within a 2km radius of the proposed turbines. For example, the ruin of St Mary's Church, a Grade II* 11th Century Church mentioned in the Domesday Book of 1086, is an ancient and sensitive structure and is located some 800m north of Turbine 1. It will be most vulnerable to vibrations during construction operations and there is a risk that an already fragile building could suffer further irreparable harm. It is also my view that three 140m-high turbines would have an inappropriate impact on the setting of these properties.

I believe that the proposal also breaches planning policy ENV8, which states that permission for development will only be granted if the proposals:

- *"Respect the intrinsic beauty, the diversity of landscape, the wealth of natural resources, and the ecological, agricultural and recreational value of the countryside; and*
- *Be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design".*

I simply do not believe that it is possible for wind turbines that are 140 metres or 459 feet in height to be sensitively integrated into rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design. Furthermore, planning policy UTL13 (Renewable energy) states that planning permission will be granted for renewable energy projects, provided that the benefits of exploiting the renewable resource in the national interest are not outweighed by demonstrable harm to the locality in terms of:

- **Visual intrusion** – The visual intrusion caused by the proposed development would be severe. The proposed structures are 140 metres (459 feet) in height, with turbine blades measuring 112 metres (367.5 feet) in diameter. These turbines would present a clear and unwelcome intrusion into the South Norfolk landscape and the shadows cast by the turbine's blades would, by the developer's own admission, introduce artificial movement into the landscape and draw further attention to the turbines.



- **Pollution from noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, ash, or the treatment and disposal of waste** – In a well-documented case, a Lincolnshire family were driven from their home due to the noise created by wind turbines 900 metres from their house.
- **The safe and free flow of traffic** – You will be aware that Norfolk Gliding Club has registered its objection to this development on safety and noise grounds.

In Volume One of its environmental statement, the applicant states that:

“Due to the proposed turbine height, there will be no lighting on the turbine structures...The “Lighting of En-Route Obstacles and Onshore Wind Turbines” Policy states that structures over 150m must be fitted with aviation warning lights. This will not be necessary for the site at Tivetshall”.

However, as the CAA’s Director of Airspace Policy, Mr Mark Smailes points out in his email to you of 7 June 2010: “the [environmental] statement does not tell the whole story”. Mr Smailes goes on to note that, whilst legislation demands that structures of 150m or more in height have aviation safety lighting fitted, aviation interests and groups may recommend that lighting be fitted to smaller structures. Indeed, in its letter of 9 June 2010 the MoD has requested that, in the interests of safety, that the turbines be fitted with aviation lighting. The MoD have explicitly stated that they require the turbines to be lit and the CAA have further made it clear that they would support any such call from the MoD. Additionally, it is not known whether the applicant has, at Mr Smailes’s suggestion, consulted Norwich International Airport over these proposals and Mr Smailes concludes: “the current position is not clear”.

With regard to the proliferation of applications for wind turbine developments in this area and the cumulative impact this will have, particularly upon aviation, Mr Swailes of the CAA states in his email of 7 June 2010: “It is possible that the proliferation of wind turbines in any particular area might potentially result in difficulties for aviation that a single development would not have generated”. Although not in legislation, government recommendations are that separate wind farms be at least 5 kilometres apart. The proposed wind farm will be less than 2 kilometres from the proposed wind farm at Pulham St Mary (2010/0383) and I believe that, as the developments at Tivetshall St Mary and Pulham St Mary are being made by different applicants – Enertrag UK Ltd and TCI Renewables Ltd respectively – the cumulative impact of the proximity of the two developments has not been assessed properly by the applicant. It should be noted that the applicant wrote to Breckland District Council on 30 October 2009 objecting to the proposal of Bernard Matthews Ltd to install two wind turbines close to the applicant’s development at North Pickenham on these exact grounds.

It should also be noted that, in its study of cumulative effects, the applicant does not appear to have included its revised plans for a four-turbine wind farm at Hempnall. On 3 March 2010, I received a letter from the applicant, stating an intention to resubmit a planning application in the area of the applicant’s previous proposal (2008/0917), which was dismissed on appeal by the Planning Inspector in December 2009. I believe that the applicant should have included its revised plans for Hempnall in its environmental statement given that its clear and stated intention, as of March 2010, is to resubmit its application.

I hope that the above points will be considered by the planning committee when it meets to consider the above proposal.

Yours sincerely,
Liam Jones